

The verb διώκω with an inanimate object is well established in Classical Greek, though a case with an infinitive like here appears to be rare. LSJ records only one instance from Dionysius Halicarnassensis (first century BCE),¹³ where the form is of the middle voice: διώκεσθαι τὸ πλεόν ἔχειν. The use of an infinitive clause as a direct object is very common, e.g. a case of ζητέω, a synonymous verb in ἐζήτει αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι ‘he sought to kill him’ Ex 4.24.¹⁴

ὥς ὄρθρον ἔτοιμον εὐρήσομεν αὐτόν] In my *Lexicon* of (2002) s.v. ἔτοιμος I translated this clause: ‘we shall find him as ready as morning,’ identifying the adjective as a predicative object of the verb εὐρίσκω. I would like to revise this analysis, for otherwise the verb would be having two separate predicative complements.¹⁵

Joosten’s translation reads: “comme une aurore certaine nous le trouvons.”¹⁶ For this translation he draws upon an analysis by Harl of Greek ἔτοιμ-lexemes.¹⁷ If the French phrase is supposed to mean ‘a dawn whose emergence is in no doubt,’ Harl does not seem to be arguing for such a sense of the adjective.

וְיֵצֵא] of the MT must mean ‘his exit, coming forth,’ probably meaning that the Lord will come out to meet the people, who have decided to approach Him repentantly. The act of coming out is continued with another verb of physical movement, יֵצֵא, a parallelism that has been lost in the LXX. Whatever the *Vorlage* of the LXX may have looked like, its translation reflects either וְיֵצֵא (indicative) or וְיֵצֵא (jussive).

The encounter between the people and their God is characterised by means of two similes with ὥς. In neither simile, however, is the tertium comparationis mentioned. Wolff, with his German translation – “fest steht .. so sicher” – identifies the feature of certainty of the course of nature. Another possibility is that the two natural phenomena mentioned here are perceived by the people as a welcome change long yearned after, a sign of hope for the bright, productive future.

The use of ἦκω here as a rendering of יָבֹא is interesting. This Greek verb and one of its principal synonyms, ἔρχομαι, show a complementary distribution: the former is limited to two tenses, pf. and fut., of which the pf. functions as a present in the sense of ‘to be present, having arrived,’ whereas ἔρχομαι is used in a full range of tenses. Its perfect, ἐλήλυθα, is used as a fully-fledged fientive, action verb, even approaching its aorist, ἦλθον, testifying to the blurring of borders between the aorist and perfect, as is typical of Hellenistic Greek. What is striking against this background is the choice of ἦξει instead

¹³ LSJ s.v. I 2.

¹⁴ For a discussion with examples, see *SSG* 30 **bef**.

¹⁵ Syrohexapla supports our new analysis: וְיֵצֵא מִטִּבְיָא.

¹⁶ Joosten 103.

¹⁷ Joosten 105; Harl 1992.154f.

of ἐλεύσεται. The database *Accordance* tells us that the verb ἦκω occurs in the LXX some 253 times. Their distribution is striking: it occurs in the Twelve Prophets 23 times, in the Pentateuch a mere 22 times, and in the former the future occurs 17 times, in the latter a mere 8 times. It is hard to decide whether this statistical skewing is indicative of a gradual, historical shift in the Greek morphology or is determined by some subtle distinction in meaning of the two future tense forms. However that may be, the MT יָבוֹא, and not בָּא, indicates that it continues the two preceding volitive forms, and may be interpreted accordingly as indicative of a wish on the part of the people: ‘May He come!’

πρόϊμος και ὄψιμος τῆ γῆ אָרְץ יוֹרָה אָרְץ יוֹרָה [כְּמִלְקוֹשׁ יוֹרָה אָרְץ] The absence in the LXX of the particle of comparison is associated with another divergence between the two text-forms. The Hebrew text speaks of only one season of rain, latter rain of spring. When this Hebrew noun is paired with a noun referring to former rain of winter, whether יוֹרָה (De 11.14; Je 5.24) or מוֹרָה (Jl 2.23), מִלְקוֹשׁ always is found in the second slot. The translator was apparently aware of this fact, and the sequence <early - late; winter - spring> may have sounded to him also logical. See Jl 2.23 ὑετὸν πρόϊμον και ὄψιμον as a rendering of MT מוֹרָה ומִלְקוֹשׁ. Our translator’s consistency in this respect made him supply a term which he thought missing in his Hebrew text: Zc 10.1 בָּעֵת מִלְקוֹשׁ translated as καθ’ ὥραν πρόϊμον και ὄψιμον. The Massoretic vocalisation of the second preposition Kaph with a shva indicates that the Massorettes correctly understood אָרְץ יוֹרָה as an asyndetic relative clause¹⁸ and the first word as a genuine verb, a Hifil imperfect as is undoubtedly the case at Ho 10.12 כִּבְּוֹא יוֹרָה צְדָק לָכֶם, though not so understood by the LXX translator despite the collocation or parallelism with the בָּוֹא in our Hosea passage: τοῦ ἐλθεῖν γενήματα δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν ‘(until) the produce of righteousness comes to you.’

6.4) τί σοι ποιήσω, Ephraim; τί σοι ποιήσω, Iouda; τὸ δὲ ἔλεος ὑμῶν ὡς νεφέλη πρωινή και ὡς δρόσος ὀρθρινή πορευομένη.

What shall I do to you, Ephraim? What shall I do to you, Juda? Your mercy is like an early-morning cloud and like evanescent dew descending at dawn.

מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה-לָּךְ אֶפְרַיִם מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה-לָּךְ יְהוּדָה וְחִסְדְּכֶם כַּעֲנַן-בֹּקֶר וְכֹטֵל מַשְׁכִּים הַלֶּךְ:

The simile in the second half of the verse recurs at 13.1, expanded further. It refers to something of extremely ephemeral, transient nature. The Massoretic accentuation with a disjunctive accent on וְכֹטֵל and not כֹּטֵל indicates that the Massorettes do not understand the following two participles as attributes

¹⁸ See JM § 137 g (p. 477).

of the preceding substantive. Strictly speaking, the grammatical subject of the two participles is not טל but חֲסֵדְךָ, though by the nature of similes it comes down to the same thing. Nor is the first participle adverbially and asyndetically used: ‘to go early, to leave early.’¹⁹ We have two fully fledged verbs asyndetically juxtaposed: dew descends early in the morning but vanishes soon unlike snow that could stay on the ground days on end. Cf. Ho 13.3.

6.5) Διὰ τοῦτο ἀπεθέρισα τοὺς προφήτας ὑμῶν, ἀπέκτεινα αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥήμασιν στόματός μου, καὶ τὸ κρίμα μου ὡς φῶς ἐξελεύσεται.

On this account I mowed down your prophets, killed them with words of My mouth, and My judgement as light will be implemented.

עַל־כֵּן הִצַּבְתִּי בְּנִבְיָאִים הֲרַגְתִּים בְּאִמְרֵי־פִי וּמִשְׁפָּטַי אִוֵּר יֵצֵא:

ἀπεθέρισα [הִצַּבְתִּי] The Greek verb ἀποθερίζω is a hapax in the LXX. Both the Greek and the Hebrew verb have to do with cutting off part of some object by force. The action indicated by הִצַּב is directed at stones and rocks. Both are capable of undergoing a further semantic development in the direction of some destructive action as indicated by the parallel verb in the following clause. Another case of the Hebrew verb in which there is no hewing in the strict sense involved is Ps 29 (LXX 28).7 קוֹל־יְהוָה הִצַּב לְהַבּוֹת אֵשׁ φωνὴ κυρίου διακόπτοντος φλόγα πυρός ‘the voice of the Lord who thrashes through the flame of fire.’ As a result of the Lord’s action the flame loses its efficacy.

According to Nyberg the LXX had קִצַּבְתִּי, though he thinks such is implausible as part of the Hebrew text here.²⁰ Indeed, this Hebrew verb is rendered in the LXX with ἀποκλάω ‘to chop a small part of’ once at 4K 6.6 in its Antiochene version, ἀποκνίζω ‘to nip off’ once *ibid.* in the majority of the witnesses, and κείρω once at Ct 4.2 ὡς ἀγέλαι τῶν κεκαρμένων ‘as flocks of shorn (ewes).’ Since הִצַּב Qal usually does not carry any destructive connotation²¹, whilst ἀποθερίζω *can* be so used,²² Nyberg’s suggestion is attractive.²³

τοὺς προφήτας [בְּנִבְיָאִים] If the MT be genuine, the preposition *beth* can be understood in the sense that the divine action took place among the prophets. Jenni identifies here *beth* instrumenti.²⁴ Although such a *beth* is firmly established, the locative interpretation seems to be much simpler here. One

¹⁹ Cf. JM § 102 *g*.

²⁰ Nyberg 1935.40.

²¹ The only sure case with such a connotation is Is 51.9 הִמְהַצַּבְתָּ רֶהֱבָה, which the LXX fails to render, jumping to the following verse.

²² LSJ s.v. mention a text from the fifth or sixth century CE with μνηστῆρας ‘suitsors, wooers’ as a direct object.

²³ Kaminka (1928.39) mentions a reference by Nöldeke to Aramaic הַצַּד ‘to harvest,’ but we are sceptical that it can carry a destructive connotation required here.

²⁴ Jenni 1992.120 (§ 1712).

οὐκ ἔχων γνῶσιν where γνῶσις is contrasted with ἐπίγνωσις in the following clause, and most likely denotes ‘body of knowledge’ since it is something possessed or not possessed (ἔχων).²⁷

ἦ] a particle of comparison, which is sometimes used loosely without any adjective or adverb of the comparative degree. Compare Jn 4.3 καλὸν τὸ ἀποθανεῖν με ἢ ζῆν με ‘it is better for me to die rather than to live’ with Ex 14.12 κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἡμᾶς δουλεύειν τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις ἢ ἀποθανεῖν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ταύτῃ ‘it is better for us to serve the Egyptians than to die in this wilderness.’ There are also some lexemes to which the feature of gradation is inherent: e.g., Nu 22.6 ἰσχυεῖ οὗτος ἢ ἡμεῖς ‘this one is stronger than we.’ θέλω in our passage can be counted among such a group of lexemes.²⁸

6.7) αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰσιν ὡς ἄνθρωπος παραβαίνων διαθήκην· ἐκεῖ κατεφρόνησέν μου.

It is they, if anybody, that are like someone transgressing a covenant; there they have despised Me.

וְהֵמָּה כְּאָדָם עֲבָרוּ בְרִית שָׁם בְּגֵדוֹ בִּי

αὐτοὶ] on which there is manifestly an element of emphasis, hence our translation using a cleft sentence. The LXX has captured the same feature in the Hebrew original here.²⁹ The sequence with the pronoun in the first slot is marked.³⁰

וְהֵמָּה כְּאָדָם עֲבָרוּ בְרִית] allows for three possible syntactic analyses. 1) We have here two asyndetically juxtaposed clauses, namely one nominal clause followed by a verbal clause, 2) one nominal clause with וְהֵמָּה כְּאָדָם עֲבָרוּ בְרִית as an asyndetic relative clause, and 3) a single verbal clause with כְּאָדָם as an adverbial adjunct. The second alternative is reflected in the LXX.

ὡς ἄνθρωπος] The substantive here is obviously used with no special reference to any particular person.³¹ The UBS committee headed by the late Barthélemy has come down on ‘comme Adam,’ rejecting ‘comme des hommes’ (= LXX) and ‘comme à Adam’ (place-name).³²

κατεφρόνησέν μου] The singular here just as in παραβαίνων is an attraction to ἄνθρωπος, though it must actually be referring to αὐτοὶ, hence our translation.

²⁷ Cf. also Joosten 78 ad 2.20.

²⁸ See *GELS* s.v. ἦ 2.

²⁹ Note ‘eux’ instead of ‘ils’ in Joosten’s translation (107).

³⁰ See JM § 154 *fa*.

³¹ See *GELS* s.v. 3 a.

³² For the details of the committee’s arguments, see Barthélemy 1992.527-31.

The choice of καταφρονέω ‘to regard or treat with contempt’ is striking, for the feature of treachery, deception or betrayal is paramount in the lexical profile of the Hebrew verb בגד Qal. The Hebrew verb occurs in the Twelve Prophets 8 more times, and only at Hb 1.13 it is rendered with the same Greek verb as here, and at Hb 2.5 with a derivative, καταφρονητής.³³ Still in Hosea, ἐγκαταλείπω is much closer to the sense of בגד: 5.7 τὸν κύριον ἐγκατέλιπον ‘they abandoned the Lord.’ In the remaining five cases, all concentrated in Ma 2, ἐγκαταλείπω is used denoting broken relationship. Ma 2.15 is illustrative: γυναῖκα νεότητός σου μὴ ἐγκαταλίπης. The most frequent rendering in the LXX as a whole is ἀθετέω (21×), followed by ἐγκαταλείπω (6×), παράνομος (6×), καταφρονέω (3×), καταφρονητής (3×), ἀσύνθετος (2×), ἀνομέω, ἄνομος, ἀσυνθετέω, ἡττάω (once each). All these Greek lexemes, except καταφρονέω and καταφρονητής, approximate the sense of בגד, what makes the choice of these latter two all the more striking. Furthermore, the second of these occurs only three times, all in the Twelve Prophets, and the first is attested a total of twenty-two times in the LXX, and, in three of them, where it translates בגד, the equation occurs twice in the Twelve Prophets. Although the notions of betrayal and contempt, particularly when directed at God, a relationship with him, and His teaching, are not mutually exclusive, the distribution of this equation and its well-nigh total concentration in the Twelve Prophets is striking all the same.³⁴

6.8) Γαλααδ πόλις ἐργαζομένη μάταια, ταρασσουσα ὕδωρ,

Gilead, a city engaged in vain affairs, troubling the water

גִּלְעָד קְרִית פְּעֻלִי אֲוֹן עֲקָבָה מַדָּם:

ἐργαζομένη μάταια אֲוֹן [פְּעֻלִי] The verb פעל Qal occurs in the Hebrew Bible 56 times, and in the majority of its occurrences (52×) it takes a direct object denoting some ethically questionable deed.³⁵ The particular phrase we have here is attested as often as 23 times and highly common in Psalms, but nowhere else in the Twelve Prophets. Our Hoseanic passage is the only one where אֲוֹן as a direct object of the verb פעל is rendered with μάταιος. On the other hand, this common participial phrase is rendered ἐργαζόμενος τὴν ἀνομίαν in every single case of its occurrences in Psalms, and this ren-

³³ The same equation is identifiable at Hb 1.5 where MT has בניים.

³⁴ Jastrow mentions a few cases of בזז in the Targum translating בגד in the Hebrew text, but there the Aramaic verb means ‘to plunder,’ despite the graphic (and possibly etymological) affinity between בזז and בזה. See Jastrow 1903.137. Incidentally, ‘Job VI, 5’ there should be read ‘Job VI, 15.’

³⁵ In Ben Sira it occurs 11 times, of which only once the object denotes a questionable deed.

dering is not attested anywhere else in the Septuagint. The utilitarian rather than ethical, religious perception reflected in the rendering μάταιος is striking and merits further investigation. In the Twelve Prophets the Greek equivalents of the Hebrew noun are: κόπος (5x: Ho 12.3; Mi 2.1; Hb 1.3; 3.7; Zc 10.2; Ma 2.13³⁶); ἀναψυχή (1x: Am 5.5); Ων as a place-name (5x: Ho 4.15; 5.8; 10.5; 10.8; Am 1.5); read as a form of וַיֵּא (2x: Ho 12.12; Am 5.5). Also in the LXX as a whole the translation equivalents reflecting such a utilitarian and / or non-ethical perspective are in the minority: κενός (1x), μάταιος (5x), μάτην (1x), μόχθος (1x), ὀδύνη (3x), πένθος (1x: Ho 9.4); πόνος (7x). The rest are ethically marked: ἀδικία, ἄδικος, ἀνομία, ἄνομος, ἀσεβής, ἄτοπος, ἄφρων, βλάσφημος, κακία, κακός, κακοῦργος, παράνομος, πονηρία. Mi 2.1 is particularly revealing: Ἐγένοντο λογιζόμενοι κόπους καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι κακὰ .. translating וְהָיוּ הַיְיָ וְיַעֲזְבוּ רַע, where κόπος is parallel to the ethically marked κακός. A close parallel may be found at Ez 11.2: οἱ λογιζόμενοι μάταια καὶ βουλευόμενοι βουλήν πονηράν. It is tempting to postulate that, in the above-mentioned two cases (Ho 12.12; Am 5.5), the translator did not actually mix up *waw* and *yod*, but rather in his mind and in the mind of some of other LXX translators the particle of negation and וַיֵּא were lexically affiliated with each other, forming a lexical field of non-existence, whether physically (absence) or metaphorically (absence of purpose, meaning, efficacy etc.).

ἐργαζομένη μάταια] is rendered by Joosten as “produit des choses vaines.” Though the verb does sometimes signify ‘to manufacture, fashion,’³⁷ and μάταια often refers to objects of pagan worship, idols,³⁸ a syntagmatic consideration suggests ‘to perform’ as a more likely meaning here and in a couple of related places in XII. In addition to the above-quoted Mi 2.1, see Ho 7.1 ἠργάσαντο ψευδῆ.³⁹

There is no need to suppose that our translator analysed הַיְיָ as an archaic feminine absolute form.⁴⁰ He simply equated the city with its inhabitants.

ταράσσουσα ὕδωρ עֲקַבְיָהּ This is the only place in the LXX where what appears to be a verb עקב Qal⁴¹ is rendered with ταρασσώ. The only other occurrence of the Hebrew lexeme is at Je 17.9, where its translation with βαθύς indicates עמק. The translator was probably at his wit’s end, and ventured free translation. What his translation is supposed to mean is not immediately apparent. ὕδωρ indicates, of course, מים.

³⁶ Probably MT וַיֵּא has been read as וַיֵּא.

³⁷ As in Nu 31.51 σκεῦος εἰργασμένον ‘wrought implement’; Ez 27.19 σίδηρος εἰργασμένος ‘processed iron’; Ps 7.16 εἰς βόθρον, ὃν εἰργάσατο ‘a pit which he made.’

³⁸ See *GELS* s.v., 1 b.

³⁹ See *GELS* s.v. ἐργάζομαι, 1.

⁴⁰ See JM § 89 n, o.

⁴¹ The Massoretic vocalisation most likely indicates a feminine form of עקב.

6.9) καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς σου ἀνδρὸς πειρατοῦ· ἔκρυψαν ἱερεῖς ὁδὸν, ἐφόνευσαν Σιχημα, ὅτι ἀνομίαν ἐποίησαν.

and your force is that of a bandit; priests concealed the way, they murdered Sicheim, since they perpetrated unlawfulness.

וּכְחָפִי אִישׁ גְּדוּדִים הָבֵר כְּהֲנָנִים דָּרְךְ יִרְצָחוּ־שְׂכֵמָה כִּי זָמָה עָשׂוּ:

כּחכּי has been broken down into כּח + an archaic, dialectal 2fem. sg. possessive pronoun כּי.

ἀνδρὸς πειρατοῦ [אִישׁ גְּדוּדִים] The Hebrew phrase probably means a member of highway gangs. Of its Greek translation, however, the second noun is an actor noun so that we have a kind of tautology, making ἀνδρὸς redundant as in the mechanical rendering of אִישׁ at Ge 46.32 ἄνδρες κτηνοτρόφοι ‘cattlemen.’⁴²

ἔκρυψαν] indicates a form of חבא. It is difficult to say what the translator’s *Vorlage* looked like. The Hebrew phrase in the MT, הָבֵר כְּהֲנָנִים, gives good sense, ‘a band of prophets.’

6.10 [¶ 6.10-11a] ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ εἶδον φρικώδη, ἐκεῖ πορνείαν τοῦ Ἐφραϊμ· ἐμίανθη Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδας.

In the house of Israel I saw shocking things, there harlotry of Ephraim. Israel was defiled along with Judas.

בְּבֵית יִשְׂרָאֵל רָאִיתִי שַׁעֲרֵי־רִיָּה [שַׁעֲרוֹרִיָּה] שָׁם זָנוּת לְאֶפְרַיִם נִטְמָא יִשְׂרָאֵל:
גַּם־יְהוּדָה

φρικώδη from φρικώδης] is a hapax in the LXX. The Hebrew word that it translates is equally infrequent. It occurs only once more in an alternative form at Je 18.13 שַׁעֲרַת עֲשָׂתָה, which is rendered φρικτά [ἴ] ἐποίησε ‘shocking things that she did.’ The noun, from which this adjective is derived, שַׁעֲרוֹרָה, occurs twice, again in Jeremiah 5.30 and 23.14 rendered in both cases with φρικτά. Lastly we encounter a form without the *resh* reduplicated: Je 29.17 where the Hexaplaric text has preserved a phonetic transliteration of MT הַשַּׁעֲרִים. We would further note a related Greek noun, φρίκη, which occurs at Am 1.11, rendering אף ‘anger,’ and Jb 4.14 for פחד ‘fear’ juxtaposed with τρόμος ‘terror.’

πορνείαν] Our translator has taken זָנוּת as in apposition to שַׁעֲרוֹרִיָּה. However, שָׁם זָנוּת לְאֶפְרַיִם can constitute a self-contained nominal clause: ‘there there is ..’⁴³

⁴² For more examples, see *GELS* s.v., 3. Thus ‘a man, a brigand’ of *NETS* is too mechanical, for there is little emphasis on the gender of the brigand.

⁴³ So Joosten 110.

6.11) Ἄρχου τρυγᾶν σεαυτῶ ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέφειν με τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου,

Begin to harvest for yourself whilst I bring the captives of My people back,

שָׁת קָצִיר לָךְ בְּשׁוּבִי שְׁבוֹת עָמִי:

ἄρχου] How the translator arrived at this, starting from שָׁת, is not clear. Joosten refers to Targum here, which has שְׁרִיאָו ‘they commenced.’⁴⁴

τρυγᾶν] possibly reflects קצור rather than MT קָצִיר.

ἐπιστρέφειν με τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν] is a well-established rendering of the standing phrase in Hebrew, שָׁב שְׁבוֹת, Qal. See Am 9.14; Jl 4.1; Zp 3.20.

⁴⁴ Joosten 110.

CHAPTER VII

7.1) ἐν τῷ ἰάσασθαι με τὸν Ἰσραηλ. καὶ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται ἡ ἀδικία Ἐφραιμ καὶ ἡ κακία Σαμαρείας, ὅτι ἠργάσαντο ψευδῆ· καὶ κλέπτῃς πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσελεύσεται, ἐκδιδύσκων ληστής ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ,

whilst I heal Israel. And the unrighteousness of Ephraim and the wickedness of Samaria will be exposed, for they practised falsehood. A thief will break in at his home, robbing him as a bandit as he is travelling

כַּרְפָּאֵי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִגְלָה עֲוֹן אֶפְרַיִם וְרַעוּת שְׁמֵרוֹן כִּי פָעְלוּ שְׂקָר וְנִגְבּ יְבוּא פֶשֶׁט
גָּדוּד בְּחוּץ:

All the three modern editors of the LXX - Swete, Rahlfs, Ziegler - add a comma after μου in 6.11 and a full stop after Ἰσραηλ in 7.1. We do not know why they decided to depart from the verse division in the traditional Hebrew text. Nevertheless, both Rashi and Radaq take the view that the two divine actions are to be taken together.¹ Besides we note the aspect opposition between ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέφειν με (Pres.) and ἐν τῷ ἰάσασθαι με (Aor.). This morphological opposition occurs elsewhere in SG, and a ground for the opposition is not always manifest, see *SSG* § 28 **hbb**. \mathfrak{H} also uses two different prepositions: בְּשׂוֹבֵי vs. כַּרְפָּאֵי, and here, too, the semantic contrast is not always straightforward, i.e. continuous, repeated vs. one-off action, see *SQH* § 18 **k** with fn. 3 on p. 119, where it is pointed out that at הִיָּה בְּעַבְרַכֶּם אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן תִּקְיִמוּ Dt 27.4 Israelites could not possibly set up memorial stones on the western shore of the river, whilst they were still in the water.²

In both of the infinitive clauses the acc. με is the grammatical subject of its respective infinitive, as is clear from the context. When two accusative noun phrases appear with an infinitive, however, their relative position does not always indicate which is its subject, see *SSG* § 69A **ai**.

ἀποκαλυφθήσεται [נִגְלָה] The number discord is more glaring in \mathfrak{H} with its second subject being fpl. רַעוּת. This can be accounted for by remembering that Ephraim and Samaria are not two distinct entities, Samaria being the capital of Ephraim.

ἐκδιδύσκων ληστής [פֶּשֶׁט גָּדוּד לְהַסִּיף] The Greek verb in the sense of ‘to strip (a victim of all his or her possessions)’ here is unknown in Classical or Contemporary Greek.³

¹ Brenton (1851) disagrees with the above-mentioned three editors.

² See also BDB s.v. \mathfrak{z} V 1 and \mathfrak{z} 3 b.

³ For its additional references in SG, see *GELS* s.v. Whether or not its attestation in Josephus, *BJ*, 2.14.2, mentioned in *LSJ* s.v., is a borrowing from SG is difficult to say.

Θ's selection of a participle here, immediately following εἰσελεύσεται indicates its circumstantial function, presumably reading \mathfrak{H} as $\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{P}$. In any case the shift in tense in \mathfrak{H} does not indicate two separate actions, i.e. ordinary theft and highway robbery, *pace* Harper 1905.293. Whether solitary or a member of a highway gang, someone broke in during his travel.

ἐκδιδύσκων may be interpreted as attributive in relation to ληστής, whereas the translator would not have viewed $\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{P}$ as being attributively used. However, דוד indicates a band or troop, not an individual member of it. Hence, the translator may have mentally supplied בן, i.e. $\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{S}\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{B}$. In any case he had to deal with the morphological shift from יבוא to פשט. In our translation we have opted for taking ληστής as a subject complement.⁴

ἐν τῇ ὀδοῦ αὐτοῦ [בהוֹי] a free, contextually informed translation.⁵

7.2) ὅπως συνᾶδωσιν ὡς συνᾶδοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν. πάσας τὰς κακίας αὐτῶν ἐμνήσθη· νῦν ἐκύκλωσεν αὐτοὺς τὰ διαβούλια αὐτῶν, ἀπέ- ναντι τοῦ προσώπου μου ἐγένοντο.

As a result they reach agreement as people reaching common understanding. I recalled all their evils. Now their designs have encircled them, they took place under My nose.

ובל-יאמרו ללככם כל-רעתם וְכָרְתִי עִתָּה סְבָבוֹם מֵעַלְיָהֶם נָגַד פְּנֵי הָיוּ:

ὅπως] This conjunction can, in this context, hardly express a purpose, thus *pace* Joosten's (111) "afin qu'ils soient en accord." This resultative value of ὅπως occurs a few more times in XII, e.g. ὅπως μὴ συναχθῆι μηδεὶς אֲשֶׁר לְאִי-יִקְנֶה לְאִי-שֵׁׁ Mi 5.7 (\mathfrak{H} 6).

ὅπως συνᾶδωσιν ὡς συνᾶδοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν לְלַכְכֶם וּבַל-יֵאָמְרוּ \mathfrak{H} represents quite a departure from \mathfrak{H} . Where does ὡς συνᾶδοντες come from?⁶ The translator may have been perplexed, not knowing what the crowd were not to say. כָּרְתִי does not answer that question.⁷ He may have anticipated something like לְאִי-יִקְנֶה לְאִי-שֵׁׁ וְלֹא-יְבִין אֲלֵהִי וְשֶׁרָאָל, cf. Ps 94.7.

πάσας τὰς κακίας αὐτῶν [כָּל-רַעְתָּם] The use of the pl. in Θ is sensible in the context.

⁴ On this feature, see SSG § 61 b. See, e.g. ἐγὼ ἀπολύομαι ἄτεκνος Ge 15.2.

⁵ We fail to follow Joosten 110: "Le traducteur a sans doute pris la lettre *waw* du mot qui suit pour le suffixe possessif de la 3^e personne sg.", i.e. בְּהוֹי read as בְּהוֹי. In BH הוֹי takes a suffix pronoun only when the former is in the plural as in הוֹי תִּסֹּדֵד אֶת-הַמְּדָנִים Zp 3.6. בְּהוֹי is unlikely, since the plural of the word always appears with וְ-, which is also true in Qumran Hebrew.

⁶ This hapax in SG does sometimes retain its etymological sense of 'to sing together,' so in NETS, which makes the crowd blissfully ignorant. That, however, would represent Θ's farther departure from \mathfrak{H} .

⁷ Mediaeval Jewish commentators do their best to make sense by sticking to the MT, but in vain. Rashi, for instance, rewrites the MT in the strain of "they do not bear in mind that all their evil deeds are written before me for memory."

7.5) ἡμέραι τῶν βασιλέων ἡμῶν, ἤρξαντο οἱ ἄρχοντες θυμοῦσθαι ἐξ οἴνου, ἐξέτεινε τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ μετὰ λοιμῶν·

the days of our kings, the rulers began to become ill-tempered from wine, he stretched out his hand with dangerous people,

יָדוּ מְלַכֵּנוּ הִקְלִי שָׂרִים מָתַח מְיִן מְשֵׁה יָדוּ אֶת־לְצַיִם:

ἡμέραι יָדוּ] Joosten (113) rightly speaks of the syntactic difficulty of the nominative case here. Is it announcing the title of this pericope? If it is about the king's birthday, does the plural suggest that the celebration is going to last more than one day?

ἤρξαντο הִקְלִי] **ח** is obviously a rendition of הִקְלִי. Other than that, both **ח** and **ט** of this verse are too vague for us to make sense of it.

7.6) διότι ἀνεκαύθησαν ὡς κλίβανος αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καταράσσειν αὐτούς, ὄλην τὴν νύκτα ὕπνου Ἐφραιμ ἐνεπλήσθη, πρωὶ ἐγενήθη ἀνεκαύθη ὡς πυρὸς φέγγος.

for their hearts became hot like an oven, as they broke (them) in pieces. All night Ephraim slept a sound sleep. It became morning, it became hot like something fiery, bright.

כִּי־קָרְבוּ כַתְנֹיֵר לִבָּם בְּאֲרָבָם כֶּל־הִקְלִיָּה יָשָׁן אִפְהָם בְּקָר הוּא בְעַר כָּאֵשׁ לְהָבָה:

ἀνεκαύθησαν] This must be translating בְּעַר in view of בְּעַר translated later in the verse with ἀνεκαύθη.⁸

αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν לִבָּם] The plural in **ח** does not necessarily presuppose לִבָּתָם. Though not the rule, Hebrew allows the use of the singular in a case like this, similarly in vs. 14 below.⁹ Note הִיטִיבָה יְהוָה לְטוֹבִים וְלִישָׂרִים בְּלִבּוֹתָם Ps 125.4, which is interestingly rendered as ἀγαθὸν, κύριε, τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ τοῖς εὐθέσι τῇ καρδίᾳ and לֹא־כִבְדָה אָזְנוּ מִשְׁמוֹעַ Is 59.1 // כבדו אוניו 1QIsa^a.

ἐν τῷ καταράσσειν αὐτούς בְּאֲרָבָם] Whilst אָרַב is intransitive, καταράσσω is transitive, and αὐτούς here is most likely the subject of the infinitive. What is its object then? Joosten (113), with his translation “ils jetaient à terre,” is apparently thinking of ‘the kings of Ephraim’ as such. However, this is a description of what happened before the conspirators fell asleep. Then their hearts seem to be more likely the latent objects of the infinitive; pondering actions to be taken, their hearts were agitated quite a bit, almost broken.

Ἐφραιμ] = אִפְהָם for אִפְרַיִם.

⁸ Joosten (114) mentions חָקַד as an alternative.

⁹ See SQH § 8 aa.

ἀλλότριος [רַיִם] ἀλλότριος means more than just ‘other than oneself,’ and often with some negative nuance. Likewise רַיִם differs from אֲהָרִים.

αὐτὸς [הוּא] This time the pronoun is emphatic, contrastive twice over in both Ⓞ and Ⓢ; people around Ephraim noticed what had happened, but he was blissfully ignorant, unawares.

7.10) καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται ἡ ὕβρις Ἰσραὴλ εἰς πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐπέστρεψαν πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐξέζητησαν αὐτὸν ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις.

and the pride of Israel will be brought low in their own presence, yet they did not return to the Lord their God nor sought Him in spite of all these things happening,

וַעֲנָה גְאוֹן־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּפָנָיו וְלֹא־שָׁבוּ אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וְלֹא בִקְשׂוּהוּ בְּכָל־זוֹאת:

καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται [וַעֲנָה] There is no compelling argument for seeing in וַעֲנָה a *w-qatalí* form, for it is not preceded by any *yiqtol* form. On the contrary, following four *qatal* forms in the preceding verse, all of preterite value, it makes better sense to analyse the *waw* here as conjunctive, and the verb is immediately followed by בִּקְשׂוּהוּ .. שָׁבוּ. Joosten (116) mentions 5.5 as an identical statement as the first clause of our verse, though there the clause is followed by כִּפְּשׂוּ. Though it might be an attempt towards harmonisation, two manuscripts, 36 and 49, do read καὶ ἐταπεινώθη, and cf. Pesh. *'etmakkak* (Pf.).

εἰς πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ [בְּפָנָיו] The sg. αὐτοῦ reproduces the Heb. 3ms pronoun, but it is sensibly followed by two pl. verbs.

7.11) καὶ ἦν Ἐφραὶμ ὡς περιστερὰ ἄνους οὐκ ἔχουσα καρδίαν· Αἴγυπτον ἐπεκαλεῖτο καὶ εἰς Ἀσσυρίους ἐπορεύθησαν.

and Ephraim was like a silly, mindless dove. He would call on Egypt and went to Assyria.

וַיְהִי אֶפְרַיִם כִּינֹנָה פֹתֵה אֵין לָב מִצְרַיִם קָרָאוּ אֲשׁוּר הִלְכוּ:

καὶ ἦν [וַיְהִי] The four *qatal* forms are idiomatically continued with a *way-yiqtol* form. However, it is translated in the Impf., not with ἐγένετο as in vs. 8 above (Ⓢ [וַיְהִי]).

οὐκ ἔχουσα καρδίαν [אֵין לָב] Parallel to ἄνους, פֹתֵה, both καρδία and לָב here denote an intellectual faculty of thinking and consideration rather than a seat of emotions. See *GELS* s.v. καρδία, where among many examples adduced διανοεῖται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ Ge 6.5 and μωρὸς καὶ ἀκάρδιος Je 5.21 (certainly not *heartless*, Ⓢ [אֵין לָב]) are interesting.

Though it comes down to the same thing, Keil (1975.108) and Rashi take לְאֵי לֵב as an attribute of Ephraim, though Targum has לֵב לְהֵלֵב and Peshitta /layt bāh lebbā/.

ἐπεκαλεῖτο [לְאֵי לֵב] The selection of the Impf. seems to imply repeated calls sent southwards. We do not know which particular period in the history of Ancient Israel the translator has in mind. He could have written ἐπεκάλησε, so he must have had some good reason for going for ἐπεκαλεῖτο. On the other hand, the shift to the Aorist, ἐπορεύθησαν, could suggest a one-off action, though πορεύονται in the next verse, if referring to the same event, is in the Pres. subjunctive. The shift from the sg. to the pl. is also intriguing. It might not be about constant changing of sides and alliances in Ancient Israel, and the last verb may not be a reference to a mission carried out by diplomatic envoys, but a mass deportation. Cf. 2Kg 17.1-7. This issue is connected with another, namely εἰς Ἀσσυρίους. In spite of the pl. form it is not a reference to Assyrians, but Assyria, an empire or a land. See Is 7.18, where Ἀσσύριοι is contrasted with Αἴγυπτος ‘Egypt,’ for which Greek does not say Αἰγύπτιοι. Hence they did not go to negotiate with Assyrians, but arrived in Assyria, an interpretation which better fits the selection of εἰς. Cf. 5.13 above.

7.12) καθὼς ἂν πορεύωνται, ἐπιβαλῶ ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς τὸ δίκτυόν μου· καθὼς τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατὰξω αὐτούς, παιδεύσω αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀκοῇ τῆς θλίψεως αὐτῶν.

When they go, I shall throw my net over them. As birds in the sky I shall bring them down, I shall discipline them as I hear of their distress.

כַּאֲשֶׁר יִלְכוּ אֶפְרוֹשׁ עָלֵיהֶם רְשָׁתִי כְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם אֲרִידֵם אִסְרֵם כְּשֹׁמֵעַ לַעֲדָתָם:

καθὼς [כַּאֲשֶׁר] Here we have a rare use of καθὼς as a temporal conjunction.¹² παιδεύσω αὐτούς] = אִסְרֵם for the difficult אִסְרֵם.

ἐν τῇ ἀκοῇ] is not necessarily = כְּשֹׁמֵעַ or כְּשֹׁמְעַ. Even if our translator pronounced his Hebrew text as in א, he could have analysed שֹׁמֵעַ as a verbal noun virtually equivalent to an inf. cst. with בִּ- or כִּ- with temporal value, not Joosten’s (117) “par,” “en conformité avec” or “comme.”

τῆς θλίψεως αὐτῶν [עֲדָתָם] The equivalence is implausible. In Muraoka 2010.57a s.v. θλίψις we suggested עֲדָתָם; this Hebrew noun is at least 15 more times so translated in LXX, including ἐν θλίψει Mi 2.12 (א בַּצָּרָה > בַּצָּרָה) and ἐκ θλίψεως Na 2.2 (א מִצָּרָה > מִצָּרָה).

¹² In GELS s.v. we would add under 2 c two cases of it with Aor. mentioned in BDAG s.v. 4, namely καθὼς δὲ ἀνηλώθη 2M 1.31 and καθὼς ἤκουσα 2E 15.6.

- 7.13) οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἀπεπήδησαν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ· δειλαιοὶ εἰσιν, ὅτι ἠσέβησαν εἰς ἐμέ· ἐγὼ δὲ ἐλυτρώσαμην αὐτούς, αὐτοὶ δὲ κατελάλησαν κατ’ ἐμοῦ ψεύδη.

Woe unto them, because they walked away from Me. Wretched they are, because they acted impiously against Me. I did rescue them, but they spoke against Me falsehoods.

אִי לָהֶם כִּי־נָדְדוּ מִמֶּנִּי שָׂד לָהֶם כִּי־פָשְׁעוּ בִּי וְאָנְכִי אֶפְדֶּם וְהָמָה דִּבְרוּ עָלַי
כְּזָבִים:

ἐγὼ δὲ .. αὐτοὶ δὲ ἠηמה .. [אָנְכִי כִי] The opposition between God and His people is evident not only due to the use of the personal pronouns as subjects, but also due to their fronted position.

δειλαιοὶ [שָׂד] In XII the root שדד is rather frequent as a verb in diverse binyans and also as a substantive as here. Its analysis as indicating an impression created and an emotion generated by a certain physical condition occurs also in Δειλαία Νινευη נִינְוָה נִינְוָה Na 3.7.¹³ A similar interpretation is attested in the Nahal Hever scroll of this latter case: τεταλαι]πώρηκε[v.¹⁴

ἠσέβησαν εἰς ἐμέ [פָשְׁעוּ בִּי] In view of κατελάλησαν κατ’ ἐμοῦ עָלַי דִּבְרוּ in the second half of the verse the use of εἰς may induce one to suspect a Hebraism. However, in τὴν ἀσεβειαν τὴν εἰς τὸν ἀδελφόν σου Ιακωβ Ob 10 we see in 𐤁 no preposition: אָחֵיךְ יַעֲזָב. In GELS s.v. ἀσεβέω we noted an example of <+ εἰς τινα> in Herodotus: ἐς τὸν νηὸν καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα .. ἠσεβήσαν οἳτοῖ 8.129. Hence, when our verse is read as a Greek text, readers may not find εἰς here as odd or anomalous.

ἐλυτρώσαμην αὐτούς אָפְדֶּם 𐤇 identified here a preterite *yaqtul*, probably in view of three straightforward *qatal*’s in the verse.

- 7.14) καὶ οὐκ ἐβόησαν πρὸς με αἱ καρδίαὶ αὐτῶν, ἀλλ’ ἦ ὠλόλυζον ἐν ταῖς κοίταις αὐτῶν· ἐπὶ σίτῳ καὶ οἴνῳ κατετέμνοντο.

Their hearts did not cry out to me, but they kept howling in their beds. They kept cutting themselves over grain and wine.

וְלֹא־זָעְקוּ אֵלַי בְּלִבָּם כִּי יִלְלוּ עַל־מִשְׁכָּבוֹתָם עַל־דָּגָן וְתִירוֹשׁ יִתְגַּדְּרוּ

αἱ καρδίαὶ αὐτῶν [בְּלִבָּם] On the sg. בָּם, see above at vs. 6.

ὠλόλυζον [יִלְלוּ] The only Hebrew verb translated with ὠλόλυζω is יִלְלוּ.¹⁵ The only virtual exception is ὠλόλυζετε הִקְהָלֵךְ Is 24.11, a noun derived from יָקַח.

¹³ Joosten (117) says that in XII this root is systematically rendered with Greek lexemes denoting misery, which is not true at οἰχίσεται Ho 10.14, μάταια 12.2, συντριμμόν Am 5.9a, and λησταί Ob 5.

¹⁴ DJD 8.48f.

¹⁵ On the morphological anomaly of this verb, see JM § 76 d.

The Greek Impf. here is a skilful representation of the imperfective aspect of the corresponding Hebrew *yaqtul* form. That applies to the following verb as well, which, however, would shock the reader.

On rare instances of ‘crying heart,’ see ἡ καρδία τῆς Μωαβίτιδος βοᾷ Is 15.5 (= \mathfrak{H}) and Ἐβόησε καρδία αὐτῶν πρὸς κύριον La 2.18 (= \mathfrak{H}).

ἐν ταῖς κοίταις αὐτῶν עַל־מִשְׁכָּבֹתָם] On the use of ἐν here, see ἐργαζόμενοι κακὰ ἐν ταῖς κοίταις αὐτῶν $\text{עַל־מִשְׁכָּבֹתָם רָע פְּעָלָיָם}$ Mi 2.1.

Along with Barré 1995.57f. we may infer that this highlights the people avoiding crying their hearts out in public in temples or synagogues.

κατετέμνοντο אֵת־גִּזְרֹתָיו \mathfrak{G} = אֵת־גִּזְרֹתָיו , an equivalence also found at 3K 18.28.

7.15) ἐπαιδεύθησαν ἐν ἔμοί, καὶ ἐγὼ κατίσχυσα τοὺς βραχίονας αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς ἔμὲ ἐλογίσαντο πονηρά.

they were educated through Me and I strengthened their arms, yet they thought up evil things against Me.

סורו בי: וְאֲנִי יִסְרַתִּי חֲזֹקְתִּי וְרוּעַתָם וְאֵלֵי יַחֲשָׁבוּ רָע:

ἐπαιδεύθησαν ἐν ἔμοί בִּי יִסְרוּ \mathfrak{G} = יִסְרוּ or יִסְרֶה , with which יִסְרַתִּי would become tautologous. The underlying form could be יִסְרֶה Nifal, so Joosten 118.

7.16) ἀπεστράφησαν εἰς οὐθέν, ἐγένοντο ὡς τόξον ἐντεταμένον· πεσοῦνται ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν δι’ ἀπαιδευσίαν γλώσσης αὐτῶν· οὗτος ὁ φαυλισμὸς αὐτῶν ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ.

They reverted, (ending up) in nothing, they became a stretched out bow. Their rulers will fall (though armed) with a sword on account of the ignorance of their tongue. This is a contempt due to them in the land of Egypt.

יָשׁוּבוּ לֹא עָלָהּ הָיָה כְּקֶשֶׁת רְמִיָּה יִפְלוּ בְּחָרֶב שְׂרִיָּהּ מִזְעָם לְשׁוֹנָם זוֹ לְעָגָם בְּאָרְץ מִצְרָיִם:

ἀπεστράφησαν εἰς οὐθέν $\text{עָלָהּ לֹא יָשׁוּבוּ}$] In *GELS* s.v. ἀποστρέφω **II 3** we proposed to analyse this form as passive intransitively used, *to be transformed and become*, noting its parallelism to ἐγένοντο. Morphological distinction between the middle and passive voices is notoriously ambiguous.

However, the parallelism to ἐγένοντο does not have to be the only yardstick for analysis. Alternatively we may compare a case such as ἀπεστράφητε ἀπειθοῦντες κυρίῳ ‘you became back-sliders (\mathfrak{H} שָׁבַתְּם), disobeying the Lord’ Nu 14.43, also mentioned in *GELS* s.v., but under **II 1 e** “to leave

the current (right) path or course of action”^{16,17} In both places the underlying Hebrew verb is **שב**, which is intransitive.

εἰς οὐθὲν **על לא יועיל**] In no way can **ח** be reconciled with **ט**. A variety of emendations have been proposed: **ללא יועיל** (Ehrlich), **לבעל**, **לבלעל** (*BHS*) etc.¹⁸

τόξον ἐντεταμένον **קשת רמה**] **ט** = **קשת רמה** with a Qal passive Ptc. of **רמה**. The collocation **קשת רמה** occurs also in **קשת רמה** ἐντεταμένου τόξου Je 4.29 **בני־אפרים נושקי רומי־קשת** .. ἐντείνοντες καὶ βάλλοντες τόξοις Ps 78.9. The selection of ἐντείνω is to be noted. Furthermore, Ps 78.9 is about Ephraim, sharing the context with our Hosea passage. In both passages Ephraim is not cast in a very favourable light. In Ps 78 Ephraim prepared themselves well with bows only to fall back (**הפכו** ἐστράπησαν), scared, once the day of battle arrived. In Ho 7.16, however, the parallelism with εἰς οὐθὲν implies that a stretched out bow is a symbol of failure, a strange symbolism, whereas **ח**, ‘a deceptive bow, raising false hopes,’ does make good sense.

δι’ ἀπαιδευσίαν **מוצם**] How **ט** has arrived at ἀπαιδευσία is difficult to fathom. Is it far-fetched to suggest that **מוצם** was read **ממוצם** = **ממוצם** ‘due to the scantiness of’? The noun occurs three more times in SG, all in Si, where its meaning is nothing extraordinary; unfortunately we have no Hebrew text preserved there (4.25, 21.24, 23.13).

¹⁶ Delete “pass in form” in *GELS* *ibid*.

¹⁷ Though no verb meaning ‘to disobey’ is found in **ח** here, Wevers (1998.234) interprets **בש** here as idiomatically indicating repetition of an action. However, ἀποστρέφω is never used to render this notion, but ἐπιστρέφω, which, besides, is not used with a complementing participle. See *GELS* s.v. ἐπιστρέφω **II 4 b**.

¹⁸ We fail to see how Nyberg’s proposed (1935.114) emendation **לעל** is supposed to improve **ח**.

CHAPTER VIII

8.1) Εἰς κόλπον αὐτῶν ὡς γῆ, ὡς ἀετὸς ἐπ’ οἶκον κυρίου, ἀνθ’ ὧν παρέβησαν τὴν διαθήκην μου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ νόμου μου ἠσέβησαν.

Into their midst like earth, like an eagle on to the house of the Lord, because they transgressed My covenant and acted impiously against My law.

אַל־חֲקֹךָ שָׁפַר כְּנֹשֶׁר עַל־בֵּית יְהוָה יַעַן עָבְרוּ בְרִיתִי וְעַל־תּוֹרַתִי פָּשְׁעוּ:

Εἰς κόλπον αὐτῶν ὡς γῆ [אַל־חֲקֹךָ שָׁפַר] The two texts cannot be harmonised with each other; אַל appears to represent שָׁפַר חֲקֹךָ. חֲקֹ is one of the commonest equivalents of κόλπος. Even so the attached 2ms suffix is incomprehensible.¹ Moreover, the first clause, whether in אַל or in אַל, is difficult to fathom. What is the prophetic message all about? The translator may want to say that they would be treated like something worthless and despicable thrown at them. Note an expression of self-deprecation such as ἐγὼ εἶμι γῆ καὶ σποδός Ge 18.27, and soil as food for snakes in γῆν φάγη πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς σου ib. 3.14. An eagle ready to swoop down on victims on the ground is easier to comprehend.

ἐπ’ οἶκον] Though ἐπί + acc. can indicate a static position,² it scarcely indicates a movement ‘on to’ when it is + gen. or dat. Like the parallel εἰς κόλπον, some vertical movement is likely to be meant. An eagle first descends on to the roof-top of the temple, to wait there for potential victims.

ἀνθ’ ὧν] See our definition in *GELS* s.v. ἀντί **3 b**: “Often in the form ἀνθ’ ὧν introducing a clause the verb of which is in the past and specifies a commendable or (mostly) punishable deed, and such a clause usually follows the main clause.”

8.2) ἐμὲ κεκραῖζονται Ὁ θεός, ἐγνώκαμέν σε.

They will cry aloud to me, o God, we have come to know You.

לִי יוֹקוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִדְעוּנִי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

ἐμὲ κεκραῖζονται] κράζω τινα instead of κράζω πρὸς τινα, e.g. πρὸς κύριον Mi 3.4, Jl 1.14 is unknown prior to SG, and recurs in ἐκέκραξά σε Ps 118.146, 129.1.³

¹ Joosten (120) thinks that the *kaf* of חֲקֹ has been turned into a preposition to go with the next word. However, חֲ or חֲ lacking a possessive pronoun is harsh.

² For examples, see *GELS* s.v. III **3**.

³ Cf. also τοῖς τέσσαρσιν ἀγγέλοις Rev 7.2.

On the extension of the reduplication characteristic of the Pf. to the Fut. of this verb, see Helbing 1907.90f.

8.3) ὅτι Ἰσραὴλ ἀπεστρέψατο ἀγαθά, ἐχθρὸν κατεδίωξαν.

For Israel rejected good things, they ran after that which is hateful (to Me),

נָנַן יִשְׂרָאֵל טוֹב אוֹיֵב יִרְדְּפוּ:

ὅτι] no equivalent in \mathfrak{H} . It introduces further justification for the predicted punishment.

ἐχθρὸν אוֹיֵב] The pair is clearly antonymic in relation to the preceding ἀγαθά טוֹב. Whilst in \mathfrak{H} both are sg., there is a number shift in \mathfrak{G} . Is ἐχθρὸν a reference to a hostile human? Who is then that individual? Whilst אוֹיֵב always has a personal referent, ἐχθρός, though not in SG, can have an impersonal referent as in ἐχθρὸν δέ μοί ἐστιν αὐτίς ἀριζήλως εἰρημένα μυθολογεύειν ‘It is an irksome thing, meseems, to tell again a plain-told tale’ Hom. *Od.* 12.452.

Furthermore, the subject - object relationship in \mathfrak{H} has been reversed in \mathfrak{G} , and יִרְדְּפוּ has been read as יִרְדְּפוּ.

8.4) ἑαυτοῖς ἐβασίλευσαν καὶ οὐ δι’ ἐμοῦ, ἤρξαν καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώρισάν μοι· τὸ ἀργύριον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ χρυσίον αὐτῶν ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς εἶδωλα, ὅπως ἐξολεθρευθῶσιν.

They appointed kings for themselves, but not through Me, they appointed rulers, but without notifying Me. With their silver and gold they made images for themselves, so that they would be annihilated.

הֵם הַמְלִיכוּ וְלֹא מִמְּנִי הַשִּׁירָו וְלֹא יִדְעָתִי כְּסֶפֶם וְזָהָבָם עָשׂוּ לָהֶם עֲצָבִים לְמַעַן יִכְרָת:

ἑαυτοῖς ἐβασίλευσαν] The misguided initiative and spirit of independence is underlined by the use of the reflexive pronoun twice over. That they were the initiative-takers is highlighted by making themselves the subjects of יִדְעָתִי > ἐγνώρισάν μοι. Basically the same tone is conveyed through הֵם in הַמְלִיכוּ.

The transitive use of βασιλεύειν is unknown prior to SG. It occurs a few more times therein, see *GELS* s.v. 2.⁴ In spite of the absence of a direct object, Joosten’s translation, “C’est pour eux qu’ils ont régné,” is debatable, for who are “ils”?

The value of the dative case here is the same as in καὶ βασιλεύσον αὐτοῖς βασιλέα 1K 8.22 < מְלִךְ לָהֶם מְלִכָּה.

⁴ On this question, see Le Moigne 1999.

ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ; **כִּי מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל**] **ⲗ** is obviously amiss, for, as it stands, it makes no sense.

αὐτὸ **הוא**] The pronoun in **ⲗ** is fronted and extraposed to lay prominence on its referent, the calf. However, the neuter αὐτὸ does not exactly refer to ὁ μόσχος, but indirectly to εἶδωλον ‘image (for worship).’

οὐ θεός ἐστὶ **הוא** **לֹא אֱלֹהִים**] The position of οὐ is not merely a mechanical reproduction of **ⲗ**. The negator does not relate to the whole clause, but to the following substantive alone, see *SSG* § 83 d. One could translate the phrase as ‘non-god.’ See above on Οὐ λαός μου 1.9, and *SSG* § 83 i. This is evident when such a phrase is prefixed with a preposition as in αὐτοὶ παρεζήλωσαν με ἐπ’ οὐ θεῶν, παρώργισάν με ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν· κἀγὼ παραζήλωσω αὐτοὺς ἐπ’ οὐκ ἔθνει *De* 32.21.⁷ **ⲗ** is thus distinct from אִינְגוֹ אֱלֹהִים.⁸

πλανῶν ἦν ὁ μόσχος σου **לְנֹשֵׁר יְהִי־בְבָיָם**] Given the difficulty of **ⲗ**, our translator seems to be doing his best guesswork. Joosten (122) mentions a Qumran pesher on Hosea, 4QHos^b, where the lemma is given as **כִּי שוֹבְבִים הֵיָה לְעַנְגָל שׁוֹמְרוֹר**,⁹ which presents a case of number discord, if the restored **שׁוֹבְבִים** is to mean ‘vagabonds.’ Joosten (ib.) also mentions ἀπεπλάνησαν αὐτούς *Je* 27(**ⲗ** 50).6. Here, too, the translator appears to be struggling with **שׁוֹבְבִים** (Q **שׁוֹבְבִים**), and allowing himself to be guided by **שׁוֹבְבִים** earlier in the verse, which he rendered as ἐξῶσαν αὐτούς ‘they banished them.’ This Hebrew word occurs also at *Je* 3.14 and 3.22, where it is rendered as ἀφεστηκότες and ἐπιστρέφοντες respectively, and from the context both Greek verbs are intransitive. Thus the selection of πλανῶ, a transitive verb, is striking, which of course fits for a description of the idolatrous calf.

πλανῶν is not just “a deceiver” (*NETS*), but a wrong, misleading guide.

- 8.7) ὅτι ἀνεμόφθορα ἔσπειραν, καὶ ἡ καταστροφή αὐτῶν ἐκδέξεται αὐτά· δράγμα οὐκ ἔχον ἰσχὺν τοῦ ποιῆσαι ἄλευρον· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ποιήσῃ, ἀλλότριον καταφάγονται αὐτό.

For they sowed wind-damaged (seeds) and their ruin will be in store for them, a sheaf incapable of producing wheat-meal. Even if it did produce, strangers will eat it up.

כִּי רִיחַ יִרְעוּ וְסוּפָתָהּ יִקְצְרוּ קָמָה אִי-לֹא צָמַח בְּלִי יַעֲשֶׂה-קָמָה אוֹלֵי יַעֲשֶׂה וְרִיחַ יִבְלַעָהּ:

⁷ Note an example in CG such as ἐν οὐ καιρῷ πάρει ‘you turn up at an untimely moment’ *Eur. Ba.* 1287.

⁸ On the analogous use of **לֹא**, see *BDB* s.v. **2d** (p. 519b).

⁹ So *Qimron* 2020.261.

- 8.10) διὰ τοῦτο παραδοθήσονται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι. νῦν εἰσδέξομαι αὐτούς, καὶ κοπάσουσι μικρὸν τοῦ χρίειν βασιλέα καὶ ἄρχοντας.

Therefore they will be abandoned among the nations. Now I shall welcome them, and they will desist a little from anointing a king and rulers.

גַּם כִּי־יָתְנוּ בְגוֹיִם עָתָה אֶקְבֹּצֶם וְיִחְלוּ מֵעַתָּה מִמְשָׁא מְלָךְ וּמִשָּׂרִים:

[παραδοθήσονται] most likely = יָתְנוּ. ℣'s יָתְנוּ is rather difficult.

[κοπάσουσι] = יִחְלוּ from √חלה 'to be ill.' ℣'s יִחְלוּ 'they will begin' is unintelligible. All the same, there is no question of infirmity, whether bodily or mental. Hence ℣'s selection of κοπάζω is sensible. *GELS* brings this instance under 2 "to cease, stop what one is doing." We would slightly emend its entry by aligning this instance with ἐκόπασε τοῦ λαλῆσαι πρὸς αὐτήν ἔτι 'she stopped speaking to her any more' Ru 1.18. The genitive article is probably not a mere marker of the infinitive, but ablative in force; the notion of stopping doing something carries by definition an ablative value.¹³ Cf. κοπάσουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν Ez 43.10.

Since in *GELS* s.v. κοπάζω "to lose strength and cease to be troublesome" is given another sense, there is no absolute need to postulate, as Joosten (124) does, יִחְדַּל as lying behind ℣ here.

[τοῦ χρίειν] = חָשַׁם, ≠ ℣ מִמְשָׁא. The Heb. preposition *min* carries the same ablative value of τοῦ. τοῦ here is no mere marker of the infinitive as is the case in μὴ προσθῆς τοῦ προφητεῦσαι Am 7.13.

[βασιλέα καὶ ἄρχοντας] = מְלָךְ וְשָׂרִים; cf. a discussion by Joosten (124).

- 8.11) ὅτι ἐπλήθυνεν Εφραιμ θυσιαστήρια, εἰς ἁμαρτίας ἐγένοντο αὐτῷ θυσιαστήρια ἠγαπημένα.

For Ephraim had kept multiplying altars, beloved altars had turned into his sins

כִּי־הֵרְבִה אֶפְרַיִם מִזְבְּחֹת הָאֱלֹהִים לֹיִלוּ מִזְבְּחוֹת מְאֹד:

[ὅτι כִּי] Either conjunction can be only causal in this context, probably indicating the background against which the events predicted in the preceding verse would take place. Alternatively, this can be one of those rare, fronted causal clauses; see *GELS* s.v. ὅτι 1 a and *SSG* § 76 d, p. 629 last paragraph. Then we would leave out *had* from *had kept* and *had turned*.

The MT adds an *athnach* to the first אֱלֹהִים. Should we follow such a division of the clause, the comma should be shifted: θυσιαστήρια, > ἁμαρτίας,. Then one would translate the second clause as 'they became for him beloved altars.'

¹³ See *SSG* § 30 c. Cf. καὶ ἐκόπασε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ ἐξελεῖν ὀπίσω Ἀβεσσαλωμ 'and the king had no mental strength enough to go after Absalom' 2K 13.39, on which see Muraoka 2015.181f.

εἰς ἁμαρτίας] = אֲחֻלָּהּ, ≠ אֲחֻלָּהּ ‘to commit sins.’ *NETS*’s alternative, “Because Ephraim .. to expiate sins” follows Ziegler’s punctuation, though אֲחֻלָּהּ does not mean ‘sin offering,’ as אֲחֻלָּהּ and אֲחֻלָּהּ do, as in ἁμαρτίας λαοῦ μου φάγονται יְאֻכְלוּ עַמִּי אֲחֻלָּהּ Ho 4.8, on which see above ad loc.¹⁴

ἡγαπημένα אֲחֻלָּהּ] The two terms are totally unrelated to each other. *BHS*, referring to the Lucianic recension, proposes deleting אֲחֻלָּהּ מְזַבְּחוֹת at the end of the verse as a case of dittography. The *Vorlage* of ⓪, however, must have had it, but the translator was justly puzzled with this repetition and rendered the last word freely.

8.12) καταγράψω αὐτῷ πλῆθος καὶ τὰ νόμιμα αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἀλλότρια ἐλογίσθησαν θυσιαστήρια τὰ ἡγαπημένα.

I shall write for him many things and the rules pertaining to him. The beloved altars were considered to be foreign.

אַכְתּוּב־[אַכְתּוּב־] לּוֹ רַבּוֹ [רַבִּי] תּוֹרָתִי כְּמִוֶּרֶךְ נְהַשְׁבוּ:

πλῆθος K רבו Q רַבִּי] The Q is anomalous in form.

θυσιαστήρια τὰ ἡγαπημένα] Most likely a free addition induced by the translator’s favourite subject in the preceding verse, which is also confirmed by the addition of the definite article.¹⁵ He may have taken note of the plural form of the verb. *Pace* Joosten (125) this phrase does not correspond to the first two words of the following verse in א, זָבַחַי הַבְּהֵבִי, which is rendered imperfectly in ⓪ as θυσίαν.¹⁶ The translator has altars (מְזַבְּחוֹת) in mind, not sacrifices (זָבַחַי).

ἐλογίσθησαν] Naturally not by Israel, but by God, who is reminding Israel that his beloved altars are alien to Him.

8.13) διότι ἔὰν θύσῃσι θυσίαν καὶ φάγῃσι κρέα, κύριος οὐ προσδέξεται αὐτά· νῦν μνησθήσεται τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκδικήσεται τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν· αὐτοὶ εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπέστρεψαν καὶ ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις ἀκάθαρτα φάγονται.

For even if they slaughter a sacrificial animal and eat meat, the Lord will not accept them. He will now recall their injustices and requite their sins. They reverted to Egypt and will eat unclean things in Assyria.

זָבַחַי הַבְּהֵבִי יִזְבַּחוּ בְּשׂוֹר וַיֹּאכְלוּ יְהוָה לֹא רָצָם עֲמָה יִזְכֵּר עֲוֹנָם וַיִּפְקֵד הַטְּאוֹתָם
הָמָּה מְצָרִים יָשׁוּבוּ:

¹⁴ On ‘sin offering’ as one of the senses of ἁμαρτία, a take-off from Hebrew, אֲחֻלָּהּ, see *GELS* s.v. 3.

¹⁵ On the syntagm <NP - Art. - Adj.> instead of the more common <Art. - NP - Art. - Adj.> see *SSG* § 37 **bbc**.

¹⁶ Andersen - Freedman (1980.510) prefer to derive הַבְּהֵבִי from אֶהְבֵּב, translating it as “my loved ones” and taking it as a reference to child sacrifice.

διότι ἐὰν θύσωσι θυσίαν יִזְבְּחוּ הַבְּהֵמָה הַבְּהֵמָה] The discrepancy between the two is considerable. In 𐤉 we see nothing that could be translated with the first two words of 𐤅. Nor is there in 𐤅 what would correspond to הַבְּהֵמָה.

αὐτά] What the n.pl. pronoun refers to is not apparent. The object suffix of 𐤁𐤏𐤏 refers to הַבְּהֵמָה, which, however, is translated as θυσίαν, fem. sg. Is reference back to θυσιαστήρια in vs. 12 meant?

The discrepancy between the two text forms at the end of the verse is as glaring as at its beginning. 𐤉 means ‘they will return to Egypt’ or ‘they kept returning (as diplomatic envoys?).’

νῦν μνησθήσεται יִזְכֹּר עַתָּה] The adverb, *now*, implies that remembrance here is not about a mere passive retention in memory, a suggestion that something is still on your mental memory stick. It signifies acting in accordance with what you still remember or consciously, wittingly retain, store in memory, or call back to memory. This holds for both יִזְכֹּר and its Greek equivalents. Note the indicative Pres. as in δίκαιοι μνημονεύουσιν διὰ παντός τοῦ κυρίου, ἐν ἐξομολογήσει καὶ δικαιώσει τὰ κρίματα κυρίου PSol 3.3; ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἀδιαλείπτως ἐν τε ταῖς ἑορταῖς καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς καθηκούσαις ἡμέραις μιμνησκόμεθα ὑμῶν 1M 12.11. See also our remarks on ἐπιλανθάνω above at 4.6.

8.14) καὶ ἐπελάθετο Ἰσραηλ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτὸν καὶ ᾠκοδόμησαν τεμένη, καὶ Ἰουδας ἐπλήθυνε πόλεις τετειχισμένας· καὶ ἐξαποστελῶ πῦρ εἰς τὰς πόλεις αὐτοῦ, καὶ καταφάγεται τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῶν.

And Israel forgot the One who made him and they built precincts, and Judah multiplied walled cities, and I shall send fire into his cities, and it will devour their foundations.

וַיִּשְׁכַּח יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־עֹשֵׂהוּ וַיִּבְנֶן הַיְכָלוֹת וַיְהוּדָה הִרְבָּה עָרִים בְּצִרְוֹת וְשִׁלְתֵּי־תִיאָא
בְּעָרָיו וְאַכְלָה אַרְמְנֵיהֶן: ס

τεμένη [הַיְכָלוֹת] *GELS* s.v. τέμενος defines its meaning as “*piece of land marked off from common uses and dedicated to god.*”

τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῶν [אַרְמְנֵיהֶן] Referring to ‘cities’ (עָרִים fem.), ‘their’ is more *logical* than 𐤉’s ‘its.’

CHAPTER IX

9.1) Μη χαῖρε, Ἰσραηλ, μηδὲ εὐφραίνου καθὼς οἱ λαοί· διότι ἐπόρνευσας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σου, ἠγάπησας δόματα ἐπὶ πάντα ἄλωνα σίτου.

Stop rejoicing, Israel, also stop being merry like the nations, for you have fornicated away from your God, you have loved gifts on every threshing floor for corn.

אַל־תִּשְׂמְחִי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־גֵּיל כְּעַמִּים כִּי זָנַיתְּ מֵעַל אֱלֹהֶיךָ אָהַבְתְּ אַתְּנָן עַל כָּל־גִּרְנוֹת דָּגָן:

μηδὲ εὐφραίνου] The commonly proposed emendation of **שׁ** to אַל גֵּיל certainly makes sense; in the *Vorlage* the verb may have stood spelled תַּגִּיל, *plena* spelled or anomalously for תַּגִּיל.¹

ἐπόρνευσας ἀπὸ **מֵעַל** זָנַיתְּ] See above at 4.12.

ἠγάπησας **תָּ** אָהַבְתְּ] Though the verb in **שׁ** is parallel to זָנַיתְּ, it cannot be made to mean ‘to make love,’ as Andersen - Freedman (1980.523) do, for their translation “for a fee” is unacceptable for this direct object.

δόματα **אַתְּנָן**] Our translator is familiar with this Hebrew word, אָתְּנָן, ‘the hire of a harlot,’ because he translates it with μίσθωμα three times in Mi 7.1 τὰ μισθώματα αὐτῆς .. ἐκ μισθωμάτων πορνείας .. καὶ ἐκ μισθωμάτων πορνείας זֹנֶה אֶתְּנָן .. זֹנֶה אֶתְּנָן .. אֶתְּנָנֶיהָ. His selection of this very generic word, the sole case in the LXX, δόμα, may have been influenced by the similarity of the Hebrew noun with גַּת. LSJ s.v. 2 mentions a 3rd cent. BCE papyrus, in which δόμα is used in the sense of ‘payment.’

ἐπὶ **עַל**] Though this Heb. preposition can indicate proximity as in עֲנָה עִמָּךְ Gn 24.30, where, true, **עַל־הַקְּמִלִים** **עַל־הַעֲרֵי** says ἐστηκότος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν καμήλων ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς, but the noun following ἐπὶ is in the genitive, and <ἐπί + acc.> is never used in this sense. So what happened was not by the threshing floor, but on it, inside of it.² What happened there may, but does not have to, refer to cases of temple prostitution associated with the local, Canaanite fertility cult, for הִנָּה here, as elsewhere in our book, is often used primarily in its metaphorical sense with the intimate relationship between Israel and their God being compared to matrimony.

9.2) ἄλων καὶ ληνὸς οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτούς, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐψεύσατο αὐτούς.

A threshing floor and a winepress did not recognise them, and the wine disappointed them.

גֵּרְן וְיֶקֶב לֹא יָרְעוּ וְתִירוֹשׁ יִכְהַשׁ בָּהּ:

¹ Andersen - Freedman 1980.522 do their best to defend the MT.

² On ἐπί see *GELS* s.v. I 3 and III and on **עַל** see *BDB* s.v. II 6.

του βουνοῦ הַבְּנֵינָה] In a very similar context the same equivalence recurs below at 10.9. It is hardly thinkable that our translator should be unfamiliar with the history recounted in Jd 19 - 20. On the contrary, his knowledge of it is manifest in view of κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ βουνοῦ. There הַבְּנֵינָה is transliterated as a place-name, Γαββα. Is our translator using ὁ βουνός as a virtual place-name, ‘the hill *par excellence*’? That παγίς ἐγενήθητε τῆ σκοπιᾶ 5.1 differs from our case here is evident in view of the revocalisation of חַ הַפְּצִמֹּץ as הַפְּצִמֹּץ; σκοπιᾶ then is functioning as an ordinary substantive.

μνησθήσεται .. ἐκδικήσῃ] On God recalling and requiting, see above at 8.13.

9.10) Ὡς σταφυλὴν ἐν ἐρήμῳ εἶδρον τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ὡς σκοπὸν ἐν συκῇ πρόϊμον εἶδον πατέρας αὐτῶν· αὐτοὶ εἰσήλθον πρὸς τὸν Βεελφεγῶρ καὶ ἀπηλλοτριώθησαν εἰς αἰσχύνην, καὶ ἐγένοντο οἱ ἐβδελυγμένοι ὡς οἱ ἠγαπημένοι.

I found Israel like grapes in a desert and I saw their fathers like an early watchman on a fig tree. They entered Beelphegor and shamefully conducted themselves as alien, and the detested became like the beloved.

כַּעֲנָבִים בַּמְדְבָר מִצְאָתִי יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּבִכְוֹרָה בְּתֵאֵנָה בְּרַאשֵׁי תְּהָרָא אֲבוֹתֵיכֶם הָמָּה בָּאוּ בְּעֵל־פְּעוֹר וַיִּנְוְרוּ לְבִשְׂתַּי וַיִּהְיוּ שְׂקוּצִים כָּאֵֿ כָּאֵֿ :

σταφυλὴν ἐν ἐρήμῳ בַּמְדְבָר כַּעֲנָבִים] Not grapes growing in a carefully maintained vineyard, but wild grapes.

σκοπὸν ἐν συκῇ πρόϊμον הַתְּשִׁימֹן הַבְּכוֹרָה בְּתֵאֵנָה הֶ] is a reference to early figs not yet fully ripe. By contrast, חַ is probably a reference to a watchman who was eager enough to rise early, but posted himself in a wrong place, not by the city gate. His sole concern was to protect figs round his house against thefts. All the same, how חַ arrived at σκοπός is a mystery. The same problem arises at συκαῖ σκοποὺς ἔχουσαι עִם־בְּכוֹרִים Na 3.12, where the authors of *BA* (23_{4,6}.227) argue that חַ represents בְּקָרֶה, not בְּכוֹרֶה. This Semitic root has little to with watchmen or guards. We do not follow their argument, either, that σκοποῖ here means “des premiers fruits du figuier.” We most likely have here a scribal error for καρπός, so in *Index* s.c. σκοπός.¹⁰

On the spelling of πρόϊμος, Walters (1973.75f., 92f.) is firm in his preference of πρῶ-.¹¹

¹⁰ Macintosh (1997.364) refers to Field (1875 ad Ho 9.10), who thinks that, here and at Na 3.12, σκοπός means ‘early fig.’ He admits that such a use is *usus alias inexploratus*. *SD* II 2321 ad loc. holds that here we maybe have an agricultural technical term, though we suspect our translator’s likely urban background and a measure of ignorance on his part in that lexical field, see ad 10.4. As *BA* ad Na 3.12 admits, a v.l. there does read καρπούς.

¹¹ For a more recent treatment of the issue, see BDAG s.v.

καὶ ἀπηλλοτριώθησαν וַיִּזְרוּ] Θ is a reference to Israelites on the way out of Egypt who not only embraced Moabite girls at Peor (Baalphegor in Θ), but also their alien (ἀλλότριος) religious practices. Given the high frequency (37 times)¹² of the equivalence of Θ ἀλλότριος and \mathfrak{H} וַיִּזְרוּ, \mathfrak{H} 's וַיִּזְרוּ must have been read as a form of וַיִּזְרוּ, say Nif. וַיִּזְרוּ. Definitely noteworthy is τὰς ἀπηλλοτριωμένας ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν αὐτῶν מִצְלֵי בְּגִלְיָהֶם Ez 14.5, also a reference to idolatry. Another slight possibility is וַיִּזְרוּ, but the only relevant case is καὶ ἠλλοτριούτο ἀπ' αὐτῶν אֶלְיָהֶם Gn 42.7, where it has nothing to do with a foreign religion, but feigning.

οἱ ἠγαπημένοι] Is אֶפְרַיִם meant for \mathfrak{H} 's אֶפְרַיִם?

9.11) Ephraim ὡς ὄρνεον ἐξεπετάσθη, αἱ δόξαι αὐτῶν ἐκ τόκων καὶ ὠδίνων καὶ συλλήμψεων·

Ephraim flew off like a bird, their glories are from births and birth pangs and pregnancies.

אֶפְרַיִם כְּצֹף יִתְעוֹפֵף כְּבוֹדָם מִלֵּדָה וּמִמְצָטָן וּמִהֶרְיוֹן:

ἐκ τόκων καὶ ὠδίνων καὶ συλλήμψεων וּמִהֶרְיוֹן וּמִמְצָטָן וּמִלֵּדָה] Θ has all the three nouns in the plural, probably in harmony with the preceding αἱ δόξαι αὐτῶν אֶפְרַיִם. However, the conversion to the plural also suggests that Ephraim glories himself in the increase in population. This also has to do with a different syntactic dissection of the verse as shown by \mathfrak{H} and Θ . The Tiberian accentuation adds a disjunctive accent to the first word, אֶפְרַיִם, and a conjunctive to the next word, כְּצֹף. This means that אֶפְרַיִם is extraposed and resumed by the suffix of כְּבוֹדָם and the subject of יִתְעוֹפֵף is not Ephraim, but his glory, an interpretation which cannot be reconciled with Θ , in which αἱ δόξαι (pl.) cannot be the subject of ἐξεπετάσθη (sg.). The thrice repeated preposition מִ is assigned ablative value as we can read in Rashi's commentary ad loc.: Ephraim's loss of glory will materialise in still births (מִלֵּדָה), pre-natal deaths (מִמְצָטָן), and sterility (מִהֶרְיוֹן). Θ , so also Jerome, may have failed to see this ablative value of the Hebrew preposition here.

their glories are from births] We have added the copula, *are*. Joosten (131) deliberately leaves it out, saying that here is an anacolouthon. In Greek the non-use of a form of εἰμί is perfectly idiomatic, when the tense of the verb is not future or preterite, or its mood is not subjunctive or optative. Thus ἐγὼ Ἦσαν ὁ πρωτότοκος σου Ge 27.19 // Ἐγὼ εἰμί ὁ υἱός σου ὁ πρωτότοκος Ἦσαν vs. 32.¹³ Another example is in our next verse: σάρξ μου ἐξ αὐτῶν.

¹² Cf. *Index* s.v. ἀλλότριος; we have proposed to include וַיִּזְרוּ in ἀλλοτριούς \mathfrak{H} וַיִּזְרוּ Ma 3.15.

¹³ For a detailed discussion, see SSG § 94 d.

- 9.12) διότι καὶ ἐὰν ἐκθρέψωσι τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν, ἀτεκνωθήσονται ἐξ ἀνθρώπων· διότι καὶ οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς ἐστι, σὰρξ μου ἐξ αὐτῶν.

For even if they nurture their children, they could lose children. For also woe to them, my flesh is from them.

כִּי אֶם-יִגְדְּלוּ אֶת-בְּנֵיהֶם וְשִׁכְּלָתֵיהֶם מֵאֲדָם כִּי-גַם-אוֹי לָהֶם בְּשׁוּרֵי מִהָמָה:

ἀτεκνωθήσονται [שִׁכְּלָתֵיהֶם] The shift from ‘I’ in 𐤏 to ‘they’ in 𐤎 lays focus on the fate to meet Ephraim, though it is eventually a divine punishment.

ἐξ - 𐤍] Both are ablative in value, indicating deprivation. Note the use of ἀπό, a synonym of ἐκ, in Rebecca’s words – μήποτε ἀτεκνωθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ὑμῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ ἄχαδ יום שְׁנֵיכֶם גַּם-אֶשְׁכַּל לָמָּה Ge 27.45, where also שְׁכַל is rendered with ἀτεκνώω.¹⁴

ἀνθρώπων אָדָם] 𐤎 has rightly analysed אָדָם here as used collectively. On the surface the clause as it stands sounds tautologous. However, the premature death of your own children, in this context, implies the eventual demise of the whole nation.

σὰρξ μου] = בְּשָׂרִי, ≠ 𐤏 בְּשׁוּרֵי ‘when I turn away.’ God’s future plan depends on those children successfully nurtured, so that ultimately they are His human representatives.

- 9.13) Εφραϊμ, ὃν τρόπον εἶδον, εἰς θήραν παρέστησαν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν, καὶ Εφραϊμ τοῦ ἐξαγαγεῖν εἰς ἀποκέντησιν τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ.

Ephraim, as I saw, proffered their children for prey, and Ephraim to take his children out to have (them) pierced through.

אֶפְרַיִם כְּאֶשְׁרֵר-רְאִיתִי לְצׁוֹר שְׁתוּלָה בְּנֹהַ וְאַפְרַיִם לְהוֹצִיא אֶל-הַרְגַּ בְּנָיו:

εἰς θήραν παρέστησαν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν בְּנֹהַ שְׁתוּלָה לְצׁוֹר] 𐤎 departs quite considerably from 𐤏. 1) εἰς θήραν = לְצׁוֹר or לְצִיד. 2) παρέστησαν = שָׁתו. 3) There is nothing in 𐤎 which would correspond to לָהֶ. Was לה read as ׀לה, i.e. ׀הָ ‘for their own sakes’? 4) τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν = בְּנוֹהַי, i.e. בְּנוֹהַי, an Aramaising form that sometimes occurs in QH, replacing the standard בְּנָיו, e.g. יסודותוהי ‘its foundations’ 1QS 8.8.¹⁵ בְּנִיהַ, i.e. בְּנֵיהַ, is unlikely in view of בְּנָי at the end of the verse.

τοῦ ἐξαγαγεῖν] The syntactic status of this prepositional adjunct in 𐤎 is as obscure as that of לְהוֹצִיא in 𐤏. König’s (1897 § 339 z) “bestimmt sein zu einem Act” may relate the infinitive to the following אֶל-הַרְגַּ, but not to what precedes. Our infinitival clause appears to be parallel to εἰς θήραν and an adverbial adjunct of παρέστησαν, but then the intervening Εφραϊμ

¹⁴ Theodoret (PG 81.1601) identifies here an agent in the passive construction, but ἐκ is not so used, see *GELS* s.v. 6.

¹⁵ See *SQH* p. 233.

is disruptive. The logical subject of the infinitive would not be Ephraim,¹⁶ i.e. it proffered his children to be taken out etc.

εἰς ἀποκέντησιν אָל־הֶרֶג] Though it eventually comes down to the same thing, the translator may have found it emotionally unbearable to select a straightforward word such as σφαγή. We could not bring ourselves to say ‘to piece (them) through,’ though Ⓞ does not say who did the piercing.

אָל־הֶרֶג may have been read as אָל־הֶרֶג.

9.14) δὸς αὐτοῖς, κύριε· τί δώσεις αὐτοῖς; δὸς αὐτοῖς μήτραν ἀτεκνοῦσαν καὶ μαστοὺς ξηρούς.

Give them, o Lord. What shall You give them? Give them a sterile womb and dry breasts.

תְּנֶהֱמָן מַה־תִּתֶּן תְּנֶהֱמָן מְשָׁכִיל וְשָׁדִים צְמָקִים:

μήτραν ἀτεκνοῦσαν מְשָׁכִיל] The same Greek verb used in vs. 12 is here intransitive.

9.15) πᾶσαι αἱ κακίαι αὐτῶν εἰς Γαλγαλ, ὅτι ἐκεῖ αὐτοὺς ἐμίσησα· διὰ τὰς κακίας τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου μου ἐκβαλῶ αὐτούς, οὐ μὴ προσθήσω τοῦ ἀγαπήσαι αὐτούς· πάντες οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν ἀπειθοῦντες.

All their evils are in Galgal, for there I disliked them. On account of the evils of their practices I shall throw them out of My house, and shall not love them any longer. All their rulers are disobedient.

כָּל־רָצָתָם בְּגִלְגָּל כִּי־שָׂמַשׁ שָׂנְאֵתֵם עַל רַע מַעֲלָלֵיהֶם מִבֵּיתִי אֶאְרְשֵׁם לֹא אוֹסֶף אֶהְבֶּתֶם כָּל־שָׂרֵיהֶם סְרָרִים:

εἰς Γαλγαλ] εἰς nothing but synonymous with ἐν; see *GELS* s.v. εἰς 8, not only locative, but also temporal.

ἀπειθοῦντες סְרָרִים] In order to differentiate between ἀπειθέω and its adjective, ἀπειθής, one could translate as ‘.. are being disobedient.’ Though our translator may have his own position different from one of his earlier colleagues, we would not insist on this in view of a vacillation such as Ἐὰν δέ τιτι ἦ υἱὸς ἀπειθής καὶ ἐρεθιστῆς De 21.18 // Ὁ υἱὸς ἡμῶν οὗτος ἀπειθεῖ καὶ ἐρεθίζεται vs. 20; Ⓞ is here basically the same, סְרָר and וּמְרָר.¹⁷

¹⁶ What seems to be implicit in Joosten’s (131) rendition: “afin de faire sortir ..”.

¹⁷ At ἀπειθοῦντες ἦτε τὰ πρὸς κύριον ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας, ἧς ἐγνώσθη ὑμῖν De 9.24 the translator could have written ἀπειθεῖς ἦτε, but he probably wanted to highlight the contrast ἠπειθήσατε τῷ ῥήματι κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν with the same verb in the Aorist in the preceding verse, where it is concerned with a one-off refusal.

- 9.16) ἐπόνεσεν Εφραιμ, τὰς ρίζας αὐτοῦ ἐξηράνθη, καρπὸν οὐκέτι μὴ ἐνέγκη· διότι καὶ ἐὰν γεννήσωσιν, ἀποκτενῶ τὰ ἐπιθυμήματα κοιλίας αὐτῶν.

Ephraim suffered, it dried up at its roots, it will never bear fruits, for even if they gave birth, I will kill the darlings of their belly.

הַכְּה אֶפְרַיִם שְׂרִשָׁם יָבֵשׁ פְּרִי בְלִי-[בל]-יַעֲשׂוּן גַּם כִּי יֵלְדוּן וְהַמְתִּי מִמֶּדְי בְּטָן: ח

ἐπόνεσεν [הכּה] The selection of an intransitive verb, πονέω, obscures the fact that its suffering comes from a third party. This selection as the high-frequency Hebrew verb occurs nowhere else in LXX.

τὰς ρίζας αὐτοῦ] Whether we construe this phrase with ἐξηράνθη in keeping with Ziegler's punctuation and the Tiberian accentuation (אֶפְרַיִם) or with ἐπόνεσεν (so Joosten 131), we have an accusative of respect, specification or limitation.¹⁸

καρπὸν οὐκέτι μὴ ἐνέγκη [פְּרִי בְלִי-יַעֲשׂוּן] On the idiomatic rendition φέρω καρπὸν instead of the verbatim ποιέω καρπὸν, quite common in SG, see Joosten 1998.70f.

γεννήσωσιν [יֵלְדוּן] Whilst Ephraim is metaphorically compared to a tree, the translator just recognised the preceding פְּרִי as an ellipsis for פְּרִי בְטָן.

- 9.17) ἀπόσεται αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσήκουσαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσονται πλανῆται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

God will reject them, because they did not hearken unto Him, and they will be wanderers among the peoples.

יִמְאַסֶּם אֱלֹהִים כִּי לֹא שָׁמְעוּ לוֹ וַיְהִיו נִדְרָדִים בְּגוֹיִם: ח

ἔσονται πλανῆται [יְהִיו נִדְרָדִים] The translator could have written ἔσονται πλανῶντες with little difference in meaning, cf. στενῶν καὶ τρέμων ἔση ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς [בְּאַרְצָה תַּהְיֶה נֶגַע וְנֶגַע] Ge 4.12, sim. vs. 14. Though this periphrastic structure appears to be alien when εἰμί is in the fut., this periphrasis meets the need to mark the imperfective aspect, since the future tense is aspect-neutral.¹⁹

¹⁸ See SSG § 22 xh.

¹⁹ See SSG § 31 fc.

CHAPTER X

- 10.1) Ἄμπελος εὐκληματοῦσα Ἰσραηλ, ὁ καρπὸς εὐθηνῶν αὐτῆ· κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῆς ἐπλήθυνε τὰ θυσιαστήρια, κατὰ τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ ὄικοδόμησαν στήλας.

Israel is a vine with vigorously growing branches, fruits are flourishing for it. In keeping with the multitude of its fruits he further added to the altars, in keeping with the splendid produce of his land they built pillars.

גָּפְן בֹּקֵק יְשֹׁרְאֵל פְּרֵי יִשְׂוֹה־לוֹ כְּרָב לְפְרָיו הַרְבֵּה לְמִצְבוֹת כָּטוֹב לְאַרְצוֹ הֵיטִיבוֹ
מִצְבוֹת:

εὐκληματοῦσα בֹּקֵק] The Heb. word is usually considered to be a hapax meaning ‘luxuriant.’ Arabic is the only cognate,¹ in which /baqqa/ is said to mean ‘to abound.’ 𐤀 is the first to take this positive view, followed by Jerome with his *frondosa*. In BH the same sequence of root consonants is more abundantly attested, but with a negative connotation as in פָּרָק יְהוָה בֹּקֵק הָאָרֶץ Is 24.1, where 𐤀 reads κύριος καταφθείρει τὴν οἰκουμένην and Vulg. *dissipabit terram*. There has, however, been an approach which would not recognise two homonyms in BH, but to account for our hapax as an instance of $\sqrt{בקק}$ as exemplified in the just cited Is 24.1. Trg. is the earliest representative of this approach: אָרֶץ בִּזְוִיָּה ‘a plundered vine.’²

𐤀 focuses on branches, hence selecting εὐκληματεῖν < κλῆμα ‘branch.’ This Gk lexeme is a hapax in LXX, and our translator, according to LSJ s.v., has the honour of being the first to use this word, followed by Philo and Philoponus (6th cent. CE). It may be a new coinage on his part.

εὐθηνῶν יְשׁוֹ] Here is a grammatical transformation: 𐤄 transitive > 𐤀 intransitive, bringing along a consequential transformation of 𐤄 accusative (פְּרֵי) > 𐤀 nominative (ὁ καρπὸς). The Heb. verb יְשׁוֹ is neutral in meaning, ‘to furnish,’ whereas, whatever a modern erudite Greek scholar might say, average readers cannot possibly fail to notice εὐ- of εὐθηνέω, certainly not that of εὐκληματεῖν. This focus on the favourable, blissful features of the agriculture in the land of Israel underscores the abominable nature of what Israel was doing with this blessing granted to him.

Our translator most probably knew that the stative verb יְשׁוֹ ‘to be similar, resemble’ is not even remotely close to what comes through from his

¹ Cf. Cohen’s *DRS* II 79 s.v.

² Cf. Ibn Ezra and Radaq: קָרָה ‘empty.’ In our times, see “a ravaged vine” (JPS) and Kaddari (2006) s.v. “to split the earth and grow,” cf. his etymological notes.

translated text.³ Joosten (33) writes “le traducteur semble avoir lu le verbe *shlw*,” and he mentions Zc 7.7 along with two other places (not in XII) as showing the same equivalence. In Zc 7.7 ̅ reads *שְׁלִי*, the referent being Jerusalem. Though the Heb. equivalent is different, our translator may have been thinking of Ps 127.3 *הַיְיָ גִּיּוֹן שׁוֹךְ אֶמְּעֵלוֹס עִירָא* *הַיְיָ*, with *אֶמְּעֵלוֹס* metaphorically used. Besides, this is not the only departure that our translator makes from ̅ in this single verse.

Some take the referent of *לו* as Israel and the subject of *יְשׁוּבָה* also as Israel, hence making the suffix pronoun reflexive.⁴ For him *לו* = *לְגֻפֵּן*, as shown by the fem. gender of the pronoun, *אֲטַחְהֵ*, referring back to *אֶמְּעֵלוֹס*, a fem. noun, though it does symbolise Israel.

אֲטַחְהֵ] Ziegler scripsit. Joosten (133) prefers to read with Rahlfs *ὁ καρπὸς αὐτῆς*, but what would that represent in Hebrew? *פְּרִי*? What would one then do with *לו* at the end of the clause? Simply delete it and reconstitute ̅ as *פְּרִי הִיא*? The fact that Rahlfs’ reading is attested by only part of the sources, for many others including B read *ὁ καρπὸς εὐθηνῶν αὐτῆς*, a secondary *lectio facilior*, which confirms the originality of *אֲטַחְהֵ*, for the gen. *αὐτῆς* separated from *ὁ καρπὸς* would be no problem in CG, but not in translation Greek of LXX nor *לו* .. *פְּרִי* cannot substitute *פְּרִי*. We would thus go along with Ziegler⁵ here.

κατὰ τὸ πλήθος τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῆς ἐπλήθυνε ... κατὰ τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ ᾠκοδόμησαν *הֵיטִיבוּ לְאֲרָצוֹ הַרְבֵּה* .. *כְּטוֹב לְפְרִי הַרְבֵּה* Both ̅ and ̅ display perfect poetic parallelism between the two parts of the second half of the verse. Both parts are an adverbial adjunct prefixed with a respective, identical preposition and are followed by a finite verb. The two verbs share the same subject, in spite of the shift from sg. to pl. The parallelism extends from the grammatical to lexico-semantic level. The preposition *kaf* is attached to a word that designates a quality and the matching quality is expressed by the respective finite verb, so at least in ̅: *רֵב* // *הַרְבֵּה* and *טוֹב* // *הֵיטִיבוּ*. Their roots are not identical, but are unmistakably cognate: $\sqrt{\text{רב}}$ // $\sqrt{\text{רבי}}$ and $\sqrt{\text{טוב}}$ // $\sqrt{\text{יטב}}$.

̅’s analysis of the Heb. preposition is in line with its use as in Ps 51.3 *כְּרֵב רְחֻמֶיךָ מִחַה פִּשְׁעֵי* which is rendered in ̅ as in our Ho passage: *κατὰ τὸ πλήθος τῶν οἰκτιρισμῶν σου ἐξάλειψον τὸ ἀνόμημά μου*. *כְּרֵב* is similarly used in BH five more times. However, it is only in our Ho passage that *כְּרֵב* is followed by the preposition *lamed* prefixed to a noun. ̅ applied the same

³ We doubt that our translator’s Hebrew vocabulary contained a homonym *שׁוּךְ* “reif machen,” which is unknown in Classical Arabic, but Nyberg (1935.71) assures us that it is abundantly attested in Egyptian and Syrian Arabic.

⁴ So BDB s.v. *ל* 5 I (a), p. 515b.

⁵ Ziegler writes: “in *ea* Hi.” (PL 25.901). The Vulg. reads *ei*, an early witness in support of Ziegler.

analysis to the parallel prepositional phrase. This preposition does occasionally intrude into a construct phrase as in *בִּן לְיִשְׂרָאֵל* 1Sm 16.18 instead of *בֶּן יִשְׂרָאֵל*, but not every cst. phrase can be broken up, e.g. *מִזְבֵּחַ אֲדָמָה* ‘earthen altar’ Ex 20.24. The examples in our Ho passage do not come under any of the notional categories⁶ which, in BH, can be optionally expressed by means of an analytic instead of synthetic structure.

The collocation such as *רַב רָהֳמָי* and the likes presumably led our translator to leave out of account this unusual preposition *lamed* away from an alternative analysis of the prepositional phrases, for *כָּרַב* and *כְּטוֹב* can be analysed as representing <כֹּף> (of time) + inf. cst.>, so in Trg. *כֵּד אֶסְגִּיתִי .. כֵּד* ‘when I multiplied .. when I brought,’ an analysis followed by Radaq with *כֹּאשֶׁר*.⁷ So König (1897 § 286d). Here, too, however, the preposition *lamed* calls for an explanation. One proposed by König (loc. cit.) is not quite satisfactory: a kind of *dativus commodi vel incommodi*, for which he mentions, e.g. *רַב לָכֶם שְׂבַת בְּהֵר הָזֶה* Dt 1.6, with a negative connotation, “you have had enough of it,” which certainly is inapplicable to our Ho example.⁸

ἐπλήθυνε] Though analysable as Impf., it is most likely Aor. in view of the parallel *ᾠκοδόμησαν*. The verb is also used intransitively, but here again the parallelism points to transitive value, so Theophylactus (*PG* 81.1605), for instance.

τὰ θυσιαστήρια *לְמִזְבְּחֹת*] The preposition *lamed* in *מִזְבְּחֹת* was probably not under Aramaic influence, but the translator, working more than half a millennium later, would certainly have been exposed to such and interpreted it as equivalent to *תַּחַת*.

κατὰ τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ *ᾠκοδόμησαν*] The poetic parallelism in *מִזְבְּחֹת* was discarded twice over: 1) *טוֹב* analysed as a substantive, *טוֹב* (so Joosten 133) or a substantivised adjective *טוֹב* and 2) the translator could have written *ἠγάθουν* (cf. 4K 9.30) or *ἐκόσμησαν* (cf. *L* there).

ᾠκοδόμησαν] Given the beautiful poetic parallelism touched upon of the verse, *מִזְבְּחֹת* must be the original reading, and our translator allowed himself to take another measure of freedom.

10.2) ἐμέρισε καρδίας αὐτῶν, νῦν ἀφανισθήσονται· αὐτὸς κατασκάψει τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτῶν, τάλαιπωρήσουσιν αἱ στῆλαι αὐτῶν.

He split their hearts, they will now be annihilated. He will raze their altars to the ground, their pillars will be miserable.

חָלַק לָבָם עֵתָהּ יְאַשְׁמוּ הוּא יַעֲרֵף מִזְבְּחֹתָם יִשְׁדֵּד מִצְבֹּתָם:

⁶ See JM § 130 and *SQH* § 21 fa.

⁷ Scarcely acceptable is Nyberg’s (1935.72) analysis; he sees here a nominal, temporal clause, i.e. “als Menge seinen Früchten war ..”

⁸ König does not say explicitly what the function of כֹּף is.

ἐμέρισε] = קִלַּה. What Ⓞ possibly means, patristic commentators are divided, cf. Joosten 134.

ἀφανισθήσονται ἀμὸ ψαῖ] On this equivalence, see above at 5.15.

αὐτὸς ἀη] It was actually up to them to act, making His intervention superfluous. Ⓞ's rendition is rather good.

κατασκάψει ἔργ] The Heb. verb here is agreed to be a denominative of ἔργ 'neck,' so 'to break or crush a neck,' and this is the only case in which the verb's etymology is not evident.

ταλαιπωρήσουσιν ἰδ] Here again we have a transformation of transitive to intransitive. There is no knowing why Ⓞ has not reproduced the parallelism in the second half of the verse: both verbs are transitive and share the same 3ms subject, and both nouns indicate installations for cultic service.

A glance at *Index* (p. 115a) under ταλαιπωρέω, ταλαιπωρία, and ταλαίπωρος shows that these lexemes account for the overwhelming equivalents of ἰד lexemes. This equivalence is rather remarkable because of a discrepancy in meaning between lexemes represented by √ταλαιπωρ- on one hand and those represented by ἰד on the other. The former, "misery," expresses an emotion effected by, and a state of affairs resulting from, an act of "devastation, destruction" expressed by the latter.

The distribution of ἰד is, to a large extent, concentrated in prophetic books, notably Is, Jer, and XII: 49 times out of 58 as verbal forms, and 20 out of 26 instances of ἰד as a substantive. Our translator thus stands in the line of this tradition of exegesis. One is naturally curious to know how all this started.

10.3) διότι νῦν ἐροῦσιν Οὐκ ἔστι βασιλεὺς ἡμῖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐφοβήθημεν τὸν κύριον, ὃ δὲ βασιλεὺς τί ποιήσει ἡμῖν;

For they are now going to say: 'We have no king, because we did not fear the Lord. But what could the king do for us?'

כִּי עַתָּה יֹאמְרוּ אֵין מֶלֶךְ לָנוּ כִּי לֹא יָרֵאנוּ אֶת־יְהוָה וְהַמֶּלֶךְ מֵהֲיִשְׁעָה־לָּנוּ:

ἡμῖν] The Gk dative here as well as its Heb. equivalent can mean either 'for us' (*dat. commodi*) or 'to us' (*dat. incommodi*). With the prospect of a hopeless situation about to emerge, the former is more likely.

10.4) λαλῶν ῥήματα προφάσεις ψευδεῖς διαθήσεται διαθήκη· ἀνατελεῖ ὡς ἄγρωστις κρίμα ἐπὶ χέρσον ἄγρου.

Uttering words which amount to nothing but false excuses, it will enter a covenant. There will rise judgement like dog's-tooth grass on (its) dry and barren field.

דְּבָרוֹ דְּבָרִים אֲלוֹת שׁוֹא כָּרַת בְּרִית וּפְרַח כְּרָאשׁ מִשְׁפֹּט עַל תְּלֵמֵי שְׂדֵי:

λαλῶν [דָּבָרוּ] Though ח may be a description of recent events, יִאֶמְרוּ in the preceding verse, unlikely a reference to the past, makes such an analysis implausible. Then ט 's Vorlage may have read יִדְבָרוּ, a pseudo haplography following לִנּוּ at the end of the preceding verse.

προφάσεις] This must represent עֲלוֹת⁹, an equivalence indicated in our *Index* 103a; there are three more instances of the equivalence. אָלָה can mean 'oath' as well as 'curse.'¹⁰ But then our translator would probably have selected a more straightforward equivalent such as ἄρά.

διαθίσεται [כָּרַת] If ט 's Vorlage accorded more or less with ח , our translator is harmonising a fair bit: כרת as יכרת Impf. 3ms // דבר.

In BH an inf. abs. is at times used with reference to a future action.¹¹ E.g. אָכּוּל וְהוֹתֵר 'they are going to eat and leave something behind' 2Kg 4.43. In יִבְאֲתֶם .. וְהִגַּבְבּוּ 'Are you going to steal .. and then come ..?' Je 7.9f. we have a construction similar to what we have in יִפְרַח .. כָּרַת, namely <inf. abs. - *w-qatalti*>.

ἐπὶ χέρσον ἄγροῦ [שְׂדֵי תְלֵמִי] Exactly the same rendition occurs at 12.11. The equivalence of χέρσος and תְּלֵם is unique to our book. How has our translator arrived at this striking exegesis? Though not a frequent word, תְּלֵם 'furrow' is correctly rendered with ἀλάξ at Nu 22.24, Jb 31.38, 39.10, Ps 64.11. Was our translator an urban scholar with little knowledge of agriculture?

ἄγρωστις [רֵאשׁ] The Gk word is defined in LJS as "dog's-tooth grass," which has been followed in *GELS*.¹² This is more specific than "grass, weed," what we find in Lust - Eynikel - Hauspie (2003.7). "Judgement like grass" is no meaningful metaphor. The word is used once more in XII: ὡς ἄρνες ἐπ' ἄγρωστιν 'like lambs on grass' Mi 5.7 for כְּרִבִּיבִים עַל־עֵשֶׂב (MT 5.6), again in a metaphor, but this time with no negative connotation, being parallel to ὡς δρόσος παρὰ κυρίου πίπτουσα 'like dew falling from the Lord.' In our current passage, however, κρίμα would not be welcome to the audience. In secular Greek, too, the word is not very common. It appears then that the connotation of the word, positive or negative, is contextually determined, hence not an ingredient of the meaning of the word. Joosten (134) may be right in asking whether ט represents דָּשָׂא. All the same the selection

⁹ Cf. Pesh. /'ellātā/.

¹⁰ Keil (1975.129) identifies in אָלוֹת an inf. abs. irregularly formed like שְׂתוֹת in lieu of שְׂתוּה Is 22.13, but "They have spoken words, falsely sworn" sounds unnatural.

¹¹ Callaham (2010.75) claims that this is the most frequent use of the inf. abs. in BH. In the majority of the examples adduced by him the future is expressed not by the inf., but by the main verb, as in מוֹת תָּמוּת Ez 3.18. We fail to see how Callaham (2010.120) can identify habitual modality in our כָּרַת.

Cf. JM § 123 w.

¹² The word is already used by Homer, though once only: *Od.* 6.90 ἄγρωστιν μελιθεᾶ 'grass as sweet as honey,' on which mules feed, but the precise meaning of the word is disputed.

of this rare word is noteworthy. Why not one of those standard equivalents such as βοτάνη and χόρτος? Cf. ὡσεὶ ὄμβρος ἐπ’ ἄγρωστιν (אָשׁוּרִי) καὶ ὡσεὶ νιφετὸς ἐπὶ χόρτον (בְּעֵשׂוּב) Dt 32.2, metaphor with positive connotation. BA V 322 comes down on “l’herbe sauvage,” though rejecting “chiendent.”

- 10.5) τῷ μόσχῳ τοῦ οἴκου Ὡν παροικήσουσιν οἱ κατοικοῦντες Σαμάρειαν, ὅτι ἐπένθησε ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ αὐτόν· καὶ καθὼς παρεπίκραναν αὐτόν, ἐπιχαροῦνται ἐπὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι μετωκίσθη ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ.

Those who reside in Samaria will live next to the calf of the house of On, because his people mourned for him, and as they infuriated Him, they will rejoice over His glory, for it moved away from it.

לְעִנְלוֹת בַּיַּת אֲנֹן יִגְוּרוּ שְׂכֵן שְׂמֵרוֹן כִּי־אָבַל עָלָיו עֲמוּ וּכְמָרְיוֹ עָלָיו יִגְלוּ עַל־כְּבוֹדוֹ
כִּי־גָלָה מִמֶּנּוּ:

τῷ μόσχῳ] A calf as an object of idolatrous worship in Samaria was mentioned earlier at 8.5, 6. The generally accepted emendation of עִנְלוֹת to עָנָה is quite reasonable. Andersen - Freedman (1980.555) sees in עִנְלוֹת a *plurale maiestatis*. However, in view of שְׂמֵרוֹן בְּהַר אֲשֶׁר הִבְשָׁן אֲשֶׁר בְּהַר שְׂמֵרוֹן Am 4.1 (> δαμάλεις [= ‘heifers’] τῆς Βασανίτιδος αἱ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῆς Σαμαρείας) ❸ did not have to change the gender.

παροικήσουσιν] ❸ identified here a homonym of גּוֹר ‘to dread,’ though the rection with the preposition *lamed* is unknown and unlikely, though ❸’s mechanical rendition with the dat. is just as problematic with παροικεῖν.¹³

κατοικοῦντες] Unless ❸’s Vorlage had שְׂכָנִי [= שְׂכַנִּי or שְׂכֵנִי], the pl. is an adjustment to παροικήσουσιν] יִגְוּרוּ. Given its meaning, the collective use of the sg. שְׂכָן or שְׂכַן is unlikely.

καθὼς παρεπίκραναν αὐτόν] Our translator probably did not know this rare Heb. noun. Another instance of it occurring in הַקְרַתִּי מִן־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה לְאֶת־שָׂאֵר הַבְּעַל אֶת־שָׁמ הַקְּמָרִים עַם־הַכְּהֻנִּים Zp 1.4 is missing in ❸ καὶ ἐξαρῶ ἐκ τοῦ τόπου τούτου τὰ ὀνόματα τῆς Βααλ καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἱερέων, where τῶν ἱερέων is most likely a rendering of הַכְּהֻנִּים.¹⁴ The only other attestation of this Heb. noun in BH is at אֶת־הַקְּמָרִים וְהַשִּׁבִּית 2Kg 23.5, where we have another translator ignorant of the word, who resorts to transliteration, τοὺς χωμαριμ, though the proto-Lucianic version is more knowledgeable with τοὺς ἱερεῖς and the historic Lucian has *sacerdotes*.

❸ is probably an attempt to render כְּמָמְרֵי, a Hif. m.pl. ptc. of מָרַר. Instead of rendering it mechanically as ὡς παραπαικραίνοντες αὐτοῦ or

¹³ A third homonym means ‘to stir up for attack, to attack.’ Andersen - Freedman’s (1980.555) ‘they were excited’ is questionable.

¹⁴ On this example, cf. a discussion in BA 23.4,9 ad loc.

παρapiκράναντες αὐτοῦ, he has performed a morphological and syntactic adjustment to the following ἐπιχαροῦνται.

ἐπιχαροῦνται [וְיִגְלוּ] If this well-known Heb. verb means also ‘to tremble’ as some think, e.g. Joosten (135), our translator disagreed. At the only other instance where such an exegesis is suggested, its translator did not agree, either: הָדַד בְּרִעְדָּה וְיָגִלוּ בְּרִעְדָּה Ps 2.11 > δουλεύσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόμῳ. Cf. what Ibn Janach already wrote ad loc.: “it is concerned with a movement which accompanies joy and mourning .. and this movement happens to someone happy, but also to someone in sorrow” (*The Book of Roots* ad וְיִגְלוּ).

This is a rare instance of ἐπιχαίρω used in *sensu bono*, for it is mostly used of malicious joy, see *GELS* s.v.

μετωκίσθη] The form is best analysed as passive in form only. Just as in Ⲭ הָגָה, who caused the disappearance is not part of the message.¹⁵ See also Μετωκίσθη ἡ Ἰουδαία ἡ ἵερωδῆ ἡ ἡγεῖα La 1.3. On this morphosyntactic issue, see *SSG* § 27 d - db. Readers, however, with no knowledge of Hebrew may see here a genuinely passive form, for unlike ἐγενήθη, ἀπεκρίθη and the like, μετωκίσθη as passive here does make sense.

10.6) καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀσσυρίους δῆσαντες ἀπήνεγκαν ξένια τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰαριμ· ἐν δόματι Ἐφραιμ δέξεται, καὶ αἰσχυνθήσεται Ἰσραηλ ἐν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ.

Binding it, too, they carried (it) as a present to the king of Yarim. He will receive it as a gift from Ephraim and Israel will suffer shame over his decision.

גַּם־אוֹתוֹ לְאֶשׁוּר יוֹכֵל מִנְחָה לְמֶלֶךְ יָרֵב בְּשָׂנֵה אֶפְרַיִם יִקַּח וְיָבוֹשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל מִצָּצָתָו:

καὶ αὐτὸν [גַּם־אוֹתוֹ] Readers might construe καὶ with the entire clause as a whole, but could also construe it with αὐτὸν alone as intended by Ⲭ, which is evident on account of the added δῆσαντες; in addition to humans, the calf was also bound and taken to Assyria.

Ἀσσυρίους] On ‘Assyria,’ and not ‘Assyrians,’ see above at 7.11.

ἀπήνεγκαν ξένια [יוֹכֵל מִנְחָה] Ⲭ represents a fairly common imperfect passivisation as in עָשׂוּ יַדְּבָרֵי עֲשׂוּ וְיִגְדוּ לְרַב־קָה אֶת־דְּבָרֵי עֲשׂוּ Gn 27.42.¹⁶ יוֹכֵל is being impersonally used and מִנְחָה is not meant to be its grammatical subject; rewritten in the active voice, the clause would be מִנְחָה לְאֶשׁוּר הוּבְלָה, where מִנְחָה is an object complement, ‘as a gift,’ an analysis which should also be applied to ξένια, the primary object of ἀπήνεγκαν being αὐτὸν.

¹⁵ Thus *pace* “elle a été exilée” (Joosten 135), “sie ist .. (ins Ausland) geführt worden” (*SD*), and “it had been deported” (*NETS*).

¹⁶ Cf. *JM* § 128.

Since the time when the hills were there, Israel sinned, they stood there. Would a war never befall them in the hill? Against the children of unrighteousness

מִיָּמֵי הַגְּבֻעָה הִטָּאת יִשְׂרָאֵל שֶׁם עָמְדוּ לֹא־תִשְׁיָגֶם בְּגִבְעָה מִלְחָמָה עַל־בְּנֵי עֵלְוָה:

Ἄφ' οὖ] A compound conjunction consisting of a preposition and a relative pronoun agreeing in case with the former is fairly common.¹⁹ By definition such introduced a full fledged clause. Hence we have here a remarkable example with the subject only given.

οἱ βουνοὶ הַגְּבֻעָה] On the non-use of a place-name, Γαβαα and the use of the pl. form, see above at 5.8 and 9.9. In this particular case the shift from the pl. to the sg. is striking.

ἤμαρτεν תְּאָתָּה] The sudden shift to 2ms in תְּאָתָּה is abrupt, and also odd in view of the immediately following עָמְדוּ.

πόλεμος:] We identify here a rhetorical question.²⁰ For Ziegler here is a statement that ends with ἀδικίας. This analysis of his has to do with the first word of the next verse, ἤλθον as conjectured by him. See further below.

10.10) ἤλθεν παιδεῦσαι αὐτούς, καὶ συναχθήσονται ἐπ' αὐτούς λαοὶ ἐν τῷ παιδεύεσθαι αὐτούς ἐν ταῖς δυσὶν ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν.

It came to discipline them, and peoples will assemble against them as they are disciplined in their two ways of unrighteousness.

בְּאִתִּי וְאֶרְם וְאֶסְפּוּ עֲלֵיהֶם עַמִּים בְּאֶסְרָם לְשֵׁתִי עֵינֹתָם [עוֹנְתָם:]

This whole verse in תְּאָתָּה is replete with difficulties, a veritable *crux interpretum*.

ἤλθεν] We postulate that this represents באה [= בְּאָהַ], Pf. Qal 3fs. with מִלְחָמָה as the subject. In the critical apparatus Ziegler states that his ἤλθον ‘I came’ is nothing but a conjecture, “*scripsi*,” not supported by any Greek manuscript or version. He is presumably reconstructing תְּאָתָּה as באתי [= בְּאִתִּי]. אֶתִּי means ‘my desire,’ which makes little sense here.

παιδεῦσαι αὐτούς] Translated back into Hebrew it could be ליסרם [= לְיִסְרָם], which can scarcely be reconciled with the form in תְּאָתָּה, and that is not to speak of the strange Tiberian vowel added to the *samekh*. We note that the same sequence אסר is rendered a few words later with the same Gk verb. The Tiberian vocalisation, Qal inf. cst., cannot be rendered as a passive form. Is our translator mentally reconstructing ביסרם [= בְּיִסְרָם], Pu. inf. cst.?

¹⁹ For details see *GELS* s.v. ὄς, ἦ, ὄ e.

²⁰ So *SD* in a footnote ad loc. Cf. also Barthélemy 1992.577f.

Ⓞ probably intends this verse to be taken as a correlative clause in relation to what is introduced with ὡς in the preceding verse. However, the particle cannot be a subordinating conjunction, because ἄρχων Σαλαμαν cannot be the grammatical subject of ἠδάφισαν in the plural. All this is a result of his reading כְּשֵׁר as כְּשָׁר. Another consequence is the need to read הִשְׁצָּץ as הִשְׁצָּצָּץ.

ἀπὸ προσώπου κακιῶν ὑμῶν מִפְּנֵי רַעַת רַעַתְכֶם Ⓞ presents a rare calque of מִפְּנֵי, a compound preposition which often indicates a cause or reason. In ὀδυνηθήσονται ἀπὸ προσώπου πόνων αὐτῶν ‘they will agonise on account of their hard works’ Hg 2.14 this Gk phrase is parallel to one of the standard causal expressions – μιανθήσεται ἔνεκεν τῶν λημμάτων αὐτῶν τῶν ὀρθρινῶν ‘he will get defiled because of their early morning gains.’ Though there is no מִפְּנֵי for this part of the verse, the translator’s *Vorlage* may have read מִפְּנֵי for the first clause cited above. Other LXX translators³³ attempted otherwise: e.g. Προσώχθικα τῆ ζωῆ μου διὰ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν υἱῶν Χετ Gn 27.46, οὐκ ἐδύνατο ἠ γῆ τῆς παροικήσεως αὐτῶν φέρειν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῶν ib. 36.7, where the translator paraphrased.³⁴

κακιῶν ὑμῶν] Is the pl. form an attempt to represent the repetition of the same noun in מִפְּנֵי?³⁵ In XII, the same form, מִפְּנֵי, is similarly represented in the pl. at Ho 7.3, Jn 4.2, and at Ho 7.2 and 9.15 even with כֹּל added. On the other hand, מִפְּנֵי is also so rendered at Jl 2.13.

³³ These two are the only cases in LXX of this causal ἀπὸ προσώπου τινος, see *GELS* s.v. πρόσωπον 6 a. On the underlying מִפְּנֵי, cf. *BDB* s.v. פְּנֵי 6 c.

³⁴ Sollamo (1979) does not deal with the two examples of ἀπὸ προσώπου τινος in XII.

³⁵ Nyberg (1935.82f.) speaks in defence of the Heb. construction as an expression of intensity, translating it with “wegen eurer ungeheuren Schlechtigkeit,” for which, however, the second noun usually appears in the pl., e.g. שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים ‘the song par excellence.’ Cf. *JM* § 141 l and *SQH* § 8 b.

51.4³). Likewise ὀρθρίζω renders Pi. רְהָשׁ thrice (Ps 62.2, 77.34, Is 26.9), and Hi. הִשְׁרַחֵץ thrice (Je 25.3,⁴ Zp 3.7, 2C 36.15). Early birds may have been considered enthusiastic, eager actors, though one might argue that, in the hot summer in the Near East, early start was an existential necessity for sheer survival, not a virtue. Since the primary sense of רְהָשׁ, however, is “to seek,” and has little to do with early morning, the notion of *early* assigned to this verb may, according to Gesenius, be due to *Volksetymologie*, i.e. non-scientific, amateur etymology.⁵ The scientific etymology seeks cognates of רְהָשׁ as a verb root in Jewish Aramaic רְהָשׁ ‘to seek’ and Akkadian /sahāru/ ‘to turn towards, go round, seek.’⁶

That the notion of eagerness had become an integral part of these two Gk lexemes fairly early on is shown by the use of ὀρθρίζω by Ben Sira’s grandson to translate not only Pi. רְהָשׁ, but also Pi. שְׁרַחֵץ: הוֹי שְׁרַחֵץ הוֹי [= הוֹי שְׁרַחֵץ הוֹי] ὀρθρίζε πρὸς αὐτόν 6.36 // מְבַקֵּשׁ הוֹי οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες πρὸς αὐτήν 4.12. Note also ὁ ὀρθρίσας ἐπ’ αὐτήν [= σοφίαν] οὐ κοπιᾷσει Wi 6.14, continuing εὕρεσκειται ὑπὸ τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν (vs. 12), and Ὡρθρίζον δὲ πρὸς Κύριον καὶ ἔκλειον περὶ Μεμφίας Test. Joseph 3.6. Luke was familiar with this feature of SG, when he wrote πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ὠρθρίζεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ Lk 21.38.⁷

Pace Horsley (1981.86) ὀρθρίζω in SG is not a mere verb denoting physical movement, “a bland ‘come.’” Why should one add another verb, and an odd one at that, to the rich Greek vocabulary in possession of multiple verbs denoting physical movement? Why should the translator of נִשְׁרַחֵץ לְקָרְבָּאֵי Ct 7.13 have said ὀρθρίσωμεν εἰς ἀμπελῶνας in lieu of, say, brand ἔλθωμεν εἰς ἀμπελῶνας? In using ὀρθρεύω, a synonymous verb, Euripides adds ἦλθον! in ὀρθρεύουσαν ψυχὰν ἐκπληχθεῖς ἦλθον φορίκα ‘I came shuddering with my mind wide awake early in the morning’ Tr. 182. The preposition πρὸς often found with this verb in SG⁸ does not merely indicate a destination as in Ἠλθομεν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφόν σου Ησαυ Ge 32.6. It is not about an external, physical movement, but an inner one of your mind directed to someone or something. Even when your feet are involved, the emphasis is on what is on your mind, in your heart as expressed in our definition in *GELS* s.v. ὀρθρίζω, 2 “to seek and turn in eager anticipation.” A verb of

³ The references are those of Ⓞ; the corresponding references in Ⓢ are 7.25, 25.4, 26.5, 32.33, 35.14, 44.4.

Though Ⓞ has not preserved any trace of הִשְׁרַחֵץ in וְדָבַר אֶלְיָכֶם הִשְׁרַחֵץ דְבַר Je 7.13, McKane (1986.158) translates it, without any philological comment, “I addressed you urgently,” and Keil (1988.158) says: “from early morn, i.e. earnestly and unremittingly.”

⁴ Ⓢ הִשְׁרַחֵץ need be emended to הִשְׁרַחֵץ.

⁵ Cf. Tov 1990a and Muraoka 2008.

⁶ Cf. HALOT 1465b s.v.

⁷ Cf. BDAG on this instance: “ὄρ. πρὸς τινα also means generally *seek someone diligently*.”

⁸ In *GELS* s.v. ὀρθρίζω 2 add Ps 77.34 and Si 39.5.

seeking such as ζῆτέω never governs πρὸς τινα or πρὸς τι. At the above-quoted Wi 6.14 the selection of ἐπί⁹ is most felicitous, highlighting focused attention.

ἀπερρίφησαν, ἀπερρίφη [נִדְמָה נִדְמָה] Whether or not ℳ's *Vorlage* actually read the pl. גַּרְמוּ, the translator wanted to read here ר instead of ד twice.

Διότι כִּי] The Heb. conjunction here is generally assigned a temporal sense, 'when.' The ancient versions disagree: Vulg. *quia* and Pesh. /mettū d-/; hence both = ℳ. Trg's אָרִי is equivocal, but not explicitly temporal. כִּי as a temporal conjunction with reference to the past, not including כִּי יָהִי כִּי, is rather rare in BH. BDB s.v. 2 a mentions six places including Ho 11.1.

νήπιος Ἰσραηλ [נֶעַר יִשְׂרָאֵל] The absence of a copula in ℳ is not necessarily a slavish reproduction of ℱ. Such a nominal clause is a commonplace in Greek, whether Classical or SG, see *SSG* § 94 *d-da*.

The range of age represented נֶעַר is quite broad. A three-month old baby Moses is so called, Ex 2.6.

καὶ ἐγὼ] The conjunction looks like a rendering of ו in ℱ, but there is nothing there that would correspond to ἐγὼ. The Gk conjunction is not linking the two clauses, the one nominal and the other verbal, but relates to ἐγὼ only. What is meant, however, is not "I also loved Israel, just as someone else did." It is like in Καὶ κύριος παρεβίβασεν τὸ ἀμάρτημά σου, οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνης < תַּמִּיתָ לֹא תָמוּת גַּם יְהוָה הַעֲבִיר הַחַטָּאתָּךְ לֹא תָמוּת 2Sm 12.13, i.e. in response to your admission of your guilt, so the Lord in turn.¹⁰ Such an analysis accords with ℳ's analysis of כִּי as causal, i.e. because Israel was still in its moral infancy, My affection for him was awakened all the more. For such an understanding you cannot do without ἐγὼ.

τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ] = לִבְנָיִ, ≠ לִבְנֵי. With "Israel" no single individual was meant. When Moses was told by God to meet Pharaoh, the latter was to hear: לְאֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי אָמַר יְהוָה בְּנֵי בְּכֹרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל Ex 4.22, when the entire community of Moses' coreligionists were to go.

11.2) καθὼς μετεκάλεσα αὐτούς, οὕτως ἀπόχοντο ἐκ προσώπου μου· αὐτοὶ τοῖς Βααλιμ ἔθυσον καὶ τοῖς γλυπτοῖς ἐθυμίων.

As I recalled them, they would move away from me. They would offer sacrifices to Baals and burn incense to their carved idols.

קָרְאוּ לָהֶם בְּן הָלָכוּ מִפְּנֵיהֶם לְבַעְעֵלִים יִזְבְּחוּ וְלִפְסֵלִים יַקְטִירוּ:

καθὼς μετεκάλεσα [קָרְאוּ] καθὼς appears to be a free addition meant to pair with οὕτως (בֶּן). To restore כִּקְרָאִי [= כְּקָרְאִי] would not do, since that would require changing מִפְּנֵיהֶם to מְפַנֵּי.

⁹ Preferred by Ziegler to πρὸς.

¹⁰ This use of καὶ is also recognisable in διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν 'therefore God in turn exalted him' Phil 2.9, i.e. in response to ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπὴρκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ ib. 2.8.

Rashi identified the subjects of קראו as prophets. In ט we could hear a personal ring of God's communication. Cf. Trg here: שְׁלַחַת נְבִיִּי לְאַלְפָּא לְהוֹן 'I sent my prophets to instruct them.'

ἀπόχοντο .. ἔθουσιν .. ἔθουμιών] Three Impf.'s follow the Aor. μετεκάλεσα as if to suggest that God summoned them once down in Egypt, but since then they kept rebelling.

αὐτοὶ] ט read םּפּנִי םּפּנִי for םּפּנִי םּפּנִי as correctly noted by Nyberg (1935.84), who defends םּ as preferable in preserving the archaic, asyndetic structure, but the asyndesis would be there in ט's reading as well.¹¹ An addition freely made as if to symbolise God's accusing finger pointed at His children persistently and ungratefully turning down God's gracious initiative.

11.3) καὶ ἐγὼ συνεπόδισα τὸν Εφραιμ, ἀνέλαβον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονά μου, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι ἴαμαι αὐτούς.

And I tied Ephraim's feet, lifted him on my arm, but they did not realise that I had cured them.

וְאַנְכִי תָרַגְלְתִּי לְאַפְרָיִם קָהָם עַל־זְרֻעֹתָיו וְלֹא יָדְעוּ כִּי רָפָאתִים:

συνεπόδισα] The sense of the Gk verb, συμποδίζω is definable as 'to tie the feet of' (*GELS* s.v.), and here it is used in a figure of a parent accompanying a toddler as it begins to walk. On another occasion it is applied to the parents trying to prevent their child from walking off and doing as he pleases, whereas the parental action indicated in םּ is more painful: וְדַקְרְהוּ 'and they will pierce him through' *Zc* 13.3.

ἀνέλαβον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονά μου] קָהָם עַל־זְרֻעֹתָיו םּ need be emended to something like וְזְרֻעֹתָי עַל־קָהָם.¹²

οὐκ ἔγνωσαν] Many stative verbs in Hebrew and Aramaic can be used with ingressive value, especially with reference to the past. Thus יָדַע can mean 'he became aware' as well as 'he was aware.' Greek uses two different verbs for the purpose: γινώσκω and οἶδα. When Abram said to Sarai Γινώσκω (יָדַעְתִּי) ἐγὼ ὅτι γυνή εὐπρόσωπος εἶ, Abram was stating his realisation of what implication Sarai's attractive appearance could have; he must have been aware for a donkey's years what an extraordinary wife she was. By contrast, a state of being aware is expressed with οἶδα. E.g. οὐκ ᾔδει ἐν τῷ κοιμηθῆναι αὐτήν καὶ ἀναστῆναι 'he was not aware ..' *Ge* 19.35,¹³ a blissful ignorance on the part of Lot. At ᾔδει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐν ᾗ ἂν ἡμέρα

¹¹ Pesh. has inserted the conjunction: /men qdāmay wa-lva'lā/.

¹² Nyberg (1935.85) postulates a haplography due to the final *mem* of אפריים, but the text as reconstructed by him, קָהָם עַל זְרַעֲתִי, cannot be translated "indem ich sie auf meine Arme nahm."

¹³ We rather prefer "er war nicht bei Bewusstsein" (*SD* 20) to "il ne s'aperçut de rien" (*BA* 158), "él no se dio cuenta" (*SS* 78), and "lui non se accorse" (*SI* 83). Lot was thoroughly intoxicated and unconscious.

11.6) καὶ ἡσθένησε ῥομφαία ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ κατέπαυσεν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ φάγονται ἐκ τῶν διαβουλίωσιν αὐτῶν.

And a sword became weak in his cities and stood still in his hands, and they will consume of what they resolved to aim at.

וְהָיָה הַחֶבֶר בְּעָרָיו וְכִלְתָּהּ בְּיָדָיו וְאָכְלָה מִמַּעֲצוֹתַיהֶם:

καὶ ἡσθένησε ῥομφαία ῥחב הלה] *℣* must have derived the verb from לה *℣* ‘to be sick,’ mentally emending the form to הללה. The sword then becomes Ephraim’s weapon of defence, not that of enemies, which would apply when the verb is derived from √לח ‘to whirl, fly about.’

καὶ κατέπαυσεν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ] = וְנָתַתָּהּ בְּיָדָיו, which accords with *℣*’s interpretation of the preceding לה.

καὶ φάγονται הללה] The sudden shift on the part of *℣* to *w-qatalítí* is difficult to account for. The subject is now perceived as bearers of the sword, hence pl.

ἐκ τῶν διαβουλίωσιν αὐτῶν ממעצותיהם] If we assume Ephraim’s enemies to be the subjects of φάγονται, the preposition *mem* is partitive, and *pace* Joosten (144) not causal, for which the Gk verb would require an object, what to be eaten.

11.7) καὶ ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπικρεμάμενος ἐκ τῆς κατοικίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὰ τίμια αὐτοῦ θυμωθήσεται, καὶ οὐ μὴ ὑψώσῃ αὐτόν.

And his people are hanging on to their residence, whilst God will be wroth over what they cherish and will never exalt them.

וְעַמִּי תְלוּאִים לְמִשׁוֹבְתָי וְאֶל-עַל יִקְרָאָהּ וְיַחַד לֹא יְרוּמֶם:

ἐκ τῆς κατοικίας αὐτοῦ] = מִשׁוֹבְתָי, as in κατοικίαν αὐτοῦ < ἰσοβ Ob 3 or = ἰσοבו.

The preposition *lamed* prefixed to *משׁוֹבְתָי* is suspicious, for whether from √לא or √לה, the verb in the sense of ‘to hang on’ governs על, and never ל. Accordingly κρεμάζω, κρεμάννυμι mostly governs ἐπί, e.g. κρεμάμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου De 21.23. There also occur, however, two other cases with ἐκ: ἐκ μαστῶν κρεμάσαντες τὰ βρέφη ‘making the babes hang at their breasts’ and more relevantly to our Ho instance in ἐξ ἡμῶν κρέματα ἢ ψυχῆ αὐτῶν ‘their lives depend on us’ Ju 8.24.²⁶ This suggests that *℣* represents *משׁוֹבְתָי*.

ὁ θεὸς] = אל.

²⁶ Among examples mentioned in BDAG s.v. κρεμάννυμι (2) we find ἐξ ὄν κρεμαμένη πᾶσα ψυχὴ πολίτου παντός ‘on which [= private possessions] every soul of every citizen hangs’ Plato *Leg.* 8.831c.

τὰ τίμια αὐτοῦ] = יְקָרָיו, either from יָקַר or יִקָּר, though the latter is attested in BH only in the sg. Another possibility is < יְקָרִי, an adjective substantivised. θυσωθήσεται] = יָחַר or יִחָרָה, in any case from חָרָה.

ὑψώση αὐτόν יְרוּמָם In \mathcal{E} of this verse every reference to Ephraim takes the form of a 3ms conjunctive pronoun. Hence αὐτόν is probably a free addition rather than an object suffix of a putative יְרוּמָם, Hif. rather than Pol.²⁷

On the whole the message that comes through from \mathcal{E} is substantially different from that of \mathcal{H} , though the interpretation of the latter is fraught with difficulties of its own, e.g. “my .. my .. him .. he,” all apparently referring to God.

11.8) τί σε διαθῶ, Εφραιμ; ὑπερασπιῶ σου, Ἰσραηλ; τί σε διαθῶ; ὡς Ἀδαμα θήσομαι σε καὶ ὡς Σεβωϊμ; μετεστράφη ἡ καρδία μου ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, συνεταράχθη ἡ μεταμέλειά μου.

How am I to deal with you, Ephraim? Am I to shield you, Israel? How am I to deal with you? Am I to treat you like Adama and like Seboim? My heart has changed over the same matter, My sense of regret has been aroused.

אֵיךְ אֶתְּנֶה אֶפְרַיִם אֲמַגֵּנְךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵיךְ אֶתְּנֶה כְּאַדְמָה אֲשִׁימָךְ כְּצְבֹאִים נְהַפֶּךָ עָלַי
לְבִי יִחַד נִכְמְרוּ נַחֲוִימֵי:

τί ἄϊ] The use of τί in the sense of ‘How?, In what way?’, unknown prior to SG, started as a Hebraism as exemplified in קִמָּה-נִצְטָדְק > τί δικαιωθῶμεν; Ge 44.16. Likewise at Ex 10.26, Nu 23.8, Si 38.25, Mi 6.3.²⁸ Since \mathcal{H} has here אֵיךְ, it appears that this innovative SG usage had stabilised by the time when the translation of XII was launched. Note that a reviser took offence at this anomaly and improved Τί [= קִמָּה] σώσει ἡμᾶς οὗτος; 1Sm 10.27 to Τίς σώσει ἡμᾶς; οὗτος; in the proto-Lucianic version.

Pace Joosten (145), who offers an alternative translation of “Que te ferai-je?,” referring to Jerome’s “*quid faciam tibi*,” τί cannot be a direct object here, for διατίθημι in the active voice does not take two direct objects.

σε διαθῶ ἄתְּנָךְ] The selection of διατίθημι twice to render the most common Heb. verb is noteworthy. The Gk verb is rather rare in SG in the active voice. Whilst תָּתַן here appears to carry the sense of ‘to give up, not to care about, abandon,’ \mathcal{E} most probably saw the following שָׁפ as being used as its synonymous parallel. In BH תָּתַן is often so used, as can be seen from quite an extensive listing in BDB s.v. **Qal 2** “*Put, set, nearly = שָׁפ, and sts. || with it*”; see also ib. under **3** “*Make, constitute*.”

²⁷ Thus *pace* Nyberg 1935.89.

²⁸ The two instances at Mi 6.3 could be added in *GELS* s.v. τίς **II *c**.

ὑπερασιῶ σου **אֶמְנַן־ךָ** **ע** accords with what it sees as God's positive, supportive stance, and it is in line with its exegesis of **נָתַן** as indicated above. This Heb. verb that occurs only twice more in BH is said to mean 'to deliver, hand over' as at **מָגַן צְרִיךָ בְּיַדִּי** Gn 14.20 > παρέδωκεν τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποχειρίους σοι. The third instance is interesting: **עָצַרְתָּ תְּמַנְנָתְךָ** Pr 4.9 > στεφάνω δὲ τρυφῆς ὑπερασίση σου. Are these two translators etymologising, starting from **מָגַן** 'spear' [> ἄσπίς five times]?

ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ] = **עָלְיִי**.²⁹ The unusual selection of **ἐν** is probably due to the translator's failure to see the value of the Heb. preposition for a painful effect being felt, a kind of *dativus incommodi*, e.g. **עָלֵי לְבִי רָוִי** 'my heart is sick' Je 8.18, **בְּהִתְעַטָּף עָלֵי רוּחִי** 'as my spirit faints' Ps 142.4, **מָתָה עָלַי רָחֵל** 'Rachel died on me' Gn 48.7; see JM § 133 f.³⁰ Though the same phrase translates **יַדְּךָ** at Zc 10.3, where 'together' makes good sense, but certainly not here.

The syntagm **ὁ αὐτός** is idiomatically used with the value of 'one and the same' and it can also be substantivised here, see *SSG* § 14. This value, however, is sometimes weakened, making the phrase as equivalent to a plain demonstrative pronoun like *the same* in obsolete English, e.g. "And Jehovah appeared unto him the same night [**בַּלַּיְלָה הַהוּא**]" Ge 26.24. This might apply to our Ho example. The gender of the pronoun is equivocal; it could be 'the same person [= the same persons, i.e. Ephraim].'

συνεταράχθη ἢ μεταμέλειά μου **נִכְמְרוּ נַחוּמֵי** Cf. **ἐταράχθη ἢ μήτρα αὐτῆς** **רַחֲמֶיהָ** 3K 3.26.

The Gk word *μεταμέλεια* occurs only once more in LXX: **ἡ χρηστότης σου ἐπὶ ἁμαρτάνοντας ἐν μεταμελείᾳ** 'Your mercy is on those who sinned(, but) are remorseful' PSol 9.7. Its cognates are more frequent: *μεταμέλομαι* 14x and *μετάμελος* 3x. Their most frequent Heb. equivalent is **נַחַם** Nif. (9x) or **נַחוּמֵי** (1x), see *Index* 78b.

11.9) οὐ μὴ ποιήσω κατὰ τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ θυμοῦ μου, οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπω τοῦ ἐξαλειφθῆναι τὸν Εφραιμ· διότι θεὸς ἐγώ εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος· ἐν σοὶ ἅγιος, καὶ οὐκ εἰσελεύσομαι εἰς πόλιν.

I shall never act according to the fury of my anger, I shall never desert Ephraim to be obliterated, because I am God, and not a human being. In Me there is a holy one, and I shall not enter a city.

**לֹא אֶעֱשֶׂה חַרוֹן אַפַּי לֹא אָשׁוּב לְשַׁחַת אֶפְרַיִם כִּי אֵל אֲנִי וְלֹא־אִישׁ בְּקִרְבִּי
קְדוֹשׁ וְלֹא אָבוֹא בְעִיר:**

²⁹ Pace Nyberg (1935.89), who thinks this is a rendition of **נָתַן**, which, in our view, is loosely represented with the prefix of **עָלְיִי**. See also *SD* II 2329.

³⁰ This force of **עָלְיִי** seems to have escaped most LXX translators, e.g. **שָׁנְתָה נִדְתָּ עָלַיְהִי** > ὁ ὕπνος ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Da 6.19 TH.

κατὰ τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ θυμοῦ μου] The translator may have been uncomfortable with ὀργή as a direct object of ποιέω. This Heb. collocation is as uncommon. Another rare instance of it is לֹא עָשִׂיתָ חֶרֶץ אֶפְסוּ בְּעַמְלֶךָ 1K 28.18, where its literal translation οὐκ ἐποίησας θυμὸν ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ ἐν Αμαλῆκ has been stylistically improved in the proto-Lucianic revision with οὐκ ἐπλησας .. ‘you did not vent ...’ cf. ἐποίησας εἰς ἡμᾶς, κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, κατὰ πᾶσαν ἐπιείκειάν σου καὶ κατὰ πάντα οἰκτιρισμόν σου τὸν μέγαν Ba 2.27.

ἐγκαταλίπω בּוֹשֵׁב] The discrepancy is considerable. One cannot even begin to guess how “I repeat” could have been interpreted as meaning “I abandon.”³¹ Since the inf. clause in 6 can be only exegetical, τὸν Εφραιμ must be a direct object of ἐγκαταλίπω, though its dislocation is anomalous, and the former is simultaneously the subject of the infinitive.

The anarthrous, indeterminate πόλις is remarkable.

11.10) ὀπίσω κυρίου πορεύσομαι· ὡς λέων ἐρεύζεται, ὅτι αὐτὸς ὠρύσσεται, καὶ ἐκστήσονται τέκνα ὑδάτων.

I shall walk behind the Lord. He will roar like a lion, because He will howl, and (then) children of waters will be stunned.

אֶהְיֶה יְהוָה יִלְכוּ כְּאַרְיֵה יִשָּׂאג כִּי־הוּא יִשָּׂאג בְּנִים מִים:

πορεύσομαι [יִלְכוּ] 6's personal focus.

αὐτὸς [הוּא] in contrast to τέκνα ὑδάτων.

τέκνα ὑδάτων] = בְּנֵי מִים or בְּנֵי מַיִם with homoioarcton. What the phrase, whether in 6 or 10, is supposed to mean is enigmatic.

ἐκστήσονται [יִקְרְדוּ] This is a rare instance of ἐξέστημι tinged with a sense of awe. Note καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα Ex 19.18, where the subject of the verb in 10 is Mount Sinai – וַיִּקְרַד כָּל־הָהָר מֵאֵד, and the occasion was a theophany accompanied by unusual natural phenomena.³²

11.11) καὶ ἐκστήσονται ὡς ὄρνεον ἐξ Αἰγύπτου καὶ ὡς περιστέρα ἐκ γῆς Ἀσσυρίων· καὶ ἀποκαταστήσω αὐτοὺς εἰς τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν, λέγει κύριος.

And they will be stunned like a bird out of Egypt and like a dove out of the land of Assyria, and I shall resettle them in their houses, says the Lord.

יִקְרְדוּ כְּצִפּוֹר מִמְצָרַיִם וְכִיּוֹנָה מֵאֶרֶץ אַשּׁוּר וְהוֹשְׁבֵיהֶם עַל־בְּתֵיהֶם נְאֻם־יְהוָה: ס

³¹ How Nyberg (1935.89) could translate 6 back to אֶשְׁבֵּנוּ is beyond us. In LXX there is not a single instance of such equivalence.

³² One is reminded of the popular application of the title קְרָדִים to regular visitors at the wailing wall.

ἐξ Αἰγύπτου καὶ .. ἐκ γῆς Ἀσσυρίων] “(On their return home) out of ..” is probably meant.

ἀποκαταστήσω αὐτοὺς] = **יְשִׁיבֵנִי** as indicated in *GELS* 2002a, s.v. ἀποκαθίστημι. This identification is supported by a case such as καὶ ἀποκαταστήσω αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν < **עַל-אֲדָמָתָם יְשִׁיבֵנִי** Je 16.15. See also Je 24.6. Noteworthy is **יְשִׁיבוּ עַל-אֲדָמָתָם** > καὶ ἀπεκατέστησεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν Je 23.8, a radical reformulation of **יְשִׁיבוּ** to **הוֹשִׁיב**. All these three instances are about a return from exile, whether from the south or north. In LXX there is no instance of **יָשַׁב** Qal or Hi, rendered with ἀποκαθίστημι.

11.12 [**י** 12.1]) Ἐκύκλωσέν με ἐν ψεύδει Ἐφραϊμ καὶ ἐν ἀσεβείαις οἴκος Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδα. νῦν ἔγνω αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός, καὶ λαὸς ἅγιος κεκλήσεται θεοῦ.

Ephraim surrounded me with falsehood, and with acts of impiety the house of Israel and Judah. Now God recognised them, and it shall be called a holy people of God.

**סְבָבְנִי בַכְחַשׁ אֶפְרַיִם וּבַמְרָמָה בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהִי וְהָיָה עַד רֹד עַם-אֶל וְעַם-קֶדְוֹשִׁים
:נְאֻמִּין**

ἐν ἀσεβείαις [בַּמְרָמָה] For some reason unknown to us the synonymic parallelism in **י** has been disrupted in **י**. The rendering in XII of these two substantives looks as below:

כְּחַשׁ	ψεῦδος	Ho 7.3, 11.21 [12.1]
	ψευδής	Ho 10.13, Na 3.1
מְרָמָה	δόλος	Mi 6.11, Zp 1.9
	ἀδικία	Ho 12.8
	ἄδικος	Am 8.5
	ἀσεβεία	Ho 11.21 [12.1]

In Ho 12.8, Am 8.5, and Mi 6.11 it is about false weights. Zp 1.9 is illuminating with two vices mentioned next to each other: ἀσεβείας καὶ δόλου, though the first term is **מִמָּה**, thus not synonymous with the second. At Ho 11.21 our translator may not have wanted to repeat two synonyms, when, in theory, he could have written ἐν δόλοις, for instance. Nowhere in LXX we find ἀσεβεία translating **מְרָמָה**.³³

³³ On the question of multiple synonyms in Hebrew and their reflection in LXX with special reference to XII, see Muraoka 2019.

νῦν ἔγνω αὐτοὺς] Already BDB s.v. **רור** identified **ר** as being equal to **רע**.

λαὸς ἅγιος κεκλήσεται θεοῦ] Is **ר** reading **רמא = רמא**? That the translator is taking a measure of freedom with his *Vorlage* is shown by the position of the added θεοῦ, separated from λαός.

This alternative Fut. form, κεκλήσομαι, instead of κληθήσομαι, is already known to Homer, as noted in *GELS* 2002a s.v. καλέω.

CHAPTER XII

12.1 [ᾧ 12.2] ὁ δὲ Εφραιμ πονηρὸν πνεῦμα, ἐδίωξε καύσωνα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν· κενὰ καὶ μάταια ἐπλήθυνε καὶ διαθήκην μετὰ Ἀσσυρίων διέθετο, καὶ ἔλαιον εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐνεπορεύετο.

Ephraim is a wicked spirit; it chased a hot wind all day long. It would multiply empty and worthless things, and made an agreement with Assyria, and would import oil into Egypt.

אֶפְרַיִם רָעָה רוּחַ וְרָדָף קָדִים כִּלְהֵיוֹם כְּנֹב וְשֹׁד יִרְבֶּה וּבְרִית עִם־אֲשׁוּר יִכְתּוּ
וְשֶׁמֶן לְמִצְרַיִם יֵבֵל:

πονηρὸν πνεῦμα] The parallelism of רוּחַ and קָדִים must have been apparent to our translator, but he may have found the wind as the object of grazing strange and reconstructed the text as רָע רוּחַ. If we want to retain רוּחַ as parallel to קָדִים, then we would need to understand רָע pragmatically in the sense of ‘harmful, destructive,’ for a wind cannot be held morally responsible for any effect produced by it, thus *pace* “an evil wind” (NETS). Beside this semantic difficulty, the translator’s reconstruction brings along syntactic ones as well. Because of its fronted position, רָע cannot be an attributively used adjective: for πονηρὸν πνεῦμα we would anticipate רָע רוּחַ, if not רוּחַ רָע. Then רָע can be only in the st. cst. In this syntagm, an adjective can be an attribute of the following nomen regens, but syntactically must concord with the preceding nucleus noun as in מֵעַלְלֵימָּ 1Sm 25.3 > ὁ ἄνθρωπος σκληρὸς καὶ πονηρὸς ἐν ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ‘the man is hard and evil in deeds.’¹ Thus ᾧ’s πονηρὸν πνεῦμα is a compromise in lieu of πονηρὸς ἐν πνεύματι or πονηρὸς πνεύματι. Cf. οἱ ἄωμοι ἐν ὁδοῖς Ps 118.1 (< תְּמִימֵי־דָרָךְ) and καλὸς τῶ εἶδει καὶ ὥραϊος τῆ ὄψει Ge 39.6 (< יָפֶה־תְּאֵר < וַיִּפֶּה מְרֹאֶה).

Joosten (148) mentions an evil spirit that harassed Saul (1K 16.14-23). One should note, however, that 1) in 1K the phrase is רוּחַ רָעָה and more importantly 2) this spirit originated with God, מֵאֵת יְהוָה (vs. 14), רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים, רוּחַ רָעָה (vss. 15, 16),² and רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים (vs. 23). If Ephraim had been in the same situation as Saul, God would have been responsible for Ephraim’s spiritual condition, at least in part, which we would consider highly unlikely.

¹ On this Hebrew construction, see JM § 129 *i-ia*.

² We agree with Driver (1913.137), who holds that רוּחַ רָעָה in רוּחַ רָעָה (1K 16.23) is an adjective, as the phrase in these two verses proves, for one cannot have two nomina regentia without a conjunctive *waw* linking them.

ἐδίωξε] = הִדְרִי for הִדְרִי? In spite of ὄλην τὴν ἡμέραν the selection of the Aor. instead of the Impf. should not be condemned. It is not grammatically wrong to decide not explicitly to underscore the ingressive nature of the action in question. Cp. ἔκλειεν ὁ λαὸς ὄλην τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην Nu 14.1 with ἔκλαυσαν τὸν Ααρων τριάκοντα ἡμέρας πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραηλ ib. 20.29, cf. SSG § 28 c (i), p. 260. ἐπλήθυνε is morphologically equivocal, whereas the shift to the Aor. διέθετο and back to the Impf. ἐνεπορεύετο is understandable. Should we postulate הִדְרִי for הִדְרִי, we would have in this single verse four *yiqtol*s with no *waw* prefixed, and one of them, יִכְרֹתוּ is perfective.³

μάταια] Most likely = שָׁו (= שֹׁוּ). שֹׁוּ is the most frequent equivalent of μάταιος in LXX.⁴ For our translator *ταλαιπωρία* is the most frequent rendition of שָׁו: Ho 9.6, Jl 1.15, Am 3.10, 5.9b, Hb 1.3, 2.17. κενός and μάταιος may have looked to him as forming a good pair.

ἐνεπορεύετο [יִבְּלֵ] The Gk verb ἐμπορεύομαι is never used in a genuine passive form, whereas יִבְּלֵ is passive with שֹׁוּ as its subject. In הִדְרִי, then, ἔλαιον must be in the acc. With the shift from passive to active the translator may be trying to harmonise the last verb with the remaining ones in the verse. As a result the reader of הִדְרִי understands that it is not about some Egyptian people engaged in import-export business, but that local immigrants from Ephraim made sure that their valuable produce back home was imported into Egypt.⁵

12.2 [הִדְרִי 12.3] καὶ κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ πρὸς Ἰουδαν τοῦ ἐκδικῆσαι τὸν Ἰακωβ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτοῦ ἀνταποδώσει αὐτῷ.

And the Lord has a case against Judah to requite Jacob in accordance with his ways, and in accordance with his practices I shall repay him.

וְרִיב לְיְהוָה עִם־יְהוּדָה וְלִפְקֹד עַל־יַעֲקֹב כְּדִרְכֵּי כְּמַעֲלָלָיו וְשִׁיב לּוֹ:

The thought expressed in this verse and the way it is worded is very close to what we find above in 4.1 and 4.9.

12.3 [הִדְרִי 12.4] ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ ἐπτέρνισεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν κόποις αὐτοῦ ἐνίσχυσε πρὸς θεὸν

In the womb he kicked his brother with the heel and through his toilsome efforts displayed strength vis-à-vis God,

בְּבֶטֶן עָקַב אֶת־אָחִיו וּבְאוּנוֹ שָׁרַף אֶת־אֱלֹהִים:

³ As known to poetic BH, see JM § 113 h.

⁴ In addition to 12 instances mentioned in HR we have added six more, including Ho 12.1. In *Index* s.v. μάταιος, Ho 5.1 is an error for Ho 5.11.

⁵ Outside of BG our Gk verb can mean ‘to travel,’ but then with a human subject.

ἐπτέρνισεν בקץ] Whilst the first half of this verse echoes back the story told in Ge 25.22-26 about a struggle between the twin brothers already at their birth, neither πτερνίζω nor בקץ is used there, for we are only told that Jacob came out of his mother's womb, gripping the heel of Esau – ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἐπειλημμένη τῆς πτέρνης Ησαυ· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰακωβ < בקץ שמו ויקרא עשו בקץ בְּעִקְבֵי אָחִיו.⁶ Later when the Heb. verb is heard in a *cri de cœur* of Esau, it is not a reference to what happened at their birth – Δικαίως ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰακωβ· ἐπτέρνικεν (בְּקָצָה) γάρ με ἦδη δεύτερον τοῦτο· τὰ τε πρωτοτόκιά μου εἴληφεν καὶ νῦν εἴληφεν τὴν εὐλογίαν μου Ge 27.36. Then we seem to have here a new folk-etymology of the name בקץ.

Whereas the Gk verb is a derivative of πτέρνη 'heel,' it is not attested prior to LXX and is rather rarely used there. One cannot be absolutely certain what the verb means, what one does with one's own heel or to someone else's. In its first occurrence in LXX (Ge 27.36) it carries a negative connotation. In neither instance said by Esau to illustrate Jacob's character the heel plays any role, so that the verb is used metaphorically.

The second half of the verse goes back to the story on the all-night wrestling between Jacob and a stranger as recounted in Ge 32.

κόποις αὐτοῦ אִוְנוֹ] The equation וְנוֹ / κόπος, always in the pl. as here, occurs a few more times in XII: Mi 2.1, Hb 1.3, 3.7, Zc 10.2. In the story in Ge 32 the wresting is expressed with קָבַץ פָּאֵלָיו.

ἐνίσχυσε πρὸς θεὸν אֶת-אֱלֹהֵים וְשָׁרָה] Cf. ἐνίσχυσας μετὰ θεοῦ καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατός < וְתוֹכַח וְעַם-אֱלֹהֵים וְעַם-אֱנָשִׁים וְתוֹכַח < אֶל, אֶת, עַם (this last in the next verse). אֶת is obviously not a nota obiecti. Greek uses two: πρὸς + acc. and μετὰ + gen. The selection of πρὸς here does not mean that the *Vorlage* of ̅ read here אֶל as in the next verse showing the equivalence [אֶל / μετὰ].

12.4 [̅ 12.5] καὶ ἐνίσχυσε μετὰ ἀγγέλου καὶ ἠδυνάσθη· ἔκλαυσαν καὶ ἐδεήθησάν μου, ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ων εὔροσάν με, καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐλαλήθη πρὸς αὐτόν.

and he displayed strength in a contest with an angel and won. They wept and implored me, in the house of On they found me, and there he was spoken to.

וַיִּשֶׁר אֶל-מִלְאָךָ וַיִּכַּח בְּכַה וַיִּתְחַנְּנוּ-לוֹ בֵּית-אֵל יִמְצְאוּנִי וְשָׁרָה יְדַבֵּר עִמָּנִי:

καὶ ἐνίσχυσε μετὰ ἀγγέλου] In view of vs. 3 this represents אֶת-מִלְאָךָ, whereas the vocalisation of the verb in ̅ presupposes שויר attested nowhere

⁶ Joosten's (147) "il saisit le talon de son frère" cannot apply to our Ho passage, unduly influenced by Ge 25.26. As questionable is SD's "ergriff."

else or ררֶץ, which, however, does not mean ‘to overpower,’ cf. וְיָשָׁר אֲבִימֶלֶךְ עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל ‘A. ruled ..’ Jd 9.22 (Θ ἠρξεν). See our discussion above at 10.11.

The shift in person is bewildering: Θ – 3sg > 3pl + 1sg > 3sg and ℔ – 3sg > 1pl.

ἐκλαυσαν καὶ ἔδειθθησαν μου]⁷ If Ge 32 is in the background, who are the subjects of these verbs and who is ‘me’? The prophet himself on the central stage is quite striking. Nobody wept in Ge 32. Jacob and his antagonist asking to know each other’s name is nothing but making an enquiry, no imploring.

ἐλαλήθη πρὸς αὐτόν] Who is “him”? Should “the house of On” be equivalent to “Bethel” as in 4.15 and elsewhere, it would be a reference to the story told in Ge 35. See at 4.15.

12.5 [℔ 12.6]) ὁ δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ἔσται μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ.

The Lord, the God Almighty, shall remain in his memory.

וַיִּהְיֶה אֱלֹהֵי הַצְּבָאוֹת יְהוָה וְזָכָר׃

μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ ῥזָר] This naturally reminds us of τοῦτό μου ἔστιν ὄνομα αἰώνιον καὶ μνημόσυνον γενεῶν γενεαῖς דַּר וְזָכַר לְדָר וְזָה לְעָלְמָא וְהָשָׁמַי לְעָלְמָא וְזָה לְעָלְמָא וְזָה לְעָלְמָא וְזָה לְעָלְמָא Ex 3.15, as stated explicitly in Trg here – וַיִּזְכְּרוּ אֵלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְזָכַרְוּ אֵלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְעָלְמָא וְזָה לְעָלְמָא וְזָה לְעָלְמָא וְזָה לְעָלְמָא וְזָה לְעָלְמָא.

12.6 [℔ 12.7]) καὶ σὺ ἐν θεῷ σου ἐπιστρέψεις· ἔλεον καὶ κρίμα φυλάσσου καὶ ἔλπιζε πρὸς τὸν θεόν σου διὰ παντός.

And you, being affiliated with your God, shall return. Mercy and justice observe, and put your hope in your God always.

וְאַתָּה בְּאַלְהֵיךָ תָּשׁוּב וְקַח וּמִשְׁפָּט שָׁמֶר וְקִנְיָא לְאַלְהֵיךָ תִּמְדָּד׃

ἐν θεῷ σου ἐπιστρέψεις בְּאַלְהֵיךָ תָּשׁוּב] What is the value of the preposition in both Greek and Hebrew here? Our Ho passage is mentioned in BDB s.v. **ב** I 4 under “often pregn. with verbs of motion, when the movement to a place results in rest in it, into.” In five of the instances mentioned Θ uses εἰς (Is 9.23, Ge 27.17, Le 16.22, Jo 23.7, 3K 11.2), once each πρὸς + acc. (Is 19.23b) and ὑπὸ + acc. (Ge 19.8). What we find interesting and important is that the above-quoted description in BDB is correct only in part: the destination of a movement can also be personal, and then it is always about more than one person as in ὅπως μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὰ ἔθνη τὰ καταλελειμμένα ταῦτα Jo 23.7, εἰσελεύσονται Ἀσσύριοι εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι πορεύσονται πρὸς Ἀσσυρίους Is 19.23, Οὐκ εἰσελεύσεσθε εἰς αὐτούς

⁷ For a lucid presentation of the difficulty present also in ℔, see Wolff 1965.275f.

12.7 [𐤅 12.8]) Χανααν ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ζυγὸς ἀδικίας, καταδυναστεύειν ἠγάπησε.

Canaan! It has false scales in its hand, it loved to cause unjust hardship.

כָּנַעַן בְּיַדוֹ מֵאֲזוּי מֶרְמָה לְעֶשֶׂק אָהֵב:

Χανααν [כָּנַעַן] The syntactic status in the verse of this first lexeme is unclear. In 𐤅 what follows, i.e. בְּיַדוֹ מֵאֲזוּי מֶרְמָה, can be analysed as an existential clause and an asyndetic relative clause, ‘Canaan, in whose hand there are ..., loved ...,’ ≠ 𐤆. Alternatively כָּנַעַן הוּא ‘it [= Israel] is Canaan,’ i.e. it has degenerated to the status of Canaan, a notorious community of defrauding tradesmen.¹³ The latter analysis is preferable, since acts of עֶשֶׂק are not exclusively commercial or financial in nature.¹⁴

ζυγὸς ἀδικίας [מֵאֲזוּי מֶרְמָה] The same Heb. phrase is rendered with a slight variation in ζυγὸν ἄδικον Am 8.5. ζυγός on its own can also mean ‘yoke’ applied to animals, a figure of subjugation, but the addition of ἀδικίας precludes such an analysis, and of course the translator could not have meant ‘yoke’ in view of מֵאֲזוּי, and such does not fit its application to Canaan, either.

καταδυναστεύειν [לְעֶשֶׂק] Both verbs are prominent in the respective vocabulary of SG and BH: the Gk verb occurs in SG 34 times, out of which 8 times in XII, and עֶשֶׂק 5 out of 37. Besides, עֶשֶׂק is the second commonest word in SG translated with this Gk verb (7 times including Mi 2.2), following Hif. הוֹנֵה (8 times).

12.8 [𐤅 12.9]) καὶ εἶπεν Εφραιμ Πλὴν πεπλούτηκα, εὗρηκα ἀναψυχὴν ἑμαυτῷ. πάντες οἱ πόνοι αὐτοῦ οὐχ εὗρεθήσονται αὐτῷ δι’ ἀδικίας, ὅς ἤμαρτεν.

And Ephraim said, ‘Yet, I have become wealthy, I have found respite to myself.’ ‘Fruit will not be available to him for any of all his toils because of injustices he committed.’

וַיֹּאמֶר אֶפְרַיִם אֶף עֲשִׂרְתִּי מְצֹאתִי אֲוֶן לִי כֹל־יְגִיעִי לֹא יִמְצְאוּ-לִי עוֹן אֲשֶׁר־חָטָא:

Πλὴν] A clause-initial discourse marker indicating that a speaker or writer disputes and objects to what has been said, whether explicitly or implicitly; for more examples, see *GELS* s.v. **A 1**.

ἀναψυχὴν [אֲוֶן] The Heb. word is usually taken in the sense of ‘wealth,’ as a financial manifestation of strength, which is a more frequent sense of

¹³ As pointed out by Harper (1905.384), by the time of Hosea Canaanites had long disappeared from the land of Israel.

¹⁴ Joosten’s (149) translation and *SD* (1175), according to their respective punctuation chosen, prefer the former. We fail to see what is meant by *NETS*’s “In his hand Chanaan is a yoke of injustice.”

the noun. 𐤂, however, took no note of the parallelism with the preceding 𐤈𐤍𐤏𐤃. Our translator is possibly envisioning a farmer looking over the fertile field and regaining some inner strength after the hard work; note πόνου in the second half of the verse.

πάντες οἱ πόνοι αὐτοῦ οὐχ εὐρεθήσονται αὐτῷ] = כל יגיעיו לא ימצאו לו
One would not know whether or not the translator is attempting to smooth out the difficult text of 𐤈.

πᾶς is often added to a noun, mostly an anarthrous sg. noun, to indicate categorical negation. There are, however, instances of articulated nouns and/or pl. so negated. Another example is οὐ μὴ πλημμελήσωσιν πάντες οἱ ἐλπίζοντες ἐπ' αὐτόν 'none of those who trust in Him will ever suffer a bad turn' Ps 33.23, cf. *SSG* § 88 **fa**, esp. p. 716, and for a similar use of כל, see *JM* § 160 *oa*.

πόνοι] The primary meaning of this Gk word is 'hard work, toil,' whereas already in Classical Greek it also means "anything produced by work," *LSJ* s.v. **III**. This equally applies to κόπος, a synonym¹⁵ and the Heb. word used here, יגיע. This reminds us of nouns meaning 'sin' sometimes mean 'penalty incurred for committing a sin'; see *GELS* s.v. ἀμαρτία 4 and ἀμαρτημα 3, developments influenced by Hebrew, in which words such as חטא, חטאת, חטון evidence similar lexical evolution.

αὐτῷ] The dative case here does not mark the agent of a verb in the passive voice, i.e. 'by him,' as sometimes occurs, e.g. παμμειγέσιν ἔθνεσιν κατοικουμένην 'inhabited by all sorts of ethnic groups' 2M 12.13.¹⁶ We have rather a *dativus commodi*, 'for his benefit, enjoyment,' just as the preceding ἐμαυτῷ.

δι' ἀδικίας, ἃς ἥμαρτεν] Most likely = מֵעוֹן אֲשֶׁר חָטָא; the preposition could be ב. In any case 𐤈 is syntactically very difficult; הוּא אֲשֶׁר חָטָא or אֲשֶׁר חָטָא הוּא is acceptable like הוּא אֲשֶׁר הוּא חָטָא, though even then the juxtaposition of two synonymous substantives joined with אֲשֶׁר is odd.

The combination ἀδικίας ἥμαρτανω occurs in Je 40 (33).8, translating the same Heb. combination as here: ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀδικιῶν αὐτῶν, ὧν ἥμαρτοσάν μοι ἡτῶν 𐤈𐤍𐤏𐤃.

12.9 [𐤈 12.10] ἐγὼ δὲ κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἀνήγαγόν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἔτι κατοικιῶ σε ἐν σκηναῖς καθὼς ἡμέρα ἑορτῆς.

I the Lord your God brought you up out of the land of Egypt, I shall again settle you in tents like on the day of a festival,

וְאָנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם עַד אוֹשִׁיבְךָ בַּהֲלִים כִּימֵי מוֹעֵד:

¹⁵ See *GELS* s.v. **d**.

¹⁶ For a discussion with more examples, see *SSG* § 22 **wo**.

1K 19.10). *GELS* defines the Gk verb as “to withdraw in order to flee a danger.” LSJ does not give ‘to flee’ as its sense. BDAG gives “withdraw, retire, take refuge”; the first instance mentioned is about Jesus taken by his parents to Egypt, Mt 2.14. The latest LSJ Sup. (1996) adds: “withdraw to place of refuge, go into hiding.” The difference is certainly slight,²¹ though for a straight “flight” Greek has φεύγω ‘to flee’ and ἀποδιδράσκω ‘to run away,’ which latter is used in Rebecca’s advice to Jacob: ἀπόδραθι Ge 27.43 (פָּרַח).²²

ἐν γυναικί ψαῖς] The Gk preposition here is a Hebraism, mechanically reproducing the so-called *Bet pretii*, ‘Bet of price.’²³ The source text displays a standard Greek usage: ἐδούλευσά σοι δέκα τέσσαρα ἔτη ἀντὶ τῶν δύο θυγατέρων σου בְּנִתַי בְּשֵׁתַי שָׁנָה אַרְבַּע־עָשָׂרָה עֶבְדְתִיָּהּ Ge 31.41. Joosten (154) mentions another source text where a different Gk preposition is found: Δουλεύσω σοι ἑπτὰ ἔτη περὶ Ραχηλ (לְרַחֵל) תְּהִי θυγατρός σου Ge 29.18, sim. vs. 20. An affiliated usage is evidenced in Classical Greek, e.g. περὶ ἐκείνης κινδυνεύειν ‘to take risks for that (land)’ Hdt. 8.74.²⁴

ἐφυλάξατο ψαῖς] The source text is most likely πάλιν ποιμανῶ τὰ πρόβατά σου καὶ φυλάξω ἀψαῖς צֹאן אֶרְעָה אֲשׁוּבָה Ge 30.31. Is the shift to the middle voice in ט intentional? Jacob was not a mere slave bought by Laban. Then the new service Jacob offered his uncle was meant for his own interest and benefit, for which the middle voice is ideal. However, there are evidences showing that the two voices of this particular verb are free variants; as one such pair we would mention τοῦ φυλάξαι πορνείαν Ho 4.10 and φυλασσόμενοι μάταια καὶ ψευδῆ Jn 2.9.²⁵

The absence of an object complement here is striking, whereas in Ge 31.41 the preceding צֹאן אֶרְעָה makes such superfluous. The Ho version effectively deals with a slight oddity arising from Ge 31.41 אַרְבַּע־עָשָׂרָה עֶבְדְתִיָּהּ בְּצֹאןִי בְּשֵׁתַי בְּנִתַי וְשֵׁנִים בְּצֹאןִי, for Jacob was not aiming to acquire the entire flock of Laban. Hence we read ψαῖς for a second time, and not צֹאן. Hosea knew that Jacob had already slaved extra seven years for Rachel, but Jacob knew that Laban would not let him go with her to build his own life. So the deal he proposed to his uncle was focused on Rachel. Hence ט’s choice of ἐν at Ge 31.41 may have been meant in its locative sense: ἐν τοῖς προβάτοις σου ‘among your sheep.’²⁶

²¹ Joosten (153) holds that our translator is concerned over the patriarch’s dignity.

²² Interestingly ט puts the same in Isaac’s mouth, though פ says לָךְ ib. 28.2. Note also ἀνεχώρησα To 1.19 ט¹ // ἀπέδρασα ט¹.

²³ For more examples, see *GELS* s.v. ἐν 4.

²⁴ For more examples, see LSJ s.v. περὶ A II 1.

²⁵ For more examples, see *GELS* s.v. φυλάσσω ad finem, NB.

²⁶ Cf. BA (238): “en échange de tes deux filles .. au milieu de tes brebis.” Similarly *NETS* and *SD*.

12.13 [𐤊 12.14] και ἐν προφήτῃ ἀνήγαγε κύριος τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, και ἐν προφήτῃ διεφυλάχθη.

And through a prophet the Lord led Israel up out of Egypt and through a prophet it was carefully guarded.

וּבְנָבִיא הַעֲלָה יְהוָה אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרַיִם וּבְנָבִיא נִשְׁמַר:

προφήτῃ [נָבִיא] Readers of 𐤊 would have understood that the reference is to Moses, who was called by the Lord Himself “a prophet” (De 18.18). Yet the noun is anarthrous; the notion of human agency is underlined, not the identity of that agent. All the same it is remarkable that Moses emerges as a background figure in prophetic books. He is mentioned by name but twice in XII (Mi 6.4, Ma 3.22) and thrice in the major prophets (Is 63.11, 12, Je 15.1).

12.14 [𐤊 12.15] ἐθύμωσεν Ἐφραιμ και παρώργισε, και τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἐκχυθήσεται, και τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ ἀνταποδώσει αὐτῷ κύριος.

Ephraim irritated and angered, and his blood will be poured out on him, and his insult will the Lord requite him.

הַכְּעִים אֶפְרַיִם תְּמָרוּרִים וְדָמָיו עָלָיו יִטּוֹשׁ וְהִרְפָּתוֹ יֵשִׁיב לוֹ אֲדָנָיו:

ἐθύμωσεν [הַכְּעִים] Some authorities add με, which may be understood from the context.

και παρώργισε [תְּמָרוּרִים] Confronted by a most unusual collocation הַכְּעִים תְּמָרוּרִים 𐤊 is probably translating free by paring two common synonyms. A lexeme derived from √מרר is not used with reference to anger, the only exception being וְיִתְמַרְמֵר אֵלָיו Da 8.7 > ἐθυμώθη ἐπ’ αὐτόν LXX, but ἐξηγγριάνθη (‘it became savage’) πρὸς αὐτόν TH. 𐤊 may be elliptical for כְּעִים הַכְּעִים תְּמָרוּרִים ‘he bitterly angered (Me).’²⁷ By contrast, Greek √πικρ- lexemes are, like Engl. *bitter*, sometimes used with reference to anger. E.g. ἐν βδελύγμασιν αὐτῶν ἐξεπίκρανάν με ‘they irritated me with their abominations’ De 32.16 (// παροξύνω); μή μοι πικρανθῆς To 5.14 𐤊^I (// ὀργισθῆς 𐤊^I); ποσάκεις παρεπίκραναν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, παρώργισαν αὐτὸν ἐν γῆ ἀνύδρω; Ps 77.40.

ἐκχυθήσεται] Far less ambiguous than 𐤊 יִטּוֹשׁ.

τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ] The pronoun may refer to Ephraim (subjective genitive) or to God (objective gen.). The suffix pronoun of וְהִרְפָּתוֹ is just ambiguous.

²⁷ Then, *pace* Nyberg (1935.99), תְּמָרוּרִים is not serving as a pseudo cognate object synonymous with כְּעִים.

κύριος אֱלֹהֵינוּ] As a reference to God אֱלֹהֵינוּ is most unusual. We are not aware of any other instance of pl. אֱלֹהֵינוּ with or without a suffix pronoun attached except אֱלֹהֵינוּ as equivalent to יהוה.

CHAPTER XIII

13.1) Κατὰ τὸν λόγον Εφραιμ δικαιώματα αὐτὸς ἔλαβεν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ καὶ ἔθετο αὐτὰ τῇ Βααλ καὶ ἀπέθανε.

According to what Ephraim said he himself received ordinances in Israel and laid them to Baal, and died,

כַּדְבַר אֶפְרַיִם רָתַת נִשָּׂא הוּא בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאשֶׁם בְּבַעַל וַיָּמָת:

Κατὰ τὸν λόγον Εφραιμ] Εφραιμ being indeclinable, “According to report, Ephraim” (*NETS*) is not totally impossible.

δικαιώματα] Difficult to see how this can be related to רָתַת ‘trembling.’ The Heb. word, being a hapax and with no other lexeme from √רתת, may have been unknown to our translator.

καὶ ἔθετο] = מִשָּׂו.

13.2) καὶ προσέθεοντο τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν ἔτι, καὶ ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς χώνευμα ἐκ τοῦ ἀργυρίου αὐτῶν κατ’ εἰκόνα εἰδώλων, ἔργα τεκτόνων συντελεσμένα αὐτοῖς· αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν Θύσατε ἀνθρώπους, μόσχοι γὰρ ἐκλελοιπασιν.

And they kept sinning more, and they made for themselves molten image(s) from their silver in accordance with the image of idols, works completed for them by craftsmen. They say, “Offer humans as sacrifices, for we have run out of calves.”

וַעֲתָה יוֹסְפוּ לְחַטֹּא וַיַּעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם מִסֶּכֶה מִכֶּסֶּפֶם כַּתְּבוּנָם צַצְצִיִּים מַעֲשֵׂה הַרְשִׁים כֶּלֶה לָהֶם הֵם אֲמָרִים זָבָחִי אָדָם צִנְגָלִים יִשְׁקֹוּן:

συντελεσμένα αὐτοῖς ἔθετο] Translated by Joosten (155) as “achevés par eux,” and he assumes that the verb was read as Pi. כֶּלֶה. Who is its subject? In the second half of the verse we see *they, them*, thus the pluralisation of Ephraim, who is still the subject of the first sentence. We would read here instead a Qal form: כֶּלֶה with מַעֲשֵׂה הַרְשִׁים as its subject. כֶּלֶה is sometimes used with an edifice as its subject, e.g. כֶּלֶה הַבַּיִת ‘the temple was completed’ 3K 6.38.¹ Besides, who are *eux*? מַעֲשֵׂה הַרְשִׁים? Then it becomes tautologous.² We probably have here an antecedentless relative clause in lieu of מַעֲשֵׂה הַרְשִׁים מִלְּהֶם. The pronoun of לָהֶם would be referring the subject of ἐποίησαν.

Θύσατε] = זָבָח.

¹ For more examples, see BDB s.v. I כֶּלֶה Qal 1 b.

² A dative nominal can indicate the agent of a passive verb; see *SSG* § 22 wo.

κατ' εἰκόνα] In *GELS* 1993 s.v. εἰκών we suggested מְמוּנָה as its Hebrew equivalent here. A more common rendering of תְּמוּנָה is ὁμοίωμα, e.g. Ex 20.4, often with reference to an object of idol worship, and once μορφή Jb 4.16.

ἐκλελοίπασιν [יִשְׁקוּן] We could appreciate the difficulty our translator may have had, trying to picture in his mind people slaughtering calves and kissing them. Hence a totally free rendition.

13.3) διὰ τοῦτο ἔσονται ὡς νεφέλη πρωΐνῃ καὶ ὡς δρόσος ὀρθρινῇ πορευομένη, ὡς χνοῦς ἀποφυσώμενος ἀφ' ἄλωνος καὶ ὡς ἀτμὶς ἀπὸ ἀκρίδων.

Therefore they will be like morning cloud and like fading, early morning dew, like chaff blown away from a threshing-floor and like a haze (rising) from grasshoppers.

לְכֵן יִהְיוּ כַעֲנַן-בֹקֶר וְכַטֵּל מְשֻׁכִּים הַלֵּךְ כְּמַץ יִסְעַר מִגֶּרֶן וְכַעֲשָׂן מֵאַרְבָּה:

Four poetic figures expressing evanescence and instability, all appropriately introduced with ὡς / כָּ.

ἀκρίδων] = אַרְבָּה, ≠ אֶרְבָּה 'lattice.'

13.4) ἐγὼ δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου στερεῶν οὐρανὸν καὶ κτίζων γῆν, οὗ αἱ χεῖρες ἔκτισαν πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιὰν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οὐ παρέδειξά σοι αὐτὰ τοῦ πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνήγαγόν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ θεὸν πλὴν ἐμοῦ οὐ γνώσῃ, καὶ σῶζων οὐκ ἔστιν ἄρεξ ἐμοῦ.

I the Lord your God is He who made the heaven solid and created the earth, whose hands created the entire host of the heaven, and I did not point them to you for you to go after them, and I am the One who led you up out of the land of Egypt, and you shall know no god other than Me, and there is no saviour apart from Me.

וְאֲנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מְאַרְךְ מִצְרַיִם וְאֱלֹהִים זולתי לא תֵדַע וּמוֹשִׁיעַ אֵין בְּלִתִּי:

This extensive plus in Ⓞ from στερεῶν up to ἀνήγαγόν σε appears to have stood in its *Vorlage*, which has been preserved in a fragmentary form in a 4Q text, 4QXII^c (= 4Q78). The verses 3-5 are reconstructed by the editor³ as below:

וְכ

אנוכי יהוה אלהיכם בצר שמים
[קונה ארץ אשר ידיו ברא כול צבא השמים ולוא הראיתם לכה ללכת אחריהמה ו]אנוכי העלותיכה
ומארץ מצרים ואלוהים זולתי לוא תדע ומושיע אין בלתי אני⁵ דדעתיכה במדבר בן ארץ תלאבות

³ In *DJD* 15.241.

στερεῶν [בַּצַּר] The reconstructed Heb. word must be meant as a Qal ptc. In BH, however, the verb seems to have little to do with strength. Only in Qal passive ptc. it often means ‘fortified and inaccessible,’ e.g. הַעֲרִים בְּצֻרֹת מְאֹד נִגְדַלְתָּ Nu 13.28, and even in conjunction with שָׁמַיִם, but עָרִים נִגְדַלְתָּ De 1.28. With our deplorable skill in epigraphy we wonder if it is possible to read מבצר, i.e. מִבְּצָר; the verb occurs twice in Piel, meaning ‘to fortify’: לְבַצֵּר הַחוּמָּה Is 22.10 and וְכִי תִבְצֹר מְרוֹם עֲנָה מֵאֵתִי Je 51.53. Such a Piel could be factitive in value, i.e. ‘to make someone or something בצור.’⁴ Let’s note that στερεῶω is used with reference to the creation of the universe in κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ πῆξας αὐτόν, ὁ στερεῶσας τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ Is 42.5, Ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ συντελῶν πάντα ἐξέτεινα τὸν οὐρανὸν μόνος καὶ ἐστερέωσα τὴν γῆν Is 44.24 and τῷ στερεῶσαντι τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων Ps 135.6; in all these cases the object of the verb is τὴν γῆν, not τὸν οὐρανόν, and the verb translates Qal רָקַע.

κτίζων γῆν [קונה ארץ] The restoration of קונה instead of בורא is justifiable in view of ὃς ἔκτισεν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν וְאַרְץ שָׁמַיִם וְאָרֶץ Ge 14.19.

The use of the Pres. participles, στερεῶν and κτίζων, is unusual, whilst the Heb. participles in these instances can refer to past actions. Note στερεῶσας Is 42.5 and στερεῶσαντι Ps 135.6 as adduced above.

οὗ αἱ γαῖρες ἔκτισαν [אשר ידיו ברא] One could restore בידיו. According to Clines’s *DCH* s.v. ברא I the subject of the verb in Qal is always God Himself. Hence בראו is unlikely.

πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιάν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ [כול צבא השמים] The same equivalence is found in Zp 1.5, 2C 33.3, 5, where it is also about idol worship as here.

παρέδειξά σοι αὐτὰ [הראיתים לכה] The Hif. verb הִרְאָה, when it indicates to whom something or someone was shown, attaches the personal referent directly to the verb. This is true in both BH and QH. E.g. וַיְרֵאָהוּ יְהוָה אֶת־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ De 34.1, וּתְרַאֲנִי עִמָּךְ 4K 8.13, and You showed me toil’ 4Q443 2.5. There are many additional instances of <הִרְאָה + suf. pers. + dir. obj.>, e.g. בְּעֵבוֹר הִרְאָתְךָ אֶת־כְּפֹתִי Ex 9.16, לֹא־הָיָה דָּבָר אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הִרְאִיתִים Is 39.4 Alternatively <את + suf. pers.> may be used as in הִרְאָה הַרְאָה 4K 11.4. But the preposition *lamed* is not used. Thus the text as restored is a case of Anglicism. Did the new situation that would emerge in MH apply here? See, e.g. הִרְאָה הַרְאָה אֶת הַדְרָךְ לְאַחֵרִים אֶת הַדְרָךְ ‘he showed others the way’ mPara 7.9.⁵ A more likely restoration would be הראיתך אתם.

⁴ Fuller (1991.345) justly mentions 1K 6.18 ἐκ πόλεως ἐστερεωμένης <מִעֵיר מִבְּצָר>.

⁵ The *DJD* editor does not appear to be aware of this problem.

A fragmentary context does not help to resolve a difficult text in אשר הוראתי אל אברהם 4Q158 4.6. Qimron (2020.17) justly rejects the original editors’ היראתי on the ground that a *plena* spelling would be anomalous here. However, his text is difficult of interpretation. ‘I was shown

13.6) κατὰ τὰς νομάς αὐτῶν. καὶ ἐνεπλήσθησαν εἰς πλησμονήν, καὶ ὑψώθησαν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν· ἕνεκα τούτου ἐπελάθοντό μου.

in accordance with their pastures, and they were fully satiated, and their hearts became uplifted. Because of this they forgot Me.

כְּמַרְעִיתֵם וַיִּשְׂבְּעוּ וַיִּשְׂבְּעוּ וַיִּרְגְּמוּ לָבָם עַל־כֵּן שָׁכַחוּנִי:

τὰς νομάς αὐτῶν [מְרַעֲיָתָם] The shift from *you* to *their* is abrupt, which, however, fits what follows.

εἰς πλησμονήν] = שבוע, i.e. שָׁבְעָה⁷ Qal inf. abs., ≠ שָׁבְעוּ, which is odd, immediately following וַיִּשְׂבְּעוּ. Cf. Trg. מְבַעַע מְבַעַע.

13.7) καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς ὡς πανθήρ καὶ ὡς πάρδαλις κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν Ἀσσυρίων·

And I shall be to them like a panther and like a leopard along the way to Assyria.

וַאֲהִי לָהֶם כְּמוֹ־שִׁחַל כְּנֹמֶר עַל־דְּרָךְ אֲשׁוּר:

καὶ ἔσομαι [וַאֲהִי] The shift in G from a past narrative to a prophecy is noteworthy, which fits the following verse.

πανθήρ [שִׁחַל] On this equivalence, see above at 5.14.

Ἀσσυρίων] = אֲשׁוּר, ≠ אֲשׁוּרָא ‘I will lie in wait,’ which accords with the Tiberian accentuation, דְּרָךְ with a disjunctive accent.

13.8) ἀπαντήσομαι αὐτοῖς ὡς ἄρκος ἀπορουμένη καὶ διαρρήξω συγκαλεισμὸν καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ καταφάγονται αὐτούς ἐκεῖ σκύμνοι δρυμοῦ, θηρία ἀγροῦ διασπάσει αὐτούς.

I shall face them like a famished bear and shall tear apart the pericardia of their heart, and (lions') cubs of a thicket will devour them there, wild beasts of a field will tear them asunder.

אֶפְגְּשֶׁם כְּדַב שְׂכוּל וְאֶקְרַע סָגוּר לָבָם וְאֶכְלֶם שָׁם כְּלִבְיָא חַיִּת הַשָּׂדֶה תִּבְקַעֵם:

ἄρκος ἀπορουμένη [דַּב שְׂכוּל] The Heb. adjective, once (Is 49.21) spelled שְׂכוּל, mostly denotes loss or absence of children, whether human or animal. This particular combination occurs twice more: 2K 17.8 (ἄρκος ἠτεκνωμένη)⁸ and Pr 17.12, where G widely departs from H , which reads almost identically with our Ho case – פְּגוּשׁ דַּב שְׂכוּל בְּאִישׁ. Whilst Heb. words derived from שְׂכַל always have to do with loss or absence of children, ἀπορέω is never so used. In SG as well as in Classical Greek this verb is not used with

⁷ So Nyberg 1935.102.

⁸ Cf. the proto-Lucianic version: ἄρκοι παροιστρῶσαι ‘(female) bears hopping mad.’

specific reference to want or lack of children. We conclude that, for whatever reason, we have here a somewhat free rendition. Even so a famished bear would be savage and gravely threatening. Cf. ἀπορῶν ἄρτων Si 10.27, though with a human subject.⁹ By selecting the fem. form, not ἀπορούμενος with ἄρκος, a noun of common gender,¹⁰ as the subject our translator shows his awareness that √שכל is normally used with a female as its agens. Note a variation in gender in ὅταν φύγη ἄνθρωπος ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ λέοντος καὶ ἐμπέση αὐτῷ ἢ ἄρκος Am 5.19. Bons (2001) argues for “acculé,” i.e. ‘hunted and cornered’ as a more preferable meaning here on the basis of the use of the verb by Xenophon. In the context of our Ho passage, however, there is nothing that allows us so narrowly to confine the context of the verb, that of hunting. In the passages quoted from Xenophon the more broader sense of ‘to find oneself in dire straits’ is perfectly acceptable. An animal or a human can land in such a situation for a variety of reasons and under diverse circumstances.

καταφάγονται αὐτούς] = יאכלם, i.e. יאכלם. The shift from 1sg to 3pl is deliberate, since no pl. noun that can serve as the subject of the verb has been mentioned before. The translator may not have been able to bear the sight of God devouring human victims, tearing up their pericardia may have been felt to be as much as he could emotionally take. This mental restructuring accords with his dropping of the preposition of comparison, i.e. σκύμνοι, and not ὡς σκύμνοι (ח כלביא).

The reconstruction of the 4Q fragment, ואכלום,¹¹ is questionable. A *w-qatali* can continue a *yiqtol*, but would not be followed by *yiqtol*, i.e. תבקעם. By contrast the tense sequence in ח follows the norm: .. אקרע .. ואכלם .. אבנקעם, namely a series of *yiqtol*'s with future value.

σκύμνοι δρυμοῦ כלביא ח) For the 4Q fragment a word has been added, most likely on the basis of ט here: כלבי היער. In BH, when a metaphor or figurative expression is prefixed with this preposition, the noun following is usually determinate, e.g. כְּאַרְיֵי כֵּן יִשְׁבֵּר כָּל־עַצְמוֹתַי ‘like a lion he broke all my bones’ Is 38.13, see JM § 137 *i*. So we could have expected כלביא. This rule is not water-tight. Even so the parallelism to the following תִּית הַשָּׂדֶה renders a cst. phrase highly probable. יער is what is rendered with δρυμός the most frequently, 55 times.

13.9) τῆ διαφθορᾶ σου, Ἰσραηλ, τίς βοηθήσει;

As you suffer destruction, o Israel, who is going to help (you)?

שִׁחַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי־בִי בְּעוֹרֶךָ:

⁹ ח מתן [ס]ר is suspect, and Segal (1958.66) justly emends the noun to מוון, i.e. מוון.

¹⁰ Pace Joosten (158) not “toujours féminin”; in many cases the gender of this noun cannot be ascertained, e.g. ἄλλο θηρίον ὁμοίωσιν ἔχον ἄρκου Da 7.5.

¹¹ So also Joosten 158.

τῆ διαφθορᾷ σου] The dat. here is of course quite distinct from what we find in, e.g. ἐβοήθησέν σοι ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐμὸς Ge 49.25. It is not an object of the verb βοήθειω, but an adverbial complement of time. Such occurs usually with a substantive denoting a period of time or a point in time as in φάγονται τὰ κρέα τῆ νυκτι ταύτη ‘on that night they shall eat the meat’ Ex 12.8. Here, however, we have an action noun. This rare usage is attested elsewhere, e.g. τῆ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες ‘being patient during the period of distress’ Ro 12.12,¹² and also in Classical Greek such as οὐδὲν ἔλασσον εἶχον τῆ μάχῃ ‘they were not worse off in the battle’ Herod. 9.102.¹³

- 13.10) ποῦ ὁ βασιλεύς σου οὗτος; καὶ διασωσάτω σε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσίν σου· κρινάτω σε ὃν εἶπας Δός μοι βασιλέα καὶ ἄρχοντα.
*Where is this king of yours? And let him rescue you in all your cities.
 Let him judge you concerning whom you said, “Give me a king and a ruler.”*

אֱהִי מִלְכָּךְ אֶפּוּא וְיִוְשַׁעַךְ בְּכָל-עָרֶיךָ וְשׁוֹפְטֶיךָ וְשָׂר אֶמְרָת תְּנַה-לִּי מֶלֶךְ וְשָׂרִים:

ποῦ [אֱהִי] שָׂר = אֶהֱיָא.

κρινάτω σε] = הִשְׁפִּיטֶנִּי. שָׂר’s הִשְׁפִּיטֶנִּי is a puzzler. If it were sg. הִשְׁפִּיטֶנִּי, it could be parallel to the preceding מִלְכָּךְ. “Judge” here does not have to denote a judge in a court, but someone who preceded the first king of Israel as described in the book of *Judges*. In 1K 8.5, 6, presumably being alluded to by Hosea, we see that שָׂפֵט was the task expected to be performed by מִלְכֵי people were calling for: שִׂמְהָ-לְנוּ מֶלֶךְ לְשִׁפְטֵנוּ .. תְּנַה-לְנוּ מֶלֶךְ לְשִׁפְטֵנוּ, though ־ uses δικάζειν, not κρίνειν. By selecting the sg. ἄρχοντα for שָׂרִים, our translator may have had this source text at the back of his mind, so that we are not having to do with two office-bearers, king and ruler, but καὶ here is epexegetic, ‘namely,’¹⁴ as in ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν καὶ ἐν ταῖς θαλάσσαις καὶ ἐν τοῖς χεიმάρροις Le 11.9.¹⁵

ὃν εἶπας] On εἶπον + acc. in the sense of ‘to say concerning ...,’ see *GELS* s.v. εἶπον **1 b** and s.v. λέγω **1g, 6**.

- 13.11) καὶ ἔδωκά σοι βασιλέα ἐν ὀργῇ μου καὶ ἔσχον ἐν τῷ θυμῷ μου
And I gave you a king in my anger and got in my fury

אֶמְנָלֶךְ מֶלֶךְ בְּאִפִּי וְאַקַּח בְּעִבְרָתִי: ס

ἔσχον אֶקַּח] As parallel to אֶמְנָל the Heb. verb must mean ‘to take into possession’ rather than ‘to possess, own.’ The perfective aspect common to the

¹² Dismissed by BDF § 196 as “suspect.”

¹³ More examples may be found in Kühner - Gerth 1898 II 445.

¹⁴ Joosten’s (159) “hendiadys” comes down to the same thing.

¹⁵ See *GELS* s.v. καὶ **17**, cf. also ib. **13**.

two aorist verbs fits such an analysis. Joosten (160) mentions an alternative parsing of ἔσχον as 3pl. Though our translator could not have meant such, readers with no knowledge of Hebrew could read the text that way. However, the parallelism between the two halves of the verse renders such an analysis somewhat unlikely.

In this quid pro quo, however, we miss a quo in 𐤒, which 𐤃 identified in the following verse. The acc. συστροφήν cannot be analysed otherwise. Alternatively, 𐤒𐤔 can mean ‘to remove and take back 𐤒𐤕, an analysis which 𐤃 did not opt for.

- 13.12) συστροφήν ἀδικίας. Εφραϊμ, ἐγκακρυμμένη ἡ ἁμαρτία αὐτοῦ.
a gathering of injustice. Ephraim, his sin is hidden away.

𐤑𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕:

συστροφήν] Among the words derivable from $\sqrt{\text{צר}}$ and identified in *Index* as equivalents of συστροφή is found 𐤑𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕. This can apply to two more instances: Ho 4.19 (𐤒 𐤑𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕) and 2K 17.13L.

𐤃 has not only transformed the first two words of this verse into a direct object of 𐤒𐤔 of vs. 11, but also broken up the cst. chain in 𐤒 of 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕, so that 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 is now 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 and 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 is an extraposed constituent of the following nominal clause.

The insertion of a comma after Εφραϊμ is a useful orthographical device to show that the word is in casus pendens, not vocative. Similarly καὶ τὸν υἱὸν δὲ τῆς παιδίσκας ταύτης, εἰς ἔθνος μέγα ποιήσω αὐτόν Ge 21.13.

- 13.13) ὠδῖνες ὡς τικτούσης ἤξουσιν αὐτῷ· οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς οὐ φρόνιμος, διότι οὐ μὴ ὑποστῆ ἔν σνντριβῆ τέκνων.
Pains like (those) of a woman in labour will come upon him. This son is not prudent, because he will never put his foot down when children are crushed.

𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕:

ὠδῖνες ὡς τικτούσης 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕] The addition of ὡς is “logical” in view of the masc. לו. In BH the idiom is an expression of acute, physical pain, hence metaphorically applicable to male victims as in ὠδῖνες αὐτοῦς ἔξουσιν ὡς γυναικὸς τικτούσης Is 13.8.¹⁶

The noun 𐤕𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤓𐤕 occurs mostly in the pl. and denotes pains of travail occurring intermittently at short intervals, which is also the same with its sole instance of the sg. in Is 66.7, though 𐤃 uses the pl. πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὸν πόνον

¹⁶ Cf. Muraoka 2014, esp. 65-67. Pace Joosten (160) 𐤃 is here unlikely to be a description of a foetus nearing birth.

There still remain, however, a couple of matters that need be addressed.

1) The Tiberian accentuation makes a cst. phrase from רִיחַ יְהוּדָה, which would then stand in apposition to קָדִים.²⁸ This Heb. word is basically a synonym of מְזֻרָח ‘east.’ That it is not an adjective meaning ‘eastern’ is shown in רִיחַ הַקָּדִים Ez 17.10, 19.12, 27.26, where we have a cst. phrase with the article attached to קָדִים alone. The value of this construct phrase is that of origin, i.e. ‘wind originating in the east’²⁹; note רִיחַ יָם ἄνεμον ἀπὸ θαλάσσης Ex 10.19. In BH, however, this east wind is not a pleasant breeze blowing from the east, but intensely and unbearably hot and destructive as in the above-mentioned three instances in Ez and also Je 18.17. Hence SG sometimes uses καύσων ‘hot wind,’ not an adjective meaning ‘hot.’ In a rendition such as ὡς ἄνεμον καύσωνα קָדִים־רִיחַ־הַקָּדִים Je 18.17 the focus is not on where the wind originates, and καύσων is in apposition.³⁰ Its appositional status is evident in ἄνεμον τὸν καύσωνα Ez 17.10 and ἄνεμος ὁ καύσων ib. 19.12, where the def. article is attached to καύσων alone; this is probably reflecting the Heb. syntax here רִיחַ הַקָּדִים, but its syntactic structure is distinct from that of ⚓, and readers ignorant of Hebrew would analyse the Gk. phrase differently. In Hebrew also קָדִים began to be used as an ellipsis for רִיחַ קָדִים, which is the case in our Ho instance and Ho 12.1(2), so also in רִיחַ יְהוּדָה קָדִים Jb 27.21 > ἀναλήμψεται αὐτὸν καύσων.³¹ In ἀνεμόφοθοροι ‘wind-blasted’ Ge 41.6, 23, 27 < רִיחַ קָדִים, however, the feature of extreme heat has not come to an expression, though here, too, the position on the compass is not in focus.

2) In καταξηρανεῖ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τὰ ἐπιθυμητὰ αὐτοῦ the rendering of רִיחַ־הַקָּדִים with καταξηρανεῖ is striking. The Heb. verb רִיחַ־הַקָּדִים is known to mean ‘to plunder, spoil’ and has little to do with drying up. Though this is its only attestation in XII, it occurs as many as 11 times in BH in Qal alone. Our translator’s ignorance of it is unlikely. He is probably focusing on parallelism, though he must have been aware of the oddity of the combination of the verb with πάντα τὰ σκεύη κ.τ.λ. as its second, direct object. Is his selection of an alternative compound verb κατα- as against ἀναξηραίνω due to his awareness that ⚓ is not using רִיחַ־הַקָּדִים this time?

²⁸ So Pesh. /tētē maḡnhā rūḥeh d-māryā/. In Syriac, too, the noun /maḡnhā/ appears to have begun to be used in the sense of ‘hot wind,’ probably under the influence of Hebrew.

²⁹ Cf. *sirocco*, derived from Arb. /sarq/ ‘east.’

³⁰ Cf. SSG § 33 c.

³¹ Note Vulg. *Adducet urentem ventum* (‘a hot-burning wind’) *Dominus*.

CHAPTER XIV

- 14.1) ἀφανισθήσεται Σαμάρεια, ὅτι ἀντέστη πρὸς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῆς· ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ πεσοῦνται αὐτοί, καὶ τὰ ὑποτίθια αὐτῶν ἔδαφισθήσονται, καὶ αἱ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσαι αὐτῶν διαρραγήσονται.

Samaria will be destroyed, because it resisted its God. They will fall with sword(s), and their babies will be dashed to the ground, and their pregnant women will be ripped open.

תָּאָשָׁם שְׁמָרוֹן כִּי מָרְתָה בְּאַלְהֵיהָ בְּחָרֵב יָפְלוּ עַל־לֵיהֶם יִרְטְשׁוּ וְהָרִיוּתִיו
בְּקִעוֹ: פ

ἀφανισθήσεται [תָּאָשָׁם] On this equivalence, see at 5.15 above.

αὐτοί] Where the pronoun is coming from is not clear. It contrasts their own fate with that of their babies and wives. The gender shift in ח is bewildering: 3(f)s ⇒ 3mp ⇒ 3ms.

The grammatical number also vacillates: sg. ⇒ pl. The addition of αὐτοί shows that the translator did not analyse יָפְלוּ as impersonal; the subject first mentioned as Samaria (sg.) now shifts to its inhabitants. This is also clear with αὐτῶν (twice), which would not be impersonally used.

This number shift is very common in Ho. To mention just one example: Εφραιμ .. αὐτός (sg.) [13.1] ⇒ προσέθεντο (pl.) [13.2] ⇒ σου .. σοι .. σε (sg.) [13.4] ⇒ αὐτῶν (pl.) [13.6]. This holds for ח as well.

ὑποτίθια] The selection of this graphic word adds to the emotional impact of the statement here: etymologically it means ‘a little one hanging under teats,’ τιτθίον being a diminutive of τιτθός ‘teat, nipple.’

ἔδαφισθήσονται [יִרְטְשׁוּ] On this equivalence, see above at 10.14.

- 14.2) Ἐπιστράφητι, Ἰσραηλ, πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεόν σου, διότι ἠσθένησας ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου.

Return, o Israel, to the Lord your God, because you have become weak in your injustices.

שׁוּבָה יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ כִּי כְשַׁלַּתְתָּ בְּעוֹנֶיךָ:

πρὸς] This preposition is often chosen to go with the verb ἐπιστρέφω to express repentance. The corresponding Heb. preposition can be עַד as here or אֶל: עַד also at Am 4.6, 8, 9, 10, 11 and אֶל at Ho 5.4, 6.1, 7.10, 14.3. A rare exception is יהוה > ἐπὶ κύριον De 4.30, 30.2.

14.3) λάβετε μεθ' εαυτῶν λόγους και ἐπιστράφητε πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεὸν ὑμῶν· εἶπατε αὐτῷ ὅπως μὴ λάβητε ἀδικίαν και λάβητε ἀγαθά, και ἀνταποδώσομεν καρπὸν χειλέων ἡμῶν.

Take with you words and return to the Lord your God. Tell Him that you do not intend to take up any unrighteous practice, but perform good (deeds) and ‘We will return fitting fruit(s) of our lips.’

קח עִמָּךְ דְּבָרִים וְשׁוּבוּ אֶל־יְהוָה אֱמָרוּ אֵלָיו כַּל־תִּשָּׂא עוֹן וְקַח־טוֹב וְנִשְׁלַמְּה פְרִים שָׂפְתֵינוּ:

λόγους] Probably meaning ‘verbalised thought.’

τὸν θεὸν ὑμῶν] Possibly added to harmonise with the preceding verse.

ὅπως μὴ כַּל In 𐤀 there is nothing that would correspond to ὅπως, and μὴ is most likely = בַּל.¹ But בַּל תִּשָּׂא cannot be said to God. Already Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and Radaq join כַּל with וְנִשְׂא, but they must know of the syntactic irregularity of such an analysis.² The *Vorlage* of 𐤀 probably read also כַּל, which he emended to בַּל. This, however, necessitated quite a transformation of the text. They could not say to God בַּל תִּשָּׂאוּ .. וְנִשְׂאוּ, but only וְנִשְׂאוּ .. וְנִקַּח, which would fit the following וְנִשְׁלַמְּה. But he did not view the third verb as coordinate with the preceding two as shown by his shift from the aor. subj. λάβητε to the fut. ἀνταποδώσομεν. This remarkable mixture of 2ms and 1pl in 𐤀 reminds one of what Abram said to his wife when they were about to enter Egypt: תִּקַּח גִּבְרֵי מִצְרַיִם גֵּימָתִי Ge 12.13, which 𐤀 has rewritten in a style which appeared to the translator more logical – εἰπὸν οὖν ὅτι Ἀδελφῆ ἀυτοῦ εἶμι.

The conjunction ὅπως here “introduces a noun clause of command, instruction, decision and suchlike.”³ The use of the subjunctive mood fits such a semantic connotation.⁴ Hence a sentence like εἶπατέ μοι ὅπως τοῦτο γεγραμμένον ἦ ἔν τῳ βιβλίῳ ‘you told me that this is written in the book’ is impossible.⁵

¹ Though extensive, Nyberg’s (1935.107-09) argument that כַּל means here “jedesmal wenn” does not convince.

² Ehrlich (1912.210) condemns it as “unhebräisch.”

³ *GELS* s.v. 3. See also *SSG* § 66 b). For a discussion of various possible syntactic analyses of the construction here, cf. Joosten 163f.; in any case his “afin de ne pas ..” makes no sense.

⁴ The partial morphological identity of the fut. and subj. aor., e.g. λύσω, has led to occasional mutual contamination. Hence the fut. in ὁρισμὸν, ὅπως .. ἐμβληθήσεται ‘a decision that .. is to be thrown in’ Da 6.7 TH, an example which, in *GELS* s.v. ὅπως 3, ought to be mentioned as illustrating this use <ὅπως + fut.>.

⁵ Hence, *pace* Joosten (163), we have no simple indirect discourse in ὑμῖν δὲ λέγεταί ὅπως .. μηδεμία .. γίγνηται IE 8.22, as correctly analysed in *SD* (563) “wird euch mitgeteilt, dass .. keinerlei .. entstehen darf.”

καρπὸν χειλέων ἡμῶν] = פְּרִי יַדַי שֶׁהָיָינוּ. The phrase in 𐤏 is very difficult. 𐤏 probably means ‘words of thanks or adoration’ (so GELS s.v. ἀνταποδίδομι 1 d)⁶ or ‘we shall act in line with our pledge.’

- 14.4) Ασσυρ οὐ μὴ σὴ ἡμᾶς, ἐφ’ ἵππον οὐκ ἀναβησόμεθα· οὐκέτι μὴ εἴπωμεν Θεοὶ ἡμῶν, τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν· ὁ ἐν σοὶ ἐλεήσει ὀρφανόν.

Assur will never save us, we shall not ride horse(s). No more shall we say “Oh our gods” to our handicrafts. He who is in You will have compassion on orphan(s).

אֲשׁוּר לֹא יוֹשִׁיעֵנו עַל-סוֹס לֹא נִרְכַּב וְלֹא-נֹאמַר עוֹד אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְמַעַשְׂהָ יְדֵינוּ
אֲשָׁר-בָּךְ יִרְחַם יְתוּם:

οὐ μὴ σὴ] The double negative with the subj. verb is parallel to <οὐ + fut.>, and then back again to <οὐ μὴ + subj.>. The two constructions appear to be free variants. See above at 1.6.

Θεοὶ ἡμῶν ἡָינוּ] 𐤏 did not see here a plural of majesty, which accords with his analysis of מַעַשָׁה as pl. (ἔργοις).

This phrase is not vocative, cp. ἐπὶ τοῦ καλουμένου τόπου Βουνὸς τῶν ἀκροβυστιῶν ‘at the spot called *Hill of foreskins*’ Jo 5.3, where the use of the nom. is to be noted. Thus our Ho case is akin to the nominative of a proper noun when it is about naming a person or a locality. See further in SSG § 22 bc.

ἐλεήσει] = חָהַם active, ≠ 𐤏 חָהַם passive.

But how does this last clause, in 𐤏 and 𐤏 alike, fit the context? A plausible explanation is that one of the clearest manifestations of God’s love and mercy is His loving care of orphans as expressed in אָבִי יְתוּמִים וְדָן אֶלְמָנוֹת אָבִי יְתוּמִים וְדָן אֶלְמָנוֹת Ps 68.6, and see also Ex 22.22, Dt 3.24, Ps 10.14. This accords well with 𐤏. The message that comes through out of 𐤏 is that the life of believers should be a reflection of the character of their God.

The preposition ἐν seems to be comparable to what we have identified above at 12.6(7). It is significant that this earlier passage has to do with repentance and return to God, and compassion is expected of penitents: σὺ ἐν θεῷ σου ἐπιστρέψεις· ἔλεον καὶ κρίμα φυλάσσου מִשֶׁמַּר וּמִשֶׁפֶּט תָּשׁוּב תִּשְׁבַּח יְהוָה בְּאֵלֶיךָ תִּשְׁבַּח יְהוָה יְתוּם.

- 14.5) ἰάσομαι τὰς κατοικίας αὐτῶν, ἀγαπήσω αὐτοὺς ὁμολόγως, διότι ἀπέστρεψεν ἡ ὀργή μου ἀπ’ αὐτῶν.

I shall heal their dwellings, love them willingly, because my anger has turned away from them.

אֲרַפֵּא מְשׁוּבְתָם אֶהְבֵּם נִדְבָה כִּי שָׁב אָפִי מִמָּוִי:

⁶ Cf. Cyr. I 317.

does not appear to be laying any particular emphasis on fragrance in this verse, but Israel, having repented and started a new phase of life, would experience magnificent and solid growth, a situation comparable to the proverbial magnitude of cedar trees of Lebanon. If the translator's *Vorlage* agreed with \mathfrak{H} , there would be no option but to read "Lebanon."

14.7) πορεύσονται οἱ κλάδοι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσται ὡς ἐλαία κατάκαρπος, καὶ ἡ ὀσφρασία αὐτοῦ ὡς Λιβάνου·

Its branches will grow, and it will be like an abundantly fruitful olive-tree, and its odour will be like (that) of Lebanon.

יֵלְכוּ יִנְקוּתָיו וְיֵהָי כְּנֵית הַדֹּדוּ וְרִיחַ לּוֹ כְּלִבְנוֹן:

πορεύσονται [יֵלְכוּ] This appears to be the only and first instance of πορεύομαι in the sense of 'to grow' (of a plant), whereas ἤλεθ does seem to have such a sense in a figurative expression on the growth of the wicked in יֵלְכוּ גַם-עֲשׂוֹ פָּרִי Je 12.2. However, such a semantic extension is easy to understand; a growing plant is not stationary, its growth means to move forward.

κλάδοι [יִנְקוּתָיו] This is the only attestation of this equivalence in SG. As is clear from its etymology, בְּנֵיָה means "young shoot (of a plant)." Other translation equivalents are βλαστός 'bud, shoot' (Jb 15.30), παραφυάς 'branch, offshoot' (Ps 79.12), and ῥάδαμος 'bough, branch' (Jb 14.7). The imperfect knowledge of agricultural technical terms in Greek may not have been unique to our Ho translator; see above at 10.12.

ἔσται] This harmonises better with the preceding πορεύσονται, though εἴη would be a superior rendering of the jussive יֵהָי. See on βαλεῖ in the preceding verse.

κατάκαρπος [וְהוּ] Nowhere else in LXX this equivalence occurs. Besides, וְהוּ is a fairly common word, and κατάκαρπος as well as its two related lexemes, κατακάρπως and κατακάρπωσις¹¹ are at the moment undocumented before LXX. The selection of κατάκαρπος, therefore, is very striking. The comparison with olive-tree may not have been felt good enough to highlight Israel's prosperity. The same combination occurs in ἐγὼ δὲ ὡσεὶ ἐλαία κατάκαρπος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ Ps 51.10, where, however, the adjective is a natural rendering of רַעַנָּן. In XII, the adverb, a hapax, meets us in Κατακάρπως κατοικηθήσεται Ἱερουσαλημ 'Jer. will be densely populated' Zc 2.4 for יְרוּשָׁלַם תִּשְׁבַּ תְּשֹׁבֵת 2.8, where the translator may be thinking of פָּרִי.

¹¹ Its meaning is defined as "ashes of a burnt sacrifice" (GELS s.v.); the word occurs twice, Le 6.10, 11, a rendering of דָּשָׁן (\mathfrak{H} 10.3, 4).

Λιβάνου] But for **לִבְנוֹן** this could be spelled λιβάνου ‘of frankincense,’ which would fit *ὄσφρασία*. But in this passage “Lebanon” plays a prominent role. In the following verse, οἶνος Λιβάνου can have little to do with frankincense.

14.8) ἐπιστρέψουσι καὶ καθιοῦνται ὑπὸ τὴν σκέπην αὐτοῦ, ζήσονται καὶ μεθυσθήσονται σίτῳ· καὶ ἐξανθήσει ὡς ἄμπελος τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ, ὡς οἶνος Λιβάνου.

They will sit under His shadow as before, they will live and be satiated with grain. His memory will bloom like a vine, like the wine of Lebanon.

שָׁבוּ יִשְׁבִי בַצֵּלוֹ יַחֲיוּ דָגָן וְיִפְרְחוּ כַכֶּפֶן זְכָרוֹ כִיּוֹן לְבָנוֹן: ט

ἐπιστρέψουσι καὶ καθιοῦνται] = **שָׁבוּ יִשְׁבִי** or **יִשְׁבִי שָׁבוּ**.¹² The use of *ἐπιστρέφω* καὶ joined with another verb is a mechanical reproduction of a similar use of **שָׁב** to indicate repetition of what happened beforehand or restoration to a former state. Similarly *ἐπιστρέψωμεν καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσωμεν* τὰς ἐρήμους **רְבוֹת וְנִבְנֶה** **נָשׁוּב וְנִבְנֶה** MI 1.4,¹³ see *GELS* s.v. *ἐπιστρέφω* II 4 b and *SSG* § 64, “Hendiadys.” Alternatively we have here a response to the earlier call **שׁוּבוּ** *ἐπιστρέφητε* vs. 3, sim. vs. 2. Then we would be having to do with an ordinary **שָׁב**.

τὴν σκέπην αὐτοῦ **צָלַו**] *Pace* Joosten (166) the suf. pronoun cannot refer to Israel in view of the pl. verb.

ζήσονται καὶ μεθυσθήσονται σίτῳ **יַחֲיוּ דָגָן**] The second Gk verb seems to be a free addition. **דָגָן** ‘grain’ as an object of **הַיָּה** ‘to keep alive or restore to life’ sounds unusual. Our translator read **יַחֲיוּ** as **יָיִ**. However **הַיָּה** Qal is intransitive. Hence he introduced a verb to go with **דָגָן**,¹⁴ though it is not clear why a verb such as *ἐμπίμπλημι*, so *ἐμπλησθήσονται*, has not been chosen, cf. *ἐμπίπλαται* *μερίδι* Si 14.9. “To get intoxicated with grain” sounds rather odd.

ἐξανθήσει] = **יִפְרָה**. Whether the *Vorlage* of **ט** read the verb here as sg. or not, for the translator its subject are not Israelites. For him the name of the true God of Israel had been long consigned to oblivion, but now it was about to be revived and would stand in the centre of the flourishing faith community. According to the Tiberian accentuation with an athnach with the preceding word, **כַּכֶּפֶן, זְכָרוֹ** is the subject of the following nominal clause, and not of the preceding verb.

¹² An example of the latter, asyndetic construction is **אֲשׁוּבָה אָרְעָה צֹאנֵךְ אֶשְׁמֵר** Ge 30.31 > *πάλιν ποιμανὼν τὰ πρόβατά σου καὶ φυλάξω*. [ntbnwn] in the Leiden Peshitta is probably a typo for [ntpnwn] (= /ntpnwn/).

¹³ Where *ἐπιστρέψωμεν* is redundant in the light of *ἀνοικοδομήσωμεν*.

¹⁴ We agree with Joosten (166) *pace* Coote (1974.165-68), who postulates **רַיָּו** (sic!) in **ט**'s *Vorlage*.

14.9) τῷ Εφραιμ, τί αὐτῷ ἔτι καὶ εἰδώλοις; ἐγὼ ἔταπεινώσα αὐτόν, καὶ ἐγὼ κατισχύσω αὐτόν· ἐγὼ ὡς ἄρκευθος πυκάζουσα, ἐξ ἔμοῦ ὁ καρπὸς σου εὔρηται.

As for Ephraim, what has he still got to do with idols? I have humiliated him, and I shall fortify him. I am like a leafy juniper tree, from Me your fruit(s) have been discovered.

אַפְרַיִם מֵה־לִּי עוֹד לְעֲצָבִים אֲנִי עֲנִיתִי וְאַשְׁרְנוּ אֲנִי כְּבָרוּשׁ רַעְנָן מִמִּנֵּי פְרִיָּהּ נִמְצְאָ:

τῷ Εφραιμ] Since the translator has read לִי as לו, he had no choice but to analyse אפרים as being extraposed, not vocative.

ἔταπεινώσα αὐτόν] = עֲנִיתִי. The equivalence <Pi. עָנָה - ταπεινώω> is quite common in LXX: more than 17 times.¹⁵

καὶ ἐγὼ κατισχύσω αὐτόν] The verb must represent √שרר, a root which has to do with “strength,” but is not represented in Hebrew, but firmly established in Aramaic; see above at 10.11. Our translator, who is drawing on such an external linguistic resource, may not have worried about the fact that this Aramaic root in Peal [= Qal] is intransitive, whilst the transitive κατισχύω would be expressed either in Pael [= Piel] or Hafel [= Hifil], for which we would not expect to find a *waw* in the middle of the verb form. The Hebraised form in our case would be אֲשַׁרְנוּ or אֲשֵׁרְנוּ. The self-assertive has been added twice over.

ἄρκευθος פְּרוֹשׁ] Cf. ξύλα κέδρινα καὶ ἄρκεύθινα καὶ πεύκινα 2C 2.7, where three adjectives are attributively used to modify ξύλα, each derived from a substantive denoting its respective tree: κέδρος ‘cedar,’ ἄρκευθος ‘juniper tree,’ and πεύκη ‘pine.’

ἐξ ἔμοῦ] The tone of divine insistence is made manifest due to the fronting of this prepositional phrase, for the use of ἔμοῦ is due to its combination with the preposition; ἐκ μου does not occur, SSG § 7 c.

The two concluding clauses must mean something like: “The delicious fruits originate from Me alone in great abundance and you have them there served to be enjoyed by you.” Note the Pf. εὔρηται.

14.10) τίς σοφὸς καὶ συνήσει ταῦτα; ἢ συνετὸς καὶ ἐπιγνώσεται αὐτά; διότι εὐθεῖαι αἱ ὁδοὶ τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ δίκαιοι πορεύσονται ἐν αὐταῖς, οἱ δὲ ἀσεβεῖς ἀσθενήσουσιν ἐν αὐταῖς.

Who is wise and can understand these (matters)? Or intelligent and acknowledge them? For the ways of the Lord are straight, and the righteous can walk along them, but the infidels could be too weak (to walk) along them.

¹⁵ To the three additional instances mentioned in *Index* 116.a s.v., add also Ps 119.71 11QPs^a.

מִי חָכֵם וְיָבֵן אֵלֶּה נִבּוֹן וְיִדְעֵם כִּי־יִשְׂרָיִם דְּרָכָי יְהוָה וְצַדִּיקִים יִלְכוּ בָּם וּפְשָׁעִים
יִכְשְׁלוּ בָּם:

[מי תי] The Heb. interrogative pronoun here looks like introducing a generalising relative clause and the use of the jussive, נִבּוֹן, is to be noted: 'Whoever is wise let him understand these matters.' See also מִי־יָרָא וְחָרַד מִי־בָּכֶם מִכָּל־עַמּוֹ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיוּ עִמּוֹ וַיַּעַל Ju 7.3, 2C 36.23. The use of the jussive seems to be optional, as can be seen in יִלְךָ הַלָּכָב יִלְךָ מִי־הָאִישׁ הַיָּרָא וְרָף הַלָּכָב יִלְךָ Dt 20.8, i.e. not יִלְךָ. Also with מה, e.g. מָה־אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים אֶעֱשֶׂה לָּכֶם. 2S 21.4. See further in JM § 144 *fa*. Τίς and τί are used in SG in an analogous manner, e.g. τίς ἐστίν, αὐτῷ ἀποδώσει 'whosoever it is, he shall return it to him' Le 6.5, see further in SSG § 18 **b**. Our Ho translator has not followed such an analysis here.

In our translation of this verse we have analysed the future tense as indicating theoretical possibility, on which see further in SSG § 28 **ge**.

MICAH

CHAPTER I

- 1.1) Καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Μιχαίαν τὸν Μωρασθι ἐν ἡμέραις Ἰωαθαμ καὶ Αχαζ καὶ Εζεκιίου βασιλέων Ἰουδα, ὑπὲρ ὧν εἶδε περὶ Σαμαρείας καὶ περὶ Ἱερουσαλημ.

And there came a word of the Lord to Micah the one from Morashti in the days of Joatham and Achaz and Ezekias the kings of Judah, what he saw concerning Samaria and Jerusalem.

דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה אֶל־מִיכָה הַמִּרְשָׁתִּי בְיָמֵי יוֹתָם אַחָז וְעֶזְקִיָּה בְּמַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה
אֲשֶׁר־חָזָה עַל־שָׁמְרוֹן וְיִרְוֹשָׁלַם:

Μωρασθι [מִרְשָׁתִּי] The translator probably did not know that the Heb. word is a gentilic of מוֹרְשָׁת, where the prophet hailed from, for in 1.14 this place name is translated as a common noun, κληρονομία.

ὑπὲρ ὧν] Who (mpl) or what (npl) the relative pronoun refers to is not clear. Since nowhere else in the book of Mi mentions the prophet any of the three kings, the translator probably does not mean ‘about whom,’ *pace* “über die,” i.e. “über die Könige.” (SD). Grammatically it cannot refer back to λόγος κυρίου, whilst the NH text (DJD 8.33) does read δ[ν 4.29. The general intention must be what the divine message showed him concerning Samaria and Jerusalem.

- 1.2) Ἀκούσατε, λαοί, λόγους, καὶ προσεχέτω ἡ γῆ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ ἔσται κύριος ἐν ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον, κύριος ἐξ οἴκου ἁγίου αὐτοῦ·

Hear, o nations, words, and let the land and all who are in it be attentive, and the Lord shall be among you for a testimony, the Lord out of His holy house.

שְׁמַעְנוּ עַמִּים כְּלָם הַקְּשִׁיבִי אֶרֶץ וּמְלֵאָה וַיְהִי אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה לְעַד אֲדֹנָי מִהֵיכָל
קְדָשׁוֹ:

Ἀκούσατε .. καὶ προσεχέτω] The first Impv. is aorist, giving a general instruction, whilst the second is Pres., an attitude and stance to be maintained.

λόγους] Odd vis-à-vis כְּלָם. The prophet had just mentioned λόγος κυρίου, though the sg. λόγος cannot mean “one word,” but “a message.”¹ The addition

¹ The first three words of the verse are also ascribed to Micah in 3K 22.28 exactly as they are here, though they are absent in 6, and are restored by Origen as ἀκούσατε λαοὶ πάντες, as in our Mi passage.

of a resumptive pronoun to כל is such a common enough phenomenon in BH² that could not have caused our translator any difficulty; see אֵלֶּה כָּלֶם ταῦτα πάντα Hb 2.6.

πάντες οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ [מְלֹאָה] A rather free rendering. As free is πόλιν σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτήν < עִיר וּמְלֹאָהָ Am 6.8. This Heb. phrase occurs pretty frequently outside of XII and is usually rendered more literally, e.g. γῆν καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς Je 8.16, 29(47).2 so Ez 19.7, 30.12, and this is what we find in the NH text (4.31) as γῆ] καὶ τὸ π[λή]ρωμα αὐτῆς.

ἐσται [יהי] Ⓞ probably understood Ⓢ as a genuine jussive, not a loosely used equivalent of יהיה; the people are being told to accept the Lord as He is going to address them.

κύριος יהוה [אֲדֹנָי] This double divine title occurs very often in XII, and it is rendered with κύριος alone. See, e.g. Am 7.1, 4, 6. Our translator probably thought the tetragrammaton is phonetically identical with the first title, then one κύριος is enough. But when he identified a vocative, he repeats κύριος, e.g. καὶ εἶπα Κύριε κύριε, ἴλεως γενοῦ < אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה סְלַח־נָא Am 7.2 as against ἔδειξέν μοι κύριος < אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה ib. 7.4.³ When he identified a single title as vocative, he writes κύριε once, e.g. μετανόησον, κύριε, ἐπὶ τούτῳ < אַתָּה יְהוָה עַל־זוֹאת ib. 7.3.

μαρτύριον [עֵד] A not very frequent equivalence, since μαρτύριον⁴ is usually impersonal, whereas עֵד is personal, “witness” (μάρτυς). The only other certain instance of this equivalence with a personal referent is μαρτύριον ἐν ἔθνεσιν δέδωκα αὐτόν Is 55.4, where αὐτόν = David.⁵

1.3) διότι ἰδοὺ κύριος ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ καὶ καταβήσεται καὶ ἐπιβήσεται ἐπὶ τὰ ὕψη τῆς γῆς,

Because, behold, the Lord is coming out of His place and will descend and mount the heights of the land,

כִּי־הִנֵּה יְהוָה יֵצֵא מִמְּקוֹמוֹ וְיֵרֵד וְדָרַךְ עַל־בְּמוֹתַי [בְּ תִי] אֶרֶץ:

τὰ ὕψη τῆς γῆς אֶרֶץ [בְּ תִי] Unlike the masc. as in οἱ ὑψηλοὶ τῆς γῆς ‘the foremost leaders of the earth’ Is 24.4 the neut. τὰ ὕψη can only denote ‘high, elevated places.’⁶

² See BDB s.v. כל 1 d.

³ This is a feature not unique to our translator. We note the same in, e.g. De 3.24, 9.26, Jd 6.22, even in 3M 2.2.

⁴ *JD* 8.33 restores μάρτυ[ρα], though there is no epigraphic reason for not reading μαρτύριον. Note Je 49 (42).5 Ἔστω κύριος ἐν ἡμῖν εἰς μάρτυρα (עֵד) δίκαιον καὶ πιστόν.

⁵ This example can be added in *GELS* s.v. μαρτύριον 1 a.

⁶ Rashi takes the Heb. phrase here as meaning ‘elevated but spiritually crude people’ (הרמים) (וגסי הררה).

- 1.4) καὶ σαλευθήσεται τὰ ὄρη ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αἱ κοιλάδες τακήσονται ὡς κηρὸς ἀπὸ προσώπου πυρὸς καὶ ὡς ὕδωρ καταφερόμενον ἐν καταβάσει.

And the mountains will shake under Him, and the valleys will melt like wax before a fire and like water running down a slope.

וְנִמְסוּ הַרְרִים תַּחְתֵּי וְהַעֲמָקִים יִתְבַּקְעוּ כְּדֹנַג מִפְּנֵי הָאֵשׁ כְּמֵים מְרַרִים בְּמִוְרָד:

σαλευθήσεται [וְנִמְסוּ] This is the only instance of this equivalence, and the selection of σαλεύω to render נִמְסוּ is striking.⁷ The second verb chosen here, τήκω, comes more readily to the mind, cf. τὰ ὄρη ἐτάκησαν ὡσεὶ κηρὸς ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου Ps 96.5 < נִמְסוּ כְּדֹנַג מִפְּנֵי הַרְרִים. Note τὰ ὄρη ἐσειέσθησαν (וְרָעַשׁוּ) ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ ἐσαλεύθησαν (וַיִּגְמְתוּ) Na 1.5.

τακήσονται [יִתְבַּקְעוּ] Nowhere else in LXX we find this equivalence. In *DJD* 8.33 (4.35) we find a revised rendering, ῥα]γήσον[ται], ‘will be broken into pieces,’ which is certainly closer in meaning to $\text{\textcircled{H}}$. Though wax that has melted is no longer in one piece, ‘wax melting under the heat of fire’ sounds better in translation.

ἀπὸ προσώπου [מִפְּנֵי] We have here a highly frequent, pseudo preposition, a verbatim reproduction of the underlying Hebrew phrase. The Heb. substantive, פְּנִים, very often combines in the cst. st. with a preposition: apart from מִפְּנֵי, we have בְּפְנֵי, לְפְנֵי, עַל פְּנֵי. Other Hebrew substantives denoting body parts display a similar feature: אָזְן, יָד, עֵין, for instance.⁸ In all these cases the constituent substantives no longer bear their original meaning. Thus ἀπὸ προσώπου has nothing to do with “face” in its literal sense.⁹

καταφερόμενον [מְרַרִים] Unlike its Heb. equivalent there does not appear to be any explicit indication that the Gk rendition implies someone pouring water out at the top of a mountain. So the form is not genuinely passive, but middle. By contrast, $\text{\textcircled{H}}$ is not about rainwater cascading down a hillside.

- 1.5) διὰ ἀσέβειαν Ἰακωβ πάντα ταῦτα καὶ διὰ ἁμαρτίαν οἴκου Ἰσραηλ. τίς ἢ ἀσέβεια τοῦ Ἰακωβ; οὐ Σαμάρεια; καὶ τίς ἢ ἁμαρτία οἴκου Ἰουδα; οὐχὶ Ἱερουσαλημ;

Because of an impiety of Jacob all this is, and because of a sin of the house of Israel. What is the impiety of Jacob? Not Samaria? And what is the sin of the house of Judah? Not Jerusalem (of all places)?

⁷ *DJD* 8.33, 86 restores τακή]σον[ται] on the basis of “the frequent LXX equivalence of τήκω $\text{\textcircled{H}}$ and the identical reading of α' [= Aquila] ad loc.”

⁸ Cf. *SSG* § 26 *i*. For a detailed treatment of the subject matter, see Sollamo 1979.

⁹ “melt like wax from before the fire” (*NETS* 795) is infelicitous; πρόσωπον on its own never means “before.”

בְּפֶשַׁע יַעֲקֹב כָּל־זֹאת וּבְחַטָּאוֹת בַּיִת יִשְׂרָאֵל מִי־פֶשַׁע יַעֲקֹב הֲלוֹא שְׂמֵרוֹן וּמִי
בְּמוֹת יְהוּדָה הֲלוֹא יְרוֹשָׁלָּם:

πάντα ταῦτα ἀνά] In this Heb. phrase the fem. dem. pron. refers to a chain of events or a state of affairs, not a single matter, and this is appropriately rendered ταῦτα, a neut. pl., and never πᾶν τοῦτο. So Ge 41.39, and in a reverse sequence, ταῦτα πάντα at De 32.27, Ps 43(44).18, 2C 21.18.

ἀσέβειαν .. ἁμαρτίαν ἀνά] In 𐤀 both nouns are in the st. cst., hence anarthrous. In the reply, however, the corresponding Gk nouns are articular. Hence its absence in the question is not a mechanical imitation of 𐤀. In the question it is about impiety and sin in general. One who hears the question would like to have reference to their specific manifestations.

ἁμαρτίαν ἀνά] No v.l. ἁμαρτίας (pl.)¹⁰ nor ἀνά (sg.) is attested. Is ἁμαρτίαν harmonisation vis-à-vis ἀσέβειαν? “Jacob” here is not a reference to an individual. Hence בַּיִת יִשְׂרָאֵל cannot account for the shift to the plural.

ἢ ἁμαρτία οἴκου Ιουδα יהודה] 𐤀 appears to be amiss, to be emended to יהודה בית יהודה. The mention of בְּמוֹת at this point is too abrupt and out of place.

τίς (2x)] This cannot mean ‘Who?’. This rare use of τίς as equivalent to τί also occurs in τίς σου ἢ ἐργασία ἐστί; ‘What is your occupation?’ Jn 1.8; πόσαι εἰσὶν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι μου καὶ αἱ ἀνομίαι μου; διδάξόν με τίνες εἰσὶν ‘How many are my sins and my iniquities? Teach me what they are’ Jb 13.23. Also in an indirect question: ὄψεσθε τὴν γῆν τίς ἐστὶν ‘Look at the land what it is like’ Nu 13.19. By contrast, BDB s.v. מִי 1 a includes our Mi example under the heading “where persons are understood or implied,” which does not apply to our example, though it is applicable in מִי שְׂמֵרוֹן (⊗ Tí) Ju 13.17.

οὐχί] Possibly more emphatic than the parallel οὐ¹¹; the sins committed in Jerusalem are more serious. Hence no mere free, stylistic variant.

- 1.6) καὶ θήσομαι Σαμάρειαν εἰς ὄπωροφυλάκιον ἀγροῦ καὶ εἰς φυτεῖαν ἀμπελῶνος καὶ κατασπάσω εἰς χάος τοὺς λίθους αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς ἀποκαλύψω·

And I shall turn Samaria into an orchard-guard's shed in a field and establishment of a vineyard, and pull down her stones into a chasm, and lay bare her foundations.

וּשְׂמֵתִי שְׂמֵרוֹן לְעֵי הַשָּׂדֶה לְמַטְעֵי כְרֵם וְהַגְרָתִי לְגַי אֲבַנֶּיהָ וְיִסְדֶּיהָ אֲנַלְהָ:

θήσομαι] On this lexical innovation of <τίθημι εἰς> ‘to cause to be or become’ see at Ho 2.12 and 4.7.

¹⁰ The NH text (4.38) reads ἀμ]αρτίαν.

¹¹ Cf. GELS s.v. 1.

ὄπωροφυλάκιον ֵצ] The Heb. word means “heap of ruins,” and is not as specific as ὄπωροφυλάκιον. However, this equivalence occurs twice more: Mi 3.12 and Ps 78(79).1, both about the ruining of Jerusalem, and in the latter the formulation is very close to what we find in our Mi passage – ἔθεντο Ἱερουσαλημ εἰς ὄπωροφυλάκιον לְעַיִם לְאָתְרוּשָׁיִם שָׁמֹ.

Ⓜ is more straightforward in its indication of the consequence of the divine punishment. By contrast, Ⓞ might be trying to say that the once splendid city of Samaria is going to become a farm land, and that an orchard provided with a guard’s shed alone.

ἀγροῦ הַשָּׂדֶה] The NH text (4.41) has added the article in line with Ⓜ, τοῦ ἀ[γρ]οῦ. The Heb. article here might be generic in value, not a reference to a particular shed or field. Note the absence of the article in the parallel cst. chain, מִטְּעֵי כָרְם.

φυτεῖαν ἀμπελῶνος] The proverbially fertile hillsides covered with vineyards will invade the city, chasing its inhabitants out.

χάος ַי] The Heb. noun is determinate, which also can be generic as הַשָּׂדֶה or a reference to a specific location in or near the city. The NH text (4.42) replaces χάος with φάραγξ, an equivalent far more frequent in LXX of ַי, אֵי or אַי.

1.7) καὶ πάντα τὰ γλυπτὰ αὐτῆς κατακόψουσι καὶ πάντα τὰ μισθώματα αὐτῆς ἐμπρήσουσιν ἐν πυρί, καὶ πάντα τὰ εἶδωλα αὐτῆς θήσομαι εἰς ἀφανισμόν· διότι ἐκ μισθωμάτων πορνείας συνήγαγε καὶ ἐκ μισθωμάτων πορνείας συνέστρεψεν.

And all her carved things they shall break into pieces and all her fees they shall burn in fire, and all her idols I shall put to destruction, because from the fees of prostitution she brought together and from the fees of prostitution she collected.

וְכָל־פְּסִילֵיהָ יִכְתוּ וְכָל־אֲתָנֻנֶיהָ יִשְׂרְפוּ בְּאֵשׁ וְכָל־עֲצָבֶיהָ אֲשֵׁים שָׂמְמָה כִּי מְאַתָּנָן זֹנָה קִבְצָה וְעַד־אֲתָנָן זֹנָה יָשׁוּבוּ:

κατακόψουσι ִכְתוּ] Whereas in Ⓜ פְּסִילֵיהָ is the subject of the verb, its reading as active in voice just as in κατακόψουσι τὰς ῥομφαίας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα < לְאֲתָיִם כְּתָתוּ הַרְבֵּיתֵיהֶם לְאֲתָיִם Mi 4.3 raises the question as to who or what the subjects of κατακόψουσι are. Are Samaritans being told to act themselves or are their enemies going to do so? The same ambiguity arises also with the second verb: ἐμπρήσουσιν (active) vs. יִשְׂרְפוּ (passive). However, since Samaria (and its inhabitants included) is referred to with the 3fs pronoun in both Ⓜ and Ⓞ, her enemies must be meant, and that fits better the last two sg verbs.

τὰ μισθώματα αὐτῆς הַתְּנִינָה] In LXX the noun μίσθωμα always denotes a reward a prostitute receives for sexual services she provides, exactly as

גְּתָא and גְּתָא. In CG it denotes “price agreed on in hiring” in general.¹² The only exceptions occur in Ez 16.33, 34, where it means part of the hire a prostitute was paid, and she gives it to her clients, perhaps as an incentive for more visits in the future. Even so the noun has to do with the life in the red light district. By contrast, μισθός is not so specified; it is more “respectable.”¹³ Later in our verse the expression is explicit: גְּתָא גְּתָא. What is meant here must be more than incomes raised by temple prostitutes. Israel’s idolatry was a prostitution against God. Offerings, monetary gifts, buildings, facilities needed for practising idol worship, all this was גְּתָא in the eyes of their divine Husband.

ἐμπρήσουσιν ἐν πυρί] As indicated just above, τὰ μισθώματα αὐτῆς comprise many things other than what prostitutes, sacred or otherwise, are paid, for metal money would not burn in fire.

θήσομαι εἰς ἀφανισμόν הַמָּוֶשׁ ׀־שָׂא] The Gk preposition could have been left out as in θήσομαι τὴν Ἱερουσαλημ λίθον καταπατούμενον ׀־שָׂא הַמָּוֶשׁ מֵעַבְדֵּי אֲבֹנֵי לְמַשְׁרָוֶי־תָא Zc 12.3. The translator is possibly thinking of θήσομαι Σαμάρειαν εἰς ὄπωροφυλάκιον יְצִי שְׂמֵרֹן שְׂמֵרֹן in vs. 6.

For θήσομαι the active voice form is restored for the NH text: θήσ[ω (5.1), whilst at vs. 6 the fragment reads θ]ήσομαι, but θήσω 8.3 (Mi 4.7, so in two minuscules). In *GELS* s.v. τίθημι II the middle voice of the verb is said to be “hardly different in function from act.” See also *SSG* § 27 da.

συνήγαγε .. συνέστρεψεν] What she brought together and collected is not stated. Probably not only the graven images, but also the entire resources accumulated from what worshippers brought and offered.

συνέστρεψεν [שִׁבְבוּ] Our translator, finding \mathfrak{H} difficult to interpret, may be translating freely, using a synonym of συνάγω. In order not to deviate too widely from \mathfrak{H} , he retained גְּתָא גְּתָא, but found דָּב impossible, reverting to ׀־ in the parallel adverbial phrase. He was apparently not too worried that, by so doing, he was repeating himself. The NH text has preserved the earliest attempt to revise \mathfrak{C} in the direction of \mathfrak{H} : ἕως μι[σθώματος πόρνης ἐπιστρέψουσ]ιν. Some variant readings such as the Origenic ἐπέστρεψεν points to the same direction, but the revision is incomplete in retaining ἐκ and the sg. verb. So ἀπέστρεψεν.¹⁴

1.8) Ἔνεκεν τούτου κόψεται καὶ θρηνησεί, πορεύσεται ἀνυπόδετος καὶ γυμνή, ποιήσεται κοπετὸν ὡς δρακόντων καὶ πένθος ὡς θυγατέρων σειρήνων·

¹² In Hdt 2.180.1 it refers to the cost of building a temple. See further LSJ s.v.

¹³ Once (Is 23.18) it is used to translate גְּתָא, because that is what Tyre is going to earn in the new era, for she was compared to גְּתָא, vss. 15-17.

¹⁴ Κατέστρεψεν and συνέτριψεν, both meaning ‘destroyed,’ are most likely inner-Greek corruptions.

Because of this she will mourn and grieve, she will walk unshod and naked, she will mourn (wailing) like dragons and grieve like daughters of sirens,

עַל־זֹאת אֶסְפְּדָה וְאֵילֵהָ אֵילָהָ שִׁילָל [שׁוֹלָל] וְעָרוֹם אֶעֱשֶׂה מִסֶּפֶד כְּתַנִּים וְאֶבֶל
כְּבָנוֹת יַעֲנָה:

κόψεται [אֶסְפְּדָה] In this verse there are used four verbs, the first three of which are explicitly marked as volitive (cohortative), and the fourth can be so analysed, though there is no means of formally marking it as volitive. Ⓔ could have used the optative forms instead of the future. Another remarkable difference is that the verbs are in the third person sg., mostly likely with Samaria as the subject, whereas they are all in the 1sg in Ⓕ. The prophet is identifying himself with the nation. Such an emotion and stance can perhaps be better expressed through the volitive mood, a position which our translator, for whatever reason, would not assign to the prophet.¹⁵ Note the fem. γυμνή for the masc. עָרוֹם.

ἀνυπόδετος [שׁוֹלָל] An equivalence found nowhere else in LXX. This rare Heb. word, occurring also at Jb 12.17, 19, is rendered αἰχμάλωτος. This Gk adjective occurs combined with γυμνός, though in reverse sequence, at Is 20.2, 3, 4 to render עָרוֹם וְיָחָץ.

σειρήνων [יַעֲנָה] Depending on the educational background of our translator he may have known of sirens in the Greek mythology. The Gk noun occurs in LXX five more times. Three times, as in our Mi case, it occurs in conjunction with תַּנִּים and following it: Jb 30.29, Is 34.13, 43.20. In all the six instances יַעֲנָה occurs as a nomen rectum in בְּנוֹת יַעֲנָה, and thrice only (Is 43.20, Je 27[50].39, Mi 1.8) בְּנוֹת is rendered in θυγατέρες σειρήνων.¹⁶ As in the Greek mythology these birds are featured in LXX for their voice, not their appearance or any other feature.

The Heb. noun here is usually thought to mean ‘ostrich,’ which is what στρουθοκαμήλων of Aq. and Sym. here means.

1.9) ὅτι κατεκράτησεν ἡ πληγὴ αὐτῆς, διότι ἤλθεν ἕως Ἰουδα καὶ ἤψατο ἕως πύλης λαοῦ μου, ἕως Ἱερουσαλήμ.

because her blow gained strength, for it reached Judah and touched the gate of my people, Jerusalem.

כִּי אֲנוּשָׁה מִכּוֹתֶיהָ כִּי־בָאָה עַד־יְהוּדָה נָנַע עַד־שַׁעַר עַמִּי עַד־יְרוּשָׁלַם:

κατεκράτησεν [אֲנוּשָׁה] The Heb. word here is generally thought to mean “incurable.” The Gk rendering is not very far from it, and a similar interpretation of it is found in מִכְּתֵי אֲנוּשָׁה ἢ πληγὴ μου στερεά Je 15.18.

¹⁵ In Trg the verbs are in 3mpl. and in Pesh Impv., 2fsg. or 2mpl.

¹⁶ For possible interaction between the biblical world and the contemporary, Hellenistic pagan mythology, see Kaupel 1935-36.

ἡ πληγὴ αὐτῆς] = מִתְּהַלַּח. The feature of grammatical concord is troublesome in this short verse; הָאֵהָ (fsg.) followed by נִנְּ (msg.).

λαοῦ μου צְמִי] Unlike in vs. 8 the prophet's identification with his coreligionists is here now manifest in 𐤄 as well.

1.10) οἱ ἐν Γεθ, μὴ μεγαλύνεσθε· οἱ ἐν Ακιμ, μὴ ἀνοικοδομεῖτε ἐξ οἴκου καταγέλωτα, γῆν καταπάσασθε καταγέλωτα ὑμῶν.

O those in Geth, stop boasting. O those in Akim, stop rebuilding a house as a laughingstock, besprinkle your laughingstock with dust.

בְּגַת אֶל־תִּגְדוּ בְּכֹ אֶל־תִּכְבְּוּ בְּבֵית לְעַפְרָה עַפְרָה תְּהַפְּלֵשׁוּ׃

μεγαλύνεσθε] = תִּגְדִּילוּ,¹⁷ cf. אֶל־גְּבוּלָם και ἐμεγαλύνοντο ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρια μου Zp 2.8 and אֶל־עַמִּי הָיָה צְבָאוֹת και ἐμεγαλύνθησαν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον τὸν παντοκράτορα ib. 2.10.¹⁸ In view of אֶל־כָּל־אֲלֵי מֵגָלֵל מֵגָלֵל מֵגָלֵל we could postulate אֶל־תִּגְדִּילוּ, which, however, would farther deviate from 𐤄; see also ib. 11.37.

Ακιμ] We do not know where the place is situated. Cf. a discussion in *SD* II 2367.

ἀνοικοδομεῖτε] = תִּבְנוּ. The rest of the verse in 𐤄 is utterly difficult to relate to 𐤄, cf. *SD* loc. cit.

The use of double accusatives with καταπάσσω is unusual. The rection as found in γῆ τὰς κεφαλὰς καταπάσαντες 2M 10.25 is Classical.

1.11) κατοικοῦσα καλῶς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς οὐκ ἐξῆλθεν κατοικοῦσα Σεννααν κόψασθαι οἶκον ἐχόμενον αὐτῆς, λήμψεται ἐξ ὑμῶν πληγὴν ὀδύνης.

Dwelling comfortably in her cities, she who was dwelling in Sennaan did not go out to mourn a house next to her, she will receive from you a painful blow.

עֲבָרִי לְכֶם יוֹשְׁבֵת שְׁפִיר עֲרִיה־בְּשֵׁת לֹא יֵצְאָהּ יוֹשְׁבֵת צֹאנָן מִסְּפַד בֵּית הָאֵצֶל יִקַּח מִכֶּם עֲמָדָתוֹ׃

עֲבָרִי לְכֶם] There is no trace of this in 𐤄. If our translator pronounced עברי לכם as in 𐤄, he may have got baffled by the fsg Impv. followed by a 2mpl suffix, and have given up.

καλῶς] = שְׁפִיר, an Aramaic word. 𐤄 looks like a place name, though even today we are not able to pinpoint its location.

τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς] = עֲרִיָהּ. בְּשֵׁת is not represented in 𐤄.

κόψασθαι] = לְסָפַד. Cf. Aram. מִסְּפַד ‘to mourn.’

¹⁷ Pace McKane (1998.40) “Do not broadcast it in Gath” hardly approximates to 𐤄.

¹⁸ On הַגְּדִיל ‘to boast,’ cf. Kaddari s.v. גַּדַּל Hif. 3. Cf. also JM § 54 d.

οἶκον ἐχόμενον αὐτῆς] = בֵּית אֶצְלָהּ. \mathfrak{H} is usually thought to be a place name. Our translator did not possibly know of such a place, and finding the addition of the definite article to a preposition odd, made a suffix pronoun out of the consonant.

λήμψεται] Unlike חָקָה this can be understood as having “she” as its subject. πληγήν] Should this be a rendering of מַכָּה, it would be a double translation of מַכַּח along with ἐξ ὑμῶν.

ὀδύνης] There is no Greek word of a Heb. word that would approximate עָמְדָה. Is it possible to postulate מַכַּת מְרֹתָ in view of ὀδύνας מְרֹתָ in the next verse? One would have to account for the letter ע in עָמְדָתָּ.

1.12) τίς ἤρξατο εἰς ἀγαθὰ κατοικοῦση ὀδύνας; ὅτι κατέβη κακὰ παρὰ κυρίου ἐπὶ πύλας Ἱερουσαλημ,

Who started (causing) pains to one who is dwelling in style? For disasters descended from the Lord upon the gates of Jerusalem.

כִּי־חָלָה לְטוֹב יוֹשְׁבַת מְרֹתָ כִּי־יָרַד רַע מֵאֵת יְהוָה לְשַׁעַר יְרוּשָׁלַם:

τίς] = מי.

ἤρξατο] = החל, i.e. חָלָה, or חל, i.e. חָלָה (so Wolff 13), an archaic preterite use of the Impf., hence a haplography of חל מי. What is the object of the verb? We suggest that it is ὀδύνας.¹⁹

εἰς ἀγαθὰ לְטוֹב] This can be seen as synonymous with καλῶς (= שְׁפִיר) in the preceding verse, both an adverbial adjunct of manner with κατοικέω. Thus εἰς ἀγαθὰ is not to be construed with ἤρξατο.²⁰

מְרֹתָ is usually taken to be a place name, though we do not know its location.

πύλας שַׁעַר] Jerusalem had more than one gate; \mathfrak{H} < ירושלים <

1.13) ψόφος ἄρμάτων καὶ ἵππευόντων. κατοικοῦσα Λαχίς, ἀρχηγὸς ἀμαρτίας αὐτὴ ἐστὶ τῆ ἠγατρὶ Σιών, ὅτι ἐν σοὶ εὐρέθησαν ἀσέβειαι τοῦ Ἰσραηλ.

The noise of chariots and soldiers on horse-back. O one who dwells in Lachish, she leads the daughter of Zion into sin, for in you have been found Israel's deeds of impiety.

רַתֵּם הַמְרַכְבָּה לְרַכְשׁ יוֹשְׁבַת לְכִישׁ רַאשִׁית חֲטָאתָהּ הִיא לְבַת־צִיּוֹן כִּי־רָךְ נִמְצְאוּ פְשָׁעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

¹⁹ This is an alternative analysis vis-à-vis *GELS* s.v. κατοικέω 1 c, where ὀδύνας is taken as metaphorically indicating a place of habitation. The verb ἄρχω, ἄρχομαι can govern an acc. as well as gen., though the former is not attested in SG; cf. ἄρχε .. δόκιμον ὕμνον ‘Begin .. a respectable hymn’ Pind. *Nem.* 3.10.

²⁰ Thus as against *GELS* s.v. ἄρχω 3: “began (to act) for her good.”

ψόφος] A hapax in LXX. A standard word for “noise,” elicited by humans, other animates or inanimate objects is ἤχος. The Heb. word here, usually parsed as an Impv. of Qal רתם ‘to bind, tie,’ is a hapax in BH, which may not have been unknown to our translator.

καὶ ἰππευόντων שָׂרָרָה] The Heb. word usually thought to mean ‘war-horse, steed’ and attested a mere four times in BH may have been too technical to our translator. When it is translated at all, its renderings in LXX are not straightforward. Note also καὶ.

- 1.14) διὰ τοῦτο δώσεις ἐξαποστελλομένους ἕως κληρονομίας Γεθ οἴκους ματαίους· εἰς κενὰ ἐγένετο τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν Ἰσραηλ.

Therefore you shall give away as far as the inheritance of Geth, worthless houses, as parting gifts. It became rubbish to the kings of Israel.

לְכֹן תַּתְּנִי שְׁלוּחִים עַל מִזְרְשֵׁת גֵּת בְּתֵי אַכְזִיב לְאַכְזֹב לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

ἐξαποστελλομένους [שְׁלוּחִים] On the first appearance Ⓢ looks like = מְשָׁלְחִים, so “ones being dispatched” (*NETS*). The meaning of שְׁלוּחִים is agreed to be ‘parting gift(s).’ For this interpretation of ἐξαποστελλομένους we refer to ἔδωκεν αὐτάς Φαραῶ ἀποστολάς (שְׁלוּחִים) θυγατρὶ αὐτοῦ 3K 5.14^b [= 1Kg 9.16].²¹ The mpl ending -ους is no reference to males, but due to οἴκους. Alternatively ἐξαποστελλομένους here could mean ‘parted, farewelled,’ hence ‘you shall give away as far as the ..., parting with worthless houses,’ on which see *GELS* s.v. ἐξαποστέλλω 6 as exemplified at Ge 26.31, 31.27, Ex 18.27.

ἕως] = דַּע.

οἴκους ματαίους [בְּתֵי אַכְזִיב] אַכְזִיב is usually taken as a place name, but Pesh. and Vulg. also took it as a common substantive with /bāttē da-srīqūā/ and *domus mendacii* respectively.²²

- 1.15) ἕως τοὺς κληρονόμους ἀγάγω σοι, κατοικοῦσα [Λαχίς] κληρονομία, ἕως Οδολλαμ ἥξει ἡ δόξα τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἰσραηλ.

Until I lead the heirs to you, o inheritance dwelling [in Lachish]; the glory of the daughter of Israel will reach Odollam.

עַד הִירַשׁ אָבִי לָהּ יוֹשְׁבַת מְרָשָׁה עַד-עֲדָלָם יְבוֹא כְּבוֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל:

ἕως] = דַּע. As a conjunction of temporal value ἕως can have its verb in the subjunctive, also with ἄν added as in ἕως ἄν παύσωνται πίνουσαι ‘until they finish drinking’ Ge 24.14. See further in *GELS* s.v. B and *SSG* § 29 c (v).

²¹ Analogously in the Antiochaeon version: 3K 5.2. Cf. also ἀποστείλατε ἀποστολάς (מְנֹת) τοῖς μὴ ἔχουσιν 1E 9.51 [= Ne 8.10].

²² Cf. Wolff (1982.10): “Die Bauten von Trugstadt.”

Λαχίς] Ziegler proposes to delete this place name against all the manuscript evidences, probably because it is not represented in \mathfrak{H} , which may be, however, a result of a scribal error, i.e. $\text{לך ישבת לכיש} > \text{לך ישבת}$. Otherwise one can hardly make sense of $\text{κατοικοῦσα κληρονομία}$.

$\text{κληρονομία}] = \text{הַשָּׂמְרָה}$, i.e. no place name. *SD* 2.2368 finds it difficult syntactically to analyse κληρονομία . We take it to be a subject complement, i.e. ‘one who dwells in Lachish as having a claim on it.’

ξῶς²³] This is a preposition, not a conjunction, *pace GELS* s.v. **B a**.

τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἰσραηλ] Whilst ‘the daughter of Zion’ (בַּת צִיּוֹן) is a standing formula, בַּת יִשְׂרָאֵל is unknown to BH.

1.16) ξύρῃσαι καὶ κεῖραι ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα τὰ τρυφερά σου, ἐμπλάτυνον τὴν χηρείαν σου ὡς ἀετός, ὅτι ἤχμαλωτεύθησαν ἀπὸ σοῦ.

Shave and cut your hair on account of your pleasurable children, extend your widowhood like an eagle, because they have gone as captives off you.

קָרְחִי וְגַזְי עַל-בְּנֵי תַעֲנוּגֵיךָ הַרְחֲבִי קְרָחְךָ כַּנְּשֹׂר כִּי גָלוּ מִמֶּךָ : ס

κεῖραι] The v.l. κεῖρε is inferior, if it is meant to be Pres. act. 2s impv. The middle voice is what is expected when it is about caring of one’s own body.²³ Nor is there a good reason for varying the voice in relation to the parallel ξύρῃσαι and shifting to the ingressive aspect instead of Aor. κεῖρον . The v.l. most likely reflects a phonetic change in the Hellenistic period: /ai/ > /e/.²⁴

ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα τὰ τρυφερά σου $\text{עַל-בְּנֵי תַעֲנוּגֵיךָ}$] The Gk preposition ἐπί + acc. can indicate someone who or something which is in the actor’s purview. When her children were with her, they would be delighted at viewing her rich hair and attractive eyelids. In their absence now she cuts them away.

GELS defines one sense of τρυφερός as “having been used to comfortable life and not prepared for harsh or rough life-style,” and in one case such a sense is applied to children: $\text{οἱ τρυφεροὶ μου ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδοῦς τραχείας}$ ‘my delicate ones have gone rough ways’ Ba 4.26. Here, however, ‘affording much pleasure’ looks more suitable. Note $\text{καλέσεις τὰ σάββατα τρυφερά}$ ‘you shall call the Sabbaths pleasurable’ Is 58.13, for then people are free from daily toils and we would note that τρυφερά translates עָנָג , a word of the same root as that of תַעֲנוּג in our Mi case.

τὴν χηρείαν σου הַקְרָחְךָ] When our translator has correctly rendered קָרְחִי ξύρῃσαι, how he has arrived at “widowhood” is a mystery. By losing her children a mother does not become a widow. All is unambiguous in χηρεία

²³ See *SSG* § 27 ca.

²⁴ See Thackeray 1909.77, (11).

καὶ ἀτεκνία **שְׂכֹלִי אֵלֶמֶן** Is 47.9. Though in BG words of the stem χηρ- always have to do with widow, we see from LSJ examples in CG where it is about absence in general. One is χηρεύει ἀνδρῶν ‘it [= an island] lacks humans’ Hom. *Od.* 9.124, and another is διὰ χηρείαν ἐπιστήμης ‘due to the lack of knowledge’ Ph. 1.358. With some hesitation we could then take χηρεία in the sense of “lack of hair.” Namely, “Cut off all the hair of your head.” Theodore, who, along with some sources, reads ξύρησιν ‘cutting of hair,’ writes: “because this bird is said to lose all its own feathers at a certain time” (*PG* 66 1.354).²⁵

²⁵ Similarly Theodoret (*PG* 81 1.1749).

CHAPTER II

2.1) Ἐγένοντο λογιζόμενοι κόπους καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι κακὰ ἐν ταῖς κοίταις αὐτῶν καὶ ἅμα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ συνετέλουν αὐτά, διότι οὐκ ἦσαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν·

They set out devising troubles and doing evil things in their beds, and with the start of the day they were there, implementing them, because they did not raise their hands to God.

הוי השבי־און ופּעַלִי רַע עַל־מְשַׁכְּבוֹתֵם בְּאוֹר הַבֶּקֶר יַעֲשׂוּהוּ כִּי יִשְׁלְּאֵל יְדֵיָם:

Ἐγένοντο] = הָיוּ.

Here we have an example of the syntagm <γίνομαι + ptc.>. When the start of a process rather than a state is to be indicated, εἰμί of the frequent, periphrastic syntagm, <εἰμί + ptc.>, is replaced with γίνομαι, and the ptc. is usually Present.¹

καὶ ἅμα] Whether or not the *Vorlage* of ̣ did have the conjunction or not, its presence makes sense and accords with the athnach with the preceding word, מְשַׁכְּבוֹתֵם.

οὐκ ἦσαν] = לֹא יִשְׂאוּ, i.e. לֹא יִשְׂאוּ. The thought expressed in ̣ radically differs from that of ̣, ‘they are capable (of it).’ Pesh. reads the same verb, though without a negator: /w-šāqlin ’idayhon lwāt ’alāhā/, and yet another thought, that of daring hypocrisy, which is better expressed with the conjunction w- rather than /mettūl d-/ ‘because.’ ̣ indicates a gesture of prayer, so in ἐν τῷ με αἰρεῖν χεῖράς μου πρὸς ναὸν ἁγίον σου Ps 27.2 <בְּנִשְׂאֵי יָדַי אֶל־דְּבִיר קִדְשֶׁךָ.

The idiomatic combination לֹא יְדֵי־ could have presented a challenge.² Here is how other translators handled it:

Ge 31.29	יִשְׁלְּאֵל יְדֵי לְעִשׂוֹת	ισχύει ἡ χεῖρ μου
De 28.32	אִין לְאֵל יְדָךְ	οὐκ ἰσχύσει ἡ χεῖρ σου
Pr 3.27	בְּהִיּוֹת לְאֵל יְדִיךָ [יְדִיךָ] לְעִשׂוֹת	ἡνίκα ἂν ἔχη ἡ χεῖρ σου βοηθεῖν
Ne 5.5 (2E 15.5)	אִין לְאֵל יְדֵנוּ	οὐκ ἔστιν δύναμις χειρῶν ἡμῶν

¹ For more references, see *GELS* s.v. γίνομαι 5 a, and for a discussion of the syntagm, see *SSG* § 31 **fk**.

² For a discussion of where the idiom comes from, see McKane 1998.60.

Our Mi translator's colleagues have all³ recognised the idiomatic nature of the expression, not mechanically translating אָל. We see that also among Hebrew scribes there was a measure of uncertainty over the grammatical number of יד, as shown by the Ktiv in Pr 3.27, ידיך.

2.2) καὶ ἐπεθύμουν ἀγροὺς καὶ διήρπαζον ὀρφανοὺς καὶ οἴκους καταδυναστεύουν καὶ διήρπαζον ἄνδρα καὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ἄνδρα καὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ.

And they coveted fields and plundered orphans and oppressed families and plundered a person along with his family, a person along with his inheritance.

וְחָמְדוּ שְׂדוֹת וְגִזְלוּ וּבְתִים וְנָשְׂאוּ וְעָשְׂקוּ גֹבֵר וּבֵיתוֹ וְאִישׁ וְנִחְלָתוֹ: פ

καὶ ἐπεθύμουν [וְחָמְדוּ] The Gk Impf., along with three other following verbs, carries on the imperfective aspect of συνετέλουν (vs. 1). This is in keeping with וְעָשְׂוּ carrying on four *w-qatalít* forms in this verse.

ὀρφανοὺς] Probably added by the translator, possibly puzzled by the conjunction *waw* of וּבְתִים with no verb to go with it in sight.⁴ The prophet probably meant it as parenthetical, i.e. not only fields, but also houses.

Our translator was now faced with the verb נָשְׂאוּ with no object. His solution was to ignore it⁵ and rewrite אָל as וּבְתִים יַעֲשֶׂקוּ⁶ and reuse וְגִזְלוּ as the verb with two parallel objects following. The vs. 2 he has mentally reconstructed may have read:

וְחָמְדוּ שְׂדוֹת וְגִזְלוּ יְתוּמִים וּבְתִים יַעֲשֶׂקוּ וְגִזְלוּ גֹבֵר וּבֵיתוֹ וְאִישׁ וְנִחְלָתוֹ.

Let us note that our translator has left οἴκους up front unlike the other three verbs.

οἴκους] Parallel to שְׂדוֹת, בְּתִים would naturally denote ‘houses, dwellings,’ whereas καταδυναστεύω takes an acc. of person. Hence our “families,” sim. NETS “households.”

³ Including Theodotion's somewhat clumsy rendering: διότι ἔχουσιν ἰσχὺν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῶν, cf. Aquila's ὅτι (ἔστιν ἐπι) ἰσχυρὸν χεῖρ αὐτῶν.

⁴ McKane (61) finds it difficult to see “Why the coveting of the fields should be coupled with the seizing of orphans.” The Gk verb here can be used not only with someone or something to be taken but also in the sense of ‘to rob someone of something’ as in διήρπασαν τὴν πόλιν Ge 34.27, i.e. valuables in the city. Thus orphans, in a vulnerable state, had their possessions robbed.

The Syriac translator appears also to have been troubled by this, solving the problem in a different way: /rāgēn ḥaqlāṭā w-vāttē/.

⁵ So Pesh.

⁶ נָשְׂאוּ is a poor fit for καταδυναστεύω, the two most frequent Heb. equivalents are יָגַב hi. (8x) and עָשָׂה qal (8x including Mi 2.2).

2.3) διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει κύριος Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ λογιζομαι ἐπὶ τὴν φυλὴν ταύτην κακά, ἐξ ὧν οὐ μὴ ἄρητε τοὺς τραχήλους ὑμῶν καὶ οὐ μὴ πορευθῆτε ὀρθοὶ ἐξαίφνης, ὅτι καιρὸς πονηρὸς ἐστίν.

Therefore thus says the Lord: “Behold, I devise disasters against this community. You will never be able to lift your necks out of them, and all of a sudden you will not be able to walk upright, for it is an evil time.

לְכֵן כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה הִנְנִי הַשְׁבַּע עַל־הַמְּשָׁפְּהָהּ הַזֹּאת רַעַר רַעַר אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִמְיִשׁוּ מִשָּׁם צִוְאַרְתִּיכֶם וְלֹא תֵלְכוּ רוּמָה כִּי עַתָּה רַעַר הִיא:

τὴν φυλὴν [הַמְּשָׁפְּהָהּ] Both words can vary in the extent of their application. By referring to Am 3.1 Pusey (ad Mi 2.3) takes this as applicable to the entire nation of Israel.

ἄρητε [תִּמְיִשׁוּ] The Gk verb here, αἶρω, is about an upward movement, whereas תִּמְיִשׁוּ denotes moving away.⁷ ⚙ is probably a figure of victims being constantly tramped down or writing in a deep pit. By contrast, in ⚙ we have an image of a yoke, a symbol of enforced subjugation and loss of freedom and self-respect.

ὀρθοὶ [רָוָה] The Heb. word is a hapax in BH, and thought to mean either ‘haughtily’ or ‘erect.’ As regards ὀρθός, it appears later in our chapter, also with the same verb as here: ὀρθοὶ πεπόρευνται ‘they have conducted themselves honestly’ vs. 7. Our verse, however, is a description not so much of Israel’s moral stance as of a consequence arising from God’s punishment of their immorality. In sorrow, miserable, and depressed they cannot walk with their heads raised.

ἐξαίφνης] Where this comes from is not clear at all.

καιρὸς πονηρὸς [עַתָּה רַעַר] It is not so much ‘a bad time,’ ‘Unheilszeit’ (SD) as ‘a time characterised by wickedness.’ The Heb. phrase here can be analysed as a cst. chain as done in Pesh. /zavnāw d-vištā/ and Trg. בְּעַתָּה רַעַר, cf. Pesh. /b-šā’tā bištā/ < עַתָּה רַעַר Ps 37.19 > ἐν καιρῷ πονηρῷ ‘in hard times’ // λιμός ‘famine.’ Similarly in ὅτι καιρὸς πονηρὸς ἐστίν [עַתָּה רַעַר] Am 5.13.

2.4) ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ λημφθήσεται ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς παραβολή, καὶ θρηνηθήσεται θρῆνος ἐν μέλει λέγων Ταλαιπωρία ἐταλαιπωρήσαμεν· μερίς λαοῦ μου κατεμετρήθη ἐν σχοινίῳ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ κωλύσων αὐτὸν τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι· οἱ ἀγροὶ ἡμῶν διμερίσθησαν.

On that day a mocking speech will be made about you, and a mournful tune will be sung, ‘We have been relegated to utter misery. Part of my people has been portioned away with a measuring-chord, and there

⁷ SD’s “ziehen” (1186) is the sense of this Heb. word.

was none who would stop him from coming back. Our fields have been dealt out.’

בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִשָּׂא עֲלֵיכֶם מְשָׁל וְנָהָה נָהָה וְנָהָה אָמַר שְׂדוֹד נִשְׁדָּנוּ חֶלֶק עַמִּי יָמִיר
אֵיךְ יָמִישׁ לִי לְשׁוֹבֵב שְׂדֵינִי חֶלֶק:

λημφθήσεται **אִשָּׁי**] The Heb. verb here can be only Qal (active), and the 3ms verb, just as 3mp, can be impersonally used. As he does three times with ἐρεῖ ‘someone might say’ **רָמַר** Am 6.10, the translator could have said λήμψεται .. παραβολήν. Note also ἐξελεύσεται ‘(someone) will come out’ **יָצָא** Mi 5.2. The reason for the selection of the passive voice may be because the suffering borne by the people could be better highlighted in that way.⁸ See also the immediately following θρηνηθήσεται.

παραβολή **לְמַן**] In the context something more than an innocuous discourse form, “parable” (*NETS*) or “Spruch” (*SD*) must be meant. See οὐχὶ ταῦτα πάντα παραβολὴν κατ’ αὐτοῦ λήμψονται (**אִשָּׁי לְמַן**) Hb 2.6, where κατ’ αὐτοῦ is to be noted, and ἔσσονται εἰς ὄνειδισμὸν καὶ εἰς παραβολὴν καὶ εἰς μῖσος καὶ εἰς κατάραν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, οὗ ἔξῳσα αὐτοῦς ἐκεῖ Je 24.9. It evidently denotes something that is said in public and hurts those about whom it is said.

ἐν μέλει] The difficult text of **Ⲙ** seems to have three words from the same root, two of which are rendered in **Ⲙ** with two words of the same stem.⁹ Whether or not our translator’s vocabulary contained θρήνευμα, he may have thought that enough had been said, and did not do as Ezekiel did in καὶ λήμψονται οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ σὲ θρήνον καὶ θρήνημα Σορ Ez 27.32, where also the translator recognised two, but not three words from one and the same root – וְנִשְׂאוּ אֶלְיָי בְּגִיָּהּ קִינָה וְקִינָנוּ.

On the selection of the passive voice here and the cognate object appearing in the nominative, see *SSG* § 57 **dd** (p. 530).

Ταλαιπωρία ἐταλαιπωρήσαμεν] The use of a noun in the dative added to a verb from the same stem is one of a few ways that correspond to an affiliated morphosyntactic structure in Hebrew, known under the name of *figura etymologica*. When such a dative noun stands on its own, not modified further, with an adjective, for instance, the verbal notion is emphasised.¹⁰

κατεμετρήθη ..] Whatever the *Vorlage* of **Ⲙ** looked like, it must have been as difficult as **Ⲙ**. Hence the concluding part of the verse presents a fairly free rendition. Even if this particular verb could represent **יָמַד**, i.e. **יָמַד**, Nif. of **מָדַד** ‘to measure,’ where does ἐν σχοινίῳ come from? From Am 7.17,

⁸ On the impersonal 3ms with a personal subject in SG, see *SSG* § 87 **bc**.

⁹ McKane (68) approvingly mentions Carmignac (1955.351), who claims to have identified **הִתְהַיָּה** in the Qumran War Scroll (17.5), where, however, it is just a Nifal ptc., ‘what is to emerge’ as against Qal **הָיָה** ‘what (already) exists,’ see Muraoka *SQH* § 12 **e 7**.

¹⁰ For a discussion with examples, see *SSG* § 56 **b** under the label of “cognate object.”

where, however, \mathfrak{H} reads $\text{קָלִיָּהּ לְבָבָהּ הִתְמַדְדָּא}$. Moreover, the notion of ‘to measure people’ is odd; it is surely not measuring their height and weight. Their landed property must be being referred to. Our translator appears to be desperate.

In comparison with $\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, the word used here carries a feature of hostility and advantage, probably marked by the prefix $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ -. Likewise in $\kappa\alpha\iota \eta \gamma\eta \sigma\upsilon\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\chi\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\omega \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\eta\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ Am 7.17, as part of a long list of painful sufferings about to be inflicted; see for more references *GELS* s.v.

$\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\psi\alpha\iota$] The gen. article could be viewed as a remnant of the archaic gen. with ablative force, thus equivalent to $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}$, and such an analysis does fit the sense of the verb $\kappa\omega\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega$, with which this inf. is to be construed. Cp. $\omicron\upsilon\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omega\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu \tau\eta\varsigma \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\eta\varsigma$ ‘they were not forced to stop the construction work’ 1E 6.6 with $\kappa\omega\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota \lambda\alpha\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ ‘to prevent the people to sin’ Si 46.7. However, the parallelism as in $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omega\lambda\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\epsilon \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \mu\grave{\eta} \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ 1K 25.26 and $\eta \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\omega\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\sigma\acute{\alpha} \mu\epsilon \dots \mu\grave{\eta} \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ ib. 33 suggests that the $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ can be regarded as a mere marker of the inf., even when it is functioning as the subject of a nominal clause; it is like *to* in *To see is to believe*.¹¹

$\delta\iota\epsilon\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$] = קָלִיָּהּ , though \mathfrak{H} can be understood as impersonally used 3s (Piel), though the passive form highlights the suffering borne by the victims. There is a v.l. $\delta\iota\epsilon\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, which must be a secondary change due to the preceding $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\eta\theta\eta$.

2.5) $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron \omicron\upsilon\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota \sigma\omicron\iota \beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu \sigma\chi\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omega \acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon.$

Therefore you shall have nobody casting a land-measure by lot among the Lord’s congregation.

$\text{לְכֹן לֹא־יִהְיֶה לְךָ מְשַׁלְיָהּ תְּבַל בְּגוֹרָל בְּקֶהֱל בְּיָהּ:$

$\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu \sigma\chi\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$] For every individual or family of the religious community there is supposed to be an appointed officer casting a land-measure and dividing the land.

2.6) $\mu\grave{\eta} \kappa\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\epsilon \delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu, \mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon} \delta\alpha\kappa\rho\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota} \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\cdot \omicron\upsilon \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \acute{\alpha}\pi\omega\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\eta.$

Stop weeping with tears nor let them shed tears over these matters, for He will not remove humiliations.

$\text{אַל־תִּטְּפוּ יְטִיפוֹן לֹא־יִטְּפוּ לְאַלְהָהּ לֹא יִסַּג כְּלָמוֹת:$

¹¹ But cf. *SSG* § 30 c, § 69 f, p. 584, f.n. 3.

Somewhat similarly to vs. 4 with one and the same root repeated three times one after another, here we have one and the same verb, Hif. הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה (< $\sqrt{\text{השח}}$), repeated as often in three different forms.¹² The middle form, not negated unlike the other two, appears untranslated in C . The prophet probably wanted to say: ‘they might do what they should not be doing.’

This Heb. verb occurs in BH in Qal and Hifil 9 times each. Leaving our three instances here it does not have anything to do with weeping, tears dropping. In QH it occurs in Hif. in the sense of ‘to teach, preach,’ a meaning which is generally thought to apply in our Mi 2.6 as well. In Qal it has a liquid such as rain water or honey dropping or dripping as the subject, but never tears ($\delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ here, dat. pl. of $\delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\upsilon\omicron\nu$). In C here, then, we have a creative application of the primary sense of the verb on the part of its translator.

$\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$] = לֹא ? The translator apparently found it stylistically unacceptable to repeat the combination $\kappa\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega \delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$, hence a shift to $\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omega$, which leads to the selection of $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, not $\mu\acute{\eta}$.

$\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$] = לְ , part of the free translation going on here.

$\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$] = גַּחַן , Hif. $\sqrt{\text{גח}}$. The subject of the verb in C and H alike is vague. God or weeping? It might come down to the same: emotional response alone would not adequately deal with the situation. On the other hand, Ziegler puts a full stop at $\delta\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\eta$. But $\delta \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$ that is made to open vs. 7 is followed by a long address by God as communicated to the prophet, and there is no predicate to go with $\delta \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$. Without saying it in so many words, *SD* removes the full stop and makes $\delta \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$ the subject of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$.¹³ This might be a better resolution of the ambiguity.

2.7) $\delta \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$ $\text{O}\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\text{I}\alpha\kappa\omega\beta$ $\text{p}\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}\rho\gamma\iota\sigma\epsilon$ $\text{p}\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ $\text{k}\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$. $\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ $\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ - $\text{t}\eta\delta\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$; $\omicron\upsilon\chi$ $\omicron\acute{\iota}$ $\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\iota$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\iota$ $\mu\epsilon\tau'$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\omicron\rho\theta\omicron\iota$ $\text{p}\epsilon\pi\acute{\omicron}\rho\epsilon\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\iota$;

He who says, ‘The house of Jacob has angered the spirit of the Lord.’ Are these his deeds? Are not His words agreeable to him for him to walk upright?

$\text{הִאֲמֹר בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל הִקְצַר רוּחַ יְהוָה אִם־אֵלֶּה מִעֲלָלָיו הֲלֹא דְבַרִי יִטְיִבוּ עִם הַיְשָׁר הַהוּלָךְ$

$\delta \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$] = הִאֲמֹר .¹⁴ On analysing this phrase as to be construed with vs. 6, see above towards the end.

$\text{p}\alpha\rho\acute{\omega}\rho\gamma\iota\sigma\epsilon$] = הִקְצַר , cf. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\text{p}\alpha\rho\omicron\rho\gamma\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\iota$ $\mu\epsilon$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\text{p}\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ $\upsilon\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\text{הִקְצַרְתָּ אֶת־אֲבֹתֶיכֶם}$ *Zc* 8.14.

¹² The verb also occurs at *Mi* 2.11, *Am* 7.16, 9.13.

¹³ But then, *pace SD* (II 2369), the speaker can hardly be the prophet.

¹⁴ *NETS*’s “One says,” is odd.

H is difficult. We fail to see how *König* (III § 236b) could view it as meaning *dicendumne*.

κυρίου] When our translator read **הָאִמְרָה**, he may not have been sufficiently aware of a discourse complication that could ensue, for we might think **μου** more logical, but that would of course imply reading **רוּחִי** instead of **רוּחַ יְהוָה**, which is a far-reaching rewriting. The same complication is inherent in **οὐχ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ εἰσι καλοὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ**, where **αὐτοῦ** cannot be referring to same person, but the first is virtually equivalent to **μου**. A similar obscurity in direct discourse occurs in Abram’s instruction to his wife: **אֲמַרְיִי אָחָתִי** **אָחָתִי** Ge 12.13, where **אָחָתִי** could be said to be more “logical,” what we find in **Θ** **Ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ εἰμι** and Pesh. **/hātēh nā/**.¹⁵

εἰ **אָחָתִי**] We concur with Ziegler, who has added **<;>** after **ἐστὶν**. The use of **אָחָתִי** as an interrogative particle is well established; see BDB s.v. **2**. Under its influence SG introduced this innovative use of **εἰ**; a long list of references can be found in *GELS* s.v. **3**. In Gn 18.21 **εἰ** renders **אָחָתִי** as well as **הֲ**. For the book of Mi, see 6.6, *7bis*, 11, and note esp. **ἐὰν φέρητε τὴν θυσίαν, εἰ προσδέξομαι αὐτὰ**¹⁶ **ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν**; ‘should you bring the sacrifice, shall I accept them from your hands?’ Ma 1.10, where **εἰ** introduces an apodosis of a conditional sentence introduced with **ἐὰν**.

οὐχ] This must be construed with **πεπόρευνται** as well.

οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ] = **דְּבָרָיו**, i.e. **דְּבָרָיו**.

εἰσι καλοὶ] The NH text has been correctly restored by Tov as **ἡγ]άθουσαν**. **μετ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὀρθοὶ**] = **עִמּוֹ וְיָשָׁר**? In any case the separation of the definite article in **Θ** from the participle is unusual for **יָשָׁר** **הַיָּשָׁר**. Wolff (40), relying on Hebraists such as Brockelmann and Gesenius - Kautzsch, suggests that the article is equivalent to **יָשָׁר** introducing an antecedentless relative clause. Such a relative clause, however, does not use a participle as its predicate verb.¹⁷

The NH text presents a revision in conformity with **Θ**: **μ[ετὰ τοῦ ὀρθῶς πορευομένου]**.¹⁸

ὀρθοὶ] The collocation **ὀρθῶς πορεύομαι** here appears to bear a moral, ethical sense, unlike in vs. 3 above, where physically upright, erect stance is indicated, whilst **Θ** there reads differently than here.

πεπόρευνται ἡγ]άθουσαν] Whilst the pl. form is intelligible in the context, the number shift comes over as unfounded.

¹⁵ On the question of *discours indirect*, see *SQH* § 42 d. Virtually identical is another Aramaic version: “Tell them about me that he is my brother (הוּא הוּא)” 1Q20 19.20.

¹⁶ The n.pl. acc. pronoun refers to several offerings mentioned earlier.

¹⁷ See examples in Brockelmann § 150a, GK § 138 i-k, and JM § 145 d-e.

In Qumran Hebrew we do find substantivised participles with or without the article. With the article, e.g. **הַשׁוֹגֵג** ‘one who errs inadvertently’ 1QS 9.1 and **הַיּוֹצֵא מִפִּיךָ** ‘that which issues forth out of your mouth’ 4Q51 II fr a-d.5, which is a variant reading of **דְּבָרֶיךָ** 1Sm 1.23. For a discussion, see *SQH* § 17 j.

¹⁸ Tov, the editor, restores **ὀρθῶς**. However, the word is used adverbially (manner), to which the rule of grammatical concord does not apply. In an editorial note (p. 86) we read **ὀρθῶς**, perhaps a typo for **ὀρθῶς**. An example of adverbially used **ὀρθῶς** is **ὀρθῶς κρίναι** ‘to judge correctly’ Pr 31.5, sim. **ὀρθῶς βλέπετωσαν** ‘Let them look straight’ ib. 4.25.

- 2.8) καὶ ἔμπροσθεν ὁ λαός μου εἰς ἔχθραν ἀντέστη· κατέναντι τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ τὴν δορὰν αὐτοῦ ἐξέδειραν τοῦ ἀφελέσθαι ἐλπίδα συντριμμὸν πολέμου.

Some time ago my people stood up as a hostile force. In spite of his peaceful stance they took his skin off to take away the hope of a ruining war.

וְאַתְמוֹל עָמִי לְאוֹיֵב יִקְוֶמָם מִמּוֹל שְׁלֵמָה אָדָר תִּפְשֹׁטוּן מִעֲבָרִים בְּחֹטְ שׁוֹבֵי מְלָחָה:

Both 𐤄 and 𐤅 are full of challenges.

ἐμπροσθεν 𐤅] This is the sole instance of this equivalence. The usual rendering of 𐤅𐤁𐤌𐤎 or 𐤅𐤁𐤌𐤎 is ἐχθές. The translator must have had some reason for selecting ἐμπροσθεν, which would refer to a more distant past than yesterday.¹⁹

εἰς ἔχθραν] “In order to meet enemy attacks” must be meant.

ἀντέστη] = 𐤅𐤎, i.e. 𐤅𐤎, for 𐤅𐤎 is transitive.²⁰ This may have caused the translator to read a Qal form here. The pl. ἀντέστησαν of the NH text is a constructio ad sensum due to the sense of λαός.

τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ] = 𐤁𐤌𐤎.

τὴν δορὰν αὐτοῦ] περιβόλαιον ‘garment’ in the NH text (6.5).

ἐξέδειραν 𐤅𐤁𐤌𐤎] The abrupt shift in 𐤅 to 2mp is odd. The NH text reads ἐξεδύσ[ατε (6.5), or possibly ἐξεδύσ[αν, ‘you (or: they) took (someone’s) clothes off.’

ἐλπίδα συντριμμὸν πολέμου] ἐλπίδα is probably in a loose relation of apposition to συντριμμὸν πολέμου, i.e. people are hoping to bring about a ruin of their enemies through a war.

συντριμμὸν πολέμου] The NH text has been restored as ἐπι[στραφήσον]ται πόλεμο[ν as a rendering of the putative 𐤅𐤁𐤌𐤎 for 𐤅𐤁𐤌𐤎 in 𐤅. We would like to know what the reconstructed Gk text is supposed to mean.

- 2.9) διὰ τοῦτο ἡγούμενοι λαοῦ μου ἀπορριφήσονται ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν τρυφῆς αὐτῶν, διὰ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν ἐξώσθησαν· ἐγγίσατε ὄρεσιν αἰώνιοις.

Therefore leaders of my people shall be thrown out of their pleasure houses, because of their evil practices they were ejected. Approach eternal mounts.

נָשִׂי עָמִי תִגָּרְשׁוּן מִבֵּית תִּעֲנֻגָּיהָ מֵעַל עֲלֵיָהּ תִּקְחוּ הָרָרִי לְעוֹלָם:

¹⁹ The fact that ἐχθές has been preserved only by Symmachus does not give a licence, *pace* Wolff (40), to emend the beginning of the verse, for instance, to עָמִי עַל אָתָּם, for 𐤄’s ἐμπροσθεν, Pesh.’s /’etmāl(y)/, and *ante unam dicem* (Jerome in his commentary) accord with 𐤅.

²⁰ Keil (444) holds that this Polel is “an intensified *kal*,” for which we would like to have certain examples. We fail to see how Wolff (38) could justify his translation, “aufgetreten.” Radaq also says just: “an intransitive verb.”

διὰ τοῦτο] > 𐤁.

ἡγούμενοι] = נשיאי, i.e. נשיאי.

ἀπορριφήσονται] = יתגרשון.

τρυφῆς αὐτῶν, διὰ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν] = תענוגיהם על מעלליהם. This is certainly a fair bit of restitution. πονηρὰ is a free, sensible addition; it is unnecessary to restate על רע מעלליהם or something like that. SG proffers a good number of instances of the type <ὁ μέγας ἀνήρ> instead of <ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ μέγας> (SSG § 37 **bba**) the position of πονηρὰ does not necessarily support such a restitution.

ἐξώσθησα] In *Index* 45a we see that √נדה is the most frequent equivalent of this Gk verb: qal 1x, ni. 5x, hi. 13x, and we include our Mi instance there, thus = ידחו, i.e. ידחו. Note esp. τὴν ἐξωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι אקבצבא הנדהתה Mi 4.6 and καὶ ἐξώσω αὐτὸν εἰς γῆν ἄνυδρον ציה אקבצבא אלה אקבצבא JI 2.20. ἐγγίσατε] = תקרבו.

ὄρεσιν αἰωνίους] = הררי לעולם. In BH a noun in st. cst. may be subordinate to a prepositional phrase, e.g. למה למו Ps 58.5, משהפת לבני-קהת, 1C 6.55.²¹

2.10) ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι σοι αὕτη ἢ ἀνάπαυσις ἔνεκεν ἀκαθαρσίας. διεφθάρητε φθορᾷ,

Arise and go, for this rest is not for you because of uncleanness. You have been utterly ruined.

קומו וּלכו כי לא-זאת המנוחה בעבור טמאה תחבל וְחבל נמרץ:

ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου] On the use of the aorist and present imperative next to each other, see SSG § 28 **ha** (iii), p. 294, where “Get going!” is suggested for the latter in contrast to ἀνάστηθι, which is a one-off action.

αὕτη ἢ ἀνάπαυσις] This could mean, as in 𐤁, ‘this is not ..’.²² The selection of the fem. pronoun would be due to the gender of ἀνάπαυσις; cf. SSG § 77 I.²³ Though not often, a bare demonstrative pronoun can be attributively used and precede, e.g. זֶה הַיָּם גָּדוֹל ‘this sea is vast’ Ps 104.25; cf. JM § 143 *i*. The position of οὐκ, not before αὕτη, is as in Οὐχὶ αὕτη ἢ ὁδὸς καὶ οὐχ αὕτη ἢ πόλις 4K 6.19L <זו העיר ולא זה הדרך ולא זה הדרך>.

διεφθάρητε] = תתחבלו.

φθορᾷ] נמרץ ‘grievous’ is left untranslated; the translator may have thought that the notion of intensity is sufficiently expressed through the cognate dative.

²¹ For a discussion with more examples, see JM § 129 *m-n*.

²² So Trg.: לא דא ארעא בית ניהא.

²³ Cf. *SD*: “nicht ist für dich dies die Ruhe.”

- 2.11) κατεδιώχθητε οὐδενὸς διώκοντος· πνεῦμα ἔστησε ψεῦδος, ἐστάλαξέ σοι εἰς οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα. καὶ ἔσται ἐκ τῆς σταγόνας τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου

You were persecuted, though none was chasing (you). A spirit brought about falsehood. It dripped to you as wine and drink, and it shall be out of the tiny number of this people

לִדְאִישׁ הַלֵּה רִוַח וְשָׁקַר כְּזָב אֶטֶשׁ לְךָ לֵינִן לְשֹׁכֵר וְהִהוּ מִטִּי הַעֵץ עַם הַזֶּה׃

κατεδιώχθητε] Nothing in \mathfrak{H} corresponds to this.²⁴

οὐδενὸς] = לוֹא אִישׁ. So also in the Murabbaat text, XII 29. On οὐδενὸς, for which μηδενὸς could have been said, see SSG § 83 **bd**.

ἔστησε] Nothing in \mathfrak{H} corresponds to this. For the meaning of the verb ἵστημι here, see *GELS* s.v. **II 5**.

ψεῦδος] One is not certain whether this is a rendering of שָׁקַר as in Zc 5.4, Ma 3.5 or כָּזָב as in Ho 7.13.

ἐστάλαξέ] = הִטָּן or הִטָּן.

ἔσται] According to *SD* Iακωβ in vs. 12 is the subject of this verb, though it has a finite verb to go with it, συναχθήσεται. Even if we added a comma at the end of vs. 11, we would expect Iακωβ in this verse.

ἐκ τῆς σταγόνας] = הִטָּן. For הִטָּן / σταγών, see Jb 36.27. What is meant by \mathfrak{E} is perhaps that the national restoration is going to be a very modest beginning.

- 2.12) συναγόμενος συναχθήσεται Iακωβ σὺν πᾶσιν· ἐκδεχόμενος ἐκδέξομαι τοὺς καταλοιπούς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ θήσομαι τὴν ἀποστροφὴν αὐτῶν· ὡς πρόβατα ἐν θλίψει, ὡς ποίμνιον ἐν μέσῳ κοίτης αὐτῶν ἐξαλοῦνται ἐξ ἀνθρώπων.

Jacob will be certainly gathered altogether. I shall certainly welcome the remainder of Israel, I shall effect their return together. Like sheep in distress, like a herd inside their pen they will jump out away from people.

הִסְבֵּךְ אֶאֱסָף יַעֲקֹב כְּקָב קֶבֶץ אֶקְבֵּץ שְׂאֵרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יַחַד שְׂמִינִי כְּצֹאן בְּצָרָה׃
כְּצֹרָר בְּתוֹךְ הַדְּבָרוֹת הַיְמִינִה מְאֹד׃

συναχθήσεται] = הִסְבֵּךְ.

συναγόμενος συναχθήσεται illustrates another common representation of the well-known Hebrew syntagm, *figura etymologica*, as in πληθύνων πληθυνῶ τὰς λύπας σου ‘I shall greatly increase your pains’ Ge 3.16 <

²⁴ *SD* II.2370 suggests that \mathfrak{E} possibly read מְרַח in lieu of מְרַח. Cf. אֶרְיָנִי Je 49.19 > ἐκδιώξω αὐτούς ib. 29.20 (\mathfrak{E}).

הַרְבֵּה אֲרֻבָּה עֲצָבוֹנָה.²⁵ The immediately following ἐκδεχόμενος represents the same feature.

τὴν ἀποστροφὴν] A free, contextually motivated addition? Since θήσομαι is a rendering of אֲשִׁימוֹנוּ, אֲשִׁיבֵנו would not come into the picture.

ἐν θλίψει] = הַרְבֵּה, ≠ אֲרֻבָּה ‘sheepfold.’ The translator probably saw here a parallelism of ב // תוך.

κοίτης αὐτῶν רִבְרָה] An unusual equivalence occurring nowhere else. רִבְרָה is thought to mean ‘pasture.’

ἐξαλοῦνται [תְּהִימְנָה] Another unusual equivalence. The Heb. verb is usually understood to have to do with vocal reaction, ‘to murmur, roar,’ not physical, bodily ‘to jump out.’

2.13) διὰ τῆς διακοπῆς πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν διέκοψαν καὶ διήλθον πύλην καὶ ἐξῆλθον δι’ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν, ὁ δὲ κύριος ἡγήσεται αὐτῶν.

Through the breach in front of them they broke through, and they went through a gate, and went outside through it, and their king went outside ahead of them, but the Lord will lead them.

עָלָה הַפָּרֶץ לְפָנֵיהֶם פָּרְצוּ וַיַּעֲבְרוּ שַׁעַר וַיֵּצְאוּ בּוֹ וַיַּעֲבֵר מֶלֶכָם לְפָנֵיהֶם וַיְהִי בְרֵאשִׁים: פ

διὰ τῆς διακοπῆς] = עָלָה הַפָּרֶץ? But עָלָה can scarcely indicate a space through which one moves.

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν [וַיַּעֲבֵר] By selecting the verb which is nearer (ἐξῆλθον וַיַּעֲבֵר) Ⓞ stresses that, though the people were acting under the king’s leadership, their true leader was God.

²⁵ For a discussion of this feature in SG, see SSG § 31 **db**. That the feature is no Hebraism is evident in Ge 3.16, for הַרְבֵּה, irrespective of its vocalisation, cannot be a participle.

CHAPTER III

- 3.1) Καὶ ἐρεῖ Ἀκούσατε δὴ ταῦτα, αἱ ἀρχαὶ οἴκου Ἰακωβ καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι οἴκου Ἰσραηλ. οὐχ ὑμῖν ἔστι τοῦ γνῶναι τὸ κρίμα;

And He will say: "Do hear these things, o the rulers of the house of Jacob and the remnant of the house of Israel. Is it not up to you to know the judgement?"

ואמר שמעו-נא ראשי יעקב וקציני בית ישראל הלווא לכם לדעת את-המשפט:

Καὶ ἐρεῖ] = ויאמר.¹

κατάλοιποι קציני] A rather anomalous equivalence. Likewise in vs. 9. Cf. τοῖς καταλοίποις οἴκου Ἰουδα יהודי בית ישראל זר 2.7.

ὕμῖν ἔστι τοῦ γνῶναι [לכם לדעת] Ⓞ is a verbatim reproduction of Ⓢ, and both constructions indicate an obligation.² The gen. article τοῦ cannot be anything other than a mere infinitive marker, since the inf. here is the subject of what is basically an existential nominal clause. See above at 2.4.

γνῶναι] ‘To find out and act on’ rather than εἰδέναι ‘to be knowledgeable about, acquainted with.’

- 3.2) οἱ μισοῦντες τὰ καλὰ καὶ ζητοῦντες τὰ πονηρά, ἀρπάζοντες τὰ δέρματα αὐτῶν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτῶν.

o those who hate good things and seek evil things, tearing their skins off them and their flesh from their bones.

שנאי טוב ואהבי רעה [רע] גזלי עורם מעליהם ושארם מעל עצמותם:

οἱ μισοῦντες] This refers back to ὑμῖν in vs. 1, the virtual subject of τοῦ γνῶναι. The selection of the nom. form suggests that the combination of οἱ and three participles is not in apposition to ὑμῖν, but vocative.

ζητοῦντες [אהבי] In view of Μεμισήκαμεν τὰ πονηρὰ καὶ ἠγαπήκαμεν τὰ καλὰ אלהי-יצבאות יהוה יחנן אולי יחנן יהוה אלהי-יצבאות Am 5.15 the selection of ζητέω, and not ἀγαπάω, is puzzling.

αὐτῶν] Not ‘their own,’ but ‘of the ruled’ of vs. 1.

¹ For a summary of scholarly discussion on this variation, see McKane 95. Cf. Pesh. /w(‘)emar/ ‘and he said,’ most likely = ויאמר, i.e. ראמר or ויאמר.

² Cf. JM § 124 l and SSG § 30 bec. In Pesh. this obligative value of the syntagm is lexicalised by means of /wālē/ ‘appropriate.’

- 3.3) ὄν τρόπον κατέφαγον τὰς σάρκας τοῦ λαοῦ μου καὶ τὰ δέρματα αὐτῶν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐξέδειραν καὶ τὰ ὀστέα αὐτῶν συνέθλασαν καὶ ἐμέλισαν ὡς σάρκας εἰς λέβητα καὶ ὡς κρέα εἰς χύτραν,

Just as they devoured the flesh of My people and removed their skin from them and crushed all their bones and cut (them) in pieces as meat to go into a cauldron and as pieces of meat into a pot,

וְאִשֶּׁר אָכְלוּ שְׂאֵר עַמִּי וְעוֹרָם מִצְלִיָּהֶם הִפְשִׁיטוּ וְאֶת־עַצְמוֹתֵיהֶם פָּצְחוּ וּפְרָשׁוּ
כְּאִשֶּׁר בְּסִיר וּכְכֹשֶׁר בְּתוֹךְ קִלְחָת:

ὄν τρόπον] = פָּאָשָׁר.

ἀπ' αὐτῶν [מִצְלִיָּהֶם] ἐπάνωθεν αὐτῶν could have been said to indicate not removal from somewhere, but that A was attached to B. Cf. Ἐξαγάγετε πάντα ἄνδρα ἐπάνωθέν μου (מְעָלִי)· καὶ ἐξήγαγον πάντα ἄνδρα ἀπὸ ἐπάνωθεν αὐτοῦ (מְעָלִי) 2K 13.9.³

ὡς σάρκας] = כְּשֵׂאֵר.

- 3.4) οὕτως κεκράζονται πρὸς κύριον, καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούσεται αὐτῶν· καὶ ἀποστρέψει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκεῖνο, ἀνθ' ὧν ἐπονηρέυσαντο ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν ἐπ' αὐτοῦς.

so they will shout to the Lord, but He will not listen to them; He will turn His face away from them at that time, because they acted wickedly with their deeds upon them."

אִזּ יִזְעַקוּ אֱלֹהֵיהֶן וְלֹא יִשְׁמָעוּ אֹתָם וַיִּסְתַּר פְּנָיו מֵהֶם בְּעֵת הַהִיא כְּאִשֶּׁר הִרְעוּ
מִצְלִיָּהֶם: פ

οὕτως] Together with ὄν τρόπον at the beginning of vs. 4 there is formed a long clause of comparison.

ἀποστρέψει [וַיִּסְתַּר] ⚭ most likely read here וַיִּסְתַּר, as Driver (1892 § 174) proposed. However that might be, the three Impf. forms in this verse may be preterite. Such a use is attested in BH in conjunction with אַז as here,⁴ a particle not represented in ⚭. In the preceding, coordinate verse all the four verbs are *qatal*. The consistent use of the Fut. in ⚭ in this verse makes sense in its own way.

The equivalence ἀποστρέφω / וַיִּסְתַּר is also attested elsewhere, e.g. ἀποστρέψω τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ' αὐτῶν פְּנֵי אֲסִתִּיר De 31.18 in a context similar to our passage; see also De 31.17, 32.20. There is hence no absolute need to postulate וַיִּסְר or וַיִּסְר, hi. from √סור.⁵

³ L, however, uses ἀπό both times.

⁴ See JM § 113 *i*. The only sure case in BH of <אַז + short *yiqtol*> with preterite value is יִקְהַל אַזּ ἐξεκκλησίασε 1Kg 8.1.

⁵ Correct *Index* 16a accordingly.

ἐπονηρεύσαντο [הִרְעוּ] The Heb. verb here is usually thought to be transitive, which, however, is not attested anywhere with this fairly frequent Hif. verb with a deed as object.⁶ Our translator's analysis of it as intransitive is underlined with the addition of ἐν, when he could have said τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα (nom.). Moreover, רָעָה never takes a deed as its grammatical subject.⁷

ἐπ' αὐτούς] A free addition with the pronoun referring to victims. Wolff (61) thinks of an infelicitous haplography, i.e. מַעֲלִיָּהֶם < מַעֲלִיָּהֶם < מַעֲלִיָּהֶם.

3.5) τάδε λέγει κύριος ἐπὶ τοὺς προφῆτας τοὺς πλανῶντας τὸν λαόν μου, τοὺς δάκνοντας ἐν τοῖς ὁδοῦσιν αὐτῶν καὶ κηρῦσσοντας ἐπ' αὐτὸν εἰρήνην, καὶ οὐκ ἐδόθη εἰς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν, ἥγειραν ἐπ' αὐτὸν πόλεμον·

These things the Lord says: "Against the prophets who lead my people astray, bite with their teeth, and preach peace at them." Yet (nothing) has been laid into their mouth, they have set a war in motion against them.

כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה עַל-הַנְּבִיאִים הַמְתַּעִים אֶת-עַמִּי הַנִּשְׁכָּחִים בְּשִׁנְיָהֶם וְקָרְאוּ שְׁלוֹם וְאָשַׁר לֹא-יִתֵּן עַל-פִּיָּהֶם וְקָדְשׁוֹ עָלֵיו מִלְחָמָה:

ἐπὶ [עַל] This Gk preposition, unlike ἐν and irrespective of which case it governs, does not express a topic of verbal communication. Governing a nominal in acc. it "indicates one to whom or that to which action, attention, thought, emotion, utterance etc. are directed" (GELS s.v. ἐπί III 4).

τὸν λαόν μου [עַמִּי] In neither language the pronoun is unlikely a reference to Micah.⁸ Hence this simple expression hardly means 'my coreligionists.' But God as its referent also sounds odd. The discourse mechanism in use here does not appear to us logical.⁹ A similar problem meets us in vs. 6. Supposing that God is speaking, how would we account for the shift from ὑμῖν to τοὺς προφῆτας .. αὐτούς? Who is God speaking to? Is τάδε λέγει κύριος equivalent to τάδε λέγω? In the parable of talents the master, on his return home, says to two of his servants: εὖ, δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἦς πιστός,

⁶ Clines (VII 531a) mentions one QH example: הִרְבַּה הֵרַע מַעֲשָׂיו 'he [= Esau] did many evil deeds' 4Q223-224 2ii5 [= Jub 35.13]. We would parse הִרְבַּה as an inf. cst. complementing the preceding הִרְבָּה, not הִרְבָּה, an analysis exactly reflected in its Ethiopic translation, /'abzeḥa 'a'keyo megbārihu/. Qimron (2020.236) appears to find the absence of ל from the inf. anomalous, but in QH we find such a feature not infrequently, see, e.g., בְּרֵאשִׁית צֵאת וּבֹא לִשְׁבֹת וְקוּם, 'at the beginning when one leaves or enters, sit or stand' 1QS 10.13, where the two syntagms occur next to each other; see further in SQH § 18 i. In Aquila's ἐκάκωσαν ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν the verb is probably transitive. In SG it is always <+ acc. rei>, but in CG <+ acc. pers.> is securely attested. Then this use of הִרְבַּה is not un-Hebraic.

⁷ Cf. Vulg. *nequiter egerunt in adinventionibus suis* = 6, but Pesh. /'av'eš(w) 'vādayhōn/ and Trg. אַבְאִישׁוֹ עֹבְדֵיהוֹן = 7.

⁸ Thus *pace* Wolff 61.

⁹ Cf. McKane 103f.

ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω· εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ κυρίου σου (Mt 25.21, 23), where he could have said μου instead of τοῦ κυρίου σου.¹⁰ Alternatively we can print Ἐπὶ and make a direct speech, God's oracle, start there, as shown in our translation above and regard the segment Ἐπὶ τοῦ .. εἰρήνην as the title of the oracle.

δάκνοντας דַּאֲכֹנְתַּא] Not a threatening figure as in δάκη αὐτόν (דַּאֲכֹנְתַּא) ὁ ὄφις 'the snake bites him' Am 5.19, but "as long as they are provided enough to eat."

κηρύσσοντας קְרִיבְתַּא] König (III 517 *m-n*) analyses the Heb. verb as invariable, but ⚭ is right in seeing it as parallel to the preceding two participles, though out of respect to ⚭ (?), the translator refrains from adding the article, τοὺς. Analogously he saw a non-invariable form in the following קְרִיבְתַּא, though his analysis is partly conditioned by his ἐδόθη. He appears to have found the sequence of tense forms here confusing and attempted a fair bit of syntactic restructuring.

ἐδόθη יָתַן] There is no absolute need to assume that ⚭ represents יָתַן. A passive, 3sg verb is sometimes used impersonally, e.g. προσετάγη τῷ κήτει 'a command was issued to the giant fish' Jn 2.11 (⚭ לָדַג יָהָה לְיָמָר).¹¹ However, יָתַן here is not impersonal. קְרִיבְתַּא ought to have been analysed as an antecedentless relative pronoun, 'one who ...',¹² and the relative clause is extraposed and joined with the main clause with an apodotic *waw* and the inherent antecedent is resumed in עָלָיו, whereas in ⚭ αὐτόν can be understood only as referring back to τὸν λαόν μου earlier in the verse, hence our *against them*, not *him*. Alternatively, ⚭ represents נָתַן = נָתַן.

ἤγειραν ἠκηρύξαν] A rare equivalence attested nowhere else. The Heb. word must mean 'they declared the war holy (sanctioned by God).'¹³ The collocation ἐγείρω πόλεμον is also met with in 1E 1.23.

3.6) διὰ τοῦτο νύξ ὑμῖν ἔσται ἐξ ὀράσεως, καὶ σκοτία ὑμῖν ἔσται ἐκ μαντείας, καὶ δύσεται ὁ ἥλιος ἐπὶ τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ συσκοτάσει ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ἡμέρα·

Therefore it shall be night for you without vision, and it shall be darkness for you without divination, and the sun shall set against the prophets, and the day shall become totally dark against them.

לְכֹן לִילָה לְכֶם מְחִוּוֹן וְהַשְׁכָּה לְכֶם מְקֻסָּם וּבָאָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ עַל־הַנְּבִיאִים וְקָדַר עַל־יָהּ הַיּוֹם:

¹⁰ In Japanese there is nothing unusual at all about a father saying to a son of his: /otōsan wa iku/ 'the father goes,' when what is actually meant is 'I go.'

¹¹ Cf. *SSG* § 87 a.

¹² So Pesh. /man d-lā ../.

¹³ On the declarative-estimative value of Piel, see *JM* § 52 d.

ἐξ] The preposition, just like its Heb. equivalent here, indicates absence, lack, or deprivation. Another example is ἡ γῆ ἀφανισθήσεται .. ἐκ διοδεύοντος καὶ ἐξ ἀναστρέφοντος (מַעְבֵּר וּמְשַׁבֵּר) ‘the land will be annihilated .. with none journeying through it and returning (thereafter)’ Zc 7.14.¹⁴

σκοτία הַשָּׁמַיִם] NH (6.41) is said to read σκοτασθ[ήσεται. It probably reflects הַשָּׁמַיִם read as a verb as in **Ⲙ**. But what is its subject, which must be fem. sg.? Σκοτάζω, just as συσκοτάζω later in the verse, is an intransitive verb, ‘to grow dark,’ unlike σκοτιζώ ‘to make dark.’ The latter, however, can be used in a pseudo-passive voice: ἕως οὗ μὴ σκοτισθῆ ὁ ἥλιος καὶ τὸ φῶς καὶ ἡ σελήνη .. ‘before the sun and the light and the moon .. become dark’¹⁵ Ec 12.2, which suggests a possible scribal error in NH for σκοτισθήσεται. On the other hand, **Ⲙ**, apparently reading הַשָּׁמַיִם, reproduces a perfect poetic parallelism in **Ⲙ**:¹⁶

A = noun		B	C (מ)		a = noun		B	c (מ)
νῦξ	ἔσται	ὕμῖν	ἐξ ὀράσεως	καὶ	σκοτία	ἔσται	ὕμῖν	ἐκ μαντείας
הַלַּיְלִית		לְכֶם	מִחִוּוֹן	וְ	הַשָּׁמַיִם		לְכֶם	מִמְקַמְ

Darkness is the central theme of this verse, looked at out of four perspectives and expressed in four short clauses, one nominal and three verbal. Each clause has a prepositional phrase, each joined to a personal referent, one and the same group of individuals, namely the doomed prophets. Given this impeccable parallelistic structure of the verse it makes sense to understand the two prepositions, ל- and על, as synonymous. We submit that they both carry a negative connotation. In ὑμῖν (twice < לְכֶם) we could recognise a dativus incommodi. In order to see visions and engage in divination prophets need light, without which they find themselves in a disadvantaged, unenviable situation, “a black-out” (McKane 106).

The combination of Qal בא with הַשָּׁמַיִם as its subject to express the notion of sunset occurs 19¹⁷ times in BH, mostly with no preposition following, e.g. שָׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם בָּא עַד-בָּא Ex 17.12. In one case ל- is used: וְתָבֹא לָהֶם הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶצֶל הַגְּבֻעָה Jd 19.14, where we have an equivalent of dativus commodi, for the travellers had reached one of the two locations of their choice for a night’s stay. In another instance we find על: שָׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם עָלָיו לֹא-תָבֹא עָלָיו De 24.15.¹⁸ Another value

¹⁴ Hardly “instead of” (Brenton) and “statt” (SD). Cf. GELS s.v. ἐκ **11** and BDB s.v. מן **7 ba-b**. Ibn-Ezra and Radaq take מן in the sense of ‘as a consequence of, originating in.’

¹⁵ Pace “are darkened” (NETS); the intransitive value of the form is supported by the parallel ἐπιστρέψουσιν τὰ νέφη ‘the clouds return.’

¹⁶ There is no absolute need to impose “our” grammatical concept of *substantive* and read מִמְקַמְ in lieu of the inf. cst. in **Ⲙ**.

¹⁷ In BDB s.v. בוא Qal **1 i** “18³⁴” should read “2Ch 18³⁴.”

¹⁸ This instance is, along with the two cases in our Mi passage, mentioned in BDB s.v. על **II 5**, as expressing “the idea of being suspended or extended, *over* anything, without however being in contact with it, *above, over*.” However, the notion of the sun setting over or above

Those who see visions will be put to shame, and the diviners will be laughed at, and they will all speak against them, because there will be none who will listen to them.

וּבְשׁוּ הַחֲזוֹנִים וְהַקְּסָמִים וְעָטוּ עַל־שִׁפְמָם כָּלֵם כִּי אֵין מַעֲנֶה אֱלֹהִים:

The third clause is rather puzzling. αὐτῶν most likely refers back to the visionaries and diviners, who, however, are unlikely to be identical with αὐτοί. The verb καταλάλησουσιν is most likely impersonal, but such a subject cannot be explicitly marked with αὐτοί. The use of πάντες with a 3pl verb impersonally used does not sound right. Nor can we identify in 𐤄 anything remotely equivalent to הָטַעַ, a fairly common verb meaning ‘to envelop or wrap oneself,’ and to שִׁפְמָ ‘moustache.’ 𐤄 is no less puzzling. What is the gesture supposed to mean?²³

The last clause in 𐤄 is straightforward: ‘there is no response from God.’ αὐτῶν] = אֱלֹהִים. Whilst the equivalence מַעֲנֶה / εἰσακούω does not occur elsewhere, הָטַעַ Qal is often rendered with εἰσακούω, e.g. εἰσάκουσόν μου, κύριε ἡ̄וּהָ עֲנֵנִי Ps 68(69).17. Where εἰσακούω comes from is a mystery, whilst the intent of the clause as a whole is clear: ‘nobody is going to have ears for whatever they say.’ In one case they will be ignored by God, in the other by the general public.

The definite article prefixed to εἰσακούων does not have a determining value, but fulfils a useful function of averting syntactic ambiguity, for without it ἔσται εἰσακούων could be misunderstood as a periphrastic construction; see further in *SSG* § 1 c (pp. 7f.).

3.8) ἐὰν μὴ ἐγὼ ἐμπλήσω ἰσχὺν ἐν πνεύματι κυρίου καὶ κρίματος καὶ δυναστείας τοῦ ἀπαγγεῖλαι τῷ Ἰακωβ ἀσεβείας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ.

I shall certainly be fully empowered through the spirit of the Lord and judgement and strength to point out to Jacob his deeds of impiety and to Israel his sins.

וְאוֹלָם אֲנֹכִי מְלֹאֲתִי כַח אֶת־רוּחַ הַיְהוָה וּמִשְׁפָּט וּגְבוּרָה לְהַגִּיד לְיַעֲקֹב פְּשָׁעוֹ
וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל חַטָּאתוֹ: ס

ἐὰν μὴ] = אִם לֹא, a typically Hebraic expression of confident assertion, which has been mechanically reproduced in 𐤄, cf. *GELS* s.v. ἐὰν III b, c.²⁴

²³ Pesh. /sefwāthōn/ suggests ‘they will cover their lips, not daring to speak any more,’ but מִשְׁפָּתִיהָ is a shade too removed from שִׁפְמָ. Likewise Sym. ἐπὶ τῶν χειλέων αὐτῶν. According to Trg. with כְּאֲבִלִין, it is a gesture of mourners.

²⁴ In *GELS* s.v. εἰ 7 εἰ μὴ, a new subsection *b needs be added: “particle of asseveration, ‘assuredly’: εἰ μὴ (H 20.23 אִם־לֹא) κραταιώσομεν ‘we shall surely overpower’ 3K 21.23.”

Rejecting Brenton's "surely" and this analysis of ours, *SD* (II 2372) maintains that here the speaker is God, not the prophet, and translates "*Deshalb wird niemand auf sie hören, es sei denn, ich erfülle (sie) mit Stärke im Geiste des Herrn.*" One weakness of this analysis is its need to supply "sie." Verbs meaning "to fill A with B" only rarely use B in the accusative, and then only when both A and B are in the accusative, e.g. ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα θεῖον σοφίας 'I filled him with a divine spirit of wisdom' Ex 31.3. Otherwise B appears in the genitive or through its equivalent prepositional phrases, ἀπό τινος or ἐν τινι.²⁵ The same can be said of מָלֵא Qal when used in the sense of 'to fill' and מָלֵא Piel.²⁶

ἐν πνεύματι אָתְרוּיָהּ] Here אָתְרוּ could be taken as the object marker. Then יהוה רוח would be in apposition to כָּה.²⁷ By contrast, אָתְרוּ represents אָתְרוּ as a preposition. In spite of its rendition with ἐν it cannot, unlike Engl. *with*, indicate an instrument, for which Hebrew uses בְּ. It retains its basic sense of "together with," synonymous with עִם. BDB, s.v. II. אָתְרוּ, 1 a mentions Mi 3.8 along with Ge 4.1 with a gloss "*with the help of.*"²⁸

Many delete אָתְרוּיָהּ as secondary, e.g. Wolff (61): "nachgetragener Kommentar." It does damage the tripartite parallelism here, but Pesh., Trg., Vulg., and Murabbaat text are also all in agreement with אָתְרוּ.

κρίματος καὶ δυναστείας] To make וְגִבּוֹרָה מְשֻׁפָּט dependent on אָתְרוּ sounds rather odd.

ἰσχὺν .. δυναστείας וְגִבּוֹרָה .. כָּה] It is not immediately apparent whether or not the two terms in both אָתְרוּ and אָתְרוּ are to be understood as complete synonyms. In two instances we find the two closely joined as וְגִבּוֹרָה .. כָּה 1C 29.12 (ἰσχὺς καὶ δυναστεία) and 2C 20.6 (ἰσχὺς δυναστείας). In both of these cases the two nouns denote qualities possessed by God, but not moral or spiritual strength, as is manifest in the latter case in view of καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς σὲ ἀντιστῆναι (לְהִתְיַצֵּב). What Micah need be equipped with is not physical, let alone military force, but moral strength in order to confront and stand up to a group of influential but misguided fellow prophets.

²⁵ More examples and details are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. ἐμπίπλημι 2. See also under synonymous verbs such as πίμπλημι 1, and πληρώω 1. The sole possible exception in SG is ὁ πίμπλησθαι ὡς Φισῶν σοφίαν Si 24.25, where the subject of the ptc. can only be the Mosaic law (νόμος תורה vs. 23), not God, in view of the fem. המלאה, i.e. המלאה. Then πίμπλημι here may be pseudo-intransitive as ἐμπίπλημι in our Mi passage. <+ dat. rei> as in χαρᾷ πεπληρωμένος 'filled with joy' Je 13.13 is equivalent to ἐν χαρᾷ. More similar instances are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. πληρώω 1.

²⁶ See BDB s.v. מָלֵא Qal 2 and Piel.

²⁷ Pace Wolff (61) the absence of the conjunction *waw* would not then be anomalous.

²⁸ On אָתְרוּיָהּ אִישׁ קְנִיָּתִי Ge 4.1 Rashi has an enlightening observation: "עִם יי: when He created me and my husband, He created us alone, but here we are collaborating with Him." So "in close association with the Lord's spirit."

- 3.9) ἀκούσατε δὴ ταῦτα, οἱ ἡγούμενοι οἴκου Ιακωβ καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι οἴκου Ισραηλ οἱ βδελυσσόμενοι κρίμα καὶ πάντα τὰ ὀρθὰ διαστρέφοντες,

Do hear these things, the leaders of the house of Jacob and the remnant of the house of Israel, who loathe justice and distort everything upright,

שָׁמְעוּ נָא זֹאת רָאשֵׁי בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וְקַצִּינֵי בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל הַמְתַּעֲבִימִים מְשֹׁפֵטִים וְאֵין כָּל־הַיְשָׁרָה יַעֲקֹשׁוּ:

κατάλοιποι [קַצִּינֵי] A strange equivalence noted above at vs. 1.

βδελυσσόμενοι [מְתַעֲבִימִים] In SG is βδελύσσω is the most frequent (14×) rendering of תַּעֲבַי Pi., e.g. אָבִירִי יְעַקֵּב אֶת־אֱלֹהֵינוּ יַעֲקֹב בְּדִלְיוֹסִי ἐγὼ πᾶσαν τὴν ὕβριν Ιακωβ Am 6.8 (מְתַעֲבַי > מְתַעֲבַי). This Gk verb usually denotes not just dislike, but carries ethical nuance as here, though we do come across a case such as πᾶν βρῶμα ἐβδελύξατο ἢ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν Ps 106.18.

- 3.10) οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες Σίων ἐν αἵμασι καὶ Ἱερουσαλημ ἐν ἀδικίαις·
those who build Zion with murders and Jerusalem with injustices.

בְּנֵה צִיּוֹן בְּדָמִים וְיְרוּשָׁלַם בְּעוֹלָה:

οἰκοδομοῦντες] = בָּנִי. The shift to the pl. is in keeping with what precedes in vs. 9.

ἀδικίαις] = עוֹלוֹת. The pl. of this Heb. noun occurs in BH only twice. By contrast, the sg. דָּם can be ambiguous, since it can indicate blood of sacrificial animals, whereas the pl. form clearly indicates multiple acts of murder. The pl. ἀδικίαις can be understood in a similar fashion.

- 3.11) οἱ ἡγούμενοι αὐτῆς μετὰ δώρων ἔκρινον, καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς αὐτῆς μετὰ μισθοῦ ἀπεκρίνοντο, καὶ οἱ προφῆται αὐτῆς μετὰ ἀργυρίου ἐμαντεύοντο, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐπανεπαύοντο λέγοντες Οὐχὶ κύριος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστιν; οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς κακά.

Her leaders would judge in return for gifts, and her priests would take questions in return for a fee, and her prophets would divine in return for silver, and they would rest (unconcerned) upon the Lord, saying “Surely the Lord is in our midst, isn’t He? Disasters will never befall us.”

רָאשֵׁיהָ בְּשָׂחָד יִשְׁפֹּטוּ וְכֹהֲנֶיהָ בְּמִחְיָר יִירוּ וְנְבִיאֶיהָ בְּכֶסֶף יִקְסְמוּ וְעַל־יְהוָה יִשְׁעוּנוּ לֵאמֹר הֲלוֹא יְהוָה בְּקִרְבָנוּ לֹא־תִבֹּא עָלֵינוּ רָעָה:

μετὰ δώρων [בְּשָׂחָד] The Heb. preposition is here used in the manner of *beth pretii*, but its rendering with μετά is rather striking, which we believe is unique to SG. There is another assured instance in Is 52.3, as mentioned

in *GELS* s.v. μετά **I 10**: Δωρεάν ἐπράθητε καὶ οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε ‘For no payment you were sold and you will be redeemed not in return for any silver’ < וְלֹא בְכֶסֶף תִּגְאָלוּ. This kind of “ב” is rendered in a number of ways, but not with μετά τινος except in the two cases just mentioned. E.g. μεμίσθωμαι γάρ σε ἀντὶ τῶν μανδραγορῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ μου ‘I have hired you in return for my son’s mandrakes’ Ge 30.16; ἐκτήσατο Δαυιδ τὸν ἄλωνα .. ἐν ἀργυρίῳ σίκλων πενήτηκοντα ‘David bought the threshing floor .. for 50 shekels of silver’ 2K 24.24; δative – πρωτότοκον ὑποζυγίου λυτρώσῃ προβάτῳ ‘you shall redeem the firstborn of a draft animal with a sheep’ Ex 34.20.

ἀπεκρίνοντο יוֹרֵי] A striking equivalence not attested elsewhere, although the notions expressed by the two words are not so widely apart from each other.

ἐπανεπαύοντο יוֹרֵי] The bracketed “unconcerned” is a negative nuance emerging from the context. In ἐπανεπαύσατο τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπ’ αὐτοῦς ‘the spirit rested on them’ Nu 11.25 no such nuance is evident.

3.12) διὰ τοῦτο δι’ ὑμᾶς Σιών ὡς ἀγρὸς ἀροτριάθησεται, καὶ Ἱερουσαλημ ὡς ὀπωροφυλάκιον ἔσται καὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦ οἴκου ὡς ἄλσος δρυμοῦ.

Therefore, because of you, Zion shall be ploughed like a field, and Jerusalem shall be like an orchard-guard’s shed and the mountain of the house like a grove of a thicket.

לְכֹן בְּגִלְלַכֶּם צִיּוֹן שְׂדֵה תִּהְיֶה וִירוּשָׁלַם עֵיין תִּהְיֶה הָהָר הַבְּיָת לְבָמֹת יִצְרָאֵל

A thought very similar to what we have here is expressed in Σιών ὡς ἀγρὸς ἀροτριάθησεται, καὶ Ἱερουσαλημ εἰς ἄβατον ἔσται καὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦ οἴκου εἰς ἄλσος δρυμοῦ Je 33.18 < צִיּוֹן שְׂדֵה תִּהְיֶה וִירוּשָׁלַם עֵיין תִּהְיֶה הָהָר הַבְּיָת לְבָמֹת יִצְרָאֵל 26.18. The LXX rendition is remarkably similar between the two passages. The mutual influence is likely. The phrase הָהָר הַבְּיָת ‘the temple mount’ occurs in these two passages only. The equivalence ἄλσος / ἄβατ does not occur elsewhere.

ὡς ἀγρὸς ἄβατ] The addition of ὡς to the subject predicate is sensible. The particle is used twice more, making the whole statement metaphorical.

ὀπωροφυλάκιον] Earlier Samaria was threatened with *I shall turn Samaria into an orchard-guard’s shed in a field* Mi 1.6. For more details see there.

ὡς ἄλσος ἄβατ] The discourse feature of metaphor made the translator continue with ὡς, whereas in the Jer passage the notion of transformation is expressed with εἰς, more closely following 𐤀’s 𐤃; the same preposition is also added to ἄβατον against 𐤀.

CHAPTER IV

4.1) Καὶ ἔσται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου, ἔτοιμον ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὄρέων, καὶ μετεωρισθήσεται ὑπεράνω τῶν βουνῶν· καὶ σπεύσουσιν πρὸς αὐτὸ λαοί,

And at the end of the days the mountain of the Lord will be visible, ready on the summits of the mountains, and will be raised high above the hills, and peoples will hasten towards it,

וְהָיָה בְּאַחֶרֶית הַיָּמִים יְהִי הָרַבַּיְתָּהּ נֶכֶן בְּרֹאשׁ הַהָרִים וְנִשָּׂא הוּא מִגְּבֻעוֹת
וְנָהָרוּ עָלָיו עַמִּים:

Almost an identical Hebrew text appears in Is 2.2:

וְהָיָה בְּאַחֶרֶית הַיָּמִים נֶכֶן יְהִי הָרַבַּיְתָּהּ בְּרֹאשׁ הַהָרִים וְנִשָּׂא מִגְּבֻעוֹת וְנָהָרוּ אֵלָיו
כָּל-הַגּוֹיִם:

Its Gk version reads:

Ἵτι ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπ' ἄκρων τῶν ὄρέων καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ὑπεράνω τῶν βουνῶν· καὶ ἤξουσιν ἐπ' αὐτὸ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη

ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν] The same equivalence is found at Ho 3.5; cf. our remarks there. This rendition is closer to **Ⲙ** than that in Is 2.2.

ἐμφανὲς] This addition, so also in Is 2.2, makes sense, since the Temple Mount would be there anyway till its destruction. What is meant by the addition is that the house will be there ready to fulfil a particular function at the end of the days, a site destined to attract the whole of humanity.¹

The position of this adjective within the clause points its independence of **Ⲙ**. Its position in Is 2.2 scarcely suggests that it is a rendering of נֶכֶן; the meaning of the latter and that of ἐμφανής are irreconcilable with each other.²

¹ Our translator was surely familiar with this typically Hebrew syntagm <וְהָיָה> - temporal expression - *yiqtol*> which introduces an event that is to take place at a specified time in the future. E.g. וְהָיָה בַיּוֹם-הַהוּא נִאֲמַרְיָהוּ תִקְרָא׃ Ho 2.18 [καὶ ἔσται ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, λέγει κύριος, καλέσει με 2.16], see also 2.33(31). He, however, decided to assign the initial וְהָיָה (> καὶ ἔσται) its plain meaning. Wolff (83) suggests that the translator probably did not wish to repeat ἔσται and substituted ἐφανές for וְהָיָה, but the addition merely for such a purpose would represent too radical a departure from **Ⲙ**.

² Pace McKane (122) ἔτοιμος as a rendering of נֶכֶן is perfectly accurate, attested a total of 16 times in SG, including וְהָיָה נֶכֶן > ὄρθρον ἔτοιμον Ho 6.3. This would seriously affect his text-critical argument comparing Mi and Is.

τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου] = יהוה יה. This shorter Heb. phrase occurs only twice, both in the Pentateuch long before the building work undertaken by Solomon: בְּהַר יְהוָה יִרְאָה > Ἐν τῷ ὄρει [= בְּהַר!] κύριος ὠφθη Ge 22.14 and וַיִּסְעוּ מִהַר יְהוָה > Καὶ ἐξῆραν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους κυρίου Nu 10.33 (with reference to Mt Sinai). Why this shorter form was selected in ④ is not apparent. The three-term long form occurs once more at בְּהַר בֵּית־יְהוָה 2C 33.15 = ἐν ὄρει οἴκου κυρίου.

The formulation in Is 2.2 represents farther departure from ④. The translator does not appear to be concerned about the resultant number discord: sg. ἔσται with two coordinate subject phrases.

κορυφὰς רִאשׁוֹת] The selection of the pl. does not mean that the house of the Lord will emerge on the summit of every mountain, but in the highest area of the mountain range.

σπεύσουσιν] Possibly = מְהֵרֵי. Not a single instance of נְהַר / σπεύδω is to be found in SG. ἤξουσιν in Is 2.2 is rather prosaic.

πρὸς αὐτὸ ἐλְיִי] נְהַר נְהַר sounds unusual; in the only other relevant instance we find אֶל גּוֹיִם: לֹא־יִנְהָרוּ אֲלֵי עוֹד גּוֹיִם: אֶל [πρὸς αὐτήν = Babylon] Je 51.44.³ On the other hand, with σπεύδω we find ἔσπευσεν Ἀβραὰμ ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν πρὸς Σαρραν Ge 18.6 [הָאֵלֶּהָ אֶל־שָׂרָה] and σπεύσουσιν ἐπὶ τὰ τείχη Na 2.6 [מְהֵרֵי מְהֵרֵי]. We are inclined to view אֲלֵי in Is 2.2⁴ as more authentic. However, its rendering with ἐπ' αὐτό is closer to ἐלְיִי, and 1QIsa^a actually reads עֲלוּהָ, an Aramaised equivalent. The Vorlage of ④ may have read אֲלֵי after all.

4.2) καὶ πορεύονται ἔθνη πολλὰ καὶ ἐροῦσι Δεῦτε ἀναβῶμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακώβ, καὶ δεῖξουσιν ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πορευσόμεθα ἐν ταῖς τρίβοις αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἐκ Σιων ἐξελεύσεται νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ.

and many nations will go and say, "Come, let's go up into the mount of the Lord and into the house of the God of Jacob, and they will show us His way, and we shall walk in His paths, for it is from Zion that the law is to issue forth and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

וְהָלְכוּ גוֹיִם רַבִּים וְאָמְרוּ לָכֹוּ וְנַעֲלֶה אֶל־הַר־יְהוָה וְאֶל־בַּיִת אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב וְיֹרְנוּ וּמְדַרְכּוֹ וְנִלְכֶה בְּאַרְחֵתָיו כִּי מִצִּיּוֹן תֵּצֵא תוֹרָה וּדְבַר־יְהוָה מִירוּשָׁלַם:

The parallel Isaiah passage (Is 2.3) reads:

καὶ πορεύονται ἔθνη πολλὰ καὶ ἐροῦσι Δεῦτε καὶ ἀναβῶμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πορευσόμεθα ἐν αὐτῇ· ἐκ γὰρ Σιων ἐξελεύσεται νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ.

³ The suffix could be referring to Bel (the king) or Babylon.

⁴ So also in two 4Q fragments: 4Q59 1.1 and 4Q60 3-6.18.

וְהָלְכוּ עִמָּי רַבִּים וְאָמְרוּ לָכֹּוּ וְנַעֲלֶה אֶל־הַר־יְהוָה אֶל־בַּיִת אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב וְיָרְנוּ מִדְּרָכָיו
וְנִלְכֶה בְּאַרְחֵיכֶם כִּי מִצִּיּוֹן תֵּצֵא תּוֹרָה וּדְבַר־יְהוָה מִירוּשָׁלַם

Δεῦτε ἀναβῶμεν [לְכוּ וְנַעֲלֶה] Δεῦτε followed asyndetically and immediately by a 1st pl. hortatory subj.(aor.) is a discourse marker used to propose a joint action.⁵ So also δεῦτε βάλωμεν κλήρους ‘now let us cast lots’ Jn 1.7.⁶ Occasionally, however, we come across the use of καί, e.g. δεῦτε καί διελεγ-
χθῶμεν [וְנִלְכֶה וְנַעֲלֶה] Is 1.18. That this syndetic construction is not necessarily influenced by \mathfrak{H} is evident in Δεῦτε λογισώμεθα .. δεῦτε καί πατάξωμεν
αὐτὸν [לְכוּ וְנִכְהוּ .. לְכוּ וְנַחֲשֶׁבֶה] Je 18.18, see also δεῦτε καί καταβάντες συγ-
χέωμεν ἐκεῖ [וְנִלְכֶה וְנַבְּלָה שָׁם] Gn 11.7.

ἐκ Σιῶν .. [מִצִּיּוֹן] From here to the end of vs. 3 there echoes in thought Is 2.3f. almost completely in both \mathfrak{E} and \mathfrak{H} , though the wording varies somewhat between the two texts, as we are going to see in vs. 3.

δεῖξουσιν ἡμῖν] = יוֹרְנוּ, cf. ירונו Is 2.3 1QIsa^a. Following on a volitive
לְכוּ וְנַעֲלֶה and followed by another, נִלְכֶה, it is more natural to take this also as
such, though there is no formal, morphological distinction possible between
the indicative and volitive.⁷ Hence the translator could have said δειξάτωσαν
ἡμῖν, an aorist impv. Similarly, the following πορευσόμεθα could have been
πορευσώμεθα.

τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ [מִדְּרָכָיו] The Heb. preposition here can indicate either a
source, ‘from, out of,’ or partitive ‘one of His ways.’ Our translator’s selec-
tion of δείκνυμι to render הוֹרָה with appears to have led him to choose the
sg. acc., cf. δηλώσεις αὐτοῖς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀγαθὴν πορεύεσθαι ἐν αὐτῇ
3K 8.36 (< תּוֹרֵם אֶת־הַדְּרָךְ הַטּוֹבָה אֲשֶׁר יִלְכוּ־בָהּ >) and ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου διδά-
ξῃς αὐτὸν [מִתּוֹרָתְךָ תִּלְמַדְנוּ] Ps 93(94).12. The deletion of the preposition has
facilitated to the shift to the sg., τὴν ὁδὸν, in lieu of the pl., τὰς ὁδοὺς. This
contrasts with the complete equivalence between ἐν ταῖς τρίβοις αὐτοῦ and
בְּאַרְחֵיכֶם. The translator of Is, by contrast, apparently thought it more logical
that the way shown to be right was that along which one was to walk, hence
ἐν αὐτῇ.

4.3) καὶ κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον λαῶν πολλῶν καὶ ἐλέγξει ἔθνη ἰσχυρὰ ἕως
εἰς μακρὰν, καὶ κατακόψουσι τὰς ῥομφαίας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα καὶ τὰ
δόρατα αὐτῶν εἰς δρέπανα, καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ ἀντάρη ἔθνος ἐπ’ ἔθνος
ῥομφαίαν, καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ μάθωσι πολεμεῖν.

⁵ Only twice in SG δεῦτε is used as a plain verb: γυναῖκες ..., δεῦτε ‘O women ..., come here’ and ἐξέλθε καὶ δεῦτε ‘Get out and come’ Da 3.93 TH, which latter is to be moved in GELS s.v. from the end of I. The sg. δεῦρο is more frequently used as a plain impv.; for details see GELS s.v. II.

⁶ More examples are mentioned in GELS s.v. I. a.

⁷ In the sg. it is possible: indicative יוֹרְנוּ vs. volitive יוֹרְנוּ. Cf. JM § 61 f.

And He will judge between many peoples and rebuke powerful nations even if (found) far away and smash their swords into ploughs and their spears into sickles, and nations will not lift a sword against one another any more, and they will not learn to wage a war any more.

ושפט בין עמים רבים והוכיח לגוים עצמם עד־רחוק וכתתו הרבתיהם לאתים
ולא־ישאו גוי אל־גוי הרב ולא־ילמדו עוד מלחמה:

The affinity with Is continues (Is 2.4):

καὶ κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἔθνῶν καὶ ἐλέγξει λαὸν πολύν, καὶ συγκόψουσι τὰς μαχαίρας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα καὶ τὰς ζιβύνας αὐτῶν εἰς δρέπανα, καὶ οὐ λήμψεται ἔτι ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος μάχαιραν, καὶ οὐ μὴ μάθωσιν ἔτι πολεμεῖν

ושפט בין הגוים והוכיח לעמים רבים וכתתו הרבותם לאתים והניתויהם למזמרות
ולא־ישאו גוי אל־גוי הרב ולא־ילמדו עוד מלחמה

[ἐλέγξει] So Ziegler and = Is 2.4; the majority reading is ἐξελέγξει.

ἔως εἰς μακράν] exactly as in Si 24.32.⁸ The compound preposition may represent $\text{לְ} \text{עַד}$ in the *Vorlage* of C , but such does not occur in H of XII. In NH 7.32 ἔως μα]κράν [= H] has been restored.

ἔθνη ἰσχυρά] In this Mi version the anti-armament message comes over more clearly than λαὸν πολύν in Is 2.4. Analogously Mi's κατακόψουσι for כתתו sounds more powerful and destructive than Is's συγκόψουσι.

τὰς ῥομφαίας αὐτῶν הַרְבֵּיתֵיהֶם] The translator of XII prefers ῥομφαία as a rendering of רַבֵּי , using μάχαιρα only once (Zc 1.17), which is a most preferred choice with the translator of Is, who uses ῥομφαία only once (Is 66.16). In Ez we find only μάχαιρα. Since the two Greek nouns show no difference in meaning,⁹ we have here an example of personal preference among different translators.

NH showing its affinity with Is at a number of places: μαχαίρας, συνκόψουσι, τὰς σιβύνας, μ[άχαιραν].¹⁰

Here again the orthography in NH is somewhat unorthodox, e.g. συνκόψουσι, ἀνθάρη, ἐφ' in lieu of ἐπ, σιβύ[νας in lieu of ζιβύνας.¹¹

⁸ Segal (146) translates the LXX reading into עד־רחוק לְמַרְחֹק , without mentioning Mi 4.3 C . Barthélemy (1992.744) prefers the rendering in *Traduction œcuménique de la Bible* (1976), "même au loin."

⁹ LEH s.v. μάχαιρα: "alternating with ῥομφαία as stereotypical rendition of הַרֵב ." See also Muraoka 1970.499f.

Whilst Trench deals with neither noun as used in NTG, BDAG differentiates them: ῥομφαία 'a large and broad sword' used by non-Greek speaking peoples, esp. the Thracians vs. μάχαιρα 'a relatively short sword or other sharp instrument, sword, dagger,' a differentiation apparently taken over by Louw & Nida 6.32 and 6.33.

¹⁰ Barthélemy (1963.205-07) notes some agreements between NH and the text of Mi as cited by Justin the Martyr.

¹¹ For a fuller presentation of the data in this matter, see Tov in *DJD* 8.142-45 (§ 12).

Our translator must have been aware that, in another book of his corpus, a contradictory, rather belligerent message was being proclaimed, in which we read, in part, *וּמִזְמֵרְתֵיכֶם לְרַמְתֶּימָם*, JI 4.10, which he renders *συγκόψατε τὰ ἄροτρα ὑμῶν εἰς ῥομφαίας καὶ τὰ δρέπανα ὑμῶν εἰς σειρομάστας*.

- 4.4) καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ἕκαστος ὑποκάτω ἀμπέλου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος ὑποκάτω συκῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἐκφοβῶν, διότι τὸ στόμα κυρίου παντοκράτορος ἐλάλησε ταῦτα.

And each one will rest under his vine and each one under his fig-tree, and there will be nobody frightening, because the mouth of the omnipotent Lord has spoken these things.

וַיָּשְׁבוּ אִישׁ תַּחַת גַּפְנוֹ וְתַחַת תְּאֲנָתוֹ וְאֵין מַחְרִיד כִּי־פִי יְהוָה צָבָאוֹת דְּבַר:

ἀναπαύσεται *וַיָּשְׁבוּ*] An equivalence attested nowhere in LXX. *Index s.v. ἀναπαύω* suggests *שָׁבַתוּ* as what the translator meant. This equivalence occurs another four times in LXX. For NH the editor restores *καθίσ[σ]ονται*, which is closer to *חָ* and attested by Justin.

ἕκαστος *אִישׁ*] This common noun here illustrates its so-called distributive use. Though sg. in form, its verb is pl., whereas *ח* adjusted the number of the verb. Similarly in *וַיִּפְתְּחוּ אִישׁ אֶמְתַּחְתּוֹ אֶרְצָה וַיִּפְתְּחוּ אִישׁ אֶמְתַּחְתּוֹ* καὶ καθέϊλαν ἕκαστος τὸν μάρσιππον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἤνοιξαν ἕκαστος τὸν μάρσιππον αὐτοῦ Ge 44.11; *וַיִּקְחוּ לָהֶם אִישׁ שֶׁה לְבֵית־אֲבָת* λαβέτωσαν ἕκαστος πρόβατον κατ' οἴκους πατριῶν Ex 12.3, where the number of the verb in *ח* is adjusted to that in *ח*; *אִישׁ לָפִי אָכְלוּ תְּכַסּוּ עַל־הַשֶּׁה* ἕκαστος τὸ ἄρκοῦν αὐτῶ συναριθμησεται εἰς πρόβατον ib. 12.4, where the verb is 2mp; *וַיִּלְכוּ כָל־הָעָם אִישׁ לְבֵיתוֹ* Καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἅπας ὁ λαὸς ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ 1C 16.43, where the real subject of the verb is added.¹² In *ח* we see ἕκαστος repeated. Was our translator possibly thinking of some people having vines in their garden and others fig-trees? The notion of “distributive” is captured well with ἕκαστος, though we see the mechanical rendition through ἀνήρ, e.g. *καὶ παρεμβαλοῦσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἀνήρ ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ τάξει* < *אִישׁ עַל־מַחְנֵהוּ* Nu 1.52, or through ἄνθρωπος, e.g. *πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ, ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ* < *כָּל־מַלְכֵי גוֹיִם כָּלָם שָׁכְבוּ בְּכַבּוֹד אִישׁ בְּבֵיתוֹ* Is 14.18. Likewise in NH in our Mi passage. This distributive use is also observable with *שָׁה* as in *וַיִּשְׁבּוּ אִישׁ לְבֵית אִמָּה* > ἀποστράφητε ἑκάστη εἰς οἶκον μητρὸς αὐτῆς Ru 1.8.

οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἐκφοβῶν *אֵין מַחְרִיד*] A substantivised ptc. can be anarthrous as in *σφύζων οὐκ ἔστιν ἀραξέξ ἔμοῦ* < *אֵין בְּלִתִּי* Ho 13.4. The article

¹² On the question of the grammatical concord here, cf. *SSG* § 77 **bb** and *SQH* § 32 **ch**.

is not determinant, implying a reference to a particular person, but probably generic, whilst it has the useful function of indicating the articular ptc. as substantivised, not purely verbal.¹³ See also *פְּתָר אֵין אֵתוּ* > *ὁ συγκρίνων οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτό* Ge 40.8, 41.15. The anarthrous form in NH formally accords with *פְּתָר*. So is *ἔστιν*.

The selection in *Θ* of the fut. *ἔσται* is more sensible than *οὐκ ἔστιν* in NH; the statement is part of a prediction.

διότι] *ὅτι* in some manuscripts and NH; as causal conjunctions the two are freely interchangeable.

κυρίου *יהוה*] NH writes the tetragrammaton, *יהוה*, in the palaeo-Hebrew script, which we see all over¹⁴ in the fragment.

παντοκράτορος *יהוה*] An equation occurring as often as 110 times in XII, a remarkable frequency; the Gk word occurs about 180 times in the whole of LXX. Mostly, and always so in XII, as part of a composite divine name. The initial component of the word, *παν*, is no semantic ingredient of the underlying Heb. *יהוה*.¹⁵ NH is consistent (9×) in its use of *δυνάμεων*, which is formally closer to *יהוה*. This relatively rare equation occurs twice in XII: Zp 2.9, Zc 7.4.

ταῦτα] Most likely a free addition conditioned contextually.

4.5) *ὅτι πάντες οἱ λαοὶ πορεύονται ἕκαστος τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ, ἡμεῖς δὲ πορευσόμεθα ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπέκεινα.*

For all the nations will walk each along its (own) path, but we shall walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and thereafter.

כִּי כָּל־הָעַמִּים יֵלְכוּ אִישׁ בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵיו וְאָנְחֵנוּ בְּיְהוָה בְּשֵׁם־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְעוֹלָם וָעַד : פ

This verse does not seem to follow naturally out of what precedes it. Hence the difficulty of what to make of the introductory *ὅτι* *כִּי*.

ἕκαστος *אִישׁ*] On the distributive value of this construction agreeing with a pl. verb, see on vs. 4. In this construction, *אִישׁ* or *אִשָּׁא*, can refer to a group of individuals, not an individual member of the group. Hence Brenton's "all *other* nations .. every one in his own way" is confusing, whereas the pl. pronoun in NH *ἐν ὀνόματι θεοῦ αὐτῶν* (*אֱלֹהֵינוּ*) has correctly analysed this construction. Similarly *אִישׁ לְלִשְׁנוֹ בְּאָרְצָתָם אִישׁ לְלִשְׁנוֹ* ἕκ αὐτῶν ἀφορίσθησαν *νῆσοι τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐν τῇ γῆ αὐτῶν, ἕκαστος κατὰ γλῶσσαν* Ge 10.5.

¹³ Hence *οὐκ ἔστιν ἀφίων αὐτὸν τοῦ ὑπνωθῆσαι* Ec 5.11 = "there is none that suffers him to sleep" (Brenton), ≠ "there is no sending him away to sleep" (*NETS*). See further *SSG* § 30 *ba* - *bb*.

¹⁴ According to Tov (*JDJ* 8.12), the editor of the scroll, twenty-four cases including partially preserved ones. The scroll does not use *κύριος* even once.

¹⁵ *SD* has "Allherrscher," but we are not certain that *κράτωρ* denotes domination.

τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ אַלְהֵי וְיִי שׁ] A discrepancy difficult to see where it originates. NH follows 𐤀: πορε[ύσσονται ἐν ὀνόματι θε]οῦ αὐτῶν.

4.6) ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, λέγει κύριος, συνάξω τὴν συντετριμμένην καὶ τὴν ἐξωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι καὶ οὓς ἀπωσάμην·

*On that day, says the Lord, I will receive the bruised and the ejected
I will welcome and those whom I rejected,*

בְּיוֹם הַהוּא אֶנְאֵם-יְהוָה אֶפְסָה הַצְלָעָה הַנְּדָדָה אֶקְבָּץ וְאֶרְעֵתִי:

συνάξω .. εἰσδέξομαι] A rendition of the synonymous parallelism of אֶקְבָּץ .. אֶפְסָה occurs also at 2.12 in a similar context.

This common Gk verb, συνάγω, carries here a sense unique to SG: “to invite, receive (guest).”¹⁶ We suspect a semantic development most likely influenced by MH סַכְסַכְּ, cf. LBH סַכְסַכְּ = אֶפְסָה.¹⁷

τὴν συντετριμμένην καὶ τὴν ἐξωσμένην הַנְּדָדָה הַצְלָעָה] There is no fem. sg. noun in the immediate context nor can we think of such which could be in the background, which also applies to 𐤀. One possibility is, though, אֶפְסָה, a fem. noun often applied to people, whether individual or group. The word occurs many times in XII, but always rendered πρόβατον, a neuter noun. Particularly illuminating here is Ποίμαινε λαόν σου ἐν ῥάβδῳ σου, πρόβατα κληρονομίας σου, κατασκηνοῦντας καθ’ ἑαυτοὺς δρυμὸν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Καρμύλου Mi 7.14, where πρόβατα, a metaphor of Israel, is further expanded with a *masc.* pl. ptc. and ἑαυτοὺς. This inflectional selection in 𐤀 then must be more likely due to the two fem. sg. participles in 𐤀. Unlike in Greek, the fem. sg. can be applied in Hebrew to a group of individuals as in אֶרְעֵתִי תֵּלַת > οἱ πτωχοὶ τῆς γῆς ‘the poor of the land’ 4K 24.14B (L τῶν πενομένων τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς γῆς). The last clause beginning with אֶרְעֵתִי rendered οὓς (m.pl.) confirms this analysis of ours.¹⁸ See also below at 7.8.¹⁹

The equation συντριβῶ passive / אֶפְסָה Qal is unusual and occurs in LXX only here and the next verse.²⁰ Whilst the Heb. verb occurs a mere three times in BH, συντριβῶ occurs more than 200 times in LXX and its meaning is well known. Our translator, however, translates this Heb. verb form in a rather similar context with ἐκπιέζω ‘to push out’: הַנְּדָדָה אֶת-הַצְלָעָה הַנְּדָדָה וְהוֹשַׁעְתִּי אֶת-הַצְלָעָה

¹⁶ GELS s.v. 2.

¹⁷ Cf. הַנְּדָדָה לְבֵיתוֹ ‘he invited him to his home’ Leviticus Rabbah s. 9 and הַנְּדָדָה אֶרְעֵתִי ‘reception of guests’ tShav 35. Note Wolff (55): “אֶרְעֵתִי hat hier einen tröstlichen Klang”; one of his references (p. 42), “Jos 20,4” should read “Jos 20,4,” and his translation reads “will ich das Lahme heimholen.”

¹⁸ NH reads הַנְּדָדָה, an obviously secondary adjustment to the preceding τὴν.

¹⁹ Cf. JM § 134 o and SSG § 20 f.

²⁰ Tov restores ἐκτεθλιμμένην for NH solely on the basis of a reading in Justin, whilst elsewhere in LXX this Gk verb never translates אֶפְסָה.

קָבַץ] και εἰσδέξομαι τὴν ἐκπεπλεγμένην και τὴν ἀπωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι²¹
Zp 3.19. Our translator may not have been certain of the meaning of this rare
Heb. verb.

εἰσδέξομαι [קָבַץ] Whilst the verb קָבַץ is translated with diverse Gk
verbs, the Heb. equivalent of εἰσδέχομαι is only this Heb. verb.²² Through
the selection of this Gk verb the aspect of friendly welcome has been added
to a mere act of gathering. This accords well with what we have noticed above
on the use of the parallel verb here, συνάγω.

ἀπωσάμην [רָחַק] Here is the only instance of this striking equivalence,
ἀπωθέω ‘to reject’ vs. רָחַק ‘to afflict, cause pain.’²³ The translator is obvi-
ously conscious of the synonym just used, ἐξωθέω, both derived from ὠθέω
‘to push with considerable physical force.’

4.7) και θήσομαι τὴν συντετριμμένην εἰς ὑπόλειμμα και τὴν ἀπωσμένην
εἰς ἔθνος ἰσχυρόν, και βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐπ’ αὐτοῦς ἐν ὄρει Σιων
ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν και ἔως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

*and I will turn the bruised into (a community of) survivors and the
rejected into a strong nation, and the Lord will reign over them in the
mount Zion from now and for evermore.*

וְשִׁמְתִי אֶת-הַצְּלִלָה לְשִׂישׁוֹן וְהַנְּחָלָה לְגֹי עֲצוּם וּמִלְךָ יְהוָה עֲלֵיהֶם בְּהָרֵי צִיּוֹן
מִעַתָּה וְעַד-עוֹלָם:

θήσομαι [שִׁמְתִי] One of the senses of this high-frequency verb in the active
voice is “to cause to be, render” (*GELS* s.v. I 3 and II 3²⁴), a sense peculiar
to SG, partly under the influence of its Heb. equivalent, שִׁמַּע, as here. The
preposition εἰς indicates transformation, entry into a certain state, not a phys-
ical space, and often corresponds to ל- as here. For this sense of τίθημι the
use of εἰς is not obligatory as shown in πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν τέθεικά σε
Ge 17.5 // θήσω σε εἰς ἔθνη ib. 17.6.

ὑπόλειμμα] A word occurring eight times in LXX, half of which in XII.
Two other times as ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ἰακωβ יַעֲקֹב מִי 5.7, 8.

²¹ We concur with *BA*’s and *SD*’s decision to depart from the punctuation in Ra and Zgl,
ἀπωσμένην· and to follow the Tiberian accentuation, קָבַץ.

²² Note also καθὼς εἰσδέχεται ἄγγυρος < קָבַץ Ez 22.20, where in the immediate
context Qal קָבַץ is rendered twice with εἰσδέχομαι.

Ton (*DJD* 8.41, 88) restores ἀθροίσω: “adapted to MT אָסַף,” but MT reads אָבַץ. From
the plate concerned of the scroll we cannot say with certainty whether or not εἰσδέξομαι is a
little too long for the space available.

²³ ἐκά[κωσα of NH is an obvious adjustment to *Q*.

²⁴ Mi 4.7 need be added here. NH reads θήσω, but for this verb there is hardly any
differentiation between the two voices, as noted in *GELS* s.v. II, and see also *SSG* § 27 e,
p. 250.

τὴν ἀπωσμένην **הִלְחִיחַ**] The Heb. word is a hapax in BH and thought to derive from **הִלְחִיחַ** ‘farther away, onwards.’ Then as a verb it probably means ‘to be removed far away.’ Semantically then is ἀπωσμένην not very far removed. However, its selection here is more probably affiliated to our translator’s use of the precisely safe form in a similar context in **הִצִּילְהוּ אֶת־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ וְהַיְיָ וְיִצְרָחֵם אֶת־הַיְיָ וְיִצְרָחֵם אֶת־הַיְיָ** καὶ σώσω τὴν ἐκπεπλεγμένην καὶ τὴν ἀπωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι Zp 3.19 adduced under the previous verse, but unrelated to his choice of the same verb to render **עָרָה** there.²⁵

ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς **הִלְחִיחַ**] NH 8.6 reads ἐπ’ αὐτῶν. There is no comparable case in XII, but in SG both <βασιλεύω τινα> and <βασιλεύω τινος pers.> are attested, e.g. Βασίλευσον ἐφ’ ἡμῶν Jd 9.8 (*L* ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς).

ὄρει Σιων **יְהִי**] NH 8.6 adds the article: ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σει[ων, but is not consistent, for in the next verse it reads θυγάτηρ [Σειων, and see also ἐν τῇ ἐπάρσει ὀνόματος **יְהוָה** θεοῦ [αὐτοῦ] 8.40 for ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν **יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ** Mi 5.4(3). On the frequent absence in SG of the article in the syntagm <substantive + genitive>, see SSG § 3 b.

ἕως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα **עַד־עוֹלָם**] Whilst NH 8.7 reads ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος (= **אֵל**), ἕως is often followed in SG by another preposition, e.g. ἕως εἰς μακράν 4.3 and ἕως ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν Ez 47.8, cf. *GELS* s.v. ἕως **A j**.

4.8) καὶ σύ, πύργος ποιμνίου ἀρχμώδης, θύγατερ Σιων, ἐπὶ σὲ ἤξει καὶ εἰσελεύσεται ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ πρώτη, βασιλεία ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος τῇ θυγατρὶ Ἱερουσαλημ.

And you, a dusty flock-tower, the daughter of Zion, the first dominion, a kingdom will come to you from Babylon and be launched for the daughter of Jerusalem.

אֶתְהַ מְגִדְל־עָרָה עָפַל בַּת־צִיּוֹן עָרִיךָ תֵּאָתֶה וּבָאָה הַמְּשַׁלָּה הָרֵאשִׁינָה מִמְּלֶכֶת לְבַת־יְרוּשָׁלַם:

πύργος ποιμνίου **מְגִדְל־עָרָה**] For various attempts to explicate this phrase, cf. McKane (131-33).

ἀρχμώδης **עָפַל**] The Heb. word is thought to mean either some geographical feature such as mound or hill, or the name of an area in or near Jerusalem. In any case it has little to do with dust. Hence **עָפָר** has been suggested in *Index* 20a as an underlying equivalent.

θύγατερ] NH (8.8) does not admit here a vocative, and then σύ **אָתָּה** would be extraposed, a case of casus pendens, resumed with a pronoun in ἐπὶ σὲ **יְהִי**, an analysis which is syntactically acceptable.

²⁵ Tov (*DJD* 8.41, 88) restores ἐκπεπλεγμένην at NH 8.5 on the basis of a reading found in Justin, but in the space available the form cannot be accommodated.

εἰσελεύσεται **הָאָבָה**] Tov (*DJD* 8.41, 88) restores ἐλεύσεται as “the regular equivalent of the root **ב.א**.” Would the reviser have joined two complete synonyms with καί?

πρώτη] Though the word can mean ‘earlier, former’ as in μεγάλη ἔσται ἡ δόξα τοῦ οἴκου τούτου ἢ ἐσχάτη ὑπὲρ τὴν πρώτην ‘the future glory of this house will surpass its former one’ Hg 2.9,²⁶ here ‘first’ is to be preferred as persuasively argued in *SD* II 2373.

ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος] Out translator correctly identified **מְמַלְכָת** as being in st. cst., and supplied a missing nomen regens, so **מְמַלְכָת בְּבָבֶל**. As in **שְׂמֵחַת בְּקִצְרִיר** ‘joy at harvest time’ Is 9.2; **מִשְׂפַּחַת לְבַנְיִי־קִהָת הַנּוֹתְרִים** ‘the clam of the remaining members of Kohat’ 1Ch 6.55.²⁷ The translator went for a different analysis. The phrase is understandably missing in NH.

4.9) Καὶ νῦν ἵνα τί ἔγνωσ κακά; μὴ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἦν σοι; ἢ ἡ βουλή σου ἀπώλετο ὅτι κατεκράτησάν σου ὠδίνες ὡς τικτούσης;

And now why have you experienced misfortunes? Was there no king for you? Or has your intelligence become lost because pains like those of a woman in labour have overwhelmed you?

עַתָּה לָמָּה תְּרִיעֵי רַע הִמְלִיךְ אִין־בָּךְ אִם־יֹעֲצֵךְ אָבָד בִּי־חֲזָקָה חֵיל כִּי־לְדָה:

ἐγnows κακά] = **רַע תְּרִיעֵי**. **ח** means ‘you cry bitterly.’ Our understanding of κακά is similar to that in *SD*: “warum *erfuhrst* du *Unheil*?” Cf. Aq. Syh. ἐκάκωσας, which is probably = **רַעֲרֵי**, i.e. Hif. of **רַעַע**, as in ἐκάκωσαν ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν.²⁸

σοι] = **לְךָ**. **ח** means ‘in your midst.’

ἢ **אם**] On ἢ introducing a disjunctive question, see *GELS* s.v. **1 b**. At NH 8.12 Tov (*DJD* 8.41, 88) restores ἐὰν in conformity with **ח**.²⁹ The interrogative **אם** is a commonplace, but ἐὰν is not so used, see *GELS* s.v.

יֹעֲצֵךְ] = ‘your counsellor.’

ὠδίνες ὡς τικτούσης **חֵיל כִּי־לְדָה**] A well-known metaphor for excruciating pains. Here the sufferer is presented as female, but it can be also male as in ὠδίνες ὡς τικτούσης ἤξουσιν αὐτῶ *Ho* 13.13 and ὠδίνες αὐτοὺς ἔξουσιν ὡς γυναικὸς τικτούσης *Is* 13.8.

This Heb. phrase is rendered exactly in the same way in *Je* 6.24, 22.23, 27(50).43, *Ps* 47(48).7 as well. Though the sg. ὠδίν is used thrice in the context of childbirth – *Is* 26.17, where the Heb. pl. **יְבֻלֵיהֶן** is to be noted, *ib.* 37.3 (a rather free rendering), and ἐπὶ τῇ ὠδίνι αὐτῆς ἐκέκραξεν *Od* 5.17 –

²⁶ The translation of this example in *GELS* s.v. *πρῶτος c* need be corrected.

²⁷ See *JM* § 129 *n.*

²⁸ Cf. Reider 1966.123, s.v. *κακοῦν*.

²⁹ Tov mentions *Hb* 2.3 in NH, but there ἐὰν rendering **אם** is an ordinary conditional particle, ‘if.’

and 𐤌 uses sometimes a pl. noun as in the just mentioned Is 26.17 and 𐤍𐤁𐤏 Ho 13.13, for instance, the pl. ὠδῖνες is the standard irrespective of the corresponding Heb. word, not only in expressions of pains of childbirth, but also in general. Among a total of 35 attestations in LXX of this Gk noun we find only three instances of the sg. Thus the pl. form has become the norm for this noun irrespective of the form in 𐤌, and it can be indicative of intensity or high frequency.

- 4.10) ὠδινε καὶ ἀνδρίζου καὶ ἔγγιζε, θύγατερ Σιών, ὡς τίκτουσα· διότι νῦν ἐξελεύσῃ ἐκ πόλεως καὶ κατασκηνώσεις ἐν πεδίῳ καὶ ἤξεις ἕως Βαβυλῶνος· ἐκεῖθεν ῥύσεται σε καὶ ἐκεῖθεν λυτρώσεται σε κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν σου.

Stay in pain and keep your foot down and come near, o daughter of Zion, like a woman delivering a baby, for now you will go out of a city and dwell in a field and reach Babylon. From there the Lord your God will rescue you and from there He will redeem you from your enemies' hand.

חולִי וְגַחִי בַת־צִיּוֹן כִּי־לֹדֶה עַל־עַמִּי מִקְרִיָּה וְשִׁכְנָהּ בַשָּׂדֶה וּבָאת עַד־בָּבֶל
שָׁם תִּנְצְלִי שָׁם יִגְאָלְךָ יְהוָה מִכַּף אִיבֹיְךָ:

ἀνδρίζου] All the three imperatives are in the imperfective aspect, but in 𐤌 we have only two verbs.³⁰ In *Index* 10b 𐤍𐤏𐤍 has been suggested. In theory 𐤌 could be translated “Be a man,” which is, however, inappropriate in an address to “daughter of Zion.”

ἔγγιζε ἡγῆ] If ἡγῆ is a form of a hollow root, ἡγ, we would expect ἡγῆ, and ἡγῆ if of ἡγ. In two passages the verb has to do with a baby coming out and being born: אַתָּה גַּחִי מִבְּטֶן מִבְּטַחִי עַל־שְׂדֵי אִמִּי (σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐκσπάσας με ἐκ γαστρὸς .. ‘You are He who pulled me out of a belly’ Ps 22.10) and בְּגִיחַ אֲצֵא מִרְחֶם (ἐμαίμασεν ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτῆς ἐκπορευομένη ‘it was eager to come out of her mother’s womb,’ where the addition of μητρὸς is to be noted) Jb 38.8. But as an address to a mother figure we would expect a transitive verb. Either way it has little to do with ἔγγιζε ‘approach.’ In *Index* 34a we have suggested Qal גָּגַשׁ, thus גָּגַשׁ.³¹ But approach where or what? A new dwelling in the countryside? 𐤌 is as difficult as 𐤌.

- 4.11) καὶ νῦν ἐπισυνήχθη ἐπὶ σὲ ἔθνη πολλὰ οἱ λέγοντες Ἐπιχαρούμεθα, καὶ ἐπόσονται ἐπὶ Σιών οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν.

³⁰ Wolff (102) holds that ἀνδρίζου is a second translation derived from ἡγῆ ‘power,’ but the status of this verb in BH is rather insecure.

³¹ *BHS* suggests two alternative emendations: ἡγῆ and ἡג. The former, ‘Take it easy,’ is incompatible with חולִי. Cf. *BHQ* 102f.*

And now many nations are gathered against you, who say “We are going to rejoice, and our eyes will look on Zion.”

וַעֲתָה נֶאֱסָפוּ עֲלֶיךָ גוֹיִם רַבִּים תִּתְּנֶנָּה וְתַחֲזוּ בְצִיּוֹן עֵינֵינוּ:

Ἐπιχαρούμεθα [תִּתְּנֶנָּה] The meaning of the Heb. verb should be evident, but has nothing to do with joy. This free translation is probably due to the translator’s failure to identify the subject of the verb as Zion whose status as עֵיר הַקֶּדֶשׁ is now being threatened. A wording such as תַּחֲזוּ בְצִיּוֹן וְתַחֲזוּ בָּהּ עֵינֵינוּ³² could have been less ambiguous.

ἐπόψονται [תַּחֲזוּ] On the collectively used Heb. verb in the sg., see JM § 150 d.

4.12) καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν λογισμὸν κυρίου καὶ οὐ συνήκαν τὴν βουλὴν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι συνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ὡς δράγματα ἄλωνος.

They, however, did not recognise the Lord’s thinking and did not understand His design, for He gathered them as sheaves of threshing-floor.

וְהִמָּה לֹא יָדְעוּ מַחְשְׁבוֹת יְהוָה וְלֹא הִבִּינוּ עֲצָתוֹ כִּי קִבְּצָם כְּעֲמִיר גִּרְנָה:

αὐτοὶ [הִמָּה] The disjunctive personal pronoun in Ⓞ and Ⓢ alike underscores the enemies’ failure to see who they were up against.

λογισμὸν [מַחְשְׁבוֹת] Wolff (102) holds that the sg. in Ⓞ is a harmonisation to the parallel βουλή וְעֲצָתוֹ.

4.13) ἀνάστηθι καὶ ἄλῳα αὐτοῦς, θύγατερ Σιων, ὅτι τὰ κέρατά σου θήσομαι σιδηρᾶ καὶ τὰς ὀπλάς σου θήσομαι χαλκᾶς, καὶ κατατήξεις ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔθνη καὶ λεπτυνεῖς λαοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ ἀναθήσεις τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς.

Arise and crush them, o daughter of Zion, for I shall make your horns iron and your hooves copper, and you shall liquidate nations with them and crush many peoples and dedicate to the Lord their accumulated possessions and their wealth to the Lord of the whole earth.

קוּמִי וְדוּשִׁי בְתַצִּיּוֹן כִּי־קִרְנֶנָּה אֲשִׁים בְּרִזְלִי וּפְרִסְתִּיךָ אֲשִׁים נְחוּשָׁה וְהִדְקוֹת עַמִּים רַבִּים וְהִתְרַמְתִּי לַיהוָה בְּצַעַם וְחִילָם לְאָדוֹן כָּל־הָאָרֶץ:

ἀνάστηθι [קוּמִי] Verbs of physical movement such as קָם, הִלָּךְ, and בָּא, in the impv. in particular and often followed by another verb without the conjunction ׀ connecting them, are used to incite and encourage. Hence Jacob, when he said to his aged father, שָׁבָה נָא וְאָכְלָה Ge 27.19, was not suggesting that

³² Exactly so in Pesh.

physical exercise was needed before the meal. In colloquial English we might say, “Come on, sit up and eat.”³³ See also below at 6.1.

τὰ κέρατά σου קַרְנֵיךָ] Some animals have only one horn. The pl. in Ⓞ is probably a harmonisation with the parallel τὰς ὀπλάς σου קַרְנֵיךָ. So Pesh. /qarnātēk(y)/.

λεπτυνεῖς] It is difficult to decide which of the two verbal clauses is a free addition. The added object λαοὺς πολλοὺς = רַבִּים עַמִּים, λεπτυνεῖς more likely = תִּקְרַח, the plus ἐν αὐτοῖς, and the fact that κατατίκω is a more generic term of destruction than λεπτόνω indicating a more particular form of destructive action may suggest the first as being independent of Ⓞ here.

ἀναθήσεις תִּתְקַרַח] Our translator, who was most likely familiar with Aramaic, had no difficulty in parsing the Heb. verb here as 2fs.³⁴

τὸ πλήθος αὐτῶν בְּצַבָּ] Our analysis of πλήθος can be assisted by looking at the other two occurrences of בְּצַבָּ in XII and Ⓞ there:

Hb 2.9 יְהִי בְצַבָּ רַע לְבֵיתוֹ ὃ ὁ πλεονεκτῶν πλεονεξίαν κακὴν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ

Ma 3.14 וְשָׂא מָטָיו ὁ δουλῆτων θεῶ, καὶ τί πλέον ὅτι ἐφυλάξαμεν τὰ φυλάγματα αὐτοῦ

The second instance is particularly illuminating, showing that the Heb. word is undertood with reference to the increase in material possessions. Possible ethical implications of increased possessions are not in view unlike in the other instance with κακὴν. We could then take τὸ πλήθος αὐτῶν as indicated in our translation above.³⁵ Thus the use of the Gk substantive here differs from what we find in πατήρ πλήθους ἔθνῶν Ge 17.4 // πατέρα πολλῶν ἔθνῶν vs. 5.

τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῶν יִשְׁחָק] Parallel with πλήθος as discussed above we would understand ἰσχὺς not in the sense of physical or military power,³⁶ but financial. With money and wealth you could exercise not a little power. This meaning of the Gk word is peculiar to SG, no doubt influenced by the semantic range covered by יִשְׁחָק.³⁷ Cf. συνάξει τὴν ἰσχὺν πάντων τῶν λαῶν (יִשְׁחָק-כָּל-הָעַמִּים) κυκλόθεν, χρυσίον καὶ ἀργύριον καὶ ἱματισμὸν εἰς πλήθος σφόδρα Zc 14.14; κατέφαγον ἀλλότριον τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτοῦ (יִשְׁחָק) Ho 7.9. Not surprisingly, δύναμις, a synonym of ἰσχὺς, also bears this meaning.³⁸

³³ Cf. BA “Viens t’asseoir et mange.” קַח, הִשָּׁב, and בֹּא are also so used, see JM § 105 e.

³⁴ See Kutscher 1974.25, 188-90, and JM § 42 f (p. 122).

³⁵ Cf. SD “ihren Reichtum,” pace NETS “their multitude.”

³⁶ Pace Wolff (102): “militärische Kraft.”

³⁷ For details see GELS s.v. 3.

³⁸ For details see GELS s.v. 4.

CHAPTER V

5.1 (4.14) νῦν ἐμφοραχθήσεται θυγάτηρ ἐμφοραγμῶ, συνοχήν ἔταξεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, ἐν ῥάβδῳ πατάξουσιν ἐπὶ σιαγόνα τὰς φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ.

Now a daughter will be totally denied passage. They have laid a siege against us. With a rod they will strike the tribes of Israel on the cheek.

עָתָה תִּתְגַּדְּדִי בַת־גְּדֹד מְצֹר שָׁם עָלֵינוּ בַּשֶּׁבֶט יִכּוּ עַל־הַחֵי אֶת שַׁפְּטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל: ס

ἐμφοραχθήσεται .. ἐμφοραγμῶ] = תִּתְגַּדְּדִי .. תִּתְגַּדְּדִי. As a verb $\sqrt{\text{גד}}$ does not occur in BH in Hitpael, though it does in MH, but in the sense of ‘to stand aloof above others.’

θυγάτηρ [בַּת] Since ⓪ does not see בַּת as being in the st. cst., the indeterminate θυγάτηρ becomes rather obscure, though its obvious referent is בַּת־צִיּוֹן in 4.13, and the 2fs form, תִּתְגַּדְּדִי, remains odd.

ἔταξεν שָׁ] Not infrequently the 3ms is impersonally used in Hebrew and Greek alike. E.g. עָלֵינוּ (ἐκλήθη) בְּבָל שָׁמָּה קָרָא Ge 11.9; קָרָא (ἐκάλεσεν) ib. 16.14.¹

τὰς φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ] = שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

5.2 (5.1) Καὶ σύ, Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθα, ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰουδα· ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ, καὶ αἱ ἕξοδοι αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐξ ἡμερῶν αἰῶνος.

And you, o Bethlehem the house of Ephratha, are too few in number to be among the thousands of Judah. It is from you that someone will come out for me to become a ruler in Israel, and his origins are in the far remote past.

וְאַתָּה בֵּית־לְחֶם אֶפְרַתָּה צָעִיר לְהָיוֹת בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה מִמָּה לִי יֵצֵא לְהָיוֹת מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וּמוֹצָאֲתוֹ מִקְדָּם מִימֵי עוֹלָם:

σύ אַתָּה] The subject fronted, there is a focus on it, and the same applies to the equally fronted ἐκ σοῦ מִמָּה.

οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθα אֶפְרַתָּה] In the OT the combination בֵּית אֶפְרַתָּה does not occur. NH possibly read another variant: σύ, οἶκος[ς ... ε]φραθα 8.32, where the lacuna is said to have room for Βηθλεεμ.

ὀλιγοστὸς] Whilst the superlative can function with the value of relative,² it can also substitute the comparative as in πλείστην ἢ ἔμπροσθεν .. ἐξουσίαν

¹ For further details, see JM § 155 d-e, SSG § 87 c, cb, and SQH § 37 a.

² So NETS “very few” and SD “sehr klein.”

'greater authority than before' 3M 7.21 and *χείριστα τῶν ἄλλων* 'worse than the others' 2M 5.23.³ τοῦ is not a mere marker of the infinitive, but is a genitive of comparison as in *Μείζων ἢ αἰτία μου τοῦ ἀφεθῆναι με* 'My guilt is greater than for me to be forgiven' Ge 4.13.⁴

μοι לְ] A case of *dativus commodi*. Fitzmyer (1956.12f.), pointing out that he does not know of a case of such a dative preceding a verb, opts for reading *לְ* with a so-called emphatic, asseverative *lamed*, 'will surely come out.' There is no intrinsic reason, however, why such a *lamed* is not to precede a verb, and we still remain rather sceptical⁵ about an emphatic *lamed* for BH.

ἐξελύσεται לְ] On the impersonal use of the 3ms, see above at verse 1.

εἷς] Missing in NH in keeping with *ח*, which makes the infinitive clause ungrammatical, because *ἄρχοντα* can scarcely function as the subject, and the predicate is to remain nominative if without *εἷς*, e.g. *ἐγὼ εἶμι κύριος ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ὑμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου εἶναι ὑμῶν θεός* '.. who led you up from the land of Egypt to be your god' Le 11.45.⁶

5.3 (5.2) διὰ τοῦτο δώσει αὐτοὺς ἕως καιροῦ τικτούσης τέξεται, καὶ οἱ ἐπίλοιποι τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέψουσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ.

Therefore He shall give them up until the time when a woman about to give birth to a baby does so, and the remainder of their brethren shall return to the children of Israel.

לְכֵן יתִּנֵּם עַד־עֵת יוֹלְדָה יוֹלְדָה וְיִתֵּר אֲחֵיו יְשׁוּבוּן עַל־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

ἕως καιροῦ τικτούσης τέξεται [עַד־עֵת יוֹלְדָה יוֹלְדָה] In poetic BH and LBH the noun *עֵת*, probably in the st. cst., can introduce a temporal clause with a finite verb as in *לָעַתְּ תָמוּט רַגְלֶךָ* De 32.35 and *וּבְעֵת הַחֲלוּ בְרָנָה* 2C 20.22.⁷ *ח*, however, is syntactically amiss: in view of *τέξεται*, a finite verb, *ἕως* looks like a subordinating conjunction, but, followed by a genitive phrase, it must be a preposition.⁸

τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν] = *אֲחֵיהֶם*.

³ See *SSG* § 23 **bb**, p. 197.

⁴ See *SSG* § 30 **cc**. Whilst it is true that in most cases of this kind the Heb. infinitive is prefixed with *מִן* rather than with *לְ*, there is at least one exception: *אֵתוֹי דַּע אֲשֶׁר־נַחֲמֵנוּ מִן־לִבְנוֹתֵינוּ* 'we ourselves are too weak to be drafted' Is 28.20. Thus, *pace* Fitzmyer (1956.10-12), there is no need to invoke Ugaritic, in which the preposition *l-* can mean 'from.'

⁵ See Muraoka 1985.113-23.

⁶ See *SSG* § 69A **ac**.

⁷ For more examples, see *BDB* s.v. *עֵת* **1 c**.

⁸ *Pace* Tov (*DJD* 8.88), adding a comma after *τικτούσης* would not deal with the syntactic ambiguity.

ἐπί על] The selection of ἐπί does not have to be viewed as a mere mechanical reproduction of על. See e.g. ἐὰν ἐπιστραφῆς ἐπὶ (לְא) κύριον τὸν θεόν σου De 30.10; ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐκ πάντων τῶν τόπων ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς (עֲלֵינוּ) Ne 4.6.⁹

5.4 (5.3) καὶ στήσεται καὶ ὄψεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἰσχύι κυρίου, καὶ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ὑπάρξουσι· διότι νῦν μεγαλυνθήσεται ἕως ἄκρων τῆς γῆς.

He will stand firm and watch out and tend his flock with the Lord's power, and they will be in the glory of the name of the Lord their God, for now he will be declared great as far as the ends of the earth.

עֲמַד וְרָעָה בְּעוֹ הַיְהוָה בְּגֵאוֹן שֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְיִשְׁבּוּ כִּי־עֲתָה יִגְדַּל עַד־אֲפֹסֵי־אֲרָרָא

στήσεται עֲמַד] Both verbs do not normally mean ‘to stand up (from a seat or sitting position),’ but ‘to stay standing.’ In this case it is about a shepherd ready to act in case of any emergency.

καὶ ὄψεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ] = הִרְאָה וְרָעָה. NH = 𐤇.

δόξῃ גֵּאוֹן] δόξα / גֵּאוֹן, an equivalence occurring four times in LXX, but only here in XII.

τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ὑπάρξουσι] = אלהיהם י. The pl. αὐτῶν fits the pl. verb. For NH (8.40) the sg. αὐτοῦ has been restored, which makes sense, since there begins after it a pl. verb with καί: καὶ ἐπιστραφήσονται = יִשְׁבּוּ.

The primary meaning of ὑπάρχω is ‘to exist.’ However, there are a few indisputable cases in which it is used as a copula in an equational clause, “A is B.” E.g. Ὡσπερ γὰρ σκευὸς ἀνθρώπου συντριβὲν ἀχρεῖον γίνεται, τοιοῦτοι ὑπάρχουσιν οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν ‘For just as a man’s tool, when broken, becomes useless, so are their gods’ Ep Je 16 and πολλαὶ σου αἰ κρίσεις ὑπάρχουσιν (𐤇¹ εἰσιν) ἀληθιναὶ ‘your many judgments are true’ To 3.5 𐤇¹¹.¹⁰ Another question that need be addressed here concerns יֵשׁ. Just like ὑπάρχω, this Heb. word primarily indicates existence. Though not very often, it does function as a copula. (1) הֲיֵשׁ אֶת־לִבְּךָ יֵשׁ כְּאֵשׁ לִבְּי עִם־לִבְּךָ ‘Is it right with your heart as my heart is with your heart?’ 2Kg 10.15; 2) אִם־יֵשׁ־נָא מַצְלִיחַ לִי דְרַבִּי ‘if you do prosper my way’ Ge 24.42.¹¹

μεγαλυνθήσεται יִגְדַּל] The identity of the subject is obscure. It can be the *glory* of the name of the Lord or the *name* of the Lord. NH reads μεγαλυνθήσονται = יִגְדְּלוּ.

⁹ Cf. GELS s.v. ἐπί III 2 and ἐπιστρέφω II 1 b.

¹⁰ Cf. GELS s.v. ὑπάρχω 2.

¹¹ There are another four examples of <יֵשׁ + suffix pronoun - participle>; see Muraoka 1985.78. In Biblical Aramaic we find an analogous construction, e.g. הֲאִיתָהּ כְּהַל לְהוֹדֵעְתָנִי אֵלְמָא ‘Are you really capable of telling me the dream?’ Dn 2.26. In אֲלֵהֵינוּ עִם־בְּשָׂרָא דִּי מְדַרְהוֹן ‘gods whose residence is not with humans’ Dn 2.11, too, we find the particle used with the value of a plain copula. See Muraoka 2020a § 17 3).

5.5 (5.4) και ἔσται αὕτη εἰρήνη· Ἀσσοῦρ ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν
καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῆ ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐπεγεροθήσονται ἐπ’ αὐτὸν
ἑπτὰ ποιμένες καὶ ὀκτὼ δῆγματα ἀνθρώπων·

*And this will be peace. When Assyria comes against our land and when
it sets its foot on our region, then seven shepherds and eight bites of
people will rise up against it.*

וְהָיָה זֶה שְׁלוֹם אֲשׁוּר כִּי־יָבִיא בְּאַרְצֵנוּ וְכִי יִדְרֶה בְּאַרְמְנֵינוּ וְהִקְמִנוּ עָלָיו שִׁבְעָה
רְעִים וְשִׁמְנָה נְסִיכֵי אָדָם:

αὕτη η] Already Ibn-Ezra and Radaq understood the Heb. pronoun as a
reference to the Messiah on the way. The selection of the fem. demonstra-
tive pronoun in 5 is a case of assimilation to the predicate, εἰρήνη.¹²

Ἀσσοῦρ [אשור] A constituent of the following subordinate clause taken
out and fronted; for other examples, see *SSG* § 84 c.

ὅταν [כִּי] Rashi and Ibn-Ezra saw in כִּי an equivalent of אִם. NH provides
a more conventional rendering, ὅτι (9.1), which, in combination with ἔλθῃ,
a subjunctive form, creates a grammatical impossibility. The same holds for
next line: ὅτι ἐπιβῆ.

ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν [בְּאַרְצֵנוּ] The Heb. preposition can be taken in a plain,
locative sense, ‘to enter our land,’ as understood by NH (ἔλθῃ [εἰς] [τὴν γῆν
ἡμῶν]), but with the selection of <ἐπί + acc.> 5 adds a nuance of hostility,
which is further highlighted with the same prefix of the verb ἐπέρχομαι, and
the same applies to the parallel prepositional phrase.

τὴν χώραν ἡμῶν] = אֶרְצֵנוּ or אֶרְמְנוֹ. NH reads βάρ[εις, pl. of βᾶρις
‘citadel.’

ἐπεγεροθήσονται [וְהִקְמִנוּ] Who Assyria is going to be up against is under-
lined. It is difficult to say whether ἐπεγεροθήσονται is meant as genuinely
passive¹³ or pseudo middle; on this intriguing question, see *SSG* § 27 db.
NH ἐπεγεροῦμεν = 𐤀.

δῆγματα] = נְסִיכֵי.¹⁴ ‘Bites’ parallel with ‘shepherds,’ and not ‘those who
bite,’ as the subjects of ἐπεγεροθήσονται sound rather odd. NH ἄρχοντας = 𐤀.

5.6 (5.5) και ποιμανοῦσι τὸν Ἀσσοῦρ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ τὴν γῆν τοῦ Νεβρωδ
ἐν τῇ τάφρῳ αὐτῆς· καὶ ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ Ἀσσοῦρ, ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὴν
γῆν ἡμῶν καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῆ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρια ἡμῶν.

*And they will tend Assyria with a sword and the land of Nebrod in its
irrigation ditch, and he will rescue out of Assyria, when it comes against
our land and when it sets its foot on our domains.*

¹² See *SSG* § 77 a c), e.g. ἐκείνη σου ἡ μερίς, οὗτός σου ὁ κληρὸς ‘that is your portion,
this is your lot’ Is 57.6 < הָיָה גִּוְרָלְךָ הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה >.

¹³ So *SD*: “werden .. erweckt werden.”

¹⁴ *Pace Wolff*’s נְסִיכֵי, which means ‘Beißer,’ not ‘Bisse.’

וְרָצוּ אֶת־אֶרֶץ אֲשׁוּר בַּחֶרֶב וְאֶת־אֶרֶץ נִמְרוֹד בַּפְּתָחֶיהָ וְהִצִּיל מֵאֲשׁוּר כִּי־יָבוֹא
בְּאֲרָצָנוּ וְכִי יִדְרֶה בְּגִבּוֹלֵנוּ:

tòn Ασσουρ [אֶת־אֶרֶץ אֲשׁוּר] The absence in Ⓞ of any equivalent of אֶרֶץ is difficult to account for. NH = 𐤀.

ἐν τῇ τάφρω αὐτῆς [בַּפְּתָחֶיהָ] As parallel to חֶרֶב one might expect another word denoting a piece of weapon, but one should note the two prepositional phrases are only partially parallel, for the first noun has no personal suffix attached. Then פְּתָחֶיהָ becomes a particular type of landscape inside the land of Nimrod. פְּתַח is often understood to mean a point of entry to a land at its border. Our translator took it to mean an opening in a field into which slaughtered victims are to be hurled. For NH (9.6) ἐν παραξ[ιφι.. has been restored with no space available for a pronoun.¹⁵ The text may be identifying a form of פְּתִיחָה ‘drawn sword,’ a hapax in BH [Ps 51(52).22], rendered with βολίς ‘drawn weapon’ or ‘weapon in general.’ This Gk noun, παραξιφίς, occurs merely twice in SG, and apparently rather rare outside of it as well, and is defined in LSJ s.v. as meaning ‘knife worn beside the sword, dirk.’ The first occurrence in SG is at 2K 5.8, where 𐤀 reads צָנוֹר, which does not denote any piece of weapon.¹⁶ The second attestation is at Jd 3.22 L¹⁷ for 𐤀 לְהַב rendered φλόξ R ‘flame’ in perhaps the shining blade of a sword.

5.7 (5.6) καὶ ἔσται τὸ ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ἰακωβ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν πολλῶν ὡς δρόσος παρὰ κυρίου πίπτουσα καὶ ὡς ἄρνες ἐπ’ ἄγρωστιν, ὅπως μὴ συναχθῆ ἡδὲ μηδεὶς μηδὲ ὑποστῆ ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων.

And the remnant of Jacob will be in the nations in the midst of many peoples like dew from the Lord dropping and like lambs on dog’s-tooth grass, so that none among the sons of men will congregate and resist.

יְהִי שְׂאֲרֵית יַעֲקֹב בְּקֶרֶב עַמִּים רַבִּים כְּטַל מֵאֵת יְהוָה כְּרִבְבִים עַל־יַעֲשׂוּב אֲשׁוּר
לֹא־יִקְנֶה לְאִישׁ וְלֹא יִיחַל לְבָנֵי אָדָם:

ὑπόλειμμα] See above at 4.7. NH has κατά]λοιπον. In XII the noun שְׂאֲרֵית occurs 16 times, always in the st. cst. followed by the name of a tribe or עַמִּים and suchlike. Its Greek equivalents are κατάλοιπος (12×), περίλοιπος (1×), and ὑπόλειμμα (3×). The third is always used in the sg., and the other two always in the pl., whereas שְׂאֲרֵית is always sg. Hence the sg. κατά]λοιπον in NH is striking. In Zp 2.9 κατάλοι[πο[ι τοῦ] λαοῦ has been restored. In theory the sg. could be restored.¹⁸

¹⁵ This variant reading is preserved in later revisions. This rare word appears to have frustrated scribes as can be seen in diverse spelling variations; see Barthélemy 1992.752, n. 2619.

¹⁶ 𐤀 here, יַנַּע בְּצָנוֹר, still remains a major headache for every scholar; it is all the more frustrating, since there is hardly any uncertainty what the two constituent words mean on their own.

¹⁷ Inadvertently missing in GELS s.v.

¹⁸ In the remaining case, Mi 4.7, NH reads ὑπόλειμμα [= Ⓞ].

ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] Probably imported from the next verse. There is no space for it in NH.

πίπτουσα] > 𐤒. For the use of πίπτω with ‘dew’ as the subject, see μὴ πέσοι ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς μήτε δρόσος μήτε ὑετός 2K 1.21L.¹⁹

ἄρνες רִבְיָבִים] The Heb. word, parallel with 𐤒, means ‘copious showers.’ In *Index* 17a רביב has been suggested as a possible equivalent. In Christian Palestinian Aramaic there is such a noun meaning ‘lamb,’ though we do not know how to vocalise it.

ἄγρωστιν ܐܘܨ] This rare Gk word, ἄγρωστις, occurs only four more times in LXX; at Ho 10.4 it symbolises uncontrollable, noisome growth. One wonders why our translator selected this rather specialised noun²⁰ instead of such common words as βοτάνη or χόρτος to translate an as common Heb. word, ܐܘܨ. NH (9.11) does read χό[ρτον.

ὅπως ܐܘܨ] This Heb. particle can certainly indicate a purpose, e.g. καὶ φυλάξιη τὰ δικαιώματα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ, ὅσας ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι σοι σήμερον, ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς σου μετὰ σέ, ὅπως μακροήμεροι γένησθε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה מְצֻנָּה אֲנֹכִי אֲשַׁר אֶת־מְצֻנָּתִי וְאֶת־חַקְיוֹ וְאֶת־חֻמֵּי וְשַׁמֵּרָתָא אֶת־חַקְיוֹ וְאֶת־חֻמֵּי וְאֶת־חֻמֵּי וְאֶת־חֻמֵּי יָמִים עַל־הַאֲדָמָה De 4.40.²¹

The message emerging from this final clause in 𐤆 differs not a little from that of 𐤒. This disparity begins with 𐤆 deriving יקה from a homonymous root and parsing it as יקנה. Nifal. If we are to take this as indicative of rebellious congregation, we would analyse συναχθῆ as middle rather than passive, thus *pace SD* “versammelt werde.”

Just as יקה and יחל are synonymous in 𐤒, ὑποστῆ appears to have been brought into conformity with συναχθῆ, though יחל has nothing to do with resistance,²² which the translator must have known.

5.8 (5.7) καὶ ἔσται τὸ ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ἰακωβ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν πολλῶν ὡς λέων ἐν κτήνεσιν ἐν τῷ δρυμῷ καὶ ὡς σκύμνος ἐν ποιμνίαις προβάτων, ὃν τρόπον ὅταν διέλθῃ καὶ διαστείλας ἀρπάσῃ καὶ μὴ ἦ ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος.

And the remnant of Jacob will be among the nations in the midst of many peoples like a lion among livestock in the thicket and like a cub among flocks of lambs, as, when it walks among them, separate them from one another, and seize (one of them), with none to rescue around.

וְהָיָה שְׁאֵרִית יַעֲקֹב בְּגוֹיִם בְּקֶרֶב עַמִּים רַבִּים כְּאַרְיֵה בְּבִהְמוֹת יַעַר כְּכַפִּיר בְּעִדְרֵי צֹאן אֲשַׁר אִם עֵבֶר וְרַמְס וְרַחַרְךָ וְאִין מְצִיל:

¹⁹ In *GELS* s.v. πίπτω **1 a** “2K 1.21” is to be corrected to “2K 1.21L.” R reads καταβῆ < καταβαίνω.

²⁰ Its English translation given above follows its definition in *LSJ*.

²¹ Some more examples are mentioned in *BDB* s.v. אֲשַׁר **8 b**.

²² In *Index* 123a s.v. ὑφίστημι, we would place 1) יחל pi. under “Del.”

κτῆνεσιν **בְּהֵמָה**] Κτῆνος, used mostly in the pl., just as **בְּהֵמָה**, denotes landed animal, whether domesticated or not. In view of the parallelism here, <ὡς - animal name, sg. + locative ἐν - animal name, pl.> κτῆνεσιν, parallel with ποιμνίοις προβάτων, most likely refer to domesticated animals grazing in a thicket and threatened by a predator. By contrast, θηρίον indicates undomesticated, land animal.

σκύμνος **כַּפִּיר**] The Gk word can denote young of any predatory animal. Here the preceding λέων suggests ‘lion’s cub.’ In גּוֹר אַרְיֵה Na 2.12 we have a two-word definition of **כַּפִּיר**, rendered analogously σκύμνος λέοντος, sim. in Ge 49.9 and De 33.22.

ὄν τρόπον] = **כַּאֲשֶׁר**. The Heb. particle here is a standard relative pronoun with λέων and σκύμνος as its antecedents. Since the three subjunctive verbs in the ὅταν-clause must be coordinate,²³ this temporal clause has ended up incomplete, without a main clause, which applies to Am 5.19 as well. In this particular instance, ὅταν may be serving as a temporal conjunction, but among the six clauses in SG introduced with ὄν τρόπον ὅταν there are some in which ὅταν is almost redundant and the main value of the clause is that of comparison, e.g. ἡ ὄψις αὐτῶν ὁμοίωμα ἐν τοῖς τέσσαρσιν, ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἦ τροχὸς ἐν μέσῳ τροχοῦ ‘they four looked like one image as if one wheel were inside in the other wheel’ Ez 10.10 < מְרֵאֵיהֶם דְּמוּת אֶחָד לְאַרְבַּעֵתָם כַּאֲשֶׁר יְהִיָּה > **הָאֹפֶן בְּתוֹךְ הָאֹפֶן**.²⁴

Am 3.12	Ὅν τρόπον ὅταν ἐκσπάσῃ ὁ ποιμὴν ἐκ στόματος τοῦ λέοντος δύο σκέλη ἢ λοβὸν ὀπίου, οὕτως ἐκσπασθήσονται οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ	כַּאֲשֶׁר יִצִּיל הָרֶעָה מִפִּי הָאָרִי שְׁתֵּי כַרְעִים אוֹ כַּדְלֵ-אֶזְן כִּן יִנְצְלוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
Am 5.19	ὄν τρόπον ὅταν φύγη ἄνθρωπος ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ λέοντος καὶ ἐμπέσῃ αὐτῷ ἢ ἄρκος	כַּאֲשֶׁר יָנוּס אִישׁ מִפְּנֵי הָאָרִי וּפָנָעוּ הַדָּב
Mi 5.8	ὄν τρόπον ὅταν διέλθῃ καὶ διαστείλας ἀρπάσῃ καὶ μὴ ἦ ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος	אֲשֶׁר אִם עָבַר וְרָמַס וְטָרַף וְאִין מִצִּיל
Zc 4.1	καὶ ἐξήγειρέν με ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἐξεγερθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑπνου αὐτοῦ	וַיַּעֲרֵנִי כַּאֲשֶׁר יַעֲוֹר מִשְׁנָתוֹ
Is 7.2	καὶ ἐξέστη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἐν δρυμῷ ξύλον ὑπὸ πνεύματος σαλευθῇ	וַיֵּנַע לְקָבוֹ וּלְקַב עִמּוֹ כְּנוֹעַ עֲצָיֵי-יַעַר מִפְּנִירוֹת
Ez 10.10	ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἦ τροχὸς ἐν μέσῳ τροχοῦ	כַּאֲשֶׁר יְהִיָּה הָאֹפֶן בְּתוֹךְ הָאֹפֶן

²³ Thus *pace* “.. raubt es; dann wird keiner da sein, der es ihm (wieder) entreißt” (*SD*). In an apodosis of a conditional sentence, we would not expect a subjunctive.

²⁴ In *GELS* s.v. ὅταν the section 2 c should better read:

c. preceded by ὄν τρόπον and almost pleonastic: ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἦ τροχὸς ἐν μέσῳ τροχοῦ Ez 10.10(-); ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἐκσπάσῃ Am 3.12(-), where ὄτ. is possibly a doublet or an equivalent of ἐάν or ἔν as in Am 5.19(-) v.l., cf. Mi 5.8(a), Zc 4.1(-), Is 7.2(-).

διαστείλας סמך] In Na 3.14 we find a correct translation of this Heb. verb, ‘to trample’: סמך בְּהֶמְרָר > συμπατήθητι ἐν ἀχύροις. It is then a figure of a lion trampling a lamb under its feet, and carrying it off dead or half-dead. Διαστελλῶ means here ‘to separate between lambs’ and to pick up one that is after the predator’s liking. Why such a free rendering has been chosen is obscure.²⁵

5.9 (5.8) ὑψωθήσεται ἡ χεὶρ σου ἐπὶ τοὺς θλίβοντάς σε, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου ἐξολεθρευθήσονται.

Your hand will be raised above those who afflict you, and all your foes will be annihilated.

תָּרַם יָדְךָ עַל-צָרֶיךָ וְכָל-אֹיְבֶיךָ יִכָּרְתוּ: פ

ὑψωθήσεται תָּרַם] *ṯ* is optative²⁶ as against תָּרַם. If our translator recognised the form as such and wished to reproduce its full value, he could have used a desiderative optative, ὑψωθείη, and continued with ἐξολετρευθείη-σαν. Though the optative is still very much alive in SG, only a few instances out of XII were noted by Turner, e.g. ἔλθοι Jo 2.8.²⁷ Our translator may have been among those whose literary ambition was modest.

Here is a figure of a hand about to attack, cf. ὑψωσας τὴν δεξιὰν τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτοῦ Ps 88.43.

5.10 (5.9) Καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, λέγει κύριος, ἐξολεθρεύσω τοὺς ἵππους σου ἐκ μέσου σου καὶ ἀπολῶ τὰ ἄρματά σου

And it will come to pass on that day, says the Lord: I shall annihilate all your horses out of your midst and destroy your chariots.

וְהָיָה בַיּוֹם-הַהוּא אֲנַם-יְהוָה וְהִכֵּיתִי סוּסֶיךָ מִקֶּרְבְּךָ וְהִאֲבִדְתִּי מִרְכָּבֹתֶיךָ:

5.11 (5.10) καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω τὰς πόλεις τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐξαρθῶ πάντα τὰ ὀχυρώματά σου·

I shall annihilate the cities of your land and obliterate all your fortresses.

וְהִכֵּיתִי עָרֵי אֲרָצְךָ וְהָרַסְתִּי כָל-מְבָצְרֶיךָ:

Though the vocabulary of BH is relatively modest in size, it is strikingly rich in a number of lexical-semantic fields. One such field is that of destruction.

²⁵ In *Index* 29b s.v. διαστελλῶ “(20) סמך qal” had better be moved under “Del.”

²⁶ But not “Erhebe deine Hand” (Wolff 123), which should be תָּרַם.

²⁷ In SG Turner (1963.119) found a total of 539 optative forms whether in main clauses or subordinate.

In this short passage alone (vs. 10[11] - 14[15]) we meet הַכְרִית, הָאֲבִיד, הַסֵּרֶה, נָתַשׁ, and הַשְׁמִיד. The list can be prolonged.²⁸ The translator's Greek vocabulary competes rather well: ἐξολεθρεύω, ἀπόλλυμι, ἐξαίρω, ἐκκόπτω, ἀφανίζω.²⁹ These are verbs denoting destruction.

5.12 (5.11) καὶ ἐξαρθῶ τὰ φάρμακά σου ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου, καὶ ἀποφθεγγόμενοι οὐκ ἔσονται ἐν σοί·

And I shall take your magic charms off your hands, and there shall be no diviners amongst you.

וְהַכְרַתִּי כְשָׁפִים מִיָּדְךָ וּמַעֲוֹנִים לֹא יִהְיוּ לְךָ:

ἐξαρθῶ [הַכְרַתִּי] Further to our remark on the preceding verse, we note that the verb הַכְרִית appears in three³⁰ consecutive verses, 10-12. Our translator, however, does not mechanically render it, but in this verse uses a different verb, ἐξαίρω instead of ἐξολεθρεύω, to which he goes back in the next verse. He must have had some good reason for this variation. In the cases where ἐξολεθρεύω is used, it involves physical destruction. In this verse, too, that may have been the case, but the locative adjunct, ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου, probably suggests that the enchanted instruments were taken out of sorcerers' hands, leading to their virtual annihilation. The instruments did not have to be smashed, but could just have been hurled into a nearby ditch or stream.

ἀποφθεγγόμενοι [מַעֲוֹנִים] The Gk verb means 'to make a clear, oral statement,' usually in public and authoritative.³¹ Of its seven attestations in SG it carries negative connotation with the sole exception of 1C 25.1, where it is applied to functionaries in the Jerusalem temple, as they sing, playing various instruments.³² Thus Ps 58.8 (with God's wicked enemies as the grammatical subject), speakers of tedious things (κόπους) Zc 10.2 (// μάντις), a variant reading in *L* of γνώστης 'diviner' 1K 28.9; its grammatical objects are μάταια 'vanities' Ez 13.9, μάταια ἀποφθέγματα 'worthless apophthegms' ib. 13.19. The instance in our Mi passage is to be understood against this background.

²⁸ See a very long list at the end of *GELS* s.v. ἀφανίζω.

²⁹ On how our translator coped with the multiplicity of synonyms in Hebrew and Greek alike, see Muraoka 2019.

³⁰ In vs. 9 the same Heb. root is used in Nifal and translated with the same Gk verb in the passive.

³¹ In CG there are instances in which such a statement was regarded as oracle (χρησμός), e.g. Diodorus Siculus 16.27 and Lucian, *Alexander* 25.

³² The Antiochene version (*L*) reads προφητεύοντας 'those who prophesy' for הַנְּבִיאִים.

- 5.13 (5.12) καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω τὰ γλυπτὰ σου καὶ τὰς στήλας σου ἐκ μέσου σου, καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ προσκυνήσῃς τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν σου·

And I shall annihilate your carved images and the steles out of your midst, and you shall not worship the works of your hands any more.

וְהִכְרַתִּי פְסִילֶיךָ וּמַצֵּבֹתֶיךָ מִקְרַבְךָ וְלֹא-תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה עוֹד לְמַעֲשֵׂה יָדֶיךָ:

τὰ γλυπτὰ σου פְּסִילֶיךָ] Between פְּסִילֶיךָ and פְּסִילִים³³ they are the most frequent equivalent of γλυπτός, 40 times. Here is an intriguing morphological matter. In Hebrew פְּסִילֶיךָ is never used in the pl. and פְּסִילִים never in the sg., hence no פְּסִילֶיךָ nor פְּסִילֶיךָ (as reconstructed in dictionaries). Γλυπτός in the sg. is sometimes used attributively, e.g. γλυπτόν ὁμοίωμα ‘a carved image’ De 4.16, but also substantively, e.g. τοῦ ποιῆσαι γλυπτόν καὶ χωνευτόν ‘to make something carved and molten’ Jd 17.3, τὸ γλυπτόν Μειχα ‘Micha’s carved (image)’ ib. 18.30. But in the pl. it is consistently pl. as in our Mi case. Ὅμοιώματα or suchlike may have been considered to be latent here.³⁴

- 5.14 (5.13) καὶ ἐκκόψω τὰ ἄλση σου ἐκ μέσου σου καὶ ἀφανίσω τὰς πόλεις σου·

And I will cut down your sacred groves out of your midst and obliterate your cities.

וַנִּשְׁתִּי אֲשִׁירֶיךָ מִקְרַבְךָ וְהִשְׁמַדְתִּי עָרֶיךָ:

ἐκκόψω וַנִּשְׁתִּי] This is the sole instance of the equation נִשְׁתִּי / ἐκκόπτω. This Heb. verb occurs 21 times in BH, mostly in Qal, 3 times in Ben Sira, and once in QH. The number of its Greek translation equivalents is disproportionately large, 14.³⁵ For a semantic analysis of the verb it is important to note that in a number of passages in the book of Jeremiah it is in an antonymic parallelism with נָטַע ‘to plant.’ One example occurs in XII: וְנִטְעַתִּים עַל-אֲדָמָתָם: וְנִטְעַתִּים וְלֹא אֲהָרִם וְנִטְעַתִּים וְלֹא וְנִטְעַתִּים וְלֹא אֲהָרִם וְנִטְעַתִּים וְלֹא אֲהָרִם Je 24.6, see also ib. 31.28, 42.10, 45.4. There cannot be found even a single case in which נִשְׁתִּי is used in a description of agricultural activity except our Mi passage which can be analysed as describing an act of uprooting carefully planted, impressive trees in a pagan temple court. The verb may have been part of farmers’ vocabulary.

- 5.15 (5.14) καὶ ποιήσω ἐν ὄργῃ καὶ ἐν θυμῷ ἐκδίκησιν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἀνθ’ ὧν οὐκ εἰσήκουσαν.

³³ This Heb. word has inadvertently dropped out in *Index* s.v. γλυπτός p. 25a.

³⁴ Substantivised neut. pl. adjectives, especially articular, may refer to tangible objects, cf. SSG § 20 ec.

³⁵ So Dos Santos 1973.138.

And I shall, with anger and with fury, execute vengeance against the nations, because they did not listen.

וְעָשִׂיתִי בְּאַף וּבְחֵמָה נִקְמָה אֶת־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר לֹא שָׁמְעוּ:

ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] אֶת־הַגּוֹיִם] BDB 668a s.v. **נִקְמָה 1** analyses אֶת as a direct object marker. עָשָׂה with הִסָּד, טוֹבָה, מְשַׁפֵּט, נִקְמָה and the like can be combined with a variety of prepositions to mark somebody affected by such a deed: בְּ-, מִן, עִם. Only with דְּבַר מְשַׁפֵּט we find three indisputable cases of combination with אֶת as nota obiecti, e.g. וְדִבַּרְתִּי מְשַׁפֵּטִי אוֹתָם Je 1.16, so ib. 4.12, 12.1, but in וַיִּדְבַּר אֹתוֹ מְשַׁפֵּטִים Je 39.5 we have a distinct syntagm with אֶת as a preposition, sim. ib. 52.9. With נִקְמָה or נִקְמָה in combination with עָשָׂה we find only בְּ- or מִן, e.g. לַעֲשׂוֹת נִקְמָה בְּגוֹיִם Ps 149.7, sim. Je 50.15, Ez 25.14, 17 and עָשָׂה לְךָ יְהוָה נִקְמוֹת מֵאֲיִבֶיךָ מִבְּנֵי עַמּוֹן Jd 11.36, sim. Je 11.20, 20.10, 46.10. In view of these data we are inclined to view אֶת in Mi 5.15(14) as a preposition.

ἀνθ' ὧν אֲשֶׁר] The causal value of אֲשֶׁר is well established. The first instance mentioned in BDB s.v. **8 c** is שָׂפָחְתִּי לְאִישִׁי יְתָן אֱלֹהִים שְׂכָרִי אֲשֶׁר־נָתַתִּי שְׂפָחְתִּי לְאִישִׁי Ge 30.18 > Ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν μισθόν μου ἀνθ' οὗ ἔδωκα τὴν παιδίσακην μου τῷ ἀνδρὶ μου. The use of the compound conjunction is felicitous because of its first constituent, ἀντί, which “precedes a noun of deed(s) which is required, whether positively (reward) or, mostly, negatively (punishment)” (GELS s.v. ἀντί 3).

CHAPTER VI

6.1) Ἀκούσατε δὴ λόγον κυρίου· κύριος εἶπεν Ἀνάστηθι κρίθητι πρὸς τὰ ὄρη, καὶ ἀκουσάτωσαν βουνοὶ φωνὴν σου.

Do hear the word of the Lord: the Lord has said, “Arise, challenge the mountains, and let hills hear your voice.”

שְׁמַעוּ־נָא אֶת אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה אָמַר קוֹם רִיב אֶת־הַהָרִים וְתִשְׁמַעְנָה הַגְּבָעוֹת קוֹלְךָ:

[λόγον κυρίου] = דְּבַר יְהוָה.

[εἶπεν] = אָמַר. It is not apparent why the translator decided to expand ἦ, if his *Vorlage* read the same: he could have said something like ὃ τι κύριος εἶπεν.

[Ἀνάστηθι] [קוֹם] On this Heb. verb which has virtually become an interjectory word, see above at 4.13. Cf. Wolff (136): “Auf.”

[πρὸς τὰ ὄρη] [אֶת־הַהָרִים] Here again arises the question of how to analyse the particle אֶת; see above at 5.15 (p. 241). The verb רִיב, meaning ‘to contest a legal case (against someone),’ lies close to אֶת נִקְמָה אֶת. BDB 936b s.v. רִיב 2 we read: “c. acc. pers. with whom (unfriendly sense), Jb 10² Is 27⁸,” where, however, the person is indicated with a suffix attached to the verb – תְּרִיבֵנִי and תְּרִיבְנָה, and we know that such suffixes are not necessarily equivalent to אֶתִּי and אֶתָּה respectively.¹ Whilst no instance is attested of an example such as אֶתְּ אֶתְּ, we find מִי־רִיב אֶתִּי Is 50.8 and הוֹאִי־רִיב אֶת־רִיבְךָ אֶתְּ Je 2.9 אֶת, parallel with אֶתְּ, must be a preposition. Cf. לְרִיב עִמּוֹ Jb 9.3. Note also the next verse: עִמּוֹ לִיהוָה עִם־עִמּוֹ רִיב κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, where רִיב is a substantive. These data lead us to the conclusion that the particle in our Mi case is a preposition, hence the phrase cannot be rewritten as אֶתְּ, but only as אֶתְּ. The translation with πρὸς is close to this analysis. Cf. Κρίθητε πρὸς τὴν μητέρα ὑμῶν בְּאִמְכֶם Ho 2.2(4).

[βουνοὶ] [הַגְּבָעוֹת] It escapes us why Ziegler rejects οἱ βουνοὶ. It is grammatically difficult as well to account for this shift from articular to anarthrous in the parallelism.

6.2) ἀκούσατε, λαοί, τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ αἱ φάραγγες θεμέλια τῆς γῆς, ὅτι κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ διελεγχθήσεται.

¹ For details, see JM § 125 *ba*.

O peoples, hear the contention of the Lord, and the chasms the foundations of the earth, for the Lord has a contention with His people, and with Israel He will debate.

שְׁמַעוּ הָרִים אֶת־רִיב יְהוָה וְהָאֲתָנִים מִסְדֵי אָרֶץ כִּי רִיב לִיהוָה עַם־עַמּוֹ וְעַם־יִשְׂרָאֵל
יְתוֹכַח:

λαοί] = עַמִּים. The reason for this discrepancy is obscure. In vs. 1 the mountains were challenged for a legal contest, apparently to be conducted verbally. Then mountains are supposed to be capable of comprehending any oral message. Ziegler has opted for this *lectio difficilior* as against variants such as ὄρη or βουνοί, easily understandable as corrections in favour of אֶרֶץ.

φάραγγες אֲתָנִים] A most unusual equivalence. A look at the only other occurrence of אֲתָנִים seems to suggest that for some reason or other our translator struggled with this Hebrew word: וַיִּגַּל כַּמִּים מִשֶּׁטַט וַצִּדְקָה כְּנַחַל אֵיתָן: και κυλισθήσεται ὡς ὕδωρ κρίμα και δικαιοσύνη ὡς χειμάρρους ἄβατος Am 5.23. A steadily flowing wadi has little to do with an impassable wadi. Finding himself cornered into this conundrum, he might be indulging himself in an association of words, for he may have remembered אֶל נַחַל אֵיתָן De 21.4 translated as εἰς φάραγγα τραχεῖαν, though he must have known that φάραγξ here is a rendering of נַחַל. Here we are dealing with a feature of the geographical landscape of the Holy Land. Earlier, ad Ho 10.4 (p. 127), we mentioned possible urban background and upbringing of our translator, for whom details of the Palestinian landscape somewhat different that of Alexandria and its environs. That might account for this rather free rendition here. Clefs or chasms in the ground can scarcely be called the foundations of the earth.²

6.3) λαός μου, τί ἐποίησά σοι ἢ τί ἐλύπησά σε ἢ τί παρηνώχλησά σοι; ἀποκρίθητί μοι.

O my people, what did I do to you? Or how did I grieve you? Or how did I annoy you? Answer me.

עַמִּי מָה־עָשִׂיתִי לְךָ וּמָה הִלְאֲתִיךָ עֲנֵה בִי:

τί [2] .. τί [3] מָה] Neither λυπέω nor παρενοχλέω is a doubly transitive verb. Hence the interrogative τί is adverbial here, meaning “In what manner?, How.” On this unique Hebraistic usage, see above at Ho 11.8. Since it is attested elsewhere in SG, its use here is unlikely to be a mechanical reproduction of מָה. Alternatively τί can be analysed as an acc. of respect; see SSG § 22 xi.

² Index 123b s.v. φάραγξ is in need of revision: under 1) אֶפֶיק Ez 6.3 is to be restored, and under 2) נִי Mi 6.2 is to be deleted.

ἐλύπησά σε .. παρηνώχλησά **הִתְאַלְּחָהּ**] From the meanings of the two Gk verbs concerned the second appears to be a rendering of **הִתְאַלְּחָהּ**, but then where does the first come from?³

מוי כִּי] On the use of the preposition in a description of exchange in court, see above at vs. 1.

- 6.4) διότι ἀνήγαγόν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας ἐλυτρώσάμην σε καὶ ἐξαπέστειλα πρὸ προσώπου σου τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ Ααρων καὶ Μαριαμ.

For I led you up out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery I redeemed you and sent before you (, as leaders,) Moses, and Aron, and Miriam.

כִּי הִעֲלֵתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וּמִבַּיִת עֲבָדִים פְּדִיתִיךָ וְאֶשְׁלַח לְפָנֶיךָ אֶת־מֹשֶׁה אֶת־אַרֹּן וְאֶת־מִרְיָם:

πρὸ προσώπου σου **הִפְנִיךָ**] In SG the preposition with the temporal value, ‘prior to,’ is not used with a personal referent.⁴ Moreover, when it has the locative value, ‘in front of,’ it is never used on its own, but as a Hebraising pseudo preposition as in our passage. We see thus that the exodus of these three figures did not take place prior to that of the rest of the congregation, but they all left together with the three as their leaders.

- 6.5) λαός μου, μνήσθητι δὴ τί ἐβουλεύσατο κατὰ σοῦ Βαλακ βασιλεὺς Μωαβ, καὶ τί ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Βαλααμ υἱὸς τοῦ Βεωρ ἀπὸ τῶν σχοίνων ἕως τοῦ Γαλγαλ, ὅπως γνωσθῆ ἡ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ κυρίου.

O my people, do remember what Balak the king of Moab decided against you and what Balaam, the son of Beor answered him, (remember your journey) from the reeds to Galgal, so that the righteousness of the Lord can be recognised.

עַמִּי וְזָכַרְנָא מַה־יַּעַץ בְּלֶק מְלֶךְ מוֹאָב וּמַה־עָנָה אֶת־וּ בְלַעַם בֶּן־בְּעוֹר מִן־הַשְּׁטִיִּים עַד־הַגְּלָגָל לְמַעַן דַּעַת צְדָקוֹת יְהוָה:

ἀπὸ τῶν σχοίνων ἕως τοῦ Γαλγαλ **לְמִן־הַשְּׁטִיִּים עַד־הַגְּלָגָל**] This prepositional phrase can hardly be construed as it is with ἀπεκρίθη nor with ἐβουλεύσατο, but with μνήσθητι, but then we need to fill a bit in as in our translation above.

Wasn't our translator familiar enough with the geography of the Holy Land? From the first mention of the place in Nu 25.1 it appears as Σαττιν,

³ Pesh. /'krit/ is = ἐλύπησά. So probably also Trg **הִתְאַלְּחָהּ** אֶת־שְׁמִי וְאֶת־קִרְבִּי אֶת־אֲבֹתַי וְאֶת־אֲבוֹתֶיךָ.

In *Index* 75b s.v. λυπέω we would delete 7) **הִתְאַלְּחָהּ** hi. and accordingly λυπέiv ib. 239a s.v. **הִתְאַלְּחָהּ** hi.

⁴ Unlike in CG, where we find, e.g. οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν γενόμενοι ‘those who lived before our time’ Isocrates 13.19 and τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ‘my predecessors’ Thucydides 1.97.

but in the other attestation in XII we have the same equivalence as here: τὸν χειμάρρουν τῶν σχοίνων < יִשְׁפֹּךְ לַחַיִּים JI 4.18.

ἡ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ κυρίου יהיה תִּקְרָצַ] The pl. of תִּקְרָצַ is attributed to God six times in BH, indicating manifestations of His character, acts of justice. LXX, however, consistently translate it in the sg., and in the sole exception, Ps 102(103).6 we read ἐλεημοσύνας. On the other hand, in SG the pl. δικαιοσύναι is always – 14 times⁵ – applied to humans, indicating manifestations of their character. E.g. οἱ ποιοῦντες ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ δικαιοσύνας πλησθήσονται ζωῆς To 12.9⁶.

6.6) ἐν τίνι καταλάβω τὸν κύριον, ἀντιλήψομαι θεοῦ μου ὑψίστου; εἰ καταλήψομαι αὐτὸν ἐν ὀλοκαυτώμασιν, ἐν μόσχοις ἐνιαυσίοις;

*With what shall I secure the favour of the Lord, reach my highest God?
Can I secure His favour with wholly burnt offerings, with one-year old calves?*

בְּמָה אֶקְדֹּם יְהוָה אֲכַף לְאֱלֹהֵי מְרוֹם הַאֲדָמָה בְּעוֹלֹת בְּעֵצִים בְּנִי שְׁנָה:

ἐν τίνι בְּמָה] The preposition ἐν in the sense of ‘in return for’ is unknown prior to SG and reflects the so-called *beth pretii*, ‘bet of price’ in Heb.⁶

καταλάβω] Deliberative subjunctive; the speaker is pondering.⁷ The same verb in the same sense is resumed later with the fut.; another example of juxtaposition of the subj. and the fut., both with deliberative value, is Τί ἀντεροῦμεν τῷ κυρίῳ ἢ τί λαλήσωμεν ἢ τί δικαιωθῶμεν; Ge 44.16.⁸ It is about an attempt to secure God’s favour.

ἀντιλήψομαι אָכַף] This rare Heb. verb (5×) occurs only here in XII. Its meaning thought to have to do with bowing or bending may have escaped our translator.⁹ From the concluding part of the verse it is apparent that the verse is about worshipping and cultic ritual. The three Gk verbs selected imply general assessment and evaluation of such observances.

θεοῦ μου ὑψίστου] Ὑψιστος is often used on its own, substantivised, e.g. ἄγιοι ὑψίστου ‘saints of the Most High’ Da 7.18.¹⁰ On the other hand, a personal pronoun in the gen. can intervene in the syntagm <noun - gen. pron. - adj.> as in τὸ ἔλεός σου τὸ ἔσχατον ‘your latest mercy’ Ru 3.10 and τὰ ἔλέη σου τὰ ἀρχαῖα ‘your former mercies’ Ps 88.50. As regards מְרוֹם the following three instances are instructive, all in Ez:

⁵ Including ὧν αἱ δικαιοσύναι οὐκ ἐπελήσθησαν ‘their [= of the merciful people] were not forgotten’ Si 44.10.

⁶ For further data, see *GELS* s.v. ἐν 4.

⁷ See *SSG* § 29 **ba** (iii), pp. 313f.

⁸ See *SSG* § 28 **gf**. The choice in *SD* of two totally distinct verbs is debatable: “einnehmen .. erreichen.”

⁹ See also Pesh. /ʿešpar/, i.e. ‘I may be considered good enough.’

¹⁰ More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. 1.

- a) 17.23 ἐν ὄρει μετεώρω τοῦ Ἰσραηλ **בְּהַר מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל**
 b) 20.40 ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τοῦ ἁγίου μου, ἐπ’ ὄρους ὑψηλοῦ **בְּהַר-קְדְּשֵׁי בְּהַר מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל**
 c) 34.14 ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ὑψηλῷ Ἰσραηλ **בְּהַר יִשְׂרָאֵל מְרוֹם-יִשְׂרָאֵל**

In c) ὑψηλός is an attributive adjective, which applies also to b), because here God Himself is speaking and He would not refer to Himself in this instance as “the Most High.” In a) μετέωρος cannot be anything other than an attributive adjective. Our document does not attest to the use of **עֲלִיּוֹן** as in **יָדַע דַּעַת עֲלִיּוֹן** ‘he who knows the knowledge of the Most High’ Nu 24.16.¹¹

- 6.7) εἰ προσδέξεται κύριος ἐν χιλιάσι κριῶν ἢ ἐν μυριάσι χειμάρρων πiónων; εἰ δὼ πρωτότοκά μου ἀσεβείας, καρπὸν κοιλίας μου ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας ψυχῆς μου;

Would He accept (me) for thousands of rams or myriads of fatted animals lined up? Shall I offer my first-born children (resulting from) impiety, fruit(s) of my belly (to atone) for the sin of my soul?

הֲיִרְצֶה יְהוָה בְּאַלְפֵי אֵילִים בְּרִבְבוֹת נַחְלֵי-שֶׁמֶן הָאֶתָּן בְּכוּרֵי פִשְׁעֵי פָרִי בְטָנִי חֲטָאֵת נַפְשִׁי:

εἰ ἦ] On εἰ introducing a question, see above at 2.7.

προσδέξεται] As a transitive verb, προσδέχομαι requires an acc. object, which we have supplied in the above translation. A direct object of this verb cannot be introduced with ἐν,¹² which is equivalent to a *bet pretii* mentioned above at 3.11 (p. 216) and 6.6 (p. 245).

ἐν χιλιάσι κριῶν **בְּאַלְפֵי אֵילִים**] The Heb. prep. **בְּ** here is conditioned by the verb, **רָצָה** ‘to be pleased, satisfied.’ The verb can take either a zero-object or a **בְּ** object. E.g. **לֹא-אֶרְצֶה מִיְדָכֶם** θυσίαν οὐ προσδέξομαι ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν Ma 1.10; **εἰ προσδέξομαι αὐτὰ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν; ib. 13.**

Since **Ⓞ** did not take **בְּ** as an object marker, he must have understood the preposition as instrumental, which is affiliated with *beth pretii*, and it is necessary to understand μέ or ἐμέ as direct object. Though no such Heb. manuscript is known, the translator might be mentally reconstructing **Ⓞ** as **הֲיִרְצֶנִי יְהוָה בְּאַלְפֵי אֵילִים** or suchlike. These remarks equally apply to the second ἐν in the verse.

The syntagm <num. st. cst. - noun phrase> is well attested in both Gk and Heb. Cf. *SGG* § 22 v (cc) and *SQH* § 26 fa - ff.

¹¹ Thus *pace* “meinen Gott, (den) Höchsten” (SD).

¹² Thus “Tausende von Widdern annehmen” (SD) is questionable. *NETS*’s “receive favourably among thousands of rams” is as questionable, for the Gk prep. here is scarcely locative.

μυριάσι] The pl. of ‘tens of thousands,’ *pace* “ten thousands” (*NETS*).

In view of the parallel χιλιάσι this larger number is likely to refer to πιόνων. “Tens of thousands of lines of fatted animals” would not be accepted even for poetic licence, although the syntactic hierarchy is <a - [b - c]>.

πιόνων שָׁמֵן] The equation *πίων* / שָׁמֵן is unattested in LXX.¹³ Oil as an essential ingredient in the ancient Israelite cult is well known, but this noun is not used on its own in the sense of a fat or fattened sacrificial animal, where שָׁמֵן as adj. meaning ‘fat’ occurs in הַשְּׁמֵנָה Ez 34.16, where הַצֹּאֵן is understood, and MH amply testifies to the word applied to animals, e.g. דָּגִים שְׁמֵנִים ‘fat fishes.’¹⁴ Our translator probably mentally reconstructed here שְׁמֵנִים.

πρωτότοκά μου ἀσεβείας פְּשַׁעִי בְּכוֹרִי בְּטָנִי] Assuming what follows, פְּרִי בְטָנִי, is in explanatory apposition, πρωτότοκος and בְּכוֹר here are best understood as denoting “first-born male child.” The neuter gender of the form used here is no hindrance to this analysis. See *πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἀνθρώπου τῶν υἱῶν σου λυτρῶση* Ex 13.13, *τὰ πρωτότοκα τῶν υἱῶν σου δώσεις ἐμοί* 22.28 and others. Though the genuine masc. form is still found, e.g. *Υἱὸς πρωτότοκόκ μου* *Ἰσραηλ* ‘Israel is my first-born son’ Ex 4.22, the widespread use of the neut.¹⁵ is probably due to the neut. gender of τέκνον.

How are we then to account for the plural? Is polygamy being implied? This might be what is meant by ἀσεβείας.

What is the grammatical, logical relationship between the two consecutive nouns in ⓐ and ⓑ alike? *HALOT* 982b s.v. פְּשַׁע 3c writes: “to give my first-born because of my crime (causal acc., see GK § 118 l.”¹⁶ Such an analysis was attempted in the Vulg., “pro scelere meo,” Rashi (קרבן לפשעי), Ibn Ezra and Radaq (בעבור פשעי). When occasions for a causal accusative are plentiful, its possibility of application limited to a couple of instances suggests that this is not much more than an ad hoc solution.

As a lexical-semantic solution BDB s.v. פְּשַׁע 6 suggests “offering for transgression,” though the only reference is our Mi case. On the other hand, such an extension is securely attested for הַטָּעָה, e.g. עוֹלָה וְהֶטָּעָה Ps 40.7, and

¹³ In *Index* 96a s.v. 5c), the only passage concerned, ἐν τόπῳ πίονι ‘in a fertile spot’ Is 5.1, is to be deleted; אָשׁׁ’s שָׁמֵן was probably read as שָׁמֵן בְּמִקְוֵם.

¹⁴ For more examples, see Jastrow 1903, s.v. שָׁמֵן II.

¹⁵ Once applied to a daughter: ὄνομα τῆ πρωτοτόκῳ Μεροβ, καὶ ὄνομα τῆ δευτέρῃ Μελχολ 1K 14.49, where the Lucianic version, taking offence at this, emended the adjective to τῆς πρεσβυτέρας.

¹⁶ The sole instance mentioned by GK loc. cit. is .. *רָאתָ שָׁמָה רֵאָתָּ שְׁמִיר* Is 7.25, where οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ ἐκεί φόβος· ἔσται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς χέρσου καὶ ἀκάνθησ ἐἰς βόσκημα προβάτου perhaps suggests that its *Vorlage* may have read, or the translator may have mentally reconstructed, .. *מִרֵּאָתָּ שְׁמִיר*. In any event, for ⓐ the subject of רֵבּוּא is רֵּאָתָּ, *pace* GK “thou shall not come thither for fear of briars.” See also Vulg. *non veniet illuc terror spinarum*, Trg. לֹא יָבֹא דִּתְהִלַּת הַיִּבְבָּא תִיעוּל לְתַמָּן דְּהַלְתָּ דְּיַרְרָא’ and Pesh. /lā’ te‘‘ōl l-tammān dehl̄tā’ d-ya‘rā’/.

Willis (1968.274) follows Lescow’s (1966.46) “für meine Bosheit .. für mein verfehltes Leben”, seeing here an acc. of cause.

innumerable references listed in BDB s.v. **חֲטֹאתַי** 4. An analogous shift, most likely under Hebrew influence, is observable in ἀμάρτημα as in ἐπιθήσει τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ ἀμαρτήματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ σφάξουσιν τὴν χίμαιραν τὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας (**חֲטֹאתַי** 2x) ‘he shall place the hand on the head of his sin-offering, and one shall slaughter the young she-goat meant for sin-offering’ Le 4.29¹⁷ and τὸ μοσχάριον τῆς ἀμαρτίας (**חֲטֹאתַי**) ‘the young calf for the sin’ Ex 29.36.¹⁸

Whilst no indisputable case is to be found for such a shift in ἀσέβεια, the analogy of the above-quoted examples such as τὴν χίμαιραν τὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας and τὸ μοσχάριον τῆς ἀμαρτίας might render support to such an assumption, thus “my first-born, (an offering to atone for my) impiety.” There is, however, one serious difficulty here. In the two parallel phrases in the second half of the verse, one of the parallel words, ἀμαρτία, is preceded by a preposition, ὑπέρ, probably added in **Θ** independently of **Α**, but ἀσέβεια not. On this use of ὑπέρ τινοσ, note τὰ ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίας ‘the sin-offerings’ Ez 40.39 and ἐρίφους δύο αἰγῶν ἀμώμους ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίας ‘two impeccable young goats for sin-offering’ ib. 43.22.¹⁹

The parallelism here also suggests that ἀσεβείας is sg., not ‘manifestations of impiety,’ though that could stand in apposition to the pl. πρωτότοκά μου. What then is the function of the genitive here? We suggest that this is a genitive of cause as in τὸ αἷμα τῆς περιτομῆς ‘the blood due to the circumcision’ Ex 4.26.²⁰ Note the use of ἀσέβεια applied to illicit sexual acts in ἕκαστος τὴν νόμφην αὐτοῦ ἐμίαινε ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ Ez 22.11.

ἀμαρτίας ψυχῆς μου **וְשֵׁנִי חֲטֹאתַי**] According to Wolff (138) **וְשֵׁנִי** with a suf. pron. added has the value of an emphatic pronoun. Then he could have translated the phrase here as “mein eigenes verfehltes Leben” instead of his own “mein verfehltes Leben.” How would he translate **חֲטֹאתַי**? Could we not say that anything one does with one’s limb or limbs ultimately flows out of one’s inner thought? The same issue arises with regard to ψυχή used here.²¹

6.8) εἰ ἀνηγγέλη σοι, ἄνθρωπε, τί καλόν; ἢ τί κύριος ἐκζητεῖ παρὰ σοῦ ἄλλ’ ἢ τοῦ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ ἀγαπᾶν ἔλεος καὶ ἔτοιμον εἶναι τοῦ πορεύεσθαι μετὰ κυρίου θεοῦ σου;

Was it told you, o man, what is good or what the Lord requires of you except to practise justice and value mercy and be ready to walk with the Lord your God?

¹⁷ NETS “on the head of his mistake”; a mistake has no head. It is the head of a young nanny goat offered to atone for his sin.

¹⁸ More examples are mentioned in GELS s.v. ἀμαρτία 3.

¹⁹ Cf. Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν 1Cor 15.3, and for further examples, see BDAG s.v. ὑπέρ A 1 b.

²⁰ More examples are added in SSG § 22 v (xxi).

²¹ On this important, though complicated, question, see above at Ho 9.5.

הַגִּיד לְךָ אֲדָם מִה־טוֹב וּמִה־יְהוָה דּוֹרֵשׁ מִמֶּךָ כִּי אִם־עֲשׂוֹת מְשֻׁפֵּט וְאַהֲבַת הַסּוֹד
וְהַצְנֵעַ לְכַתֵּעַם־אֱלֹהֶיךָ:

e] A *heh* may have dropped out, i.e. haplography: הַהִיד > הַגִּיד.

[ἀνηγγέλῃ] By using the passive form the translator might be averting the question that might arise as to who said it.²² Hence there is no absolute need to assume that his *Vorlage* actually read הַגִּד = הַגִּד. Of course it is possible that he parsed the *defectiva* spelled הַגִּד as Hofal. In both Hebrew and Greek the third ms verb form is occasionally used impersonally.²³

[ἀγαπᾶν ἔλεος הַסּוֹד וְאַהֲבַת הַסּוֹד] The parallelism with עֲשׂוֹת shows that אַהֲבַת here is functioning as an inf. cst. just as אָהַב Ec 3.8. Its syntactic status differs in שְׂמַתְּפָה צַד שְׂמַתְּפָה אֶת־הָאֲהָבָה צַד שְׂמַתְּפָה Ct 2.7. As regards its meaning, it is not so much as ‘to love’ as ‘to attach great value and importance to.’ Just as the two greatest commandments אַהֲבַת הַסּוֹד is here presented virtually as a commandment. It is an act of mercy granted to you by your neighbour and also such an act performed by you for your neighbour. If one is surprised to be commanded to accept mercy, one might remind oneself of what St Paul says he had heard Jesus saying μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν ‘it is a greater blessing to give than to receive’ Acts 20.35. Neither virtue is our inborn tendency. Hence our Mi text continues with another requirement: humility.²⁴

[ἔτοιμον εἶναι] A rather unexpected rendering. The root צנע commonly thought to have to do with humility occurs only once more in BH, and correctly rendered in Ⓞ: אֶת־צְנוּעִים הַכְּמָה: στόμα δὲ ταπεινῶν μελετᾷ σοφίαν Pr 11.2. The root occurs four times in Ben Sira, but its Gk translations are problematic:

- 16.25 דַּעֵי אַחוּהַ צְנוּעַ אַחוּהַ ‘I shall express my unexaggerated view’
ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἀπαγγεῶλῶ ἐπιστήμην ‘I shall tell a view with accuracy’
- 35.3 שְׂכַל הַצְנוּעַ שְׂכַל ‘Keep (your talk on) science under control’
ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἐπιστήμῃ ‘with accurate knowledge’
- 34.22 צְנוּעַ הִיָּה מַעֲשֶׂיךָ כִּכֵּל ‘whatever you do, be humble’
ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις σου γίνου ἐντροχῆς ‘in all your works be skilful’
- 42.8 חֵי כָל־אִישׁ צְנוּעַ לְפָנַי כָּל־חֵי ‘a humble man in the presence of every living one’
δεδοκιμασμένος ἔναντι παντὶ ζῶντος ‘acceptable before every living one’

We see this translator also struggling. Our Mi translator might be doing his own best.²⁵

²² Both Vulg. and Pesh. got out of the problem by making the prophet speak: *Indicabo* and /hawwītāk/, quite a departure from Ⓞ. For Rashi, Ibn Ezra and Radaq God is answering the questions put earlier in vs. 7.

²³ On Hebrew, cf. JM § 155 b, d-f and SQH § 37 a, and on Greek, cf. SSG § 87 a, c.

²⁴ Cf. Muraoka 2020b.90f.

²⁵ On a morphological issue here, see Muraoka 2020.124.

- 6.9) Φωνὴ κυρίου τῆ πόλει ἐπικληθήσεται, καὶ σώσει φοβουμένους τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. ἄκουε, φυλὴ, καὶ τίς κοσμήσει πόλιν;

The voice of the Lord will be addressed to the city, and He will save those who fear His name. Hear, o tribe, and who will adorn a city?

קול יהוה לעיר יקרא ותושיה יראא שמה שמעו מטה ומי יעדה:

Φωνὴ κυρίου יהוה] For the Tiberian Massorettes the first Heb. word was not in st. cst., as shown by a disjunctive accent (*ytiv*), hence an exclamation, ‘Listen!’, an analysis not opted for by $\text{\textcircled{C}}$. But a voice, not a person, addressing the city may have sounded unusual, so that יקרא was parsed as Nif. יקרא. One wonders whether or not our translator shared the conventional interpretation of קול קורא במדבר פנו דרה יהוה ישרו בערבבה מסלה לאלהינו Is 40.3, where the use of the capital letter in the standard LXX editions with Ἐτοιμάσατε instead of Ἐν τῆ ἐρήμῳ is to be noted: φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῆ ἐρήμῳ Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

καὶ σώσει ..]. This middle part of the verse in $\text{\textcircled{H}}$ is rather obscure. Since Qal ראה is not doubly transitive, שמה must be the subject of יראא, but what on earth could שמה יראא mean? Faced with this riddle, our translator radically rewrote the text: והושיע יראי שמו.²⁶

ἄκουε] = שמע, an adjustment of the sg. מטה. The pl. of $\text{\textcircled{H}}$ is ad sensum.

κοσμήσει] יעדה was derived by the translator from עדה ‘to adorn,’ and not from יעד ‘to appoint, assign.’²⁷

πόλιν] = עיר, which comes from עוד at the start of the following verse.²⁸

- 6.10) μὴ πῦρ καὶ οἶκος ἀνόμου θησαυρίζων θησαυροὺς ἀνόμους καὶ μέτρον ὕβρεως ἀδικία;

Fire and the house of a lawbreaker hoarding ill-gotten treasures and a measure of arrogance, injustice?

עוד האש בית רשע אצרות רשע ואיפת רזון ועומה:

μὴ πῦρ καὶ οἶκος] = האש ובית. μὴ presumably introduces a rhetorical question that anticipates a negative answer. The clause consists of three noun phrases joined with καί. It can be seen as an answer to the question put at the end of the preceding verse.²⁹

²⁶ Barthélemy (1992.759) goes into some details of divergent readings among Hebrew manuscripts.

²⁷ SD’s commentators (II 2376) and we agree at this point. However, to translate $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ with *regieren* does not represent our translator’s perspective, but that of readers ignorant of Hebrew. None of the four patristic commentators (Cyril, Theodor, Theodoret, Theophylactus) so interpreted the verb.

²⁸ So, for instance, SD II 2376.

²⁹ So understood by Theophylactus (PG 126.1 1155), for instance, who says, inter alia, the fire of invading enemies, which might look brilliant from afar, would rather destroy and devour the entire decorum (κόσμος) of the city.

θησαυρίζων] Ziegler encloses the word with square brackets. Though only one Gk manuscript lacks this word and \mathfrak{H} has no equivalent for it, it cannot be missed in the interest of the Greek syntax.³⁰ How would one otherwise account for the following acc., θησαυροὺς ἀνόμους?

θησαυροὺς ἀνόμους רְשָׁעִים אוֹצְרוֹת] Following his predecessors, Ziegler rejects an important v.l., ἀνομίας. In the overwhelming majority of its instances ἄνομος refers to a person, e.g. οὐκ ὠφελήσουσιν θησαυροὶ ἀνόμους ‘treasures would not benefit the unlawful’ Pr 10.2, ἀνήρ ἄνομος Is 55.7. When applied to a non-personal entity, it is usually substantivised neuter, e.g. ποιοῦντες ἄνομα καὶ ἀντέστησαν θεῷ Ma 3.15. In Hebrew, אוֹצְרוֹת רְשָׁעִים is unthinkable. The reading θησαυροὺς ἀνομίας merits further consideration, not only because of its greater conformity with \mathfrak{H} here.

μέτρον ὕβρεως ἰουγὰ אִיפַת] Ziegler’s reading is an indisputable improvement on the traditional μετὰ ὕβρεως in view of אִיפַת.

In *Index* 120a s.v. ὕβρις ἰουγὰ has been suggested as an equivalent of this Greek noun.³¹

False measures are to be condemned as illegal, but what have they got to do with arrogance? Is our translator of the view that correct measures ultimately originate from God, so that attempts to falsify them are indicative of arrogance and impudence?³²

- 6.11) εἰ δικαιωθήσεται ἐν ζυγῷ ἄνομος καὶ ἐν μαρσίππῳ στάθμια δόλου;
Can someone unlawful as regards scales and falsified weights as regards bags be justified?

הֲאֵצְפָה בְּמִאֲזַי רְשָׁע וּבְכִיסִים אֲבִי מְרָמָה:

δικαιωθήσεται] = הֲצִיִּי. The translator read רְשָׁע, which forced him to manipulate מִאֲזַי, reading it מִאֲזַיִּים and not doing justice to the parallelism of the two prepositional phrases.

- 6.12) ἐξ ὧν τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν ἀσεβείας ἔπλησαν, καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτὴν ἐλάλουν ψευδῆ, καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν ὑψώθη ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν.

From these they have filled their wealth with impiety, and her residents have kept talking lies, and their tongue has been lifted high in their mouth.

אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂירֶיהָ מְלֵאוּ חָמָס וַיִּשְׁבְּהָ דְבָרוֹ-שָׁקָר וּלְשׁוֹנָהּ רְמִיָּה בְּפִיהָם:

³⁰ *SD* supplies “Speichert,” saying that Ziegler prefers to delete θησαυρίζων, but the gen. ptc. cannot serve as the subject of the nom. πῦρ καὶ οἶκος ἀνόμου: “[Speichert] etwa das Feuer und das Haus .. unrechte Schätze ..?”

³¹ The most frequent among eight equivalents. As the eighth is to be added דָּרָה Jd 5.22L; cf. Schreiner 1957.122.

³² None of the four patristic commentators consulted offers any hint on the matter.

עָצָה וְעָשָׂה] The antecedents of עָשָׂה are most likely the immediately preceding στάθμια δόλου, which served as instruments for unlawful accumulation of wealth. The Heb syntax, however, makes us anticipate בָּהֶם or something like that inside the relative clause.³³

τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν ἀσεβείας ἔπλησαν] = עָשָׂה מְלֵא מְלֵא. In Hebrew both Qal מְלֵא and Piel מְלֵא can take two zero-objects. E.g. מְלֵא אֶרְבָּעָה כְּדִים מִים 1Kg 18.34; מְלֵא אֶתְּךָ אֶתְּךָ אֶתְּךָ אֶתְּךָ Ex 31.3. By contrast, πίμπλημι, when it takes two objects, enters only one syntagm, <vb - acc. - gen.>, and never <vb - acc. - acc.>. Hence ἀσεβείας in our Mi passage is sg. gen., not pl. acc. Interestingly, a synonymous verb, ἐπίμπλημι attests to both syntagms: ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα θεῖο σοφίας Ex 31.3, where σοφίας is to be construed with πνεῦμα θεῖον, and not with the verb as against ἐνέπλησεν αὐτοὺς σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως ib. 35.35. Likewise Is 11.3, Ps 90.16, 104.40. Our translator probably meant to say that they took recourse to all dubious and illegal tactics and means as they accumulated their wealth.

We would not analyse ἀσεβείας as a gen. of quality, i.e. ‘their wealth obtained through acts of impiety,’ for Hebrew does not allow מְלֵא to intervene between the two terms of the cst. chain. Furthermore, such an analysis would make the verb mean ‘to multiply,’ a meaning that is alien to πίμπλημι.

ὕψωθη] = מָהָר from רָוַם. The verb is indicative of arrogance,³⁴ cf. ὕψωθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ רָוַם לְבָבוֹ De 17.20.

The last three words of the verse is comparable to a nominal clause we find in ‘I embody insight, I am insight *par excellence*’ אֲנִי בִינָה Pr 8.14 in lieu of a more prosaic אֲנִי מְבִיֵן. This may have been missed by the translator, hence Ø’s attempt to restructure ~~Ⓜ~~.³⁵

The 3fs pronouns must be referring to the city (πόλις) in vs. 9 above.

6.13) καὶ ἐγὼ ἄρξομαι τοῦ πατάξαι σε, ἀφανισῶ σε ἐπὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις σου.

I on my part shall begin to strike you, I shall exterminate you on account of your sins.

וְגַם-אֲנִי הֶחֱלִיתִי הַכּוֹתְךָ הַשָּׂמֵם עַל-חַטָּאתְךָ:

καὶ ἐγὼ וְגַם-אֲנִי] The ubiquitous particle גַּם cannot mean here that two persons do the same thing. Hence not to be rendered ‘I, too.’ An analogous case is גַּם-יְהוָה הָעֵבִיר חַטָּאתְךָ לֹא תָמוּת 2Sm 12.13.³⁶

³³ An argument presented by Wolff (160) for viewing עָשָׂה as causal in value. So many modern translations.

³⁴ Cf. ὑπερηφάνῳ κεχρημένοι διανοία ‘having taken recourse to arrogant thinking’ Theodor of Mopsuestia in PG 66.1 388.

³⁵ Barthélemy’s proposed interpretation, “Eux dont la langue est tromperie en leur bouche,” is questionable, since there is no pl. noun preceding that can serve as the antecedent of the French relative pronoun.

³⁶ Radaq attempts to retain the usual sense of the particle: “Just as you have made the indigent people sick who are robbed by you through your deceptions,” though no such incident is

ἄρξομαι] = יִתְּחַלֵּךְ. The selection of the fut. in Ⓞ, however, is anomalous. ἀφανιῶ σε ׀מִשֵּׁה] Ἀφανίζω is one of the most frequent equivalents of the verb root √מִשֵּׁה. It is not easy to say precisely how the translator parsed ׀מִשֵּׁה. Replacing the initial ה with א as the 1s prefix of Hif. Impf. would not do, since one would anticipate a single *mem*. Thus he probably identified an inf. abs. Hif., which he translated somewhat freely. The absence of καί before ἀφανιῶ suggests that he identified ׀מִשֵּׁה as a non-finite verb form.³⁷

6.14) σὺ φάγεσαι καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐμπλησθῆς· καὶ σκοτάσει ἐν σοὶ καὶ ἐκνεύσει, καὶ οὐ μὴ διασωθῆς· καὶ ὅσοι ἐὰν διασωθῶσιν εἰς ῥομφαίαν παραδοθήσονται.

You may eat but will never be be sated. It will become dark inside yourself and people will move away, and you will never be rescued. Whoever are saved will be handed to a sword.

אַתָּה תֹאכַל וְלֹא תִשְׂבַּע וְיִשָּׁחַךְ בְּקֶרְבְּךָ וְתִסַּג וְלֹא תִפְלִיט וְאִשָּׁר תִּפְּלֹט לְחַרְבַּ אֶתְּךָ:

σὺ ἀתָּה] The morphologically redundant pronoun in Greek and Hebrew alike is comparable to an accusing finger pointed at a person.³⁸

σκοτάσει] = יִשָּׁחַךְ. The Heb. word here is a crux interpretum.³⁹ Ⓞ may be wanting to say: “you will agonise in depressive darkness.” The use of the 3ms form here is typical of natural phenomena. Another example is σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος ‘it will become dark, though the sun is rising’ Is 13.10, cf. *SSG* § 87 **cc**.

ἐκνεύσει Ⓞ] Comparison with another occurrence of the same verb root in Mi could be illuminating. In οὐ γὰρ ἀπόσεται δνειδή ‘for He will not remove humiliations’ Mi 2.6 Ⓞ must have read Hif. יִסַּג as against יִסַּג לֹא לְמִוְתָא. In both instances it is about distancing. However, transitive in the one and intransitive in the other. In our present instance the translator may have read יִסַּג, though he leaves the identity of the subject vague, maybe deliberately⁴⁰: “someone who should be coming to your rescue will look away.”

mentioned by the prophet. The same holds for Barthélemy’s (1992.768) remark: “de même que .. par la violence .. moi aussi .. avec violence.”

SD reads “Und ich, ich werde ..”; without reference to יִסַּג we could see here “assertive” force of the independent personal pronoun, on which see *SSG* § 7 **be**. But in view of ׀א that could not have been our translator’s intention.

³⁷ *Pace* Harper (2016.85) we have not here an inf. abs. following a weqatal form.

³⁸ For Greek see *SSG* § 7 **bc**, and for Hebrew Muraoka 1985.50f., 58 (3).

³⁹ *HALOT* 446b s.v. “dirt, filth” is proposed, apparently based on Ehrman (TM: not Ehrmann) 1959.156 (TM: not 56), who translates: “Thou shalt eat but not be satisfied, and thy wastes shall be locked up within you.” He mentions Arb. /wash/ ‘dirt.’ Cf. also Driver 1965.114.

⁴⁰ Note our remark below on παραδοθήσονται. *SD* II 2377 asks: “Kann die 3. Pers. Sg. – wie im Hebräischen – unpersönlich wiedergegeben werden.” Our answer is “Ja,” see *SSG* § 87 **cb**. Here is a special case, however, should our assumption be correct. The translator is too sensitive to state the subject explicitly.

διασωθῆς טַלְפָּלָה] ⚭ may be meant as Qal, טַלְפָּלָה, cf. ἀνασωθήσονται וַטְּלַף Ez 7.16. Would one then postulate וַטְּלַף in lieu of טַלְפָּלָה?

ὅσοι רָצָא] Some modern Bible translations translate רָצָא as “that which,” “what,” etc., but things you manage to rescue would not be handed over to a sword. The mpl. ὅσοι can only refer to animate beings, humans. The person being addressed here, according to ⚭, is in some leadership position, attempting to rescue coreligionists or compatriots of his.

παραδοθήσονται] = יִתְּנוּ. The translator may not have been able to bear the image of God delivering some of His own people to be beheaded just like that.⁴¹

6.15) σὺ σπερεῖς καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀμήσης, σὺ πιέσεις ἐλαίαν καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀλείψῃ
ἔλαιον, καὶ οἶνον καὶ οὐ μὴ πίητε,

You may sow, but will never harvest. You may squeeze olive(s), but you will never anoint (your body) with olive oil, and wine you will never drink,

אַתָּה תִּזְרַע וְלֹא תִקְצֹר אֶתְּךָ תִּדְרֹךְ-וַיִּתְּן לְאֶתְּ-חֲסוּדֵי שָׂמֶן וְתִירוֹשׁ וְלֹא תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶיֶן:

σὺ אַתָּה] On the value of these pronouns which are morphologically redundant, see at vs. 14 above. In this verse it is even repeated.

πιέσεις דָּרַךְ] The Heb. verb makes it plain that it is about treading fresh olives on a floor, which may escape readers of ⚭, in which πιάζω / πιέζω can mean ‘to press, squeeze with a hand or hands.’

ἀλείψῃ ἔλαιον] This verb, when used in the middle voice, can be governed by a prepositional phrase of instrumental value as in ἀλειφόμεναι ἐν σμυρνίνῳ ἐλαίῳ Es 2.12 ο’, where it might not be a Hebraism (בְּשֶׁמֶן הַמֵּר) in view of a case in CG such as ἀλειψαμένῳ λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ ‘when the two anointed themselves richly with oil’ Homer *Il.* 10.577.

וְתִירוֹשׁ] Once in XII this noun occurs in conjunction with יַיִן and both have been translated: יַיִן וְתִירוֹשׁ יִקְחֶנּוּ לֶבַח οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα ἐδέξατο καρδία λαοῦ μου Ho 4.11. No manuscript or version supplies another substantive. Despite of its position it is not very likely that it has been translated with οἶνον, יַיִן left untranslated.

The equivalences in LXX of the words in question look as below:

תִּירוֹשׁ	38	יַיִן	142	שָׂכָר	26	שָׂכָרוֹן	3
μέθυσμα	1	οἶνος	132	μέθυσμα	4	μέθυσμα	1
οἶνος	36	γλεῦκος	1	οἶνος	3		
				μέθη	3	μέθη	2

⁴¹ Another LXX translator might be displaying a measure of sensitivity and sympathy towards a dramatis persona in the text he is translating, Hagar running away from her pestering mistress. See Muraoka 2020b.97f.

The sole instance in LXX of the equivalence תִּירוֹשׁ / μέθυσμα is οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα Ho 4.11. This is striking since the above table shows that οἶνος is the standard rendering of both תִּירוֹשׁ and יַיִן. If we postulate that the latter means ‘not fermented, new wine, must,’ then we would have to conclude that, for LXX translators, יַיִן is a generic lexeme, “drink produced from grapes,” making תִּירוֹשׁ one variety of it.⁴² The selection of οἶνος in our Mi passage should be considered against this general background. However, another factor may be playing a role here. Did our translator know precisely what תִּירוֹשׁ meant? His knowledge of this detail of the agriculture in the Holy Land may not have been good enough as to suggest to him τρύξις as the best rendering. One could safely assume that this Greek word, not a particularly rare one, was in his Greek vocabulary. Once he settled on this equivalence, he may have found it unnecessary to repeat οἶνος.⁴³

οἶνον καὶ י תִּירוֹשׁ Irrespective of the question of equations between the two Heb. words and the one Gk word, the conjunction here in both languages calls for an explanation. Is the noun preceding it highlighted one way or another? It appears that alcoholic drink is considered distinct by the translator from the other two agricultural products. The verb is suddenly shifted from the sg. to the pl. Wine is viewed as indispensable for an enjoyable life: ‘What is life when wine (οἶνος) becomes scarce?’ Si 34.27 and ‘a musicians’ melody accompanied by pleasant wine (οἶνος)’ ib. 35.6. The pl. verb suggests a family dinner or a social occasion.

In 𐤁 the less expensive variety was mentioned first: “And new wine? No way. You do not deserve any kind of יַיִן in order to have fun.” By contrast in 𐤂 the generic term alone was mentioned: “Not food alone, but also οἶνος would not be available for you to enjoy with others.”

6.15 end) καὶ ἀφανισθήσεται νόμιμα λαοῦ μου 6.16) καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα οἴκου Αχασαβ, καὶ ἐπορεύθητε ἐν ταῖς βουλαῖς αὐτῶν, ὅπως παραδῶ σε εἰς ἀφανισμόν καὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν εἰς συρισμόν· καὶ ὄνειδη λαῶν λήμψεσθε.

and regulations of my people will be destroyed as well as all the works of the house of Ahab, and you went along with their decisions, so that I would (eventually) hand you over to destruction and all its residents to (target of) hissing, and you will be subjected to derisions by peoples.

וַיִּשְׁתַּמְּרוּ חֻקֹת עַמִּי וְכָל מַעֲשֵׂה בֵית־אֲחָאָב וַתֵּלְכוּ בְּמַעֲצוֹתָם לְמַעַן תִּתִּי אֶתְּיָא
לְשִׂמְיָה וְיִשְׁבִּיָה לְשִׂרְקָה וְחִרְפַת עַמִּי תִשְׂאוּ:

⁴² This is probably what is meant in “The Bible called it [= יַיִן] תִּירוֹשׁ” (jNed 40.2), not that the two words are always freely interchangeable. I am told by an Israeli resident in Jerusalem, Mr Richard Medina, that in a local supermarket you can buy for a twopence a bottle of תִּירוֹשׁ, grape juice, as distinct from intoxicating יַיִן.

⁴³ On potential implications of our translator’s probably urban upbringing, see above at p. 127.

ἀφανισθήσεται] In *Index* 20a s.v. ἀφανίζω דַּמְשָׁי has been suggested.⁴⁴ However, our identification at מְשָׁיִךְ (> ἀφανισθῶσι) Ho 5.15 as מְשָׁיִךְ renders מְשָׁיִךְ more likely. Note also הַמְשָׁיִךְ / ἀφανισμός here.

λαοῦ μου] = עַמִּי. Pace Rahlfs Ziegler justly adds a full stop after μου, making the clause continue vs. 15, for otherwise καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα οἴκου Αἰθαίωβ would end up hanging in the air, not linked backwards or forwards.

After μου Rahlfs adds καὶ ἐφύλαξας [= מְשָׁיִךְ] τὰ δικαιώματα Ζαμβρι, which is roughly equivalent to 𐤀, but a second translation of the preceding clause. Obviously we need to adopt only one translation. A doublet of an entire clause is unheard of.

τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν הַיְיִשְׁרָאֵלִים] Though the ptc. is substantivised in Greek and Hebrew alike, SG never allows the use of a gen. form here, hence not αὐτῆς. Either the acc. or a prepositional phrase is used, e.g. οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ הַיְיִשְׁרָאֵלִים 2C 20.20.⁴⁵

λαῶν] = עַמִּים, which gives a message totally different from 𐤀, which is saying that some leaders are doomed to be derided by heathen nations on behalf of the entire people of God.

⁴⁴ Barthélemy (1992.769) rejects a form of $\sqrt{\text{דמ}}\text{ש}$ as an equivalent here, but his alternative interpretation “l’on s’excitait à observer ..,” let alone a play on words, “l’on se samarisait selon les prescriptions ..,” are not very convincing.

⁴⁵ For a fuller discussion, see *SSG* 31 **bbb**.

CHAPTER VII

7.1) Οἴμμοι ὅτι ἐγενόμην ὡς συνάγων καλάμην ἐν ἀμῆτῳ καὶ ὡς ἐπιφυλλίδα ἐν τρυγήτῳ οὐχ ὑπάρχοντος βότρυος τοῦ φαγεῖν τὰ πρωτόγονα. οἴμμοι, ψυχῆ,

Woe, that I have become like someone collecting stubbles during harvest and like small grapes during a vintage, there being no bunch (of grapes) to eat, the first-fruits. Woe, o (my) soul,

אֶלְלִי לִי כִי הָיִיתִי כְּאֶסְפִּי־קִיץ כְּעֵלְלַת בְּצִיר אֵין־אֶשְׁכּוֹל לְאֶכּוֹל בְּבוֹרָה אֹתָהּ
נַפְשִׁי:

Οἴμμοι לִי אֶלְלִי] An equivalence that occurs only twice, the other occurrence in Jb 10.15.

συνάγων] = אָסַף.¹

καλάμην ἐν ἀμῆτῳ] Obviously too long for אָ, and קִיץ ‘summer’ has nothing to do with אָ here. In *Index* 8a s.v. ἄμητος, אָ בְּקִצִיר, אָ has been proposed, though this must be rather tentative, given its considerable departure from אָ.² The equivalence καλάμη / אָ occurs nine more times in LXX.

ἐν τρυγήτῳ] = אָ בְּבֹרָה.³

τὰ πρωτόγονα] This must be meant to be in apposition to βότρυος, though the separation of the two terms in apposition is not common, and their grammatical case does not match. The first term is generic, the second specific.⁴ In אָ בְּבוֹרָה is the object of the following verb, ‘(my soul) desired.’⁵ Once our translator analysed אָ בְּבוֹרָה as we are suggesting here, there remained not much scope for him to do as he did, admitting here an equivalent of אֶלְלִי, maybe אָהָה, a word he appears to be fond of. In another passage in XII he repeats it three times, when אָ uses it once only: אָהָה לִי־וּם Οἴμμοι οἴμμοι οἴμμοι εἰς ἡμέραν JI 1.15.

¹ The difference between אָ and אָ is not, *pace* SD (II 2378), that of sg. // pl., but between two different lexemes, Qal ptc. sg // cst.pl. of אָסַף, a substantive, as shown by the dagesh of the *pe*.

² However, SD (II 2378) interestingly thinks of a possible intertextual allusion to Ex 5.12, where we read Israelites gathered stubble for straw (καλάμην εἰς ἄχυρα), and אָ reads אָ for καλάμη.

³ In *Index* 119b s.v. τρύγητος, delete 2) a. אָ בְּבֹרָה.

⁴ See SSG § 33 c.

⁵ Pesh. reinforces this analysis by adding the conjunction /w-/ at the start of the last clause.

Wolff (173) and McKane (216) admit here in אָ an asyndetic relative clause, an analysis that would be analogous to that in אָ. We would, however, not equate אָ with אָ, see above (p. 115) ad Ho 9.4.

7.2) ὅτι ἀπόλωλεν εὐλαβῆς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ κατορθῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις οὐχ ὑπάρχει· πάντες εἰς αἵματα δικάζονται, ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ ἐκθλίβουσιν ἐκθλιβῆ.

for the pious have vanished from the land, and those who conduct themselves uprightly are not to be found among people. They all demand capital punishment, they harass one another severely.

אָבָד קָסִיד מִן־הָאַרְצָה וְיִשָּׂר בְּאַדָּם אֵין כָּלֶם לְדָמִים יֵאָבְבוּ אִישׁ אֶת־הָהוּי וְיִצְרָו
:הָרָם

ἀπόλωλεν] The 2Pf. of ἀπόλλυμι is intransitive, but the 1Pf. transitive, e.g. ἔθνος ἀπολωλεκὸς βουλήν ‘a nation that is at their wits’ ends’ De 32.28, οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀπολωλεκόσιν τὴν ὑπομονήν ‘Woe to you, who have lost patience’ Si 2.14. Cp. ὁ δίκαιος ἀπώλετο אָבָד קִי־הַצְדִּיק Is 57.1.

ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς קָרָה־מִן] Pace “von der Erde” (SD) the prophet’s audience is most likely local.

δικάζονται] יִרִיבוּ. Here emerges a message quite different from that of 𐤉, in which people are lying in wait to commit murders, whereas in 𐤌 people in a court cannot care less over justice, as long as the accused gets a death sentence brought down on his head.

ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ יֵהוּ אֶת־הָהוּי] A well-known Hebraising expression of reciprocity. In XII alone the Gk formula occurs 9 more times, once (Zc 11.9) fem., but each time 𐤉 reads יַעֲהוּ. On the other hand, our translator makes use of an alternative, also Hebraising, expression as in דִּסְקַי אֶת־הָהוּי וְשׂוּ אִישׁ אֶת־הָהוּי וְרָחֲמִים עָשׂוּ יָלֵעוּס וְכִי־רַחֲמִים וְרַחֲמִים יַעֲהוּ εἴλεος καὶ οἰκτιρμὸν ποιεῖτε ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Zc 7.9; four more times in XII. One wonders whether or not 𐤌’s *Vorlage* read יַעֲהוּ here.⁶

ἐκθλίβουσιν] In *Index* 36b s.v. ἐκθλίβω we suggested Qal צַר as a Heb. equivalent.⁷ But on second thoughts, its Hif. looks a better candidate in the light of an example such as καὶ ἐκθλίψω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους וְהִצְרַתִּי לָאָדָם Zp 1.17 and καὶ ἔθλιψαν αὐτούς וְיִצְרוּ לָהֶם Ne 9.27. So 𐤌 read יִצִירוּ, i.e. יִצְרָו.

ἐκθλιβῆ] This can be analysed as an instance of the well-known cognate dative.⁸ However, in 𐤉 there is no matching figura etymologica, something like הִצְרָתִי or צַר. Though one could dismiss it as freely translated, the translator might have in his mind הָרָם ‘fishing net’ as in Hb 1.15, 16, 17, for such a net would come over to caught fish as harassing. The translator uses there σαγήνη.

⁶ Pesh. /’ahu(h)y/, Trg. אָהוּי, and Vulg. *fratrem suum* = 𐤉.

⁷ Wolff (175) suggests יִצִירוּ, i.e. < √צור ‘to besiege, shut in.’

⁸ For details, see *SSG* § 22 *wr*.

7.3) ἐπὶ τὸ κακὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐτοιμάζουσιν· ὁ ἄρχων αἰτεῖ, καὶ ὁ κριτὴς εἰρηνικούς λόγους ἐλάλησεν, καταθύμιον ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ ἐστί, καὶ ἐξελοῦμαι τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν

They prepare their hands for the evil. The ruler demands, and the judge spoke sweet-sounding words. That is what he desires. And I shall carry off their good things

עֲלֵה־הָרַע כְּפִים לְהִטִּיב הַשֶּׁר שְׂאֵל וְהַשְׁפֵּט בְּשָׁלוֹם וְהַגְדִּיל דְּבַר הַחַיִּט וְנִשְׂאוּ הוּא
וַיַּעַבְדוּהוּ:

ἐτοιμάζουσι] The translation is Aramaising. In Aramaic Pael טַיַּב means ‘to prepare.’

εἰρηνικούς λόγους] Unlike in λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ καὶ κρίμα εἰρηνικὸν κρίνατε ἐν ταῖς πύλαις ὁμῶν Zc 8.16 the adjective here must be taken in sensu malo. שָׁלוֹם of 𐤇 must have been read as שָׁלוּ, and דְּבַר as דְּבַר, but even so the rendition is rather expansive. What has happened to וְהַגְדִּיל?

ἐξελοῦμαι וַיַּעַבְדוּהוּ] Another free rendition of a hapax in BH.

τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν כְּטוֹב] This is the first word of vs. 4. The neut. adjective here is substantivised.⁹ As implied in n. 9, ἀγαθὰ always implies value judgement. It is not used like its Engl. equivalent as in “goods train” as against “passenger train.” The use of the article is optional.¹⁰

7.4) ὡς σῆς ἔκτρώγων καὶ βαδίζων ἐπὶ κανόνος ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σκοπιᾶς σου. [οὐαὶ οὐαὶ.] αἱ ἐκδικήσεις σου ἦκασι, νῦν ἔσσονται κλαυθμοὶ αὐτῶν.

like a moth that devours and walks on a rod on the day when you are watched. [Woe, woe.] your punishments are come.

טוֹבָם כְּחַדְק יִשָּׂר מְמַסּוֹכָה יוֹם מְצַפִּיָּה פְּקַדְתֶּךָ בָּאָה עִתָּה תְהִיָּה מְבוֹכָתָם:

σῆς ἔκτρώγων καὶ βαδίζων ἐπὶ κανόνος מְמַסּוֹכָה יִשָּׂר] Here again our translator appears to be struggling with features of the landscape of the Holy Land.¹¹ Is he aware of: חַדְק וְאַרְחַ יִשְׂרָיִם סְלֵלָה: Pr 15.19? There, however, no moth is around. מְסוֹכָה ‘hedge’ is a hapax in BH.

αἱ ἐκδικήσεις σου פְּקַדְתֶּךָ] It is difficult to decide whether or not the translator read the pl. פְּקַדְתֶּךָ, but elsewhere in XII we note ἦκασιν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς ἐκδικήσεως < יְמֵי הַפְּקַדָּה >.

⁹ The entry in question in GELS 2a s.v. ἀγαθός 6 is in need of emendation: “articular and” > “subst.”; “goods, possessions” > “good, valuable possessions; treasures”; “their goods” > “their good things.”

¹⁰ So in NTG, e.g. πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν ‘He filled the hungry with good things’ Lk 1.53 and CG, e.g. ἦν οἱ ἄλλα τε ἀγαθὰ μυρία ‘he possessed countless other treasures’ Herodotus 2.172.3.

¹¹ We fail to see why SD II 2379 believes the assumption of an Aramaism here √רַק can help.

κλαυθμοὶ αὐτῶν] Are the referents of the pronoun personal? If so, who are “they”? It is possible to identify here an objective genitive with the pronoun referring to the preceding ἐκδικήσεις σου, hence ‘lamentations over your punishments,’ cf. αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ πέντους τοῦ πατρός μου ‘the days of mourning for my father’ Ge 27.41.¹² The same analysis applies to σκοπιᾶς σου. \mathfrak{H} with its pl. form differs slightly: “the day when those who watch you are out there.’

A number of equivalents are possible: מְבַכֵּי, cf. בְּכֹת אֱלֹן Βάλανος πένθους Ge 35.8, and מְבַכֵּי in MH.

7.5) μὴ καταπιστεύετε ἐν φίλοις καὶ μὴ ἐλπίζετε ἐπὶ ἡγουμένοις, ἀπὸ τῆς συγκοίτου σου φύλαξαι τοῦ ἀναθέσθαι τι αὐτῇ·

Do not trust friends, nor hang your hope on leaders, beware of your companion in bed in communicating anything to her,

אֲלֹמֵי אֶרֶץ אֲלֵהֶם לֹא תִבְטְחוּ בְּאַרְבָּנֵי הָרֶשֶׁת מִשְׂכָּכֵת חֵיקָה שְׂמֵר פִּתְחֵי פִי:

μὴ καταπιστεύετε] Followed by another negatived Pres. Impv., and then a positively worded Aor. Impv. On the intriguing complexity of these aspectual variations of Impv. forms, see *SSG* § 28 **ha - hb**.

ἐλπίζετε ἐπὶ ἡγουμένοις] On various modes of the government of the verb ἐλπίζω, see *SSG* § 52 **c**; in CG <+ dat.> is the norm.

τῆς συγκοίτου] The adj. σύγκοιτος is epicene and has no explicitly marked fem. form, but τῆς is revealing. So in ἦν τῷ βασιλεῖ σύγκοιτος .. καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτήν 3K 1.4 L. Hence either one’s wife or concubine is meant.

φύλαξαι] This verb in the middle voice, ‘to be on guard,’ often takes ἀπό as here. Since this preposition has already been used, the following τοῦ is probably a mere marker of the inf., an inf. of expegetic value here, although it could be assigned an ablative value.¹³

ἀναθέσθαι] An idiomatic, free rendering of \mathfrak{H} , ‘the doors of your mouth.’¹⁴ For the sense of ἀνατίθημι mid., cf. ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Gal 2.2.

7.6) διότι υἱὸς ἀτιμάζει πατέρα, θυγάτηρ ἐπαναστήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς, νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτῆς, ἐχθροὶ ἀνδρὸς πάντες οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.

¹² Cf. *SSG* § 22 v xiii).

¹³ Cf. *SSG* 30 **c**, esp. pp. 361f. Whilst in SG the inf. is often introduced with a variety of prepositions, not a single case of <ἀπὸ τοῦ - inf.> is attested, see *SSG* § 30 **aba**. Hence ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναθέσθαι is unlikely here.

¹⁴ Pace Wolff (175) יְהִיחַ is no dual. What would its pl. be?

because a son dishonours (his) father, a daughter rebels against her mother, a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, the people in one's family are all his enemies.

כִּי־בן מְנַבֵּל אָב בֵּת קָמָה בְּאֵמָה כְּלָהּ בְּחַמְתָּהּ אִבִּי אִישׁ אֲנָשִׁי בֵּיתוֹ:

ἀτιμάζει [מְנַבֵּל] This is the only instance of the equation ἀτιμάζω // נְבַל. πατέρα [בָּ] The lack of grammatical parallelism with τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς is a mechanical reproduction of **℔**.¹⁵

7.7) Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐπιβλέψομαι, ὑπομενῶ ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτηρίῳ μου, εἰσακουσέσθαι μου ὁ θεός μου.

I, however, would look to the Lord, continue to count on God my saviour, my God will listen to me.

וְאֲנִי בֵּיהוָה אֶצְפָּה אוֹחִילָה לְאֱלֹהֵי יְשָׁעִי יִשְׁמְעֵנִי אֱלֹהֵי:

Ἐγὼ [וְ] There is unmistakable underlining and implicit opposition: whatever others might do, I ..., see SSG § 7 **bd**.

אֶצְפָּה] Being of a Lamed-He verb, there is no morphological possibility to mark this form as volitive, but its parallelism with אוֹחִילָה indicates in that direction. Analogous analysis can be applied to יִשְׁמְעֵנִי as against יִשְׁמְעֵנִי, though we are not certain how our translator pronounced this unvocalised form.¹⁶ The last verb in **℔** could be rendered “May my God listen to me!”.

7.8) μὴ ἐπίχαιρέ μοι, ἢ ἐχθρά μου, ὅτι πέπτωκα· καὶ ἀναστήσομαι, διότι ἐὰν καθίσω ἐν τῷ σκότει, κύριος φωτιεῖ μοι.

Do not rejoice over me, o my enemy! Yes, I have fallen, but shall get up. For, if I am sitting in darkness, the Lord will provide light for me.

אַל־תִּשְׂמְחֵי אִיבְתֵּי לִי כִּי נִפְלַתִּי קָמְתִּי כִּי־אֲשׁב בְּחַשְׁךָ יְהוָה אור לִי:

ἐπίχαιρέ] As is usually the case, the verb is used of malicious joy. For a rare exception, see at Ho 10.5. The target of such a joy is appropriately expressed through a *dativus incommodi*, μοι לִי.

ἢ ἐχθρά μου [אִיבְתֵּי] As rightly pointed out the suffix /-i/ cannot mean ‘my’,¹⁷ since the form is accented, in the Tiberian accentuation, as penultimate. The final vowel is a so-called paragogic *i*, frequent with participles in particular, JM § 93 *n*. We see that **℔** has analysed the form differently. The fem. gender may be compared to the standing expression בֵּת צִיּוֹן. Its identity, however, is disputed already by mediaeval Jewish commentators; the Roman

¹⁵ Improved in Pesh. /la(‘)vū(h)y/, cf. Trg. /‘abbā’/.

¹⁶ On this detail, see JM § 61 *f*.

¹⁷ Thus *pace* Wolff 187 and McKane 218.

Empire, Babylonian, or Assyrian Empire have been mentioned. מְלוּכָה אֶרֶץ or מְמַלְכָּה may be at the back of the speaker’s mind as a referent of the fem. participle. In BH the fem. sg. can be a reference to a group of individuals, e.g. אֶרֶץ הַדָּלָת > 4K 24.14 οἱ πτωχοὶ τῆς γῆς, cf. JM § 134 o.

כִּי Though a most frequent equivalence, the conjunction in the two languages do not appear to mean the same thing. As correctly punctuated by Rahlfs and Ziegler, this ὅτι-clause is to be construed backwards, indicating a cause of the enemy’s gloating, namely I’m fallen; cf. ἐπιχαρύντες τῆ σῆ πτώσει ‘having gloated over your fall’ Ba 4.31. By contrast, the כִּי-clause is to be construed forwards and is often taken to be concessive in value, ‘though’: “Though I did fall, look, I am already up and about.”¹⁸ This analysis is rendered likely in view of the shift in tense in Ⓞ, Pf. > Fut., in contrast to the two *qatal*’s in Ⓜ. In order to express a usual causal idea our translator skillfully changes the conjunction in this very verse: διότι.

ἐάν] Most likely freely added, though possibly = כִּי אִם אֲשֶׁב.

φωτειῖ] Possibly = אֹרֶךְ or the translator saw a substantive, “the Lord is a light for me,” but freely translated.

7.9) ὀργὴν κυρίου ὑποίσω, ὅτι ἥμαρτον αὐτῷ, ἕως τοῦ δικαιῶσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου· καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸ κρίμα μου καὶ ἐξάξει με εἰς τὸ φῶς, ὄψομαι τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ.

I shall bear the wrath of the Lord, for I have sinned against Him, until He deals with my case and performs my verdict and takes me out into the light, I shall see His justice.

וְעַף יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר כִּי חָטְאתִי לוֹ עַד אֲשֶׁר יָרִיב יָרִיבִי וְעָשָׂה מִשְׁפָּטִי יוֹצִיאֵנִי לְאוֹר
אֶרְאֶה בְּצַדִּיקוֹתָי:

ὀργήν] A rare equivalence that occurs once more, also about divine anger, at 2C 28.9. The Heb. word appears in Jn 1.15 with reference to the rolling swell of rough sea, rendered with σάλος.

τοῦ δικαιῶσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου] Cf. δίκασον τὴν δίκην μου] *רִיבָה רִיבִי* Ps 42(43).1, an appeal to God.

וְעָשָׂה מִשְׁפָּטִי] Cf. עָשִׂיתָ מִשְׁפָּטִי ἐποίησας τὴν κρίσιν μου Ps 9.5.

καὶ ποιήσῃ] The punctuation adopted by Swete, Rahlfs, and Ziegler as well as the shift from the infinitive (δικαιῶσαι) to the future show the progression of thought reflected in Ⓞ as different from that in Ⓜ. In the latter, וְעָשָׂה is a *w-qatalti* form constituting an integrated complex with the preceding *רִיבִי*. By contrast, in Ⓞ, a totally new thought is introduced with וְעָשָׂה, an analysis which harmonises with the addition of καὶ, which is missing from

¹⁸ The concessive כִּי is not very frequent in BH. HALOT s.v. II כִּי 12 mentions 6 instances, but LXX has not so analysed it, even in an obvious case such as Pr 6.35. The notion of “though, although” is usually expressed with εἰ καὶ or ἐὰν καὶ, but in SG they mean “even if.”

יִצְיָאֲנִי. Whilst Keil (500) points out that יִצְיָאֲנִי is not governed by אֶשׁוּרְ and, starting with יִצְיָאֲנִי, “the hope takes the form of the certain assurance,” the vocalisation instead of יִצְיָאֲנִי might be indicative of a wish. Cf. our remarks above ad 7.7 above. A volitive value can be applied to אָרָאָה.

ποιήσει τὸ κρίμα μου] Because the speaker has admitted his sinful past, the verdict cannot be “completely innocent.” Even so, he is wishing, God will take him out of the total darkness and grant him sparks of light.

אָרָאָה בְּצִדְקָתוֹ] The collocation אָרָאָה בְּ means ‘to look with interest’ whether in sensu bono or sensu malo.¹⁹ This Hebraism has become naturalised in SG to a certain extent, e.g. לְרֵאוֹת בְּטוֹבַת בְּהִיָּרְיָהּ τοῦ ἰδεῖν ἐν τῇ χρῆσιτότητι τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν σου Ps 105(106).5,²⁰ but has often been rejected as in our Mi case, so also Ob 12, Je 36(29).32, Jb 20.17, 33.28, Ps 127(128).5.

7.10) καὶ ὄψεται ἡ ἐχθρά μου καὶ περιβαλεῖται αἰσχύνην ἢ λέγουσα πρὸς με Ποῦ κύριος ὁ θεός σου; οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου ἐπόψονται αὐτήν· νῦν ἔσται εἰς καταπάτημα ὡς πηλὸς ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς

Then my enemy will see (it) and the tongue which used to say to me “Where is the Lord your god?” will be covered with shame. My eyes will look at her. Now she will become something like clay to be trampled upon in the streets

תִּרְאֶינִי אֵיבָתִי וּתְכֻסָּהּ בּוֹשָׁה הָאֲמָרָה אֲלֵי אִי יְהוָה אֲלֶהְיָ עֵינַי תִּרְאֶינָהּ בְּהָ עָתָה
תִּהְיֶה לְמַרְמָס כְּטִיט חוּצוֹת:

[אֵיבָתִי] See above at vs. 8.

περιβαλεῖται αἰσχύνην ἢ λέγουσα בּוֹשָׁה הָאֲמָרָה] On this metaphorical use of περιβάλλομαι, cf. περιβαλέσθωσαν αἰσχύνην καὶ ἐντροπήν οἱ ζητοῦντες τὰ κακά μοι Ps 70.13. The passive voice in the translation above, “be covered,” does not imply that περιβαλεῖται is genuinely passive, which should be περιβληθήσεται. The subtle nuance of the middle voice here is “she will have no choice but to put on shame, she will find herself wearing.” Note the active voice in 𐤁: ‘shame will cover her.’

αὐτήν] Instead of ἐν αὐτῇ. See at vs. 9 end.

ἢ λέγουσα הָאֲמָרָה] A substantivised ptc. with the article attached can refer to a past event or condition,²¹ as in ἐνετείλατο Ἰωσηφ τῷ ὄντι ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ ‘Joseph commanded the one who was in charge of his house’ Ge 44.1. In our case the present tense may carry imperfective value.²² Otherwise ἢ εἰπούσα ‘she who once said’ could have been used.

¹⁹ BDB s.v. אָרָאָה Qal 8 a.

²⁰ For more examples, see GELS s.v. εἶδον *2 b and ὄρω I 2 a. Under the former verb, the asterisk is missing.

²¹ See SSG § 31 ba-bba.

²² As captured by Pesh. /d-(‘)āmra (h)wāt/ and Trg. אָמְרָה תִּהְיֶה

ἐπόπονται αὐτήν **בְּ** **הַאָרֶץ**] On the collocation **בְּ** **הַאָרֶץ**, see on the preceding verse. In **Ⲝ** and **Ⲟ** alike the fem. pronoun can be referring to her shame.

καταπάτημα **מְרַמָּה**] The Gk word refers to a result of καταπατέω ‘to trample,’ whereas **מְרַמָּה** here indicates the action itself, for which SG has καταπάτησις as in ἔθοντο αὐτοὺς ὡς χοῦν εἰς καταπάτησιν (**שְׂרָרָה**) 4K 13.7. A somewhat loose use of this substantive is exemplified in οὐκ ἀπέστρεψεν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ καταπατήματος ‘He did not pull His hand back from ..’ La 2.8, for the noun is about what one does with one’s feet.²³ Note the use of καταπατέω as in καταπατοῦσαι (**תִּצְרַרְרָה**) πένητας Am 4.1 // καταπατοῦντες (**צְרַרְרָה**) δίκαιον ib. 5.12, where the second Heb. verb in particular has nothing to with feet.

7.11) ἡμέρας ἀλοιφῆς πλίνθου. ἐξάλειψίς σου ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη, καὶ ἀποτρίπεται νόμιμα ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη·

on the day of daubing (and making of) brick. That day is your obliteration, and that day shall annul regulations.

יֹם לְבִנוֹת גְּדֵרֶיךָ יוֹם הַהוּא יִרְחַק־קִחֶיךָ:

ἡμέρας] Should one follow here Rahlfs’s and Ziegler’s reading, this is most likely a temporal genitive, ‘on the day of ...’ and the the first three words must be concluding the preceding verse. A variant, ἡμέραν, can be similarly analysed. Another variant ημερα should be accented ἡμέρα, a temporal dative.²⁴ In yet another variant, εν ημερα, i.e. ἐν ἡμέρα, the temporal value is explicitly marked with the preposition.²⁵

ἀποτρίπεται] = **קִחֶיךָ**.

The message of the main part of the verse in **Ⲝ** is very difficult to fathom in relation to **Ⲟ**, in which latter we can identify nothing that would be equivalent to ἐξάλειψις. Nor do we see what difficulty **יִרְחַק־קִחֶיךָ** could have caused.²⁶ In **Ⲝ** we hear a doomsday prophecy instead of a gospel message

²³ Ziegler, basing himself solely on the fifth column of Origen’s *Hexapla*, reads καταποντίσματος. We would regard this as a secondary harmonisation with κατεπόντισε(v) in vss. 2 and 5. The meaning of καταποντίζω also testifies to deviation from its primary meaning of ‘to drown by throwing into the sea’ in the direction of ‘to obliterate, annihilate (in general),’ e.g. κατεπόντισεν πάσας τὰς βάρεις αὐτῆς La 2.5; God would have had the towers of Jerusalem transported hundreds of kilometres to the Mediterranean Sea, the Sea of Galilee or the Dead Sea.

Pace LSJ s.v. καταπάτημα the word is unlikely to mean “that which is trampled under foot.”

²⁴ See SSG § 22 h, xc, we. Brenton reads .. ταῖς ὁδοῖς. Ἡμέρα .. πλίνθου, ἐξάλειψις ..

²⁵ To read with Swete .. ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς. ¹¹ ἡμέρας ἀλοιφῆς πλίνθου, ἐξάλειψίς σου .. makes for rather loose syntax.

²⁶ *SD* II.2380 identifies πλίνθος as a rendering of **לְבִנָּה**, but one could fairly assume that our translator knew that the pl. of **לְבִנָּה** ‘brick,’ which occurs as often as 9 times in BH, is **לְבִנִּיִּם**, never ***לְבִנּוֹת**.

over a rosy future.²⁷ It must be admitted, however, that the wording of **ח** is not quite normal: **יום ההוא** and also **יום הוא** at the start of the next verse.

7.12) *καὶ αἱ πόλεις σου ἕξουσιν εἰς ὄμαλισμὸν καὶ εἰς διαμερισμὸν [Ἀσσυρίων] καὶ αἱ πόλεις σου αἱ ὄχυραὶ εἰς διαμερισμὸν ἀπὸ Τύρου ἕως τοῦ ποταμοῦ, ἡμέρα ὕδατος καὶ θορύβου·*

and your cities will come to be levelled and to be a (spoil) divided among Assyrians and your fortified cities to be a spoil from Tyre to the river, a day of water and disarray.

יום הוא ועדיה יבוא למני אשור וערי מצור ולמני מצור ועד-נהר ויום מים ונהר:

*αἱ πόλεις σου*¹] = **עריה**.²⁸

εἰς ὄμαλισμὸν καὶ εἰς διαμερισμὸν [למני אשור] The comparison with the following *εἰς διαμερισμὸν למני* suggests that, for whatever reason, **ח** reversed **מני** and **אשור**. **ח** was familiar with the compound preposition **למן** equivalent to **מן**, as we can see in *למן-היום* ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας Hg 2.18. But **למני**, a hapax in BH and an equivalent to **מן**, may have been unknown to our translator.²⁹ His solution was **מנה** ‘part, portion.’

Now the selection of *ὄμαλισμός* is possibly due to **ח** deriving **אשור** from $\sqrt{\text{שר}}$. Particularly interesting is *דלתות ד[אישור] וקהורים אושר* **אני לפניה אלך וקהורים אושר** *Εγὼ ἔμπροσθέν σου πορεύσομαι καὶ ὄρη ὄμαλιῶ, θύρας χαλκᾶς συντριψῶ καὶ μοχλοὺς σιδηροῦς συγκλάσω* Is 45.2, where *ὄρη ὄμαλιῶ* represents **אישור** **אישור** and all the last three verbs are about destructive activities.³⁰ Cf. an idiomatic Dutch expression: *met de grond gelijk maken*.

αἱ πόλεις σου αἱ ὄχυρα] The possessive pronoun is a harmonisation with the preceding **עריה** (< **עדיה** **ח**), for **עריה מצור** is impossible in Hebrew here.

ἀπὸ Τύρου] = **מצור**.

τοῦ ποταμοῦ **נהר**] The article has been sensibly added, as the reference is to Euphrates.

ἡμέρα ὕδατος καὶ θορύβου] The first half is obviously = **ים מים**, but what lies behind *θορύβου* is quite a mystery, but it must be admitted what **נהר הנהר**

²⁷ Cf. *SD* II.2379f.

²⁸ Pesh. is also struggling: /zavnēk(y)/ ‘your [fs] time,’ perhaps reading a form of **מועד**.

²⁹ A shorter, poetic equivalent, **מני**, does not occur in XII nor in Ez.

³⁰ On the basis of this instance we have suggested in *Index* 85a s.v. *ὄμαλισμός* “*1) $\sqrt{\text{yδ}}$ [1: Mi 7.12].”

Kutscher (1974.222) maintains that the scribe of 1QIsa^a, by writing **יאושר**, was possibly thinking of the verb **אשר** ‘to go,’ but in this verse God is speaking in the first person. A scribal error for **אישור** is more reasonable, unnecessarily retaining the *waw* in his *Vorlage*. Also important to note is that 1QIsa^a reads **הררים**.

is supposed to mean is as mysterious. Is a day of flooding and disarray in a battlefield meant?

- 7.13) και ἔσται ἡ γῆ εἰς ἀφανισμόν σὺν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτὴν ἐκ καρπῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτῶν.

And the land will become a ruin along with its inhabitants because of the fruits of their (mal)practices.

וְהָיְתָה הָאָרֶץ לְשִׂמְמָה עַל־שִׁשְׁבֵי־הָיָה מַפְרִי מְעַלְלֵיהֶם:

τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτὴν] Not .. αὐτῆς, on which see above at 6.16, p. 256.

ἐκ] Causal, *GELS* s.v. 6.

- 7.14) Ποίμαινε λαόν σου ἐν ράβδῳ σου, πρόβατα κληρονομίας σου, κατασκηνοῦντας καθ’ ἑαυτοὺς δρυμὸν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Καρμηλῶ· νεμήσονται τὴν Βασανίτιν καὶ τὴν Γαλααδίτιν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος.

Tend My people with your staff, sheep of your inheritance, inhabiting by themselves in a thicket in Carmel. They shall live in Bashan and Gilead as in the olden days.

רָעָה עֲמָךְ בְּשִׁבְטְךָ צֹאן נַחֲלֹתְךָ שְׁכָנִי לְבָדֶד יַעַר בְּתוֹךְ כְּרָמְלָה יִרְעוּ בְּשָׁן וְגִלְעָד
כִּימֵי עוֹלָם:

πρόβατα κληρονομίας σου ἠτάλην] The genitive as well as the st. cst. can be either appositive or partitive: “sheep which are your inheritance” or “sheep as part of your inheritance.”³¹

κατασκηνοῦντας καθ’ ἑαυτοὺς ἠτάλην] The selection of the masc. gender is because of the metaphor of people as sheep. Its pl. form may be a harmonisation with πρόβατα, but שכני may have been read as שכני instead of the archaic sg. form with a paragogic yod (JM § 93 n).³² In either case the first member is in the st. cst., and such can be governed by a non-substantival or adverbial adjunct, e.g. “שְׁבִי בְּאֶרֶץ צִלְמוֹת” ‘those who dwell in the land of utmost darkness’ Is 9.1; see further JM § 129 m - o.

καθ’ ἑαυτοῦς] With acc., κατά “indicates, esp. with a refl. pron., separation, dissociation or seclusion” (*GELS* s.v. II 9). See also παρέθηκαν αὐτῷ μόνῳ καὶ αὐτοῖς καθ’ ἑαυτοῦς καὶ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις τοῖς συνδειπνοῦσιν μετ’ αὐτοῦ καθ’ ἑαυτοῦς ‘they set (foods) to him alone and to them apart and to the Egyptians .. apart’ Ge 43.32.

³¹ See *SSG* § 22 v (iii) and (x), *JM* § 129 f 8), *SQH* § 21 b (iii) and (viii).

³² The punctuation in “Shepherd .. the shepherd of your possession, tenting alone in a forest” (*NETS*) can be misleading. Is the shepherd tenting alone? If not, are your sheep (pl.) kept in a tent?

δρυσὸν עַץ] The acc., followed by ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Καρμήλου, is not necessarily a Hebraism. A synonymous verb, κατοικέω often governs an acc. of place, as in κατοικοῦσα καλῶς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς 1.11, cf. *GELS* s.v. κατοικέω **1 c**. See also the immediately following νεμήσονται τὴν Βασανίτιν.

νεμήσονται] The verb in the middle voice means “to live in the open which provides grass and water” (*GELS* s.v. **II 1**) with animals as its subjects. Note an instance in the active voice: νεμήσει αὐτοὺς κύριος ὡς ἀμνὸν ἐν εὐρυχώρῳ ‘the Lord will tend them like sheep in a wide open area’ Ho 4.16.

καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος עֲלֵי עוֹלָמְךָ] Exactly as in Am 9.11. Strictly speaking, the use of the nominative here is ungrammatical, cf. κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ αἰῶνος Si 50.23.³³ See the beginning of vs. 15 and κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἔμπροσθεν vs. 20.

τοῦ Καρμήλου כַּרְמֶל] 𐤀 takes the Heb. word as a place name, not a substantive in the sense of ‘garden-land.’ So Am 1.2, 9.3. Especially important is כַּרְמֶל וְכָשֶׁף ἢ Βασανίτις καὶ ὁ Κάρμηλος Na 1.4, where also the word is anarthrous in 𐤀 and coordinate with another place-name.

7.15) καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐξοδίας σου ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ὄψεσθε θαυμαστά.

And you will see wonders comparable to those in the days of your exit out of Egypt.

כִּימֵי צֵאתְךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם אֲרָאֶנּוּ נִפְלְאוֹת:

ἐξοδίας] The same event is also called ἔξοδος, e.g. Ex 19.1, Nu 33.38 +.

ὄψεσθε] = וַרְאֵה. Is our translator of the view that the speaker here is still, as earlier in vss. 7-9, Jerusalem? Then the shift from the sg. (σου) to the pl. (ὄψεσθε) is not quite right. But for the sake of fairness, 𐤀 is also problematic: why “I will show him (or: them = Israel),” and not 𐤀 אֲרָאֶךָ? Then God would be the speaker.³⁴

7.16) ὄψονται ἔθνη καὶ καταισχυνθήσονται ἐκ πάσης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτῶν, ἐπιθήσουσι χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν, τὰ ὄτα αὐτῶν ἀποκωφωθήσονται.

³³ For more examples of <καθὼς + nom.>, see *GELS* s.v. **1**.

³⁴ Whilst Vulg. = 𐤀, Pesh. ‘as in the day on which they went out of the land of Egypt, I shall show them wonders’ and Trg. ‘as in the day of your (pl.) exit from the land of Egypt I shall show them wonders’ are struggling. Some Greek manuscripts read δεῖξω αὐτοῖς.

Some modern scholars (Wellhausen 1898.150, Wolff 189) propose emending the last word to וַרְאֵנּוּ ‘show us’ (Impv.), but we fail to see how that helps. Wolff almost says that the MT gives an impression as if “צאתך den Auszug des Volkes meint und nicht den Jahres.” MT cannot mean anything other than that; otherwise we would expect וַרְאֵנּוּ אֶתְךָ. We cannot make a head or tail of a short remark by Ehrlich (1912.291): “Statt אֲרָאֶנּוּ lies וַרְאֵנּוּ, vulgäre Aussprache für וַרְאֵה.”

Nations will see (it) and feel ashamed because of all their power, they will put their hands on their mouth, their ears will be deafened.

יִרְאוּ גוֹיִם וַיְבִשׁוּ מִכָּל גְּבוּרָתָם וַיְשִׂימוּ יָד עַל־פִּה אֲזוּיָהֶם תִּחְרָרְשָׁנָה:

ἐκ πάσης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτῶν] In terms of the sheer military strength they had no rivals.

χεῖρας ַד] Apparently in order to stress their complete astonishment and inability verbally to react ־ uses the pl., whereas the use of the sg. is idiomatic in ־.³⁵ This contrasts with אֲזוּיָהֶם. The selection of the dual in this case makes sense. Cf. χεῖρα θήσω ἐπὶ στόματί μου לְמוֹתַי לְמוֹתַי Jb 40.4.

ἀποκοφωθήσονται] A verb unknown prior to SG. What ־ wants to say is probably that heathens put their fingers into their ears, not being able to stand triumphant shouts of Israelites.

7.17) λείξουσι χοῦν ὡς ὄφεις σύροντες γῆν, συγχυθήσονται ἐν συγκλεισμοῦ αὐτῶν· ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ θεῶ ἡμῶν ἔκστησονται καὶ φοβηθήσονται ἀπὸ σοῦ.

They will lick dust like snake(s), crawling over the earth, they will be dazed in their confinement. They will be astounded by the Lord our God and will fear you.

יִלְחֲכוּ עָפָר כְּנֶחֱשׁ כְּזֹחֲלֵי אֶרֶץ יִרְגְּזוּ מִמַּסְגָּרְתֵיהֶם אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִפְתְּדוּ וַיִּרְאוּ מִמֶּךָ:

σύροντες לְזֹחֲלֵי] As shown by the preposition *kaf*, the pl. participle must be referring to crawling animals, and the verb ־ never takes a human as its subject. Heathens were now downgraded to such a miserable, pitiable status, as declared by God to the first snake: “Accursed are you more than any cattle and any animal on the earth. You shall walk on your belly and dust you shall eat all your life” Ge 3.14. However, the definite article in ־ is not meant to be a reference to the serpent in Ge 3, but in metaphors introduced with the preposition ־ the article is idiomatically used, see JM § 137 *i*.

συγχυθήσονται יִרְגְּזוּ] The respective primary meaning of συγχέω ‘to mix together’ and יִרְגַּז ‘to tremble’ have little to do with each other. Here the inner, psychic disarray and loss of control that expresses itself in trembling body is in focus. Twice more in XII we note this same equivalence: συγχυθήτωσαν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν הַשָּׁבִי הָאֶרֶץ JI 2.1, and in πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν συγχυθήσεται ἡ γῆ καὶ σεισθήσεται ὁ οὐρανός לְפָנָיו

³⁵ Peshitta ‘their hands’ is probably due to the plurality of the people involved. In Jb 40.4 it reads ‘my hand.’ The Trg. is Hebraic, as far as the number is concerned: “their hand .. their mouth.”

םשמי רעשו רצו רב רב ib. 10 the verb is parallel with σείω expressing physical shaking.³⁶

ἐν συγκαλεισμῷ [ממסגרתיהם] About heathens captured and locked up. Whilst the Heb. preposition used here expresses a cause of their state of minds, the Gk one refers to their physical confinement, a POW camp.

ἐκστήσονται καὶ φοβηθήσονται [ויפחדו ויראו] The two Heb. verbs are synonymous, but not their Gk renderings. Note καὶ ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ Ho 3.5, where the subjects are Israelites and the occasion for their consternation also differs – ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτοῦ.

ἀπὸ σοῦ [מִמֶּךָ] Since א retains ה's אֱלֹהֵינוּ הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ the pronoun cannot refer to God, but only to Israel.

7.18) τίς θεὸς ὥσπερ σύ; ἐξαίρων ἀδικίας καὶ ὑπερβαίνων ἀσεβείας τοῖς καταλοιποῖς τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ συνέσχεν εἰς μαρτύριον ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι θελητῆς ἐλέους ἐστίν.

Who is god like You, removing injustices and passing over ungodly acts for the remnants of His inheritance, and has not retained His anger for evidence, because He is desirous of mercy?

מִי־אֵל כְּמוֹךָ נִשְׂא עוֹן וְעָבַר עַל־פְּשָׁע לֹא־יְחַיֶּיךָ לְעַד אֲפֹ
כִי־פָנַי צַדִּיק הוּא:

τίς θεὸς [מִי־אֵל] The interrogative pronoun in Gk and Heb. alike, when followed by a substantive, could be analysed as adjectival.³⁷

ἀδικίας .. ἀσεβείας [עוֹן .. פְּשָׁע] It looks more natural to parse the Gk nouns as pl. acc. rather than sg. gen.³⁸

ὑπερβαίνων] The sense required here, ‘to pass over, overlook intentionally,’ is unknown prior to SG.

εἰς μαρτύριον] = לְעַד.

The segmentation of the verse in א is complicated. The question mark added after σύ leaves the following two participial clauses syntactically hanging loose. By adding καὶ א adds another perspective witnessing the uniqueness of the God of Israel.³⁹ This ambiguity is because the initial question is virtually rhetorical, as captured by Pesh. and Trg., both of which render the interrogative with a negator, ‘there is not’: /layt/ and לֵי.

θελητῆς] Almost adjectival, just as א צַדִּיק here.⁴⁰

³⁶ Cf. γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης συνήλθεν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ συνεχύθη, ὅτι ἤκουον εἷς ἕκαστος τῆ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ λαλοῦντων αὐτῶν Acts 2.6.

³⁷ BDB admits the attributive use of מִי s.v. I a a. We wonder whether or not such an analysis can be extended to מִי. Cf. GELS s.v. τίς V. Cf. SD “Welcher Gott ist wie du.”

³⁸ Cf. SD “Vergehen .. und Gottlosigkeit.”

³⁹ SD begins with an interrogative “Welcher,” but without a question mark at the end.

⁴⁰ For an analysis of substantives in SG ending with τῆς or τῆς, see Muraoka 2005.66f.

- 7.19) ἐπιστρέψει καὶ οἰκτιρήσει ἡμᾶς, καταδύσει τὰς ἀδικίας ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπορρίψει εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θαλάσσης πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν.

He will change His mind and show mercy on us, take our injustices and casting all our sins into the depths of the sea.

יָשׁוּב יִרְחֶמְנוּ יִכְבֹּשׂ עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ וְתִשְׁלֵךְ בְּמַצְלוֹת יָם כָּל־טִטְאוֹתֵם:

ἐπιστρέψει καὶ [יָשׁוּב] The verb ἐπιστρέφω joined with καὶ to another verb underlines “a change of heart or course of action” (GELS s.v. **4 a**). The same construction indicates repetition of an action at Ho 14.8, q.v.

καταδύσει [כָּבֹשׁ] An equivalent attested nowhere in LXX. The Heb. verb has little to do with movement downwards, but ‘to subdue.’ καταδύω, however, harmonises well with ἀπορρίπτω.

ἀπορρίψει [תִּשְׁלֵךְ] In 𐤇 with the verb in the second person⁴¹ the prophet’s oracular statement is shifting to a personal prayer, for which “our sins” is more fitting.

- 7.20) δώσεις ἀλήθειαν τῷ Ιακωβ, ἔλεος τῷ Ἀβρααμ, καθότι ὄμοσας τοῖς πατέραςιν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἔμπροσθεν.

You will grant truthfulness to Jacob, mercy to Abraham, as You swore to our forefathers as on the former days.

תַּתֵּן אֱמֶת לְיַעֲקֹב חֶסֶד לְאַבְרָהָם אַשֶׁר־נִשְׁבַּעְתָּ לְאַבְתֵּינוּ מִיַּמֵּי קֶדֶם:

δώσεις [תַּתֵּן] 𐤇 continues the speaker’s personal prayer, which now 𐤄 joins in.

ἀλήθειαν [אֱמֶת] Faithfulness as regards pledges and promises made rather than truth as against falsehood.

καθότι] = כִּי־אֲשֶׁר.

⁴¹ Cf. Trg. יִרְמֵי, Vulg. *proiciet*, and Pesh. /nešdē/.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABEL, F.M. ³1967. *Géographie de la Palestine*. Paris.
- ANDERSEN, F.I. and D.N. FREEDMAN. 1980. *Hosea* [The Anchor Bible 24]. Garden City.
- BA = *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Traduction et annotation des livres de la Septante sous la direction de M. HARL, G. DORIVAL et O. MUNNICH assistés de C. DOGNIEZ. Paris, 1986-.
- BABUT, J.-M. 1995. *Les expressions idiomatiques de l'hébreu biblique. Signification et traduction. Un essai d'analyse componentielle*. Paris.
- BARRÉ, M.L. 1995. "Hearts, beds, and repentance in Psalm 4, 5 and Hosea 7, 14," *Bibl.* 76.53-62.
- BARTHÉLEMY, D. 1963. *Les devanciers d'Aquila*. Leiden.
- 1992. *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. Tome 3: *Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*. Fribourg / Göttingen.
- BDAG = BAUER, W., W. ARNDT, F.W. GINGRICH and F.W. DANKER. ²1979. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago • London.
- BDB = BROWN, F., S.R. DRIVER and CH.A. BRIGGS. 1907. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford.
- BDF. See below under BLASS, DEBRUNNER and FUNK.
- BEN-ḤAYYIM, Z. 2000. *A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew Based on the Recitation of the Law in Comparison with the Tiberian and Other Jewish Traditions*. Jerusalem • Winona Lake, IN.
- BEN YEHUDAH, E. 1958-59. *מלון הלשון העברית הישנה והחדשה (A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew)*, 8 vols. New York • London • Jerusalem.
- BH = Biblical Hebrew.
- BHQ = *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*. [The minor prophets as edited by A. GELSTON].
- BHS = *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. [The minor prophets as edited by K. ELLIGER].
- BLASS, F., A. DEBRUNNER and R.W. FUNK. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago • London.
- BONS, E. 2001. "La signification de ἄρκος ἄπορουμένη en LXX Osée xiii 8," *VT* 51.1-8.
- BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ, A. 1879-82. *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, 4 vols. Paris.
- BRENTON, L.C.L. 1851. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. London.
- BROCKELMANN, C. 1956. *Hebräische Syntax*. Neukirchen.
- BROWN, F., S.R. DRIVER and Ch.A. BRIGGS. 1907. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford.
- CAIRD, G.B. 1969. "Towards a lexicon of the Septuagint. II," *JThSt* 20.21-40.
- CALLAHAM, S.N. 2010. *Modality and the Biblical Hebrew Infinitive Absolute* [Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 71]. Wiesbaden.
- CARMIGNAC, J. 1955. "Précisions apportées au vocabulaire de l'hébreu biblique par la guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres," *VT* 5.345-65.
- CG = Classical Greek.
- CHANTRAINE, P. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.

- . 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris.
CLINES = DCH.
- COHEN, A. 1948. *The Soncino Books of the Bible*. London.
- COHEN, D. 1970-. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques*. Paris • Leuven.
- COOTE, R.B. 1974. "Hos 14:8: 'They who are filled with grain shall live'," *JBL* 93.161-73.
- DANIEL, S. 1966. *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la septante*. Paris.
DCH = CLINES, D.J.A. (ed.), 1993-2016. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 9 vols. Sheffield.
- DEL OLMO LETE, G. and J. SANMARTÍN. 1996-2000. *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica*, 2 vols. Barcelona.
DJD = *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, 40 vols. Oxford.
DJD 8 = TOV, E. et al. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* [Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 8]. Oxford.
- DINGERMAN, F. 1948. "Massora-Septuaginta der kleinen Propheten," diss. Würzburg.
- DOGNIEZ, C. 2002. "The Greek renderings of Hebrew idiomatic expressions and their treatment in the Septuagint lexica," *JNWSL* 28.1-17.
- DOLD, A. 1940. *Neue St. Galler vorhieronymianische Propheten-Fragmente der St. Galler Sammelhandschrift 1398b zugehörig* [Texte und Arbeiten, I. 31]. Beuron.
- DORIVAL, G., M. HARL and O. MUNNICH. 1988. *La Bible grecque des Septante: du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*. Paris.
- DOS SANTOS, E.C. 1973. *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint*. Jerusalem.
- DRIVER, G.R. 1931. "Studies in the vocabulary of the Old Testament. IV," *JThSt* 33.38-47.
- . 1933. "Studies in the vocabulary of the Old Testament. VI," *JThSt* 34.375-85.
- . 1954. "Problems and solutions," *VT* 4.225-45.
- . 1965. Rev. of M. DAHOOD, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (1963) in *JSS* 10.112-17.
- DRIVER, S.R. 31892. *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and some other Syntactical Questions*. Oxford.
- . 21913. *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford.
- EHRlich, A.B. 1912. *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*. Vol. 5. Leipzig.
- EHRlich, C.S. 1985. "The text of Hosea 1:9," *JBL* 104.13-19.
- EHRMAN, A. 1959. "A note on ׀ׁ in Mic. 6:14," *JNES* 59.156.
- ELLIGER, K. and W. RUDOLPH (eds). 1967-77. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart.
- FIELD, F. 1875. *Origenis Hexapla*, 2 vols. Oxford.
- FITZMYER, J.A. 1956. "י as a preposition and a particle in Micah 5,1 (5,2)," *CBQ* 18.10-13.
- FRANKEL, Z. 1831. *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*. Leipzig.
- FULLER, R.E. 1991. "A critical note on Hosea 12:10 and 13:4," *RB* 98.343-57.
⊕ = the text of the Septuagint as in Ziegler.
- GEHMAN, H.S. 1972. "Ἐπισκέπτομαι, ἐπισκέψις, ἐπίσκοπος, and ἐπισκοπή in the Septuagint in relation to ׀ׁ and other Hebrew roots – a case of semantic development similar to that of Hebrew," *VT* 22.197-207.
- GELS [= *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*] 1993, 2002a, 2009. See below under MURAOKA.

- GELSTON, A. 2010. *תרי עשר The Twelve Minor Prophets* prepared for *BHQ* Stuttgart.
GK = GESENIUS, W., E. KAUTZSCH and A.E. COWLEY. 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Oxford.
- Ⲙ = the text of the Hebrew Bible as in *BHQ*.
- HALOT = KOHLER, L. and W. BAUMGARTNER. 1994-2000. *The Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 5 vols., translated from the German ed. (1967-76) and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. RICHARDSON. Leiden • New York • Köln.
- HARL, M. 1992. *La langue de Japhet*. Paris.
—. 1993. "La «Bible d'Alexandrie» et les études sur la Septante. Réflexions sur une première expérience," *VC* 47.313-40.
- HARPER, W.R. 1905. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea*. Edinburgh.
- HATCH, E. and H.A. REDPATH. ²1998. *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids, MI.
- HELBING, R. 1907. *Grammatik der Septuaginta: Laut und Worthebre*. Göttingen.
—. 1928. *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta. Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der Κοινή*. Göttingen.
- HORSLEY, G.H.R. 1981. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity. A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1976*. Sydney.
- Index* = see below at MURAOKA 2010.
- JASTROW, M. 1903. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli etc.* New York.
- JENNI, E. 1968. *Das hebräische Pi'el: Syntaktisch-semasiologische Untersuchung einer Verbalform im Alten Testament*. Zürich.
—. 1992. *Die hebräischen Präpositionen*. Bd. I: *Die Präposition Beth*. Stuttgart • Berlin • Köln.
- JM = see below under JOÜON and MURAOKA 2009.
- JOHANNESSEN, M. 1910. "Der Gebrauch der Kasus und der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta," diss. Berlin.
—. 1926. *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta*. Berlin.
- JOOSTEN, J. 2002. *La Bible d'Alexandrie. Les douze prophètes: Osée*. Paris.
- JOÜON, P. and T. MURAOKA. ²2009. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* [*Subsidia Biblica* 27]. Rome.
- KADDARI, M.Z. 2006. *מילון העברית המקראית*. Ramat-Gan.
- KAMINKA, A. 1928. *Studien zur Septuaginta an der Hand der zwölf kleinen Prophetenbücher*. Frankfurt a. M.
- KAUPEL, H. 1935-36. "'Sirenen' in der Septuaginta," *BZ* 23.158-65.
- KBS = KÖHLER, L., W. BAUMGARTNER and J.J. STAMM. 1967-96. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*. Leiden.
- KEIL, C.F. 1866. *Biblischer Commentar über die zwölf kleinen Propheten*. Leipzig. Quoted from Martin's English translation, see below.
—. 1975. Tr. of the above by J. MARTIN as *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*. Vol. X. Grand Rapids, MI.
—. 1872. *Biblischer Commentar über den Propheten Jeremiah und die Klagelieder*. Leipzig.
—. 1988. Tr. of the above by D. PATRICK as *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*. Vol. VIII. Grand Rapids, MI.
- KÖNIG, F.E. 1881-97. *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*. III 2. Leipzig.
- KOUWENBERG, N.J.C. 1997. "Gemination in the Akkadian Verb." Diss. Leiden Univ.

- KÜHNER, R. and B. GERTH. ³1898. *Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, 2 vols. Hannover • Leipzig.
- KUTSCHER, E.Y. 1974. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (I Q Isa^a)*. Leiden.
- LAMPE, G.W.H. 1961-68. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. 5 fascicles. Oxford.
- LEE, J.A.L. 1985. "Some features of the speech of Jesus in Mark's Gospel," *NT* 27.1-26.
- LEMOIGNE, PH. 1999. "βασιλεύω transitif: du corpus au système, et réciproquement," *Cahiers de Biblia Patristica* 6.177-243.
- LESCOW, TH. 1966. *Micha 6, 6-8. Studien zu Sprache, Form und Auslegung* [Arbeiten zur Theologie I 25]. Stuttgart.
- LIPSCHITZ, A. 1988. *Ibn Ezra: Commentary on Hosea*. New York.
- LOUW, J.P. and E. NIDA. 1988. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, 2 vols. New York.
- LUST, J., E. EYNIKEL and K. HAUSPIE. 2003. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart.
- LXX = Septuagint.
- MACINTOSH, A.A. 1997. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea* [ICC]. Edinburgh.
- MAYSER, E. 1934. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* etc. Band II 2. Berlin • Leipzig.
- MCKANE, W. 1986. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*. Vol. I. Edinburgh.
- . 1998. *Micah: Introduction and Commentary*. Edinburgh.
- MM = MOULTON, J.H. and G. MILLIGAN. 1930. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. London.
- MOMMSEN, T. 1895. *Beiträge zur Lehre von der griechischen Präpositionen*. Berlin.
- MOULTON, J.H. and W.F. HOWARD. 1919-29. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. II. *Accidence and Word-Formation with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament*. Edinburgh.
- MURAOKA, T. 1964. "The use of ὡς in the Greek Bible," *NT* 8.51-72.
- . 1970. "Is the Septuagint Amos viii 12-ix 10 a separate unit?," *VT* 20.496-500.
- . 1973. "Literary device in the Septuagint," *Textus* 8.20-30.
- . 1979. "ערות על תרגום השבעים לספר הושע" [Remarks on the Septuagint Book of Hosea], in Ch. Rabin et al. (eds), *Studies in the Bible and the Hebrew Language* [Fschr. M. Wallenstein], pp. 180-87. Jerusalem.
- . 1982-83. "The Greek texts of Samuel - Kings: Incomplete translations or recensional activity?," *Abr-Nahrain* 21.28-49.
- . 1983. "Hosea IV in the Septuagint Version," *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 9.24-64.
- . 1985. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem • Leiden.
- . 1986. "Hosea V in the Septuagint Version," *Abr-Nahrain* 24.120-38.
- . 1991. "Hebrew hapax legomena and Septuagint lexicography," in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leuven 1989* [Septuagint and Cognate Studies 31], pp. 205-22. Atlanta, GA.
- . 1993. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)*. Leuven.
- . 1995. "Hosea III in the Septuagint version," in J. DAVIES, G. HARVEY and W.G.E. WATSON (eds), *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed. Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer*, pp. 242-52. Sheffield.

- . 2002. “Introduction aux douze petits prophètes,” in *La Bible d’Alexandrie*, 23.1, *Les douze prophètes: Osée*, pp. I-XXIII. Paris.
- . 2002a. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets*. Leuven.
- . 2005. “Apports de la LXX dans notre compréhension de l’hébreu et du grec, et de leur vocabulaire,” in J. JOOSTEN and PH. LE MOIGNE (eds), *L’apport de la Septante aux études sur l’Antiquité: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg 8-9 novembre 2002*, pp. 57-68. Paris.
- . 2008. “Septuagint lexicography and Hebrew etymology,” in A. VOITILA and J. JOKIRANTA (eds), *Scripture in Transition* [Fschr. R. Sollamo], pp. 463-69. Leiden • Boston.
- . 2008a. “Hosea 6 in the Septuagint,” in H. AUSLOOS, B. LEMMELIJN and M. VERVENNE (eds), *Florilegium lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, pp. 335-49. Leuven.
- . 2009. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven. [= GELS].
- . 2010. *A Greek ≈ Hebrew / Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint*. Leuven.
- . 2012. “Luke and the Septuagint,” *NT* 54.13-15.
- . 2014. “Women labouring,” in K. DE TROYER et al. (eds), *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes* [Fschr. A. Aejmelaeus], pp. 65-78. Leuven.
- . 2015. “Nathan’s ominous and tragic prophecy becoming a reality: 2Samuel 13:23-39,” in T.D. FINLAY and W. YARCHIN (eds), *The Genre of Biblical Commentary: Essays in Honor of John E. Hartley on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday*, pp. 166-83. Eugene, OR.
- . 2016. *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven.
- . 2019. “How did our translator of the Greek Minor Prophets cope with multiple synonyms?,” in C. DOGNIEZ and Ph. LE MOIGNE (eds), *Les Douze Prophètes dans la LXX. Protocoles et procédures dans la traduction grecque: stylistique, poétique et histoire* [Vetus Testamentum Supplement 184], pp. 88-95. Leiden • Boston.
- . 2020. *A Syntax of Qumran Hebrew*. Leuven.
- . ²2020a. *A Biblical Aramaic Reader with an Outline Grammar*. Leuven.
- . 2020b. *Why Read the Bible in the Original Languages?* Leuven.
- NEEF, H.-D. 1986. “Der Septuaginta-Text und der Masoreten-Text des Hoseabuches im Vergleich,” *Bib.* 67.195-220.
- NETS = *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York • Oxford, 2007.
- NH ⇒ *DJD* 8 above.
- NITZAN, B. 1986. *Peshar Habakkuk. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea (1QpHab)*. [Heb]. Jerusalem.
- NÖLDEKE, TH. 1910. *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Strassburg.
- NYBERG, H.S. 1935. *Studien zum Hoseabuche, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Klärung des Problems der alttestamentlichen Textkritik*. Uppsala.
- OLYAN, S.M. 1992. “«In the Sight of Her Lovers»: On the interpretation of *nablūt* in Hos 2.12,” *BZ* 36.255-61.
- Pesh. = Peshitta, quoted from A. GELSTON (ed.), *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version* III 4. Leiden, 1980.
- PG = MIGNE, J.P. (ed.). 1857-66. *Patrologia graeca*. Paris.
- PL = MIGNE, J.P. (ed.). 1841-55. *Patrologia latina*. Paris.
- PUSEY, PH.E. 1868. *The Minor Prophets: A Commentary*, 2 vols. Oxford.
- QIMRON, E. 2019. *A Grammar of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Jerusalem.
- . ²2020. מגילות מדבר יהודה: החיבורים העבריים, vol. 2. Jerusalem.
- Ra = RAHLFS, A. (ed.). 1935. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart.

- REIDER, J., completed and revised by TURNER, N. 1966. *An Index to Aquila*. Leiden.
- SCHENKEL, J.D. 1968. *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*. Cambridge, MA.
- SCHLEUSNER, J.F. 1820-21. *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos veteris testamenti*, 5 vols. Leipzig.
- SCHREINER, J. 1957. *Septuaginta - Massora des Buches der Richter. Eine textkritische Studie*. Roma.
- SCHWYZER, E. ³1950-53. *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*, 3 vols. München.
- SD = *Septuaginta Deutsch*, Stuttgart, 2009.
- SD II = *Erläuterungen und Kommentare II Psalmen bis Daniel*, Stuttgart, 2011.
- SG = Septuagint Greek.
- SEGAL, M.Z. ²1958. ספר בן סירה השלם. Jerusalem.
- SI = Italian Septuagint. *La Biblia dei LXX*. Roma, 1999.
- SIMON, U. 1989. *Abraham Ibn Ezra's Two Commentaries on the Minor Prophets. An Annotated Critical Edition*. Vol. 1. [Heb]. Ramat Gan.
- SOISALON-SOININEN, I. 1965. *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*. Helsinki.
- . 1973. "Der Gebrauch des *genetivus absolutus* in der Septuaginta," in *The Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies IV*, pp. 131-36. Now in SOISALON-SOININEN, I., *Studien zur Septuaginta-syntax* (Helsinki, 1987), pp. 175-80.
- SOKOLOFF, M. 2009. *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum*. Winona Lake, IN • Piscataway, NJ.
- . 2014. *A Dictionary of Christian Palestinian Aramaic*. Leuven.
- SOLLAMO, R. 1979. *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*. Helsinki.
- SPICQ, C. 1991. *Lexique théologique du Nouveau Testament*. Fribourg (Suisse) • Paris.
- SQH = see above at MURAOKA 2020, *A Syntax of Qumran Hebrew*.
- SS = Spanish Septuagint. *La Biblia Griega: Septuaginta*. Salamanca, 2008.
- SSG = see above at MURAOKA 2016, *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*.
- STREANE, A.W. 1896. *The Double Text of Jeremiah (Massoretic and Alexandrian Compared)*. Cambridge.
- SWETE, H.B. (ed.). ⁴1909-12. *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, 3 vols. Cambridge.
- SWINN, S.P. 1990. "ἀγαπᾶν in the Septuagint," in T. MURAOKA (ed.), *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*, pp. 49-82. Atlanta, GA.
- Syh. = Syrohexapla.
- TAL, A. 2000. *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic*, 2 vols. Leiden.
- THACKERAY, H.ST.J. 1903. "The Greek translators of the prophetic books," *JThSt* 4.578-85.
- . 1909. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Vol. I: *Introduction, Orthography, and Accidence*. Cambridge.
- . ²1923. *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*. London.
- THUMB, A. 1901. *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*. Strassburg.
- TOV, E. 1990. "Renderings of combinations of the infinitive absolute and finite verbs in the Septuagint - Their nature and distribution," in D. FRAENKEL, U. QUAST, and J.W. WEVERS (eds), *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*, pp. 64-73. Göttingen.

- . 1990a. "Greek words and Hebrew meanings," in T. MURAOKA (ed.), *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*, pp. 83-126. Atlanta, GA.
- TRENCH, R.C. *Synonyms of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1953 [= repr. of (London, 1880)]).
- Trg. = Targum, quoted from A. SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic III* [= Targum Jonathan]. Leiden, 1962.
- TUR-SINAI, N.H. 1972. ספר איוב. Jerusalem.
- TURNER, N. 1963. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 3: *Syntax*. Edinburgh.
- TURNER, P.D.M. 1977. "ANOIKOΔOMEIN and intra-septuagintal borrowing," *VT* 27.492-93.
- VOLLERS, K. 1883-84. "Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner. 1. Teil," *ZAW* 3.219-72; *ZAW* 4.1-20.
- Vulg. = Vulgate.
- WALTERS, Peter. 1973. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation* [as ed. by D.W. GOODING]. Cambridge.
- WEITZMAN, M.P. 1989. Rev. of A. GELSTON, *The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets* (Oxford, 1987) in *JThSt* 40.162-65.
- WELLHAUSEN, J. 1898. *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt*. Berlin.
- WEVERS, J.W. 1990. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* [Septuagint and Cognate Studies 30]. Atlanta, GA.
- . 1993. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* [Septuagint and Cognate Studies 35]. Atlanta, GA.
- . 1998. *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* [Septuagint and Cognate Studies 46]. Atlanta, GA.
- WILLIS, J.T. 1968. Rev. of LESCOW 1966 in *VT* 18.273-78.
- WOLFF, H.W. ²1965. *Das Dodekapropheton 1: Hosea* [BKAT 14/1]. Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- . 1982. *Dodekapropheton 4: Micha* [BKAT 14/4]. Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- YADIN, Y. 1965. *The Ben Sira Scroll from Massadah*. Jerusalem.
- ZIEGLER, J. 1943. "Beiträge zum griechischen Dodekapropheton," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Jahrgang 1943, Nr. 10*. Göttingen.
- . ²1967. *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum etc. XIII, Duodecim Prophetae*. Göttingen.
- . 1971. *Sylloge: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta*. Göttingen.
- ZIMMERLI, W. 1969. *Ezechiel*. Neukirchen-Vluyn.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- Bickel S., Schroer S., Schurte R., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Bilder als Quellen. Images as Sources. Studies on Ancient Near Eastern Artefacts and the Bible Inspired by the Work of Othmar Keel*, 2007, XLVI-560 p. + XXXIV pl.
- 25.1a Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band Ia: Der syrische Text der Edition in Estrangela. Faksimile des griechischen Papyrus Bodmer XI*, 1980, 64 p.
- 25.3 Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band III: Forschungsgeschichtliche Bibliographie 1799-1984 mit kritischen Anmerkungen. Mit einem Beitrag von Majella Franzmann: A Study of the Odes of Solomon with Reference to French Scholarship 1909-1980*, 1986, XXXIV-478 p.
- 25.4 Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band IV*, 1998, XII-272 p.
- 46 Hornung E., *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskub. Eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen. Dritte Auflage*, 1982, XII-133 p.
- 50.3 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*, 1992, CCXLII-1150 p.
- 50.4 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 4: Psaumes*, 2005, XLVIII-931 p.
- 50.5 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 5: Job, Proverbes, Qohélet et Cantique des Cantiques*, 2015, XXVIII-974 p.
- 55 Frei P., Koch K., *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich. Zweite, bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage*, 1996, 337 p.
- 61 Engel H., *Die Susanna-Erzählung. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Septuaginta-Text und zur Theodotion-Bearbeitung*, 1985, 205 p.
- 75 Schulman A.R., *Ceremonial Execution and Public Rewards. Some Historical Scenes on New Kingdom Private Stelae*, 1988, XXX-223 p. + 35 fig. + 6 pl.
- 77 Utschneider H., *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz. Studien zur Bedeutung der sinaitischen Heiligtumstexte (Ex 25-40; Lev 8-9)*, 1988, XIV-320 p.
- 78 Gosse B., *Isaïe 13,1-14,23 dans la tradition littéraire du livre d'Isaïe et dans la tradition des oracles contre les nations*, 1988, 300 p.
- 81 Beyerlin W., *Bleilot, Brecheisen oder was sonst? Revision einer Amos-Vision*, 1988, 61 p.
- 82 Hutter M., *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung. Das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspar aus mittelbithitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 - KUB IX 34 - KBo XXI 6)*, 1988, 180 p.
- 85 Otto E., *Rechtsgeschichte der Redaktionen im Kodex Ešnunna und im «Bundesbuch». Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche und rechtsvergleichende Studie zu altbabylonischen und altisraelitischen Rechtsüberlieferungen*, 1989, IV-209 p.
- 89 Abitz F., *Baugeschichte und Dekoration des Grabes Ramses' VI.*, 1989, 196 p.
- 90 Henninger J., *Arabica Varia. Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Arabiens und seiner Randgebiete. Contributions à l'histoire culturelle de l'Arabie et de ses régions limitrophes*, 1989, 498 p.
- 92 O'Brien M.A., *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis. A Reassessment*, 1989, XIV-319 p.
- 94 Cortese E., *Josua 13-21. Ein priesterschriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*, 1990, VI-122 p.

- 96 Wiese A.B., *Zum Bild des Königs auf ägyptischen Siegelamuletten*, 1990, XVI-207 p. + XXXII Taf.
- 98 Schart A., *Mose und Israel im Konflikt. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Wüsten-erzählungen*, 1990, VI-284 p.
- 100 Keel O., Shuval M., Uehlinger C., *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band III: Die Frühe Eisenzeit. Ein Workshop*, 1990, XIV-458 p. + XXII Taf.
- 103 Schenker A., *Text und Sinn im Alten Testament. Textgeschichtliche und bibeltheologische Studien*, 1991, VIII-302 p.
- 105 Osumi Y., *Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Bundesbuches Exodus 20,22b-23,33*, 1991, XII-273 p.
- 107 Staubli T., *Das Image der Nomaden im Alten Israel und in der Ikonographie seiner sesshaften Nachbarn*, 1991, XII-308 p. + 125 Abb.
- 109 Norton G.J., Pisano S. (eds), *Tradition of the Text. Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*, 1991, XII-310 p. + VII pl.
- 114 Schneider T., *Asiatische Personennamen in ägyptischen Quellen des Neuen Reiches*, 1992, XIV-482 p.
- 115 von Nordheim E., *Die Selbstbehauptung Israels in der Welt des Alten Orients. Religions-geschichtlicher Vergleich anhand von Gen 15/22/28, dem Aufenthalt Israels in Ägypten, 2 Sam 7, 1 Kön 19 und Psalm 104*, 1992, VI-220 p.
- 117 Richards F.V., *Scarab Seals from a Middle to Late Bronze Age Tomb at Pella in Jordan*, 1992, XII-138 p. + XIII pl.
- 118 Goldman Y., *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil. Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie*, 1992, XIV-259 p.
- 119 Krapf T.M., *Die Priesterschrift und die vorexilische Zeit. Yehezkel Kaufmanns vernach-lässigt Beitrag zur Geschichte der biblischen Religion*, 1992, XX-351 p.
- 123 Zwickel W. (ed.), *Biblische Welten. Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburts-tag*, 1993, XII-248 p. + VIII Taf.
- 125 Kass B., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals. Proceedings of a Symposium held in Fribourg on April 17-20, 1991*, 1993, XXIV-336 p.
- 126 Bartelmus R., Krüger T., Utzschneider H. (eds), *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte. Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag*, 1993, X-401 p.
- 127 Ivantchik A.I., *Les Cimmériens au Proche-Orient*, 1993, 325 p.
- 128 Voss J., *Die Menora. Gestalt und Funktion des Leuchters im Tempel zu Jerusalem*, 1993, 112 p.
- 131 Burkert W., Stolz F. (eds), *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich*, 1994, 123 p.
- 132 Mathys H.-P., *Dichter und Beter. Theologen aus spätalttestamentlicher Zeit*, 1994, X-374 p.
- 135 Keel O., *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band IV. Mit Registern zu den Bänden I-IV*, 1994, XII-325 p. + 23 Taf.
- 136 Stipp H.-J., *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches. Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte*, 1994, VIII-186 p.
- 137 Eschweiler P., *Bildzauber im alten Ägypten. Die Verwendung von Bildern und Gegen-ständen in magischen Handlungen nach den Texten des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches*, 1994, X-371 p. + XXXVI Taf.
- 143 Bieberstein K., *Josua - Jordan - Jericho. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Land-nahmeerzählungen Josua 1-6*, 1995, XII-483 p.
- 144 Maier C., *Die «fremde Frau» in Proverbien 1-9. Eine exegetische und sozialgeschichtliche Studie*, 1995, XII-296 p.

- 145 Steymans H.U., *Deuteronomium 28 und die «adè» zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons. Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel*, 1995, XII-425 p.
- 146 Abitz F., *Pharao als Gott in den Unterweltbüchern des Neuen Reiches*, 1995, VIII-219 p.
- 148 Bachmann M., *Die strukturalistische Artefakt- und Kunstanalyse. Exposition der Grundlagen anhand der vorderorientalischen, ägyptischen und griechischen Kunst*, 1996, 80 p.
- 150 Staehelin E., Jaeger B. (eds), *Ägypten-Bilder. Akten des «Symposiums zur Ägypten-Rezeption», Augst bei Basel, vom 9.-11. September 1993*, 1997, 383 p. + 96 Taf.
- 152 Rossier F., *L'intercession entre les hommes dans la Bible hébraïque. L'intercession entre les hommes aux origines de l'intercession auprès de Dieu*, 1996, XIV-380 p.
- 153 Kratz R.G., Krüger T. (eds), *Rezeption und Auslegung im Alten Testament und in seinem Umfeld. Ein Symposium aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstags von Odil Hannes Steck*, 1997, 139 p.
- 154 Bosshard-Nepustil E., *Rezeptionen von Jesaia 1-39 im Zwölfprophetenbuch. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Verbindung von Prophetenbüchern in babylonischer und persischer Zeit*, 1997, XIV-521 p.
- 156 Wagner A., *Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik*, 1997, VIII-199 p.
- 157 Artus O., *Études sur le livre des Nombres. Récit, Histoire et Loi en Nb 13,1-20,13*, 1997, X-298 p.
- 158 Böhler D., *Die heilige Stadt in Esdras Alpha und Esra-Nehemia. Zwei Konzeptionen der Wiederherstellung Israels*, 1997, XIV-435 p.
- 159 Oswald W., *Israel am Gottesberg. Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinaiperikope Ex 19-24 und deren historischem Hintergrund*, 1998, X-286 p.
- 160.5 Veenhof K.R., Eidem J., *Mesopotamia. The Old Assyrian Period. Annäherungen 5*, 2008, 382 p.
- 163 Bietenhard S.K., *Des Königs General. Die Heerführertraditionen in der vorstaatlichen und frühen staatlichen Zeit und die Joabgestalt in 2 Sam 2-20; 1 Kön 1-2*, 1998, XIV-363 p.
- 164 Braun J., *Die Musikkultur Altisraels/Palästinas. Studien zu archäologischen, schriftlichen und vergleichenden Quellen*, 1999, XII-388 p.
- 167 Bollweg J., *Vorderasiatische Wagentypen im Spiegel der Terracottaplastik bis zur Altbabylonischen Zeit*, 1999, X-206 p.
- 168 Rose M., *Rien de nouveau. Nouvelles approches du livre de Qohéleth. Avec une bibliographie (1988-1998) élaborée par Béatrice Perregaux Allison*, 1999, 629 p.
- 171 Macchi J.-D., *Israël et ses tribus selon Genèse 49*, 1999, XIV-380 p.
- 172 Schenker A., *Recht und Kult im Alten Testament. Achtzehn Studien*, 2000, X-208 p.
- 173 Theuer G., *Der Mondgott in den Religionen Syrien-Palästinas. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von KTU 1.24*, 2000, XVIII-657 p.
- 174 Spieser C., *Les noms du Pharaon comme êtres autonomes au Nouvel Empire*, 2000, XII-398 p.
- 176 de Pury A., Römer T. (eds), *Die sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids. Neue Einsichten und Anfragen*, 2000, VI-189 p.
- 177 Egger J., *Influences and Traditions Underlying the Vision of Daniel 7:2-14. The Research History from the End of the 19th Century to the Present*, 2000, VIII-143 p.
- 178 Keel O., Staub U., *Hellenismus und Judentum. Vier Studien zu Daniel 7 und zur Religionsnot unter Antiochus IV.*, 2000, XII-147 p.
- 179 Goldman Y., Uehlinger C. (eds), *La double transmission du texte biblique. Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, 2001, VI-114 p.
- 180 Zwingenberger U., *Dorfkultur der frühen Eisenzeit in Mittelpalästina*, 2001, XX-593 p.
- 181 Tita H., *Gelübde als Bekenntnis. Eine Studie zu den Gelübden im Alten Testament*, 2001, XVI-251 p.

- 182 Bosse-Griffiths K., *Amarna Studies and Other Selected Papers. Edited by J. Gwyn Griffiths*, 2001, IV-244 p.
- 183 Reinmuth T., *Der Bericht Nebemias. Zur literarischen Eigenart, traditionsgeschichtliche Prägung und innerbiblischen Rezeption des Ich-Berichts Nebemias*, 2002, XIV-383 p.
- 184 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel II*, 2002, XII-194 p.
- 185 Roth S., *Gebietlerin aller Länder. Die Rolle der königlichen Frauen in der fiktiven und realen Aussenpolitik des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches*, 2002, XII-168 p.
- 186 Hübner U., Knauf E.A. (eds), *Kein Land für sich allein. Studien zum Kulturkontakt in Kanaan, Israel/Palästina und Ebirnâri für Manfred Weippert zum 65. Geburtstag*, 2002, VIII-331 p.
- 187 Riede P., *Im Spiegel der Tiere. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mensch und Tier im alten Israel*, 2002, XII-364 p.
- 188 Schellenberg A., *Erkenntnis als Problem. Qohelet und die alttestamentliche Diskussion um das menschliche Erkennen*, 2002, XII-333 p.
- 189 Meurer G., *Die Feinde des Königs in den Pyramiden-texten*, 2002, X-404 p.
- 190 Maussion M., *Le mal, le bien et le jugement de Dieu dans le livre de Qohélet*, 2003, VIII-199 p.
- 192 Koenen K., *Bethel. Geschichte, Kult und Theologie*, 2003, X-251 p.
- 193 Junge F., *Die Lehre Prahhoteps und die Tugenden der ägyptischen Welt*, 2003, 286 p.
- 194 Lefebvre J.-F., *Le jubilé biblique. Lv 25 - exégèse et théologie*, 2003, XII-443 p.
- 195 Wettengel W., *Die Erzählung von den beiden Brüdern. Der Papyrus d'Orbiney und die Königsideologie der Ramessiden*, 2003, VI-301 p.
- 196 Vonach A., Fischer G. (eds), *Horizonte biblischer Texte. Festschrift für Josef M. Oesch zum 60. Geburtstag*, 2003, XII-316 p.
- 199 Schenker A., *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher*, 2004, XXII-197 p.
- 200 Keel-Leu H., Teissier B., *Die vorderasiatischen Rollsigel der Sammlungen «Bibel+Orient» der Universität Freiburg Schweiz. The Ancient Near Eastern Cylinder Seals of the Collections «Bibel+Orient» of the University of Fribourg*, 2004, XXII-472 p.
- 201 Alkier S., Witte M. (eds), *Die Griechen und das antike Israel. Interdisziplinäre Studien zur Religions- und Kulturgeschichte des Heiligen Landes*, 2004, X-199 p.
- 202 Sayed Mohamed Z., *Festvorbereitungen. Die administrativen und ökonomischen Grundlagen altägyptischer Feste*, 2004, XVI-185 p.
- 204 Cornelius I., *The Many Faces of the Goddess. The Iconography of the Syro-Palestinian Goddesses Anat, Astarte, Qadesh, and Asherah c. 1500-1000 BCE*, 2008, XVI-216 p. + 77 pl.
- 205 Morenz L.D., *Bild-Buchstaben und symbolische Zeichen. Die Herausbildung der Schrift in der hohen Kultur Altägyptens*, 2004, XXII-373 p.
- 206 Dietrich W. (ed.), *David und Saul im Widerstreit - Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit. Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuches*, 2004, 312 p.
- 207 Himbaza I., *Le Décalogue et l'histoire du texte. Études des formes textuelles du Décalogue et leurs implications dans l'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*, 2004, XIV-354 p.
- 208 Isler-Kerényi C., *Civilizing Violence Satyrs on 6th-Century Greek Vases*, 2004, XII-123 p.
- 209 Schipper B.U., *Die Erzählung des Wenamun. Ein Literaturwerk im Spannungsfeld von Politik, Geschichte und Religion*, 2005, XII-383 p. + XII Taf.
- 210 Suter C.E., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Crafts and Images in Contact. Studies on Eastern Mediterranean Art of the First Millennium BCE*, 2005, XXXII-395 p. + LIV pl.
- 211 Léonas A., *Recherches sur le langage de la Septante*, 2005, X-340 p.

- 212 Strawn B.A., *What is Stronger than a Lion? Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*, 2005, XXX-587 p.
- 214 Böhler D., Himbaza I., Hugo P. (eds), *L'Écrit et l'Esprit. Études d'histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, 2005, XXXII-472 p.
- 215 O'Connell S., *From Most Ancient Sources. The Nature and Text-Critical Use of the Greek Old Testament Text of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible*, 2006, XII-178 p.
- 216 Meyer-Dietrich E., *Senebi und Selbst. Personenkonstituenten zur rituellen Wiedergeburt in einem Frauensarg des Mittleren Reiches*, 2006, XII-438 p.
- 217 Hugo P., *Les deux visages d'Élie. Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17-18*, 2006, XXII-389 p.
- 218 Zawadzki S., *Garments of the Gods. Studies on the Textile Industry and the Pantheon of Sippar according to the Texts from the Ebabbar Archive*, 2006, XXIV-254 p.
- 219 Knigge C., *Das Lob der Schöpfung. Die Entwicklung ägyptischer Sonnen- und Schöpfungshymnen nach dem Neuen Reich*, 2006, XII-365 p.
- 220 Schroer S. (ed.), *Images and Gender. Contributions to the Hermeneutics of Reading Ancient Art*, 2006, 383 p. + 29 pl.
- 221 Stark C., *«Kultprostitution» im Alten Testament? Die Qedeschen der Hebräischen Bibel und das Motiv der Hurerei*, 2006, X-249 p.
- 222 Pruin D., *Geschichten und Geschichte. Isebel als literarische und historische Gestalt*, 2006, XII-398 p.
- 223 Coulange P., *Dieu, ami des pauvres. Étude sur la connivence entre le Très-Haut et les petits*, 2007, XVI-282 p.
- 224 Wagner A. (ed.), *Parallelismus membrorum*, 2007, VIII-300 p.
- 225 Herrmann C., *Formen für ägyptische Fayencen aus Qantir. Band II: Katalog der Sammlung des Franciscan Biblical Museum, Jerusalem und zweier Privatsammlungen*, 2007, X-125 p. + XXIX Taf.
- 226 Heise J., *Erinnern und Gedenken. Aspekte der biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit*, 2007, IV-385 p.
- 227 Frey-Anthes H., *Unheilsmächte und Schutzgenien, Antiwesen und Grenzgänger. Vorstellungen von «Dämonen» im alten Israel*, 2007, XIV-363 p.
- 228 Becking B., *From David to Gedaliah. The Book of Kings as Story and History*, 2007, XII-227 p.
- 229 Dubiel U., *Amulette, Siegel und Perlen. Studien zu Typologie und Tragsitte im Alten und Mittleren Reich*, 2008, XVI-270 p. + XVIII Taf.
- 230 Giovino M., *The Assyrian Sacred Tree. A History of Interpretations*, 2007, VIII-242 p. + 107 fig.
- 231 Kübel P., *Metamorphosen der Paradieserzählung*, 2007, X-238 p.
- 232 Paz S., *Drums, Women, and Goddesses. Drumming and Gender in Iron Age II Israel*, 2007, XII-143 p.
- 233 Himbaza I., Schenker A. (eds), *Un carrefour dans l'histoire de la Bible. Du texte à la théologie au IIe siècle avant J.-C.*, 2007, X-151 p.
- 234 Tavares R., *Eine königliche Weisheitslehre? Exegetische Analyse von Sprüche 28-29 und Vergleich mit den ägyptischen Lehren Merikaras und Amenemhats*, 2007, XIV-306 p.
- 235 Witte M., Diehl J.F. (eds), *Israeliten und Phönizier. Ihre Beziehungen im Spiegel der Archäologie und der Literatur des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt*, 2008, VIII-295 p.
- 236 Müller-Roth M., *Das Buch vom Tage*, 2008, XII-603 p. + XXIX Taf.
- 237 Sowada K.N., *Egypt in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Old Kingdom. An Archaeological Perspective*, 2009, XXIV-309 p. + 48 fig. + 19 pl.

- 238 Kraus W., Munnich O. (eds), *La Septante en Allemagne et en France. Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d'Alexandrie. Textes de la Septante à traduction double ou à traduction très littérale. Texte der Septuaginta in Doppelüberlieferung oder in wörtlicher Übersetzung*, 2009, XII-307 p.
- 239 Mittermayer C., *Enmerkara und der Herr von Arata. Ein ungleicher Wettstreit*, 2009, VIII-386 p. + XIX Taf.
- 240 Waraksa E.A., *Female Figurines from the Mut Precinct. Context and Ritual Function*, 2009, XII-246 p.
- 241 Ben-Shlomo D., *Philistine Iconography. A Wealth of Style and Symbolism*, 2010, X-232 p.
- 242 LeMon J.M., *Yahweh's Winged Form in the Psalms. Exploring Congruent Iconography and Texts*, 2010, XIV-231 p.
- 243 El Hawary A., *Wortschöpfung. Die Memphitische Theologie und die Siegesstele des Pije – zwei Zeugen kultureller Repräsentation in der 25. Dynastie*, 2010, XII-499 p. + XXIV pl.
- 244 Wälchli S.H., *Gottes Zorn in den Psalmen. Eine Studie zur Rede vom Zorn Gottes in den Psalmen im Kontext des Alten Testaments und des Alten Orients*, 2012, VIII-191 p.
- 245 Steymans H.U. (ed.), *Gilgamesch: Ikonographie eines Helden. Gilgamesch: Epic and Iconography*, 2010, XII-452 p.
- 246 Petter D.L., *The Book of Ezekiel and Mesopotamian City Laments*, 2011, XVI-198 p.
- 247 Fischer E., *Tell el-Far'ah (Süd). Ägyptisch-levantinische Beziehungen im späten 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 2011, X-430 p.
- 248 Petit T., *Edipe et le Chérubin. Les sphinx levantins, cypriotes et grecs comme gardiens d'Immortalité*, 2011, X-291 p. + 191 fig.
- 249 Dietrich W. (ed.), *Seitenblicke. Literarische und historische Studien zu Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch*, 2011, 459 p.
- 250 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Langlois M. (eds), *Le jeune héros: Recherches sur la formation et la diffusion d'un thème littéraire au Proche-Orient ancien. Actes du colloque organisé par les chaires d'Assyriologie et des Milieux bibliques du Collège de France, Paris, les 6 et 7 avril 2009*, 2011, VI-360 p.
- 251 Jaques M. (ed.), *Klagetraditionen. Form und Funktion der Klage in den Kulturen der Antike*, 2011, VIII-110 p.
- 252 Langlois M., *Le texte de Josué 10. Approche philologique, épigraphique et diachronique*, 2011, 266 p.
- 253 Béré P., *Le second Serviteur de Yhwh. Un portrait exégétique de Josué dans le livre éponyme*, 2012, XVI-275 p.
- 254 Kilunga B., *Prééminence de YHWH ou autonomie du prophète. Étude comparative et critique des confessions de Jérémie dans le texte hébreu massorétique et la «Septante»*, 2011, XVI-216 p.
- 255 Gruber M., Ahituv S., Lehmann G., Talshir Z. (eds), *All the Wisdom of the East. Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and History in Honor of Eliezer D. Oren*, 2012, XXVIII-475-85* p.
- 256 Mittermayer C., Ecklin S. (eds), *Altorientalische Studien zu Ehren von Pascal Attinger*, 2012, XVIII-452 p.
- 257 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Hutzli J. (eds), *Les vivants et leurs morts. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 14-15 avril 2010*, 2012, X-287 p.
- 258 Thompson R.J., *Terror of the Radianc. Aššur Covenant to YHWH Covenant*, 2013, X-260 p.
- 259 Asher-Greve J.M., Westenholz J.G., *Goddesses in Context. On Divine Powers, Roles, Relationships and Gender in Mesopotamian Textual and Visual Sources*, 2013, XII-454 p.

- 260 Zawadzki S., *Garments of the Gods. Vol. 2: Texts*, 2013, XIV-743 p.
- 261 Braun-Holzinger E.A., *Frühe Götterdarstellungen in Mesopotamien*, 2013, X-238 p. + 46 pl.
- 263 Sugimoto D.T. (ed.), *Transformation of a Goddess: Ishtar - Astarte - Aphrodite*, 2014, XIV-228 p.
- 264 Morenz L.D., *Anfänge der ägyptischen Kunst. Eine problemgeschichtliche Einführung in ägyptologische Bild-Anthropologie*, 2014, XVIII-257 p.
- 265 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Bürki M. (eds), *Comment devient-on prophète? Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 4-5 avril 2011*, 2014, XII-223 p.
- 266 Michel P.M., *La culte des pierres à Emar à l'époque hittite*, 2014, VIII-312 p.
- 267 Frevel C., Pyschny K., Cornelius I. (eds), *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case*, 2014, X-440 p.
- 268 Bleibtreu E., Steymans H.U. (eds), *Edith Porada zum 100. Geburtstag. A Centenary Volume*, 2014, XVI-642 p.
- 269 Lohwasser A. (ed.), *Skarabäen des 1. Jahrtausends. Ein Workshop in Münster am 27. Oktober 2012*, 2014, VI-200 p.
- 270 Wagner A. (ed.), *Göttliche Körper - Göttliche Gefühle. Was leisten anthropomorphe und anthropopathische Götterkonzepte im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament?*, 2014, X-273 p.
- 271 Heintz J.-G., *Prophétisme et Alliance. Des Archives royales de Mari à la Bible hébraïque*, 2015, XXXVI-373 p.
- 272 von der Osten-Sacken E., *Untersuchungen zur Geflügelwirtschaft im Alten Orient*, 2015, XVI-670 p.
- 273 Jaques M., *Mon dieu qu'ai-je fait? Les diğir-ša-dab_(S)-ba et la piété privée en Mésopotamie*, 2015, XIV-463 p.
- 274 Durand J.-M., Guichard M., Römer T. (eds), *Tabou et transgressions. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 11-12 avril 2012*, 2015, XII-314 p.
- 275 Himbaza I. (ed.), *Making the Biblical Text. Textual Studies in the Hebrew and the Greek Bible*, 2015, XIV-192 p.
- 276 Schmid K., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Laws of Heaven - Laws of Nature: Legal Interpretations of Cosmic Phenomena in the Ancient World. Himmelsgesetze - Naturgesetze: Rechtsförmige Interpretationen kosmischer Phänomene in der antiken Welt*, 2016, X-177 p.
- 277 Wasmuth M. (ed.), *Handel als Medium von Kulturkontakt. Akten des interdisziplinären altertumswissenschaftlichen Kolloquiums (Basel, 30.-31. Oktober 2009)*, 2015, VIII-175 p.
- 278 Durand J.-M., Marti L., Römer T. (eds), *Colères et repentirs divins. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 24 et 25 avril 2013*, 2015, X-393 p.
- 279 Schütte W., *Israels Exil in Juda. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung der Schriftprophetie*, 2016, X-270 p.
- 280 Bonfiglio R.P., *Reading Images, Seeing Texts. Towards a Visual Hermeneutics for Biblical Studies*, 2016, XIV-364 p.
- 281 Rückl J., *A Sure House. Studies on the Dynastic Promise to David in the Books of Samuel and Kings*, 2016, VIII-356 p.
- 282 Schroer S., Münger S. (eds), *Khirbet Qeiyafā in the Shephelah. Papers Presented at a Colloquium of the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies Held at the University of Bern, September 6, 2014*, 2017, IV-168 p.
- 283 Jindo J.Y., Sommer B.D., Staubli T. (eds), *Yehezkel Kaufmann and the Reinvention of Jewish Biblical Scholarship*, 2017, XVIII-376 p.
- 284 Nocquet D.R., *La Samarie, la Diaspora et l'achèvement de la Torah. Territorialités et internationalités dans l'Hexateuque*, 2017, X-354 p.

- 285 Kipfer S. (ed.), *Visualizing Emotions in the Ancient Near East*, 2017, VIII-294 p.
- 286 Römer T., Dufour B., Pfitzmann F., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Entre dieux et hommes: anges, démons et autres figures intermédiaires. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 19 et 20 mai 2014*, 2017, XII-367 p.
- 287 Römer T., Gonzalez H., Marti L. (eds), *Représenter dieux et hommes dans le Proche-Orient ancien et dans la Bible. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 5 et 6 mai 2015*, 2019, XII-386 p.
- 288 Wyssmann P., *Vielfältig geprägt. Das spätperserzeitliche Samaria und seine Münzbilder*, 2019, XII-368 p.
- 289 Anthonioz S., Mouton A., Petit D. (eds), *When Gods Speak to Men. Divine Speech according to Textual Sources in the Ancient Mediterranean Basin*, 2019, X-138 p.
- 290 Wasserman N., *The Flood: The Akkadian Sources. A New Edition, Commentary and a Literary Discussion*, 2020, X-187 p.
- 291 Römer T., Gonzalez H., Marti L., Rückl J. (eds), *Oral et écrit dans l'Antiquité orientale: les processus de rédaction et d'édition. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 26 et 27 mai 2016*, 2021
- 292 Himbaza I. (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015)*, 2020, XII-278 p.
- 293 Galoppin T., Bonnet C. (eds), *Divine Names on the Spot. Towards a Dynamic Approach of Divine Denominations in Greek and Semitic Contexts*, 2021, VIII-256 p.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS. SERIES ARCHAEOLOGICA

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- 1 Briend J., Humbert J.-B. (eds), *Tell Keisan (1971-1976), une cité phénicienne en Galilée*, 1980, XXXVIII-392 p. + 142 pl.
- 5 Müller-Winkler C., *Die ägyptischen Objekt-Amulette. Mit Publikation der Sammlung des Biblischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg Schweiz, ehemals Sammlung Fouad S. Matouk*, 1987, 590 p. + XL Taf.
- 12 Wiese A.B., *Die Anfänge der ägyptischen Stempelsiegel-Amulette. Eine typologische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu den «Knopfsiegeln» und verwandten Objekten der 6. bis frühen 12. Dynastie*, 1996, XXII-194 p. + 93 Taf.
- 14 Amiet P., Briend J., Courtois L., Dumortier J.-B., *Tell el Far'ah. Histoire, glyptique et céramologie*, 1996, IV-91 p.
- 18 Nunn A., *Die figürliche Motivschatz Phöniziens, Syriens und Transjordanien vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, 2000, XII-269 p. + 78 Taf.
- 19 Bignasca A.M., *I kernoi circolari in Oriente e in Occidente. Strumenti di culto e immagini cosmiche*, 2000, XII-324 p.
- 20 Beyer D., *Emar IV: Les Sceaux. Mission archéologique de Meskéne-Emar. Recherches au pays d'Aštata*, 2001, XXII-490 p. + 50 pl.
- 21 Wäfler M., *Tall al-Hamidiya 3: Zur historischen Geographie von Idamaras zur Zeit der Archive von Mari₍₂₎ und Šubat-enlil/Šehnā*, 2001, 298 p. + 14 maps
- 22 Herrmann C., *Die ägyptischen Amulette der Sammlungen BIBEL+ORIENT der Universität Freiburg Schweiz. Anthropomorphe Gestalten und Tiere*, 2003, X-291 p.
- 23 Wäfler M., *Tall al-Hamidiya 4: Vorbericht 1988-2001*, 2003, 253 p. + 8 Pläne
- 24 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Band III*, 2006, XII-359 p.
- 25 Egger J., Keel O., *Corpus der Siegel-Amulette aus Jordanien. Vom Neolithikum bis zur Perserzeit*, 2006, XVIII-510 p.
- 26 Kaelin O., «Modell Ägypten». *Adoption von Innovationen im Mesopotamien des 3. Jahrtausends v. Chr.*, 2006, 204 p.
- 27 Ben-Tor D., *Scarabs, Chronology, and Interconnections. Egypt and Palestine in the Second Intermediate Period*, 2007, XVI-211 p. + 109 pl.
- 28 Meyer J.-W., *Die eisenzeitlichen Stempelsiegel aus dem 'Amuq-Gebiet. Ein Beitrag zur Ikonographie altorientalischer Siegelbilder*, 2008, X-655 p.
- 29 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band II: Von Bahan bis Tel Eton*, 2010, XIV-642 p.
- 30 Kletter R., Ziffer I., Zwickel W., *Yavneh I: The Excavation of the 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit and the Cult Stands*, 2010, XII-297 p. + 176 pl.
- 31 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band III: Von Tell el-Far'a Nord bis Tell el-Fir*, 2010, VI-461 p.
- 32 Rohn K., *Beschriftete mesopotamische Siegel der Frühdynastischen und der Akkad-Zeit*, 2011, XIV-385 p. + 66 pl.
- 33 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band IV: Von Tel Gamma bis Chirbet Husche*, 2013, XVI-715 p.
- 34 Golani A., *Jewelry from the Iron Age II Levant*, 2013, XII-313 p.
- 35 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Perserzeit. Katalog Band V: Von Tel el-'Idham bis Tel Kitan*, 2017, XVIII-672 p.

- 36 Kletter R., Ziffer I., Zwickel W., *Yavneh II: The 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit*, 2015, XIV-288 p. + 63 pl.
- 37 Choi G.D., *Decoding Canaanite Pottery Paintings from the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age I. Classification and Analysis of Decorative Motifs and Design Structures - Statistics, Distribution Patterns - Cultural and Socio-Political Implications*, 2016, XII-272 p. + CD.
- 38 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Band IV: Von der Spätbronzezeit IIB bis in römische Zeit*, 2016, XVI-510 p.
- 39 Keel O., *700 Skarabäen und Verwandtes aus Palästina/Israel. Die Sammlung Keel*, 2020, XX-319 p.
- 40 Attinger P., Cavigneaux A., Mittermayer C., Novák M. (eds), *Text and Image. Proceedings of the 61e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Geneva and Bern, 22-26 June 2015*, 2018, XXIV-526 p.
- 41 Ahrens A., *Aegyptiaca in der nördlichen Levante. Eine Studie zur Kontextualisierung und Rezeption ägyptischer und ägyptisierender Objekte in der Bronzezeit*, 2020, XX-451 p.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS. SUBSIDIA LINGUISTICA

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- 1 Van Damme D., *Altarmenische Kurzgrammatik*, 2004, X-149 p.

