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FOREWORD

Over more than sixty years the Septuagint has been one of the foci of my research. My first engagement with this oldest translation of the Bible took place when I chose to investigate a small word ὡς for my MA thesis at Tokyo Kyoiku University (now Tsukuba University) under the supervision of the late Prof. M. Sekine. A brief summary of the results of this investigation would become my first publication in English in an academic journal: *Novum Testamentum* vol. 8 (1964).

For a total of 33 years I taught at three overseas universities, and there my sphere of responsibilities was confined to Hebrew and Semitic studies. However, my first love, Greek, never left me, and I kept working at it on the side, which resulted in a number of publications prior to my retirement from Leiden University in 2003. After my retirement I have no human employer in whose direction I am obliged to glance over the shoulder, so that I have been able to invest as much time as I please in Greek philology, the Septuagint in particular, having a good number of articles and books published in the meantime. Viewing a study of the biblical languages and ancient translations of the Bible as a mission entrusted to me by my Creator I am still working hard at it.

For large-scale reference works such as my Septuagint lexicon, syntax, two-way index, all published by Peeters I naturally needed to undertake a close study of the Septuagint in relation to its two original languages. Long before I started working on these three projects I had fruits of my research out of such a perspective published back in 1979, a contribution written in Modern Hebrew on Hosea 2 in a Festschrift for M. Wallenstein, whom I succeeded in 1970 as an upstart Semitist at the University of Manchester, a volume edited by my Jerusalem Doktorvater, the late Prof. Ch. Rabin. Since then I had similar studies on the following four chapters of Hosea published in Festschriften and journal articles (1983, 1986, 1995, 2008). I have recently succumbed to a temptation to complete the whole book of Hosea. When that work was completed, I noted that the book of Micah is still missing among the Twelve Prophets in the excellent, ongoing series, *La Bible d’Alexandrie*, and immediately started working on it. *Et voilà*!

I do hope that this monograph will contribute towards our better appreciation and understanding of these two Septuagint books.

Once again I am deeply grateful to Peeters Publishers agreeing to publish this monograph and to Mr B. Verrept and his staff for their friendly assistance.
and technical expertise. I am also grateful to the editorial board of *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis* for including this work in their outstanding series.

I dedicate this book to my spouse, Keiko, on her birthday as a humble token of my appreciation of her indefatigable support over more than half a century.

T. Muraoka
Oegstgeest, The Netherlands

31 August, 2020
These days one hardly need be apologetic about writing a commentary on a book of the Septuagint.¹ A friend of long standing of mine, Prof. John F.A. Sawyer, for whose honour I contributed a study on Hosea 3 in 1995, has consistently championed the position that the Bible can be profitably studied not only in its historico-critically reconstructed Ur-form, but also in its canonicised form and likewise in the light of its subsequent interpretations.

I do not recall any longer why I chose the book of Hosea in 1979 to undertake my first, close study of the text of the Septuagint in relation to its Semitic original. We all know that this gigantic, historic undertaking of translating a book of the size of the Bible (including some books additional to the sixty-six of the Jewish Bible) took more than a couple of centuries before its completion and quite a number of scholars were involved. With the sole exception of Ben Sira’s grandson we know nothing about these translators’ identity and background. As Thackeray argued, some books of considerable size may have been translated by more than one person. I share the view of many specialists that the Twelve Prophets can be attributed to a single translator. Such a perspective is important when one attempts to understand why this Hebrew word is translated in this way and what the translated Greek text is supposed to mean on the part of the translator. In my study of the two books this time I have not found any evidence which might contradict the single-translator hypothesis for this part of the Septuagint.

As in any serious study of an ancient text, textual criticism is an essential ingredient. In the case of a translated text, such a text-critical work covers the original language(s) and the target language. For the former our starting point is the Codex Leningradensis, and for the latter the critical Göttingen Septuagint as edited by J. Ziegler for this corpus. Both works are the best we have at our disposal at the moment. However, both editors themselves must have been aware that the text as established by them may not have been identical with their respective Urtext in every detail. In the case of the Hebrew

¹ For a recent general and stimulating discussion of the issue, see Harl 1993. For earlier expressions of our view on the matter, see Muraoka 1983 and Muraoka 1986. Now cf. also Wevers 1990 and 1993.

The Greek text used here is of Ziegler 1967, and in text-critical remarks abbreviations in the critical apparatus in Ziegler’s edition are used. For the Twelve Prophets in the Hebrew Bible we use the text prepared by A. Gelston for Biblia Hebraica Quinta (2010). For the remaining books of the OT we use Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. The Massoretic cantillation signs, except the athnach, have been left out. The abbreviations used in text-critical comments on the Greek text are those used in the above-mentioned Ziegler’s edition.
text, of course, the text written by the prophets themselves was purely con-
sonantal, no vowel signs, Tiberian accents, end-of-verse colon. As for Greek
we would note that in the Greek Minor Prophets found in Nahal Hever, writ-
ten round the turn of the era, the text is all written with capital letters, with
no punctuation marks, accents, and very often with no space between adjoining
words. This is still the same in a slightly later manuscript, Codex Sinaiti-
cus. The decision regarding the choice between majuscule and minuscule,
the punctuation marks, accents, and scriptio continua is ultimately Ziegler’s
decision. In his apparatus criticus he presents data as they are in actual manu-
scripts with the exception of scriptio continua. These technical details do have
at times a bearing on our attempt to understand the Greek text.

Since the discovery in the last century of biblical and related texts hailing
from Qumran caves and adjoining spots in the Judaean Desert we know now
much about the fluidity of the biblical texts round the turn of the era. It is
generally agreed that the text Septuagint translators worked on, their Vorlage,
diverged at many a point from what we find in the Leningrad codex stripped
of its vowel signs and massoretic accents. This adds a new dimension to the
conventional textual criticism aiming at establishing the Hebrew / Aramaic
Urtext of biblical books by taking ancient versions into account. Even within
our limited corpus of the Twelve Prophets we see that our translator’s Vorlage
cannot have been what we see in BHS or BHQ.

We should also remember that, even when his Vorlage was basically iden-
tical with the massoretic text, he may have decided, for a reason unknown
to us, not to translate as in his Vorlage. Our first task must be to try to find
and establish how he understood his Vorlage and how he wanted his readership
to understand his translation. After that we may wish to see how his translation
could have been understood by his readership, whether they knew Hebrew or not.
At this stage daughter versions of the Septuagint and ancient commentaries on it such as patristic commentaries could be enlightening
and throw some valuable light. I am no expert in patristics, whether Greek or
Latin, and ignorant of Armenian and Coptic. Hence my foray into this vast area
of research is necessarily limited in scope.

Just as the Hebrew text, so the Greek text would be copied many times
over and go through various modifications, as is amply evident in the critical
apparatus of Ziegler’s edition. Apart from mere scribal errors subsequent
scribes could be, whether consciously or unconsciously, influenced by related
or parallel expressions or passages within a particular or other books of the
LXX or even later texts such as the New Testament.

The above-mentioned Nahal Hever fragments here served for Barthélemy
as an important basis for establishing his position that the original Septuagint

---

2 In March 2021 tiny scraps of a Greek translation of the Minor Prophets were discovered
in a Qumran cave. On my enquiry with Prof. E. Tov, he replied in an email dated to 7 April 2021
went through not only occasional, unsystematic modifications, but also a deliberate revision. After the publication in 1963 of his revolutionary Les devanciers d'Aquila specialists began to speak about “the Kaige recension” and “the proto-Lucianic or proto-Antiochian recension.” There is no indication, however, that the Twelve Prophets have been subjected to such a revision.

We are going to see at quite a few points that, whilst textual criticism, grammar or linguistics, and lexicography are distinct disciplines, they are to be viewed as complementary and mutually enlightening.

For the benefit of the reader we conclude with a number of practical details.

1) Our English translation of the LXX text of Hosea and Micah is what we believe what the translator meant to say, not how it may have come over to readers of his translation, whether or not they were ignorant of Hebrew. The same perspective was applied to my Septuagint Lexicon and Septuagint Syntax.

2) Much of the statistical data mentioned in this study comes from the Accordance Bible.

3) Abbreviated names of Septuagint books follow the same style as in our Septuagint Lexicon and Septuagint Syntax, e.g. 4K = 4Kingdoms, i.e. 2Kg of the Hebrew Bible.

that they are so fragmentary that there is no need for me to revise this manuscript which had already been submitted to Peeters.
HOSEA
CHAPTER I

1.1) Λόγος κυρίου, δές ἐγενήθη πρὸς Ὡσηε τὸν τοῦ Βεηρί ἐν ἡμέραις Οζιου καὶ Ιωαθαμ καὶ Αχαζ καὶ Εζεκίου βασιλέων Ιουδα καὶ ἐν ἡμέραις Ιεροβοαμ υἱοῦ Ιωας βασιλέως Ἰσραηλ.

The word of the Lord that came to Hosea the (son) of Beeri in the days of Oziah and Jotham and Achaz and Ezekias, the kings of Judah and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Josh the king of Israel.

The LXX neatly joins the names of the four kings by means of καί, whereas the MT is unusual not using ἄ at all. In the LXX this sort of absolute asyndeton is rather rare, see SSG § 78 b. In BH, the conjunction may be attached only to the last of three or more terms1, but the total asyndesis is unusual. 

Cp. וּמְרָרִי קְהָת גֵּרְשׁוֹן לֵוִי בְּנֵי 1Ch 5.27 with וּמְרָרִי וּקְהָת גֵּרְשׁוֹן לְתֹלְדֹתָם בְּנֵי־לֵוִי Ex 6.16, see JM § 177 o.

1.2) Αρχὴ λόγου κυρίου ἐν Ὡσηε· καὶ εἶπεν κυρίος πρὸς Ὡσηε Βάδιζε λαβὲ σεαυτῷ γυναῖκα πορνείας καὶ τέκνα πορνείας, διότι ἐκπορνεύουσα ἐκπορνεύσει ἡ γῆ ἀπὸ ὀπίσθεν τοῦ κυρίου.

The beginning of the word of the Lord through Hosea; and the Lord said to Hosea, ‘Go, take for yourself a woman of whoredom and children of whoredom, because the land is certainly going to play a whore, desiring the Lord’

A syntactic pattern which is rare in BH was presumably unknown to our translator, who took דִּבֶּר as a substantive, דְּבַר. In two other examples mentioned in JM § 129 p 3) the LXX is struggling with a verbal clause as a nomen rectum: ἀπὸ φονῆς ἀλώσεως Βαβυλῶνος Jr 27.46 (מֵאַחֲרֵי קָרֵיָה הַמַּיִם הַיָּם; MT 50.46); πόλις Αριηλ, ἧν Δαυιδ ἐπολέμησεν Δαυιδ Jr 39.1, where the Hexaplaric tradition uses a straightforward substantive - Aq πόλις παρεμβλήσεως Δαυιδ and Sym πόλεις παρεμβλήσεως Δαυιδ.

1 As done by Joosten (2002.63) on his own bat and with no comment.
If the Vorlage of $\Gamma$ was identical with MT, πρός attested in some sources such as Alexandrinus is most likely a stylistic improvement on ἐν, a reading which may have come over as unusual. In Hebrew, too, בְּプレxed to an interlocutor, though securely attested, is not very common, either. E.g. יְָהָוִּים נֹּר הָיָה יְָהָוִּים Nu 12.2, where two early Jewish traditions divert from each other – $\Gamma$ מֹּּשֶׁה us. ἦμιν vs. TO עִמַּנָא us. מֶשֶׁה, and similarly at ib. 12.6, 8. Joosten (2002.64) lists a few examples in the NT as suggesting that this Greek usage is not necessarily a Hebraism. One instance is illuminating: πάλαι ο θεός λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἐπ᾿ ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἔλαλησεν ἦμῖν ἐν υἱῷ Heb 1.1f., where the dative and the instrumental ἐν are contrasted twice. We are not, however, certain that the construction <verb dicendi + ἐν τινι> was common in contemporary non-biblical Greek.2

The asyndesis of two imperatives is common in both languages. In $\Gamma$ we find a total of 11 cases, all of which begin with a Present impv. of βαδίζω. When joined with καί, by contrast, among 5 cases both verbs are Aorist, e.g. βαδίσατε καὶ ἀπαγάγετε Ge 42.19 (אֲבָאָבָו), the only exceptions being βαδίζε καὶ ποίει 2K 7.3 (הָבִיאוּ לְכוּ) and βάδισον εἰπόν De 5.30 (אִישָּו). The asyndetic combination with the first verb in the present aspect may imply that the impv. of βαδίζω is not a full, self-standing verb and is expressive of a feature of urgency, insistence or suchlike as in Get going! in Spoken English or Geh schon! in Spoken German.3 The overwhelming majority of instances of the impv. of πορεύομαι are Present. Likewise the impv. of חָלַח, as in our lemma here, is very often asyndetically followed by another imperative. This process of grammaticalisation is evident when הָלָּח is said to a woman as in נַשְׁקֶה לְכָה Ge 19.32 and it is followed by a 1pl. verb as in תִּרְחָּח לְכָה Ge 31.44.4

This exemplifies one of the well established ways of translating the Hebrew inf. abs. complementing a verb of the identical root, a structure traditionally known as figura etymologica. This Greek construction is not a Hebraism; on this question, see Muraoka 2016.383-85, § 31 db. Callaham (2010.115) includes this instance among those in which he analyses this Hebrew syntagm as indicating habitual action. Our example here allows for other possible analyses such as a feature of certainty, ’surely.’

2 BDAG, s.v. λαλεῖω 2 γ, does not mention any instance of λαλεῖω ἐν τινι; apparently they are not aware of any. In another instance, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ἦμῖν Mt 10.20 F. Delitzsch, in his Hebrew translation, hesitates mechanically to translate into Hebrew: מְדַבֵּר בְּפִיכֶם.
3 Cf. Muraoka SSG, p. 294.
4 Cf. JM § 105 e.
According to Joosten (2002.65) the Greek future tense here indicates a future action, but the future in Greek is capable of indicating more, even if the action in question is envisaged as happening after the moment of speech. It can indicate likelihood or probability or theoretical possibility; see Muraoka 2016.284-92. Reservations can be also indicated regarding Joosten’s analysis of the Hebrew imperfect here as indicating repetition or durativity.

On the other hand, the present aspect of ἐκπορνεύομαι is imperfective.

ἐκπορνεύσει ἡ γῆ ὑπὸ ὀπίσθεν τοῦ Κυρίου τῆς ἡγήσεως

In contrast to ἄχρις τῆς the added preposition indicates desertion, cf. μήποτε διαθήκην τοῖς ἐγκαθημένοις πρὸς ἄλλους ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, and ἐκπορνεύσωσιν ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν ἀλλὰ ἐκτείνει ἐκ τῆς ἀναγεννησίας.

Ex 34.15.

The use of τῇς here is indicative of a mixture of direct and indirect speech, what is called *discour* indirect libre in French grammar. In pure direct speech we would anticipate μετὰ τοῦ ὑπὸ μου.

1.3) καὶ ἔπορεύθη καὶ ἔλαβε τὴν Γομερ θυγατέρα Δεβηλαίμ, καὶ συνέλαβε καὶ ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ υἱόν.

*and he went and took Gomer, a daughter of Debelaim’s, and she conceived and bore a son for him*.

αὐτῷ ὡς can be construed with both of the preceding verbs. Against the traditional translation of ὡς ἐλαβέν as exemplified in καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔλαβεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ Gn 38.18, we argued that ὡς can only mean ‘she became pregnant for him, in his best interest.’

1.4) καὶ εἶπε κύριος πρὸς αὐτὸν Κάλεσον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ιεζραελ, διότι ἔτι μικρὸν καὶ ἐκδικήσω τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ιεζραελ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ιηου καὶ ἀποστρέψω βασιλείαν οἴκου Ισραηλ.

*And the Lord said to him, ‘Call his name Jezrael, because in a little while I am going to requite the blood of Jezrael on the house of Jeou and do away with the kingdom of the house of Israel*.

This apodotic καί following a temporal adjunct and introducing a main clause is un-Greek, being a calque, a mechanical reproduction of the Hebrew structure. The un-Greek nature of

the syntagm is all the more evident in the use of a noun in the nominative as in ἔτι τρεῖς ἡμέραι καὶ μνησθήσεται 'three more days, then he will remember' Ge 40.13.6 καὶ ἀποστρέψω The same equation between G and H recurs at καὶ ἀποστρέψω πάσας τὰς εὐφροσύνας αὐτῆς Ho 2.11 (H 2.13). In the following verse we see this Greek verb is parallel to ἀφανίζω: καὶ ἀφανίζω ἅμπελον αὐτῆς (G 2.13). We may conclude that ἀποστρέψω in our verse denotes an action more drastic than Joosten's (65) repousser. Cf. also οὗτος ἔξολεθρεύσει αὐτούς, καὶ οὗτος ἀποστρέψει αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ προσώπου σου καὶ ἤσωμεν λίπαν αὐτὸν דt 9.3, where the parallelism between ἔξολεθρεύσει and ἀποστρέψει is to be noted. Then our ἀποστρέψω may be a translation of ἢσωμεν after all than ἢσωμεν postulated by Ziegler (59) and Joosten (65).

1.5) καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ συντρίψω τὸ τόξον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι τοῦ Ἰεζραήλ.

and on that day I shall shatter the arrow of Israel in the valley of Jezrael

The G translator refrained from reproducing the typical Hebrew syntagm with a consecutive Waw of ἢσωμεν, but stopped there, retaining ἔσται. We are not absolutely sure that the translator meant ἔσται to be taken as impersonally used as suggested by Joosten’s translation: “et il adviendra en ce jour-là.” In one instance we miss this ἔσται: καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξελεύσεται υὸς ζῶν τῆς κρέατος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ Zc 14.8, though H has no consecutive waw.

1.6) καὶ συνέλαβεν ἐτὶ καὶ ἐστεκε θυγατέρα. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Κάλεσον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Οὐκ ἥλεμμένη, διότι οὐ μὴ προσθήσω ἔτι ἔλεησαι τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ἀλλὰ ἄντιτασσόμενος ἀντιτάξομαι αὐτοῖς.

and she conceived again and bore a daughter. And He said to him, “Call her name ‘Unpitied, for I shall not pity the house of Israel any longer, but I shall be definitely hostile to them. This is the first occurrence in Ho of the double negator οὐ μή. This combination occurring some 750 times

6 For more details, see GLS s.v., 11.
CHAPTER I

in SG is significantly concentrated in prophetic books. In Ho alone we find 21 instances, without counting a case such as οὐκέτι μὴ εἴπωμεν 14.4, which is equivalent to οὐ μὴ εἴπωμεν ἔτι. Frequency statistics for some other books are: Ps 37, Jb 49, Si 54, Pr 13. Thus it is typical of a stylistically higher register, i.e. poetic. It is said to be “a powerful and somewhat formal expression suited to biblical style generally and divine utterances in particular.” In NTG it is virtually confined to sayings of Jesus and quotations from LXX. This οὐ μή is used with a verb in the subjunctive, but, as here, its use with the fut. is not uncommon. In Ἡμέρας πολλὰς καθήση ἐπ᾽ ἐμοὶ καὶ οὐ μὴ πορνεύσῃς οὐδὲ μὴ γένῃ ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ 3.3 the two forms are juxtaposed, so in 4.10, 5.6, 11.7. The subjunctive in such cases has the same value as the future. Moreover, again as here, the combination is at times found in main, not subordinate, clauses. See below at διότι οὐ μὴ ύποστῇ 13.13, also a causal clause, but with an aor. subj. form. 8

By changing διότι to ἀλλ᾽ ή Ε clearly sees an opposition between the two concluding clauses of the verse, equating ἄντιτασσόμενος ἄντιτάξομαι αὐτοῖς λάθος ισαίας Ps 106.26. An analogous example is: κολοῦντος καὶ αὐτοῖς Ps 106.26. An analogous example is: קֹלוֹ בַּחוּץ κְּלַא לֹא יָשְׂא וְלֹא יַשְׁמִיעַ יִשָּׂא וְלֹא יִצָּק לֹא Is 42.2, where יִשָּׂא = קֹלוֹ יִשָּׂא Y 9

Joosten (66) concludes his survey of the selection in LXX of ἀντιτάσσομαι to render multiple similar looking Hebrew roots of diverse meanings by suggesting that the translator of אֲשִׁיתֶנּוּ נָשִּׂיא 1Kg 11.34 may have been inspired by our Hosea passage in translating it as ἀντιτασσόμενος ἀντιτάξομαι αὐτῷ, though the contextual link between the two passages is rather faint. More interesting is ἀντέστησάν σοι ἠδυνάσθησαν πρὸς σὲ καὶ ἁλίων καὶ ἀποτελέσαν Ob 7 mentioned by Joosten.

1.7) τοὺς δὲ υἱοὺς Ιουδα ἑλεήσω καὶ σάσω αὐτοῖς ἐν κυρίῳ θεῷ αὐτῶν καὶ οὐ σώσω αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ῥόμβῳ οὐδὲ ἐν πολέμῳ οὐδὲ ἐν ἀρματείᾳ οὐδὲ ἐν ὑποκυπτεῖ οὐδὲ ἐν ὑπεράνωσι.

However, the sons of Judah I will pity and save them in the Lord their God, and I shall not save them with an arrow nor with a sword nor through a war nor with chariots nor with horses nor with horsemen’

7 So Lee 1985.20.
8 For an extended discussion on this double negator, see SSG § 83 ca.
9 For more details, see JM § 125 be.
The use of δὲ in lieu of the mechanical καί for ρ赖以 serves to indicate the contrast in the fate awaiting the house of Israel as against the house of Juda, though that contrast is highlighted in Ἰ by the direct object being fronted, which is followed in Ὀ, too.

ἐν κυρίῳ θεῷ αὐτῶν is another example of discours indirect libre; see above at vs. 2.

οὐδὲ ἐν ἅρμασιν [There is no equivalent for this in Ἰ. What easily springs up in one’s mind is ἤρμασιν. ἤρμασιν and σοσὶ is a very common combination in either sequence, e.g. 2Kg 6.14, ἤρμασιν ἤρμασιν ἤρμασιν Ps 76.7. ἤρμασιν is consistently used in the sg., the only exception occurring in ἤρμασιν Ct 1.9. We do not know if this word formed part of Ὀ’s Vorlage. Another question is whether it was prefixed with the conjunction ρ赖以生存 or not. The preceding three substantives are so connected. The meticulous repetition of οὐδὲ may suggest ἤρμασιν, and then ἤρμασιν ἤρμασιν ἤρμασιν.

1.8) καὶ ἀπεγαλάκτισε τὴν ὘κ-ἡλεμήμενην καὶ συνέλαβεν ἑτὶ καὶ ἐτεκεν υἱόν.

1.9) καὶ εἶπε Κάλεσον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ὀυ λαός μου, διότι ύμεῖς Ὀυ λαός μου, καὶ ἔγω οὐκ εἰμί ραῦκ.

and she weaned Unpitied and she conceived again and bore a son

and He said, ‘Call his name Not my people, for you are not my people, and I am not yours.’

The addition of εἰμί is not only a reflection of Ὄν ὁμοίωσεν, but also serves to show that, unlike Ὀυ λαός μου, it is not a name. Ὀυ λαός μου is, just like Ὀυ λαός μου, nothing but a name. Hence Ziegler’s use of the capital letter is questionable in Ὄν ὁμοίωσεν. As debatable is “ich (bin) nicht > Ich bin euere” (SD). Hence we would use a capital letter in ύμεῖς Ὀυ λαός μου as against Ziegler’s οὖ. Otherwise we could have anticipated ύμεῖς οὐκ ἔστε λαός μου [= vous n’êtes pas mon peuple, Joosten 67]. See also Joosten 67f. He refers to Ex 3.14, but there in Ἐγώ εἰμί ὃ ὁ ὁν we have a standard nominal clause, and God is declaring that ὃ ὁν is His name, as we see from its sequel: καὶ εἶπεν ὘υτος ἐρείς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ Ὄ ὁν

10 Cf. Muraoka SSG § 83 i, p. 721 with n. 2 there.
ἀπέσταλκέν με πρὸς ὑμᾶς. If any OT passage has inspired our Greek translator, it would be וּבִצְדָקָה בֶּאֱמֶת לֵאלֹהִים לָהֶם אֶהְיֶה וַאֲנִי לְעָם וְהָיוּ־לִי Zc 8.8, which he translates καὶ ἔσονταί μοι εἰς λαόν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεόν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνη, see also Je 30.22, Ez 36.28 etc. God is declaring that none of this applies to His relationship with, and stance towards them.

1.10 [大大小] Καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ ὡς ἡ ἁμμὸς τῆς θαλάσσης, ή οὐκ ἕκμετρησεται οὐδὲ ἕξαριθμησεται. καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὐ ἔρρεθη αὐτοῖς. Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοί υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντο.

And the number of the sons of Israel was like the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor counted up, and in the place where it was said to them, ‘You are not my people,’ they even will be called sons of a living God.

Kaὶ ἦν .. καὶ ἔσται [כְּחוֹל בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִסְפַּר וְהָיָה: אֵל־חָי בְּנֵי לָהֶם יֵאָמֵר אַתֶּם לֹא־עַמִּי לָהֶם אֲשֶׁר־יֵאָמֵר. The contrasting rendition indicates that for the translator the first clause relates to the past history and the second to the future. His use of ἦν, not ἐγένετο or ἐγενήθη, also indicates that it is not about an explosion in the population that took place after the denouncement uttered in vs. 9, but he is looking back on the remote past. The translator may be thinking of a divine promise given to Abraham (Ge 22.17) or made to Jeremiah (Je 33.22).

It is difficult to say whether the translator mechanically translated the second ἔρρεθη or regarded it as being loosely and impersonally, namely what is told in the sequel is going to happen.

إن تُوْ تَوْضِيرْبَ بَمْكُومَ أَشْرَى بَمْكُومَا بُمْكُومَا. However that might be, pace Joosten (68) is not necessarily “façon peu concrète,” for a measure of ambiguity is in the nature of the Hebrew construct state: can mean either ‘a son of the king’ or ‘the (particular) son of the king.’11 The prophet must have known which place God was speaking about.

ἔρρεθη η ἀμερικαί not ἀμερικαί. We are still with the divine message conveyed to the prophet, not a narrative recounting the past prior to the moment of speech. Hence the same Hebrew verb is next rendered in the future tense, κληθήσονται.

11 See JM § 140 a.
καὶ αὐτοὶ] In this plus the meaning is unlikely ‘they, too,’ thus pace NETS, “auch sie” STD, and “eux aussi” Joosten 67. It serves rather to highlight a contradiction with what precedes, ‘even they (who were once named Οὐ λαός μου)’ or or to introduce an element of surprise or something unexpected.12

1.11 [H 2.2)] καὶ συναχθήσονται οἱ γυναικείοι καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ἑαυτῶν ἀρχήν μίαν καὶ ἀναβήσονται ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Ιεζραελ.

and the sons of Judah and the sons of Israel will gather at the same place and they will appoint for themselves one leader and will rise from the land, for the day of Jezrael is great.

ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τῆς ἡμέρας] The Greek phrase is rather commonly used, though not meaning the same every time. The notion of commonality is always there, expressed through the articular αὐτός. Here, without reference to Ἁ it could be understood in the sense of ‘at the same time.’ At οὐκ ἐκδικήσει δίς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν θλίψει ‘He will not penalise the same (offence) twice with a distress’ Na 1.9, however, Ἡλίας ἐκδικάζει τὸ κάθαρσις Παρθένου ἡμέρας has nothing that corresponds to it, and the preposition indicates a ground for a penalty brought down.13

ἀρχὴν μίαν ἐν ἕνα] For ‘one leader’ ἀρχήν ἐν ἕνα could have been said. That ἀρχή can signify not only ‘leadership,’ but also a person invested with, and exercises such is clear from αἱ ἀρχαὶ ὁικοτάκαλα ἄνδροι Κατάλοιποι ὁικοτάκαλα ἄνδροι, ἐνάντια ἐπὶ ἐν γῆς ὁικοτάκαλος ἀρχήν, where the parallel κατάλοιποι is to be noted. See also Ἀρχή ἐθνῶν Αμαλγή Nu 24.20.14

12 Cf. Muraoka LSG s.v., 5, 6.
13 Delete a reference to Na 1.9 from Muraoka GELS s.v. αὐτός 2 b, but see ib. s.v. ἐκδικέω 1 k.
14 For further examples of ἀρχή ‘leader,’ see Muraoka GELS s.v. 2 c.
CHAPTER II

2.1 [H 2.3]) εἴπατε τῷ ἀδελφῷ ὑμῶν Λαός-μου καὶ τῇ ἀδελφῇ ὑμῶν Ἡλεημένη.

Say to your brother ‘My people’ and to your sister ‘Pitied.’

When unpointed, ἀδελφός can be read as sg., ἀδελφάς, but not so with ἀδελφή. However, ἀδελφός is anomalous; ἀδελφή is expected. Why did Ὑ opt for the sg. τῷ ἀδελφῷ? Harmonisation with τῇ ἀδελφῇ ὑμῶν Ἡλεημένη?

2.2 [H 2.4]) Κρίθητε πρὸς τὴν μητέρα ὑμῶν κρίθητε, ὅτι αὐτή οὐ γυνή μου, καὶ ἕγω οὐκ ἀνήρ αὐτής· καὶ ἔξαρα τὴν πορνείαν αὐτῆς ἐκ προσώπου μου καὶ τὴν μοιχείαν αὐτῆς ἐκ μέσου μαστῶν αὐτῆς.

Contest a legal case against your mother, contest, for she is not my wife, and I am not her husband, and I shall remove her whoredom from before me and her adultery from between her breasts,

Κρίθητε does not necessarily imply a juridic battle in a court of law. Likewise רָב is mostly about a verbal strife or contest, e.g. καὶ ἐλοιδορεῖτο ὁ λαὸς πρὸς Μωυσῆν ὁ Ἰσραήλ ἐν τῷ ἡρῴῳ ἐν τῷ ἱππείῳ ἡμερῶν ἑπτά Ex 17.2, where the selection of πρὸς τινα as in our Hosea passage is to be noted.

By translating as if Ὑ read μὴν παρασκεύασῃ τὴν γυνήν τῆς ζενίνας the translator highlights the strong will on the part of God: ‘I shall see to it that she removes ..’ In that process the common compound preposition had its nuance changed: μὴν παρασκεύασῃ implies that she is showing off her shameful behaviour of whoredom, whereas with μὴν God is saying “I can’t stand the sight!”

The sg. number in Ὑ relates to the character of her behaviour, whereas the pl. in Ὑ indicates its manifestations. The same can be said of γυναῖκα πορνείας ἡ ἐν τῆς πορνεία 1.2 above.

1 This noun attests to other anomalous forms: אַחְיוֹתֵי Josh 2.13 for אַחְיוֹתַי, אַחְיוֹתָה Ez 16.51 with Q אַחִי. The confusion must be due to נַא- of the sg. form.
2 must be a scribal slip for מִפְּנֵי.
3 Joosten (70) suggests a possible influence of Ho 2.17 (H 19).
2.3 (H 2.5]) ὅπως ἀν ἐκθύσω αὐτὴν γυμνὴν καὶ ἀποκαταστήσω αὐτὴν καθὼς ἡμέρα γενέσεως αὐτῆς· καὶ θήσωμαι αὐτὴν ὡς ἐρήμον καὶ τάξω αὐτὴν ὡς γην ἀνυδρον καὶ ἀποκτενῶ αὐτὴν ἐν δίψει·

by stripping her naked and restoring her (look) as on the day of her birth, and I might make her like a desert and position her like a dry land and kill her with thirst

Joosten (70) rightly points out that this equivalence is attested elsewhere only in ἀποκαταστήσατε ἐν πύλαις κρίμα μισή Am 5.5. In both cases it is about a return to a former state of affairs.6

2.4 (H 2.6]) καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς οὐ μὴ ἐλεήσω, ὅτι τέκνα πορνείας ἐστίν.

and her children I shall not pity by any means, for they are children of whoredom.

οὐ μὴ ᾧ] The double negative may be combined with the subjunctive as well as the future, hence our inability to parse with confidence our ἐλεήσω.7 τέκνα πορνείας ἐστίν] on the pl. noun concording with the sg. verb, see Muraoka SSG § 77 bh.

4 See also Lk 24.20, where the conjunction is used with a verb in the indicative mood as in ὅπως κεν ἐθέλησιν 'as he will' Iliad 20.243. For more examples in Classical Greek, see LSJ s.v. ὅπως A I.
5 For a fuller picture of ὅπως as used by out translator, see Muraoka GELS s.v.
6 See Muraoka 1979.182.
7 For an extended discussion of this double negator in Septuagint Greek, see Muraoka SSG § 83 ca. See also above at 1.6.
2.5 (2.7) διὶ ἐξεπόρνευσεν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτῶν, κατῆχυνεν ἡ τεκοῦσα 
αὐτὰ· ὅτι εἶπε Πορεύσομαι ὃπισώ τῶν ἐραστῶν μου τῶν διδόντων
μοι τοὺς ἄρτους μου καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ μου καὶ τὰ ἰματία 
μου καὶ τὸ ἔλαιόν μου καὶ πάντα ὅσα μοι καθήκει.

Because their mother played the whore, she that bore them made (them)
feel ashamed, for she said ‘I should go, I wonder, after my lovers who
give me my bread and my water and my clothes and my linen cloth and
my oil and all that I am entitled to.’

κατῆχυνεν ἡ τεκοῦσα καὶ τὸν ἐγείρετον
ὅτι εἶπε Πορεύσομαι ὃπισώ τῶν ἐραστῶν μου καὶ τὰ ἰματία
μου καὶ τὸ ἔλαιόν μου καὶ πάντα ὅσα μοι καθήκει.

Whilst the Hebrew form cannot be derived from 'to be dry,' its intransitive use of הובישׁ, an alternative form of Hi. הובישׁ, is firmly established. By contrast, καταισχύνω in the active voice is not known to be used intransitively, ‘to act shamelessly,’ thus pace NETS. Hence we submit that them is latent, i.e. her children feeling ashamed of having
her as their mother.

In view of the cohortative ἀλήθη we submit that the
future tense here in Г carries a deliberative modality. Some certain examples
are identifiable, e.g. τί ἀντεροῦμεν ..; ‘how could we gainsay, we wonder .. ?’
Ge 44.16.

For the obvious reason there is a vast amount
of studies devoted to the Greek vocabulary relating to the notion of love.10
One noteworthy fact is the extreme rarity in Biblical Greek of lexemes derived
from the root ἐρ- in comparison with those derived from ἀγαπ- and φιλ-.
Thus in SG the verb ἐράω occurs a mere three times. By contrast, in CH
the root ἐραστής reigns supreme. Also important is that of the 17 instances of ἐραστής in SG it is used in connection with idolatry, the only exception
being in Lam 1.19.11 Hence in the mainstream Judaism and Christianity
there attaches a negative connotation to the ἐρ- words.

This equivalence occurs in SG only once more, later
in our book, 2.9, also in the same combination with ὁθόνια. Since the
ignorance on the part of our translator as to what this common Hebrew
substantive means is unthinkable, the selection of ἰματία is most likely due to
his understanding that food, water, and clothes are three essential commodi-
ties for humans.

Though the Hebrew noun is attested in the sg. and
pl. alike, the pl. ὁθόνια does not necessarily suggest that the translator read

8 Ibn Ezra, sensing the complexity, postulated נפשנה ‘herself’ as the object.
9 See further Muraoka SSG § 28 gf.
10 For a modest contribution by us, see Muraoka 2020b.89-94.
11 First noted by us in Muraoka 1979.183.
The pl. form is most likely influenced by τὰ ἴματα, whose pl. number is idiomatic in Greek.

The Hebrew word here is generally understood to be derived from the common root שִׁקּוּיָי and to mean ‘something to drink,’ though it occurs only two more times. Our Greek translator presumably knew its meaning, but may have found its position at the very end of the list, not close to מֵימַי, odd and have decided to take some freedom, which appears to be manifest in the addition of πάντα. Referring to the rendition in Syrohexapla, /ḥāšḥān/ ‘needs’ here we (GELS s.v. καθήκω) mentioned as an alternative understanding, ‘all that is requisite, needed,’ a meaning which, however, is unknown elsewhere in the Greek literature, and it is probably a contextual analysis. What is closer to our Hosea passage appears to be found in τούτῳ καθήκει τὰ προτοτοκεῖα ‘this one is entitled to the rights of the firstborn’ De 21.17 and σοὶ κληρονομία καθήκει λαβεῖν τὴν θυγατέρα αὐτοῦ ‘it is an inheritance due to you, to take his daughter’ To 6.13 ᾿Η, preceded by Δεδικαίωται σοὶ λαβεῖν αὐτὴν ‘you are in the right to take her.’ One could say that the woman was entitled to some form of return on her devotion to her lovers.

The woman counts on six commodities to be provided by her lovers. ᾿Η concatenates all of them syndetically and neatly by means of καί, whereas ᾿Η arranges them semantically into three groups, each of two constituents: (a) commodities for bodily needs, (b) commodities requisite for covering one’s body, (c) fluids. By contrast our translator rearranged them into two groups; see above. This complete concatenation may be designed to underscore the woman’s devotion to, and reliance on her lovers.

Therefore, behold, I build a hedge around her way with thorns and I shall rebuild her ways, and she will never find her route: (C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in theMinor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω... Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm is always (fourteen times) translated in the Minor Prophets with ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ - an indicative present tense verb. It is hard to believe that the pronoun is emphatic in every case. Moreover, ἰδοὺ ἐγώ...
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is rendered in the same manner, e.g. ἵδον εγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ἵνα ἐπιτύγχανην. Am 9.9, so also Zc 11.6, 16, Ma 4.4. See also how ἵνα followed by no verb has been rendered: ἵδον ἐγὼ ἐπί σε ἵνα ἐπιτύγχανη Na 2.14, similarly ib. 3.5. We conclude, therefore, ἐγὼ is merely reproducing ἵνα; there is no other way.

A strange mixture in Ἑ of your and her / she has been straightened out in Θ, unless its Vorlage read ἠνά. ἐνοικοδομήσω τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς. Our translator chooses the same Greek verb to render the same Hebrew verb once again in ἐνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς ἐντέλλομαι ἥνεκ αὐτῆς. Am 9.11, where, however, it is about repairing, as shown also by the prefix ἀνα- attached to another three verbs in the verse – ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνήν τὴν πεπτωκύιαν ἐν τῷ ἑαυτῆς καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτῆς καθὼς τὰς ἡμέραις τοῦ αἰῶνος. In our Hosea passage it is not about repair work, but restructuring the way in order to prevent freedom of movement. Our translator possibly thought that with the use of ἐν σκόλοψι the preventive, obstructive work was sufficiently expressed.14 Note also that he uses ἐμφράσσω and ἐμφραγμός to render the words he derives from the root גדר in ἐμφραχθήσεται θυγάτηρ Εφραιμ ἐν φραγμῷ. The sg. גדרה has been transformed to the pl. ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς. Whichever way she turns, she would find her way blocked. Conversely the pl. נְתִיבוֹתֶיהָ has been transformed to the sg. τὴν τρίβον αὐτῆς; there will be found no route for her to follow.

2.7 [Ἑ 2.9]) καὶ καταδιώξεται τοὺς ἐραστὰς αὐτῆς καὶ οὐ μὴ καταλάβῃ αὐτοῦς· καὶ ἰητήσει αὐτοὺς καὶ οὐ μὴ εὕρῃ αὐτοὺς· καὶ ἐρεῖ Πορεύσομαι καὶ ἐπιστρέψω πρὸς τὸν ἀνδρά μου τὸν πρῶτον, ὅτι καλῶς μοι ἤν τότε ἤ νῦν.

and she will chase her lovers but never catch up with them. She will look for them but never find them. Then she will say ‘I will go back to my first man, for it was better for me then than now’

14 Joosten (71), citing “to wall up” in LSJ (s.v. ἀνοικοδομέω 2), renders our text as “je barricaderai ses chemins.” Of the three attestations from Classical Greek for this sense, Aristoph. Pax 100 is the only one that is text-critically assured. In the end he comes down on “une traduction ad sensum.” In Muraoka GELS s.v. ἀνοικοδομέω 2 we also suggested “to wall up” for Ho 2.6, La 3.5, 3.9. At La 3.9 the verb is parallel to ἐμφυράσσω, and the whole verse resembles our Ho case very much: ἀνοικοδομήσειν ὁδοὺς μου, ἐνεφραζέων τρίβους μου, ἐτάραξεν, which translates מְצַוֶּה וְגָדַרְתִּי. Turner (1977) suggests that our translator “clearly resorted to the Lamentations version,” though it is not easy to demonstrate that point. The adjunct κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ La 3.5 (also 3.7) is indicative of the notion of hostility and inconvenience: Ἑ reads ὑπὲρ (3.7) and ἐντέλλομαι (3.5).
καταδιώκειν] The Piel stem here probably has the value of plurality of actions15, “to pursue ardently” (BDB s.v. Piel) or “persistently.”16 Note also the selection of καταδιώκειν instead of διώκειν.

καθὼς μοι ἐν ἑαυτῷ τῷ θεῷ is equivocal, for it can be a Pf. 3ms or an adjective with ἐν understood.

and she did not realise that it was I that had given her the grain and the wine and the oil, and I multiplied silver for her, but she made (images) of silver and gold for Baal.

αὐτὴ ἄρα] The Greek pronoun is probably not a mechanical reproduction of its Hebrew equivalent, but is focusing on her, an accusing finger in her direction.

οὐκ ἔγνω ἄρα] The Greek Aorist here indicates a process, not a state of ignorance, ‘she was unaware,’ which could be expressed with οὐκ ἦδει, cf. ἔγνω κύριος ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἦδειν ἐτι πλὴν ἐμοῦ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἦδεις με ‘.. you are not acquainted with Me’ Is 45.5.

ἔγνω ἀνεξάρτητο] Opposed to her lovers.

δέδουξα ἡ γυνὴ] Not ἐδοξασία, aorist, once upon a time. She is still surviving, which she owes to God.

αὐτὴ δὲ] ≠ . On the function of the nominative, personal pronoun, see above. How daring she was!

ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ ἐποίησεν τῇ Ἡβραίῳ μητρὶ ἑαυτοῦ] The dative τῇ shows that ἐν cannot indicate transformation, “machen zu.”17 It is rather equivalent to dativus commodi. The use of the n.pl. adjectives suggests that εἴδωλα is understood, cf. τὸ ἀργυρὸν αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ χρυσίον αὐτῶν ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς εἴδωλα so ἐποίησεν αὐτῇ καὶ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ ἢθισσας τὰς τρισάριων τινὰς τὴν τῆς Ἡβραίας μητρίας. Ho 8.4. The addition of ἀργυρᾶ is understandable, given the frequent mention of the two metals together. Indeed the absence of κεφαλῆς strikes us as somewhat odd.

15 Thus pace JM § 52 d not about multiple subjects or objects. On the corresponding stem in Akkadian that can at times indicate plurality of actions, see Kouwenberg 1997.162-68. Cf. Jenni 1968.215. Ibn Ezra disputes the notion of “always,” mentioning examples in which Qal and Piel of the same verbs seem to make no difference.


17 KBS s.v. I פעל qal 3.
The feminine gender of Baal occurs for the first time in Jd 2.13A, though in conjunction with ταῖς Ἀστάρταις. Likewise in Ho 13.1 and Zp 1.4. Most of the time, however, its gender is masculine, if explicitly indicated at all.

2.9 (H 2.11) διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιστρέψω καὶ κομιοῦμαι τὸν σῖτόν μου καθ’ ὥραν καὶ τὸν οἶνόν μου ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀφελοῦμαι τὰ ἱμάτια μου καὶ τὰ οἶθόνια μου τῷ μή καλύπτειν τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτῆς:

Therefore I shall again carry off my grain in its hour and my wine in its time and remove my clothes and my linen cloth in order for her not cover her indecency

לְכַסּוֹת וּפִשְׁתִּי צַמְרִי וְהִצַּלְתִּי בְּמוֹעֲדוֹ וְתִירוֹשִׁי בְּעִתּוֹ דְגָנִי וְלָקַחְתִּי אָשׁוּב לָכֵן:

The negator in G is required by the context, though its Vorlage may have read מִלְּכַסּוֹת, as in 4Q166 [= 4QpHos a] 2.9. Even so an inf. cst. can be used to complement a substantive, e.g. לָלִין מָקוֹם Gn 24.23, שָׁרֵת כְּלֵי 2Ch 24.14.20

2.10 (H 2.12) καὶ νῦν ἀποκαλύψω τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν αὐτῆς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἐραστῶν αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐ μὴ ἔξεληται αὐτὴν ἐκ χειρὸς μου:

and I shall now expose her impurity in front of her lovers, and nobody will ever deliver her out of my hand

τῇ ν ἀκαθαρσίᾳ αὐτῆς ἐμὲ δεὶκνύσει καὶ ἀποκαλύψω τὴν ἀρχαίας μιρίς:

The noun מַעְרֵי מָיִם is a hapax in BH. It is attested in QH, e.g. לא ישמיע בק🌹 בת ימיה ויהו מים לא ישמיע בק ROLE. ‘there shall not be found in my mouth ..’ From the parallel words the lexeme obviously denotes some vice verbally and orally, but not visually expressed, which, however, does not fit our context, and the understanding represented by G appears to come closer to the truth. It is most likely a euphemistic reference to pudenda, cf. δείξω ἐθνεῖσιν τὴν αἰσχύνην σου ἡραίοιτε γενειάδι Na 3.5.

18 Harl (1988,209) mentions Le Déaut, who maintained that this feminine gender reflects the Jewish reading tradition, wherein בַּעַל was euphemistically pronounced בֹּשֶׁת, which is αἰσχύνη, a fem. noun, in LXX.
19 So noted by us (Muraoka 1979.185).
21 Cf. DCH V 596b. For an older view, see Olyan 1992.
and I shall do away with all her merry-makings, her holidays, her festivities on new moon, and her sabbaths and all public festivals.

and I shall destroy her vine-tree(s) and her fig-trees, which she said 'These are my earnings given to me by my lovers,' and I shall make them a witness, and the beasts of the field and the birds of the sky and the creeping animals of the earth will devour them.

The disagreement between ™ and ℓ in terms of number and determination is noteworthy. It is difficult to fathom a reason for it. ℓ appears in the pl. at ℎ בַּגְפָנִים ™ 3.17 and translated accordingly with ℓ ν τὰ σφήλειας.

Both antecedents are feminine in gender. The neuter plural concord is due to the predicate, μισθώματα, as in ℓ αἱ ἑπτὰ βόες αἱ καλαὶ ἑπτὰ ἔτη ἐστίν 'the seven beautiful cows are seven years' ℳ 41.26.22

Joosten (74) mentions a study by Spicq (1991.1040), according to whom μισθώματα denotes what a prostitute earns for her service as well as a gift she gives to her customers, a disputable position, for the Greek noun can not mean ‘gift,’ for which δόμα, δόσις etc. are used. On καὶ σῦ

22 See SSG § 77 l.
δέδωκας μισθώματα πάσι τοῖς ἐρασταῖς σου καὶ ἐφόρτιζες αὐτοὺς τοῦ ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς σὲ κυκλόθεν ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ σου Ez 16.33 (GELS s.v. μίσθωμα) we have suggested it means either “she gave away what she had earned as a harlot” or “out of her income as a harlot she paid her client lovers an incentive for the bother of coming to please her,” in any case no gift.

See also below at 4.7.

εἰς μαρτύριον λְיַעַר שַׂמְתִּים] The syntagm <τίθημι (act. or mid.) + acc. + εἰς> is unattested prior to SG, see GELS s.v. τίθημ I 3 b, II 4.

The sg. form καταφάγεται might speak against it, for the sg. verb concording with three n. pl. subject nouns is rather unlikely. Cf. כָּל־יוֹשֵׁב וְאֻמְלַל הָאָרֶץ תֶּאֱבַל יֵאָסֵפוּ הַיָּם וְגַם־דְּגֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׂדֶה בְּחַיַּת b) vs. 18 (20)? The sg. form καταφάγεται might speak against it, for the sg. verb concording with three n. pl. subject nouns is rather unlikely. Cf. כָּל־יוֹשֵׁב וְאֻמְלַל הָאָרֶץ תֶּאֱבַל יֵאָסֵפוּ הַיָּם וְגַם־דְּגֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׂדֶה בְּחַיַּת Ho 4.3. In our passage fishes are absent for the obvious reason.

2.13 [(H 2.15)] καὶ ἔκδικήσω ἐπ’ αὐτῆς τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν Βααλιμ, ἐν αἷς ἐπέθυεν αὐτοῖς καὶ περιετίθετο τὰ ἐνώτια αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ καθόρια αὐτῆς καὶ ἐπορεύετο ὀπίσω τῶν ἐραστῶν αὐτῆς, ἐμοῦ δὲ ἐπελάθετο, λέγει κύριος.

and I shall punish her for the days of Baals when she would offer sacrifices and wear her ear-rings and necklaces and go after her lovers, forgetting me, says the Lord.

This Greek verb in the sense of ‘to punish’ appears to be an important part of the vocabulary of the Minor Prophets. Of a total of its 81 attestations in the entire LXX it occurs here 17 times, very often rendering Qal ἔπικα. The rection occurring here, ἔκδικέω τι ἐπί τινα, recurs five more times.23 τῶν Βααλιμ μῆλητον] Joosten (74) opines that understood the pl. suffix /-i:m/ as part of the name of the divinity, but then he could have said τοῦ or τῆς. The woman also worshipped a female Baal (vs. 8).24 If anything, ἔπικα, 23 See GELS s.v. I, where other rection patterns are also mentioned.
24 Cf. HALOT s.v. I 2 b.
not only with reference to Baal of local Canaanites, but also may have started being used as a generic name for any foreign divinity. Then its plural could be genuinely plural. Note especially καὶ ἐξαρῶ τὰ ὄνομα [not τὸ ὄνομα] τῶν Βααλίμ (הַבְּעָלִים תְמוֹת) ἐκ στόματος αὐτῆς vs. 17.

εἰπέθεν δὲ ἡ Ἰσσήκη] The Impf. in θ accordingly reflects the imperfective aspect of ἡ Ἰσσήκη: 'she offered sacrifices habitually.' The two following way-yiqtol forms, however, are not consecutive in the sense that the actions indicated by them took place after the first. All the three indicate what she used to do habitually. Unless there was a functional argument for delaying the last two verbs, there was no other alternative. Thus the syntactic situation differs from what we find in, e.g. יַחְדָּו וְעִם־בָּנָיו עִמּוֹ וַתִּגְדַּל וַיְחַיֶּהָ קָנָה אֲשֶׁר קְטַנָּה אַחַת כִּבְשָׂה 2Sm 12.3, where מִפִּתּו, מִכֹּסוֹ, וּבְחֵיקוֹ are fronted to underline the extraordinary affection showered on the lamb, and the fronting enabled the repetition of the imperfective yiqtol.25 θ appropriately repeats the Impf. twice more: καὶ περιετίθετο καὶ ἐπορεύετο. Then it shifts to the Aorist, ἐπελάθετο, with which the translator characterises her attitude which was manifest in her habitual deeds, and for that purpose there was no need to use the Impf., ἐπελανθάνετο, as in υγίας τῆς σβεστικῆς φύσεως ἐπελανθάνετο // πῦρ ὑπελευθερώθη στὰς χεῖράς σου.26 His choice of περιτιθήματα instead of κοσμέω, which he rightly uses at Ez 16.11, may be a solution of a syntagmatic problem presented by the verb κοσμέω, which normally takes a person or something to be decorated as its object.

τὰ ἐνώτια αὐτῆς τὰ ἐνώτια] The Hebrew word, ἔνωτια, denotes a ring used to decorate one’s nose or ears. Its etymology notwithstanding, ἐνώτιον (< οὖς, ὄτιόν) appears to be used rather loosely in SG, as shown in ἐδώκα ἐνώτιον περὶ τὸν μυκτήρα σου (ἐγένοντο) Ez 16.12 and ἐνώτιον ἐν ῥινῷ υός (ἵππος) Pr 11.22. Then at Ge 35.4 we might not be having to do with tautology not only in ἐγένοντο, but also in θ τὰ ἐνώτια τὰ ἐν τοῖς ῥινοῖς αὐτῶν. By selecting the pl. ἐνώτια our translator is probably using the word in the sense of ear-rings, and that is a probable reason why he has not rendered

26 See Muraoka 1979.185, where we also mentioned Thackeray (1923.28-39), who had argued that XII and Ez 1-27, 40-48 were translated by one and the same person. On this issue, see also Joosten XIII.
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2.14 [Ἑ 2.16]) Διὰ τοῦτο ἵδον ἐγὼ πλανῶ αὐτὴν καὶ κατάξω αὐτὴν εἰς ἔρημον καὶ λαλήσω ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῆς

Therefore, behold, I shall lead her astray and lead her down into a wilderness and speak to her affectionately

κατάξω αὐτὴν καὶ λαλήσω ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῆς. As we (Index s.v. πλανάω) indicated, this equivalence occurs four times in LXX, 28 of which twice in καὶ ὁ προφήτης ἐὰν πλανηθῇ καὶ λαλήσῃ, ἐγὼ κύριος πεπλάνηκα τὸν προφήτην ἐκεῖνον Ez 14.9, where the translator presumably read ἡ τῆς as τῆς.

It is unlikely that πλανάω as well as πᾶσι should be being used with negative connotation, ‘to mislead,’ as was seen by Rashi: “to persuade her and talk her into following Me (away from her familiar path).” Initially she may fail to understand why the Lord should do that to her. The pronoun ἐγὼ is not a mechanical representation of ἐγὼ, which he knows is indispensable in Hebrew.29

κατάξω] Justly corrected by Ziegler (121) from τάξω universally read in the manuscripts. An urban settlement is perceived as situated on higher ground. In the majority of its attestations in SG the prefix κατά appears to retain its etymological value.

καὶ λαλήσω ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῆς τὰ τῆς ἀκήρου ἀνάρσεις, καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται ἐκεῖ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἡμερίτης καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἀναβάσεως αὐτῆς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου.

2.15 [Ἑ 2.17]) καὶ δώσω αὐτῇ τὰ κτήματα αὐτῆς ἐκεῖθεν καὶ τὴν κοιλάδα Ἀχωρ διανοίξαι σύνεσιν αὐτῆς, καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται ἐκεῖ κατὰ τὰς ἥμερας ἡμερίτης καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἀναβάσεως αὐτῆς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου.

27 By Dr M. Theocharos in Athens I am informed that in Ancient Greece women wore only ear-rings, and Greek did not have a word for nose-rings. Some ancient Cypriot terra cottas are known, showing men wearing nose-rings, but one does not know what they were called.

28 We also noted (ib. 321, s.v. πιθός) that διαπλανάω ‘to mislead thoroughly’ is used at Jd 19.8L.

29 SD ad loc. remarks: “Im Griech. steht ein betontes Pers.-Pron.”

30 Cf. Dogniez 2002.6-10. To say, as Babut (1995.81) does, it means “offrir un partenaire une (nouvelle) relation positive” is reading into the context.
and I shall give her her farms from there and the valley of Achor in order to enable her comprehension, and she will be humbled there as in the days of her infancy and as in the days of her ascent from the land of Egypt
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כִּימֵי שָּׁמָּה וְעָנְתָה תִּקְוָה לְפֶתַח עָכוֹר וְאֶת־עֵמֶק מִשָּׁם אֶת־כְּרָמֶיהָ לָהּ וְנָתַתִּי מֵאֶרֶץ־מִצְרָיִם עֲלֹתָהּ וִּכְיוֹם נְעוּרֶיהָ.

Two common renditions of כְּרָמֶיהָ are ἀμπελών and ἄμπελος. Given its meaning, כְּרָמֶיהָ here is, in spite of its derivation from κτάομαι ‘to acquire,’ unlikely to mean ‘possessions’ in general, including household utensils and clothes.31

καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται וְעָנְתָה וְעֻנְּתָה תִּקְוָה לְפֶתַח Whereas our translator undoubtedly identified לִפְתֹח in his Hebrew text, he is unlikely indulging in a somewhat complicated etymological game of II נַחֲק ‘to assemble’ and סְנֵסִיס < סְנֵיָהוּ and συνίημι. It is rather a case of contextually informed, somewhat free translation. When she has regained her better sense, a hope32 of return to her good old days is opening up for the woman. This Greek substantive is used more than 100 times in SG, but in no case can be with confidence analysed as derived from σύνειμι.

καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται νηπίος Of multiple homonymous roots Θ represents one from which ὑπήρχε is derived. However, pace Joosten (76), no painful punishment need be implied, which would not harmonise well with κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας νηπίοτητος αὐτῆς. Nor need the rendition presuppose ταπεινωθήσεται can be analysed as middle in value: “to take a humble, low view of one’s own value out of a sense of awe or respect for sbd else” (GELS s.v. ταπεινόω 1 f), a position she would have taken in the presence of parents and other adults.33 Cf. εἴπατε τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ τοῖς δυναστεύουσιν Ταπεινώθητε καὶ καθίσατε, ὅτι καθηρέθη ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν στέφανος δόξης ὑμῶν Je 13.18.

κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἀναβάσεως αὐτῆς ἐκ γῆς Ἀιγύπτου τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν κατεκληρόνομσα "by expelling Canaanites they had acquired their land" (PG 126.612). Wolff’s (1965.37) remark sounds to us a bit too clever: “LXX verallgemeinert τὰ κτήματα αὐτῆς = ‘ihre Besitztümer’ und aktualisiert damit den Text für die städtischen Gemeinden des Diasporajudentums.” Cf. Frankel 1831.156 on Dt 22.9.

31 Already in Muraoka 1993 s.v. we preferred ‘landed property’ to ‘possessions.’ At Ji 1.11 SD renders the word as “Sklaven.” Though our noun is the subject of θηρνεῖτε, a passage such as πενθήσει ἡ γῆ ἡ ἔρημή ἡ τῆς ἀλεξάνδρου Ἡσίατος Ho 4.3 is nothing unusual in the Bible. In BDAG s.v. we read “2 landed property, field, piece of ground, in later usage κ. came to be restricted to this meaning (since Demosth. ...).”

Theophylactus, in his commentary on Hosea, says: τοὺς Χαναναίος ἐκβαλοῦσα, τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν κατεκληρόνομσα “by expelling Canaanites they had acquired their land” (PG 126.612).

32 Cf. κατοικιῶ σε ἐκ’ ἐλπίδα Ho 2.18.

33 νηπιότης probably indicates an age lower than SD’s “Jugend.” See also Joosten 74, discussing his rendition, “les jours de sa petite enfance.”
Israelites went through a fair bit of humbling, trying experiences. Cf. Dt 8.2, 3, 16, where עִנָּה is rendered with κακόω ‘to put through difficulties.’

2.16 [H 2.18]) καὶ ἔσται ἐν ἔκεινῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, λέγει κύριος, καλέσει με ὁ ἄνήρ μου, καὶ οὐ καλέσει με ἐτι Βααλίμ.

and on that day, says the Lord, she will call me ‘My husband,’ and she will not call me ‘Baalim’ any longer.

καλέσει με Ρααλίμ] Here is another case of admixture of direct and indirect speech. See above at 1.2. Pace Joosten (76) our translator could not have read the yod of Ρααλίμ as the suffix for ‘me,’ for which one would expect τακράιναι, and cf. the immediately following Ρααλίμ.

Βααλίμ] See above at vs. 13. Here Βααλίμ is of course a reference to one divinity.

2.17 [H 2.19]) καὶ ξαρά τὰ ὄνοματα τὸν Βααλίμ ἐκ στόματος αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθῶσιν οὐκέτι τὰ ὄνοματα αὐτῶν.

and I shall remove the names of Baals out of her mouth, and their names will never be mentioned again.

οὐ μὴ μνησθῶσιν οὐκέτι τὰ ὄνοματα αὐτῶν τῆς μνήμης [H] means ‘they will not be invoked by name again.’ Is θ an attempt to harmonise the two halves of the verse?

Unlike ἄνα-, ὑπομιμνῆσκοι this high-frequency verb never appears in SG in the active voice form, but always as μιμνῆσκομαι, even where the meaning is not middle nor passive. However, if our translator’s consonantal Vorlage looked like the MT, with the preposition -β in particular, μιμνῆσκομαι must be understood by him as passive Nifal. μεμμὴ ἐκ τῆς μνήμης ‘to remember (someone) under a certain name’ is unknown to Biblical Hebrew. Then our μνησθῶσιν must be semantically passive, in which case it can also be rendered as ‘will not be retained in memory,’ the names will not be on the people’s memory sticks any more.34

2.18 [2.20] καὶ διαθήσομαι αὐτοῖς ἐν ἔκεινῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ διαθήκην μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τοῦ ἀγροῦ καὶ μετὰ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἀρπητῶν τῆς γῆς καὶ τῶν καιρῶν καὶ πόλεμον συντρίψω ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ κατοικίω σε ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι.

34 In GELS s.v. 2 we mentioned this sense as a possible alternative.
and I will conclude a contract for them on that day with the beasts of the field and with the birds of the sky and with the animals creeping on the ground, and bow and sword and war I shall abolish from the earth and I will let you live with a hope

μετὰ τὸν ἔρπετον τῆς γῆς ἀκμάζων οὐκ ἐχομεν [If Η’s Vorlage also lacked the preposition, the translator has sensibly supplied it, for it could be absent from the second noun phrase, but not from the last alone. Cf. σὺν τοῖς θηρίοις τοῦ ἀγροῦ καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἐρπετοῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ σὺν τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ Η 4.3.]

πόλεμον συντρίψω [Πόλεμος as direct object of συντρίβω also occurs in συνέτριψεν (ἦν) τὰ κράτη τῶν τόξων, ὡπλον καὶ ῥομφαίαν καὶ πόλεμον Ps 75.4, see also Ex 15.3, Ju 9.7, 16.2. Hence it is not absolutely necessary to take the word as an ellipsis for ὁπλα πολέμου. Perhaps an end to armed conflicts is meant.]

καὶ κατοικίω σε ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι [Whilst Theophylactus remarks that ἡ γῆ can denote the land (of Israel) well as the earth and the opposition in our verse between τῆς γῆς and τοῦ οὐρανοῦ makes it more likely that the prophet meant the former, readers ignorant of Hebrew could scarcely have failed to notice the contrast here between τῆς γῆς and τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, and may have understood ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς as we have translated above.]

καὶ κατῴκισας με [Three things stand out. Firstly, σε as against σε. Our translator sees the woman as representing the whole community of Israel. Secondly, this is the only case in LXX where κατῴκισας corresponds to κατοικίσω. Joosten (77f.) holds that this Greek verb represents κατοικίζω. True, κατασκεύαστε and κατασκευάστε are two distinct concepts. In certain contexts, however, they are interrelated and close to each other. See, for instance, τὴν τόπον θύσιν κατασκεύαστε καὶ κατασκευάστε Ps 4.9. When one can look forward (ἐπ’ ἐλπίδιοι) to a night of undisturbed, peaceful sleep, one is living a secured, peaceful life. Note the end of Ps 4.9 ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κοιμηθήσομαι καὶ ὑπνώσω, ὅτι σὺ, κύριε, κατὰ μόνας ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι κατοικίσας με. Cf. also ἄνατας ἔσω ἐσπευσμένος τῷ προφήτῃ κατοικίσας Ps 4.9.]

καὶ κατοικήσει Ιερουσαλημ πεποιθότως λάβῃ Ἑβραῖς Le 26.6, the second half of which reminds us of our Hosea verse. In XII we find relevant αὕτη ἡ πόλις ἡ φαυλώτρια ἡ κατοικούσα ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι Zp 3.1 and κατοικήσει Ιερουσαλημ πεποιθότως ήμεν ἔρισθαι καὶ κατασκεύαση ιερουσαλήμ Zc 14.11. Note a case with ἀρβανίτης, a synonym of ἀρβανίτης in in Is 14.30.

35 PG 126.617: Τοιτέστι, τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἢ καὶ τὰ ἄστερον ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς γεγονότα.
36 Le 26.6 is mentioned by Cohen (1948.11) ad Ho 2.20.
That the notions of hope and security are viewed as close to each other is apparent in

\[\text{םַחֲרִיד} \text{וְאֵין וְרָבַצָּת}: \text{תִּשְׁכָּב לָבֶטַח} \text{וְחָפַרְתָּ תִּקְוָה כִּי־יֵשׁ וּבָטַחְתָּ} \]

Jb 11.18f.37

2.19 \([\text{Η 2.21}]) \text{kai μνηστεύσομαι σε ἐμαυτῷ εἰς τὸν αἰώνα καὶ μνηστεύσομαι σε ἐμαυτῷ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἐν κρίματι καὶ ἐν ἐλέει καὶ ἐν οἰκτιρμοῖς}

and I shall betroth you to myself for ever and I shall betroth you to myself in righteousness and in justice and in mercy and in compassion.

\[\text{καὶ μνηστεύσομαι σε ἐμαυτῷ} \]

Joosten (78) rightly rejects the notion of ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐλπίδα.\(^{38}\) betrothal price, as sometimes applied here and to the following three prepositional phrases.\(^{38}\)

2.20 \([\text{Η 2.22}]) \text{kai μνηστεύσομαι σε ἐμαυτῷ ἐν πίστει, καὶ ἐπιγνώσῃ τὸν κύριον.}

and I shall betroth you to myself in faith, and you will come to know the Lord.

ἐπιγνώσῃ τὸν κύριον.\(^{39}\) Greek is more subtle than Hebrew here. The compound verb implies more than being acquainted with or aware of, which we indicated by defining its meaning as to come to know character and nature of, \text{GELS} \text{s.v. I.}\(^{39}\) We (1979.187) pointed out that, whether our translator, who could have used the simplex, γνώσῃ, so intended or not, his readership at least would not have misunderstood the text as referring to sexual intimacy, for up to this point the relationship between God and His people is being depicted in terms of marital relationship. Note the institution of temple prostitutes.

2.21 \([\text{Η 2.23}]) \text{kai ἔσται ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, λέγει κύριος, ἐπακούσομαι τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπακούσεται τῇ γῇ,}

and on that day, says the Lord, I shall hearken to the heaven, and it will hearken to the earth.

37 Hence we disagree with \text{BDAG} \text{s.v. ἐλπίς I bu, where it is stated that ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι in ἡ σάρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐκπρ. ἐλπίδι Ἄc 2.26 (< Ἱσραήλ Ἰσμαήλ Ps 16.9) is a Hebraism, meaning “in safety”; see already in \text{Muraoka} 1979.187.

38 So, for instance, Harper (1905.243). Keil (1975.64) characterises these four abstract nouns as qualities of a new relationship about to be established.

39 Cf. also Joosten 78.
The prefix ἐπι- underscores attention to speaker(s), not just reception of sound waves. Note its definitions given in GELS: 1. to give ear, listen; 2. to take sympathetic note of; 3. to accede to a request orally made by; 4. to grant sth in response to a request; 5. to react to oral message. We have put our Ho passage under 1, but it could come also under 2, as in τῷ θεῷ τῷ ἐπακούσαντι μοι ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεως Ge 35.3.

The first אענה is missing in ג and Peshitta. The repetition could be original: the first being generic, and the second specific. There are four parties involved here: 1) God, the creator and commander-in-chief, 2) the nature that requires rain and sunshine, 3) agricultural products, and 4) humans dependent on those products for survival. This interaction is reflected in the multifaceted syntagmatics of ענה and ἐπακούομαι in these two verses, 21 and 22. 1) responds to a call coming from 2), and 2) to the one coming from 3), and 3) to the one coming from 4).

αὐτὸς ἂν] ‘it in turn.’ This is a reading replacing ὁ οὐρανός in Rahlfs.

2.22 [H 2.24]) καὶ ἡ γῆ ἐπακούσεται τὸν σῖτον καὶ τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον, καὶ αὐτὰ ἐπακούσεται τῷ Ιεζραελ.

and the earth will grant the grain and the wine and the oil, and they will respond to Jezrael

2.23 [H 2.25]) καὶ σπερῶ αὐτὴν ἐμαυτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐλεήσω τὴν Οὐκ ἡλειμένην καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ λαβὼ μου Λαός μου εἰ σὺ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐρεῖ Κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἰ σὺ.

and I shall sow her on the earth for myself and pity the unpitied and say to Not my people ‘You are my people,’ and they will say ‘You are the Lord my God.’

καὶ σπερῶ αὐτὴν ἐμαυτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ λαβὼ μου Λαός μου εἰ σὺ

καὶ σπερῶ αὐτὴν ἐμαυτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ λαβὼ μου Λαός μου εἰ σὺ

She is to be sowed as seeds to produce abundant and right crops. Cf. σπερῶ αὐτοὺς ἐν λαοῖς καὶ ἐρὲι Κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἰ σὺ. See Zc 10.9. On variety of prepositions to go with this Greek verb, see Mt 13.19-24 in the parable of the sower.

The ג version is expanded, presumably an attempt to harmonise with what precedes.

40 Two patristic commentators make her a farmer (γεώργιος): Theodoretus (PG 81.1568) and Theophylactus (PG 126.624).
3.1) And the Lord said unto me, ‘Go again, and love a woman who loves wicked things, and an adulteress, as God loves the sons of Israel, though they look away towards alien gods and take delight in cakes (stuffed) with dried grapes.’

The aorist tense of the imperative contrasts with the present participle ἀγαπῶσαν describing the woman’s attitude and disposition. The prophet is commanded to take action, though it has been debated by scholars exactly what kind of action is meant.

καί2]1 According to the Massoretic cantillation the adverb דּוֹר is to be construed with what precedes it. דּוֹר as well as ētī are equally flexible as regards their position: e.g. 1.6 דּוֹר וְתָהְרָה κָאַי וְסָכַלָבְנ ētī; 12.92 דּוֹר אֵאָשׁ שְׁפָרֵךְ ētī קָאַיָּו; Zc 11.15 .. דּוֹר וְתָהְר. ētī λάβε σְאָוָם, where an athnach is found on the preceding Hebrew word. Thus there is no linguistic clue for settling the question.

The use of καί between the two imperatives in contrast to the asyndetic structure of the Hebrew text may be due to the fact that the translator thought that the imperative לֵךָ had its full significance, not a kind of interjection3. This might also account for the choice of πορεύομαι instead of βαδίζω, which latter is much more idiomatic in such an asyndetic construction, e.g. 1.2 βαδίζε λάβε σεαυτῷ γυναῖκα for .. σας σʼ τοῦ κόσμου. See also Am 7.12, 15.4

The MT form τῆς ἁμαρτίας is generally revocalised in conformity to the LXX reading and the Peshitta /rāḥmā/.5 But it is not absolutely necessary to read τῆς ἁμαρτίας for a passive participle can also indicate a state as in בּוּרְבֵבְר הַשָּׁל הַם ‘holding a sword’ Ct 3.8.6 Hence, she once fell in love and is still in love.

1 See a discussion in Wolff 1965.75.
2 Where the chapter and verse number differs between the Hebrew and the Greek texts, we follow the latter’s numbering.
3 Cf. JM § 105 e.
4 See above at 1.2 and GELS s.v. βαδίζω.
5 See, e.g., BHS, ad loc., and Wolff 1965.70.
6 See JM § 121 o, and cf. also Simon 1989.45; Macintosh 1997.95 and BHQ 56*. 
πονηρά] Our translator obviously read בֶּשֶׁת so the Peshitta /bīšāṭā/. He may have been aware of the traditional reading, בֶּשֶׇת, and of the application of בֶּשֶׇת to husband as in הוַי תּוֹנִי וַתָּפָר תּוֹנִי Je 3.20,7 but may have wished to see a more explicit expression such as מְשֵׂשִי and save his readership the wrong impression as if God was ordering the prophet also to commit adultery. The prophet is now being told to take another dubious woman and love her.

When the Greek word is used substantively in the neuter, the plural is the rule: so also at 7.15, Am 5.13,15, Mi 3.2, Na 1.11, Hb 1.13; exceptions are Am 5.14, Ma 2.17. In all these places the Hebrew text shows the singular, בֶּשֶׇת or תּוֹנִי.

μοιχαλίν] for the more usual μοιχαλίδα.8

ὁ θεός] If one excepts innumerable cases of κύριος δ θεός, Ma 2.17 is the only other instance in which the tetragrammaton in the MT is rendered with δ θεός. Regarding Je 1.2, where the same equivalence is observable, Streane (1896.27) writes: “It is unlikely that O’ would, without any apparent reason, violate their rule, carefully to distinguish the words for Lord and God.” Trg., Pesh., and Vulg. all apparently read יהוה. The rendering δ θεός may be due to the desire to contrast it with the following θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους.

ἀποβλέπουσιν], a verb recurring at Ma 3.9. The prefix ἀπο- is indicative of apostasy in this instance, whereas we have a totally different perspective in “He [= Moses] regarded disgrace for the sake of Christ as of greater value than the treasures of Egypt, because he was looking ahead to his reward (ἀπέβλεπεν γὰρ εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν)” Heb 11.26, i.e. looking away from A, and towards B instead. The v.l. ἐπι- may best be regarded as secondary arising from an attempt to harmonise the form of the verb with the following preposition.9 For further cases of the figurative use of ἐπί see De 31.18 ἐπέστρεψαν ἐπὶ θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους, 20 ἐπιστραφήσονται ἐπὶ θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους, Le 19.4 οὐκ ἐπακολούθησετε εἰδώλοις.

θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους] Also Ma 2.11. The Heb. collocation אלוהים אחרים may be rendered more literally as θ. ἔτεροι as in Ex 23.13.10


As Keil (1975.68) correctly points out, בֵּית does not refer to idols who love such fruits, but is parallel to מִינֵי, which has been correctly captured by the LXX.

---

7 See a persuasive argument by Keil 1975.67.
8 See Moulton - Howard 1919-29.131f.
9 See also GELS s.v. 2.
10 For nuances of the epithet ἀλλοτρίος, see GELS s.v. 3.
11 On the syntax of the participle in the construct state, see JM § 121 k.
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πέμματα. Note that the Greek word πέμμα is elsewhere in the LXX attested only in Ezekiel (11x), where it renders ניש. Otherwise, ניש is rendered variously: ἀμόρα ‘sweet cake’ Ct 2.5, λάγανον ἁπάντη τηγάνου 2K 6.19, ἀμορίτη 1C 16.3. Aquila (παλαϊα) seems to have read ניש, ‘aged, ancient.’

3.2) καὶ ἐμισθωσάμην ἑμαυτῷ πεντεκαίδεκα ἀργυρίου καὶ γομορ κριθῶν καὶ νεβελ οἴνου

And I hired (her) for myself for fifteen (pieces of) silver and a homer of barley and a flagon of wine.

ἐμισθωσάμην] ἑκρα must have been read as ἐκρα or ἐκρα. The absence of an object is awkward. Aquila’s ἔσκαψα is a rendering of a homonym, κή ‘to dig.’

LXX translators seem to have had some difficulty with this rather uncommon verb. Even when it is parallel to ἐκρα Qal in De 2.6, where it is translated with a straightforward equivalent, ἀγοράζω, the synonymous κρα is rendered with a colourless λαμβάνω. Is our translator, with the choice of μισθόω, referring to a prostitute? But Ehrlich (1912.171) wishes to interpret the unusual dagesh of the kaf in ἐκρα as indicating that the Massoretes wanted to read the form as ἐκσερήσα, which the LXX translates with our verb, μισθόω. Whether our translator actually read ואשלכת or not, the general thought seems to be close to that of the Genesis passage.

γομορ]. The same transliteration is found in Ez 45.11, 13, 14. The similarity in sound to the prophet’s wife Gomer must be noted. Though indeclinable just as the following νεβελ, γομορ must be understood as genitive of price.

---

12 The Hebrew word ניש at 1QpHab 6.11 probably means ‘strong men’; see Nitzan 1986.170.


14 Ehrlich (1912.171) maintains that the referent of the object suffix is vague, for it is, according to him, supposed to mean “da mietete ich mir eine,” for it could not possibly, in his view, refer to the prophet’s wife. Such a use of a pronominal suffix, however, is unknown to us.

Should we assume, however, that ואשיך was what the translator had in mind, as mentioned below, the final heh does not have to be an object suffix, for wa-eyqatla without being a genuine cohortative is well known. See JM § 47 d-e. On the other hand, אalice as a non-apocopated way-yiqtol is unlikely, for such is virtually confined to forms which are immediately followed by a guttural, e.g. עמריוו יבשע 1Kg 16.25; for more examples, see JM § 79 m.

15 Nöldeke (1910.76) mentions Arb. /karīyun/ ‘hirer.’

16 Cf. Wellhausen 1898.105: “.. dass Gomer in fremde Gewalt gekommen war, vielleicht gar in Sklaverei.”

17 This is also Ibn Ezra’s alternative interpretation: Simon 1989.272. Contra Simon loc. cit., I am not sure that Ibn Ezra rejects this interpretation in his main commentary on Hosea. See also Andersen - Freedman 1980.298f. for a discussion of various exegetical possibilities.

18 See Mayser 1934.218-23, esp. 221f. and SSG § 22 i.
3.3) καὶ εἶπα πρὸς αὐτήν Ἡμέρας πολλὰς καθήσῃ ἐπ᾽ ἐμοὶ καὶ οὐ μὴ πορνεύσῃς οὐδὲ μὴ γένῃ ἄνδρι, καὶ ἐγὼ εἶπόν σοι.

And I said to her, ‘You shall stay with me many days and shall not prostitute nor become (any) man’s (woman), and I also (shall stay) with you,’

κατὰ τὴν ημέραν τὴν ἰεράν, ἵνα μὴ τ留下了 καὶ οὐδὲ μὴ γένῃ ἂνδρι, καὶ ἐγὼ δείχνον Aleph. The sense of the verb may be defined as “to remain, and not move away or abandon.”

For a discussion of this unique rendition, see Muraoka 1991.214f. For a remarkable reading of Symmachus προσδοκῆςας με, see Ziegler 1943.353. Cf. also Wolff 1965.77, where he mentions Am 2.7 ἐλ Αλή. Manifestly our translator took βας at the end of the verse as parallel to αὐτήν with its beginning, mentally supplying καθήση ἐπὶ ἐμοὶ, although the collocation εἶπα πρὸς αὐτήν is otherwise unknown. Ibn Ezra completes the elliptical clause as πρὸς ἄλλοις πρὸς τινα, and see Old Latin: apud me ... apud te (Dold 1940.266).

For a discussion of this unique rendition, see Muraoka 1991.214f. For a remarkable reading of Symmachus προσδοκῆςας με, see Ziegler 1943.353. Cf. also Wolff 1965.77, where he mentions Am 2.7 ἐλ Αλή. Manifestly our translator took βας at the end of the verse as parallel to αὐτήν with its beginning, mentally supplying καθήση ἐπὶ ἐμοὶ, although the collocation εἶπα πρὸς αὐτήν is otherwise unknown. Ibn Ezra completes the elliptical clause as πρὸς ἄλλοις πρὸς τινα, and see Old Latin: apud me ... apud te (Dold 1940.266).

For a discussion of this unique rendition, see Muraoka 1991.214f. For a remarkable reading of Symmachus προσδοκῆςας με, see Ziegler 1943.353. Cf. also Wolff 1965.77, where he mentions Am 2.7 ἐλ Αλή. Manifestly our translator took βας at the end of the verse as parallel to αὐτήν with its beginning, mentally supplying καθήση ἐπὶ ἐμοὶ, although the collocation εἶπα πρὸς αὐτήν is otherwise unknown. Ibn Ezra completes the elliptical clause as πρὸς ἄλλοις πρὸς τινα, and see Old Latin: apud me ... apud te (Dold 1940.266).

For a discussion of this unique rendition, see Muraoka 1991.214f. For a remarkable reading of Symmachus προσδοκῆςας με, see Ziegler 1943.353. Cf. also Wolff 1965.77, where he mentions Am 2.7 ἐλ Αλή. Manifestly our translator took βας at the end of the verse as parallel to αὐτήν with its beginning, mentally supplying καθήση ἐπὶ ἐμοὶ, although the collocation εἶπα πρὸς αὐτήν is otherwise unknown. Ibn Ezra completes the elliptical clause as πρὸς ἄλλοις πρὸς τινα, and see Old Latin: apud me ... apud te (Dold 1940.266).
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οὐ μή] on this forceful and solemn negation, see *GELS* s.v. οὐ, g.

ἀνδρὶ] Many witnesses add ἐτέρῳ apparently for the sake of clarity. Cf. De 24.2 καὶ ἀπελθοῦσα γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ (יָדָה) and Je 3.1 ἀπέλθη ἀπʼ αὐτοῦ καὶ γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ (יאֵמֶל). The phrase γίνομαι ἀνδρὶ with a woman as subject means “to enter intimate relationship with a man.” Thus Ru 1.13 γενέσθαι ἀνδρὶ; Ez 16.8 ἐγένετο αὐτῷ καὶ γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ (אַחֵר לְאִישׁ וְהָיְתָה וְהָלְכָה).

Many witnesses add ἑτέρῳ apparently for the sake of clarity. Cf. De 24.2 καὶ ἀπελθοῦσα γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ (אַחֵר לְאִישׁ וְהָיְתָה וְהָלְכָה) and Je 3.1 ἀπέλθῃ ἀπʼ αὐτοῦ καὶ γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ (לאֵשׁ וְהָיְתָה מֵאִתּוֹ הָלְכָה).

The phrase γίνομαι ἀνδρὶ with a woman as subject means “to enter intimate relationship with a man.” Thus Ru 1.13 γενέσθαι ἀνδρὶ; Ez 16.8 ἐγένετο αὐτῷ καὶ γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ (אַחֵר לְאִישׁ וְהָיְתָה וְהָלְכָה).

The phrase γίνομαι ἀνδρὶ with a woman as subject means “to enter intimate relationship with a man.” Thus Ru 1.13 γενέσθαι ἀνδρὶ; Ez 16.8 ἐγένετο αὐτῷ καὶ γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ (אַחֵר לְאִישׁ וְהָיְתָה וְהָלְכָה).

It also indicates that the verb to be understood is not אָכֵח, but אָשׁב.

3.4) διότι ἡμέρας πολλὰς καθήσονται οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ οὐκ ὄντος βασιλέως οὐδὲ ὄντος ἄρχοντος οὐδὲ οὔσης θυσίας οὐδὲ οὔσης θυσιαστηρίου οὐδὲ ιερατείας οὐδὲ δήλων.

because many days will the sons of Israel remain without a king, and without a ruler, and without sacrifice, and without an altar, and without priesthood, and without means of divination.

οὐκ ὄντος ..] a praiseworthy stylistic achievement. The genitive absolute, which is by no means frequent in the LXX, 25 often renders a Hebrew circumstantial clause. So, e.g., Ge 18.1 Θεὸς δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς τῇ δρυὶ τῇ Μαμβρη καθημένου αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς for πεταῖ, ἀναλήσῃ καὶ καταβάς.

In Hellenistic Greek, μή is normal with the participle and infinitive. 26 ἄρχοντος] always = ἐν in XII, except at Mi 5.2, where it renders לְשׁוֹן. The Greek noun ἄρχον often occurs in conjunction with βασιλεύς, and following it, which most likely indicates the former’s humbler position in the hierarchy. See *GELS* s.v. I.

οὐδὲ] οὐκ A-Q* etc., perhaps because the following pair is to be grouped differently from the preceding one (of persons).

θυσιαστηρίου] an equation attested only here in LXX. Even in Hosea (10.1,3, both // θυσιαστήριον = מְזֻבָּה), στήλη renders the Hebrew word in

24 See JM § 160 oa, SQH § 40 d, and SSG § 83 f.

25 Cf. Soisalon-Soininen 1987 (1973), 175-80. None of the functions Soisalon-Soininen attributes to the gen. abs. in the LXX – temporal, conditional, and concessive – seems to apply to our examples here: they are purely circumstantial in the true sense of the term. See now SSG § 31 h.

26 See BDF 1961 § 430, and now SSG § 83 b (v), bd.
question. So also at Mi 5.12. The unusual rendering can be explained as due to the accompanying θυσία.27

ἱερατείας [It is hard to decide whether this rendering is due to ignorance on the part of our translator or it is simply a free rendering. In XII this is the only occurrence of ἱερατεία, and the equation is unique in the entire LXX, while ἱερατεία renders either κήρυξ or the Piel infinitive construct of םס. The Hebrew word דֶּשֶׁק is usually translated with ἐπομίς, e.g. Ex 25.7 (23× in all), ποδήρης only at Ex 28.31, στολή in 2Kι 6.14, and 1Ch 15.27, and also transliterated at Jd 17.5 et passim (13×). Seeing that the Greek translators understood דֶּשֶׁק as a kind of garment, we might be permitted to regard the rendering ἱερατεία ‘priesthood’ as a free rendering, a case of metonymy.

דֶּשֶׁק[ This Hebrew word occurs also at Zc 10.2 and is translated οἱ ἀποφθεγμένοι. Its other renderings in the LXX are: γλυπτά Ez 21.26, εἰδόλα Ge 31.19, 34, 35, κενοτάφια 1K 19.13, 16, and transliterated at Jd 17.5, 18.14, 17, 18, 20, 1K 15.23, 4K 23.24. The translator of XII empha-sises the divining function of the Hebrew word. Cf. also Trg. in our place: מְחַוֵּי. The Greek word δῆλοι appears nowhere else in XII, while elsewhere in the LXX it renders either ἀνρίμ (Nu 27.21, 1K 28.6) or κενοτάφια (De 33.8, 1K 14.41). The combination of דֶּשֶׁק and τράπες occurs also at Jd 17.5, 18.14, 17, 18, 20, each time transliterated in Codex A, B, and L.

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιστρέψουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν κύριον τὸν θεόν αὐτῶν καὶ Δαυιδ τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτῶν ἐπ᾿ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν.

After this the sons of Israel will return and seek the Lord their God and David their king and will be astounded at the good (deeds) of His at the end of the days.

The change of tense, Imperfect > Perfect, indicates that the verb שָׁב does not have the typical adverbial force “again,” but is used in the sense of “to return (in repentance).” The Greek version, however, does not distinguish these two different uses of the Hebrew verb. Thus we find ἐπιστρέφω at Zc 5.1, 6.1, Ma 1.4, where the Hebrew verb means “again”: at Ma 1.4 ἐπιστρέψωμεν και ἀνοικοδομήσωμεν τὰς ἐρήμους the first verb is rather mechanically used, since the text does not mean a second rebuilding. For the rest of the Old Testament the following results may be given:28

27 Likewise Vulg. altar and Pesh. /madbḥā/.
28 This enquiry is based on the list given in BDB s.v. שָׁב Qal 8. See also GELS s.v. 4, b.
(a) ἐπανέρχομαι + inf. – Jb 7.7; (b) ἐπαναστρέφω + inf. – De 24.4; (c) ἐπιστρέφω – De 30.9 (+ inf.), 3K 13.33 (οὐκ ἐπέστρεψεν Ἱεροβομ απὸ τῆς κακίας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν καὶ ἐποίησεν ..), 19.6 (ἐπιστρέψας ἐκοιμήθη), 4K 19.9, 21.3, 2C 33.3, Ec 1.7 (+ inf.), 4.1, 7, 9.11, Esr 9.14 (+ inf.), Ne 9.28 (+ inf.); (d) πάλιν – Ge 26.18, 30.31, Jd A 19.7, 2Ch 19.4, Is 6.13, Je 18.4, 43.28, Jb 10.16; (e) προστίθημι + καί and verb. fin. – 4K 1.11, + inf. 4K 1.13.

ἐπιζητήσουσι] ζητήσουσι V L’ Δ-613-764 C’-68. The simplex is far more frequent: in XII, ζητέω (14×), ἐπιζητέω (2×). So also with God as object: Ho 5.15 ἐπιζητήσουσι [B-V+ z._] τὸ πρόσωπόν μου, Zp. 1.6 τοὺς μὴ ζητοῦντας τὸν κύριον, and similarly ib. 2.3, Ma 3.1. The composita is altogether rare in the LXX, occurring some 20 times. Its choice in our passage may have been influenced by the preceding ἐπιστρέψουσιν or it is an attempt to vary the style; see 7.10 ἐπιζητήσας αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐπέστρεψαν πρὸς κύριον .. καὶ οὐκ ἔξεστήσαν ..

ἐκστήσονται] The same rendering is found in Mi 7.17 ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ ἠμῶν ἐκστήσονται καὶ φοβηθήσονται ἀπὸ σοῦ ἡμᾶς καὶ τῆς παραδόξου τῆς σωτηρίας; Je 2.12 εὐδόκησα ἐπὶ σοί and συνεβουλεύσαντο ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ. The equivalence ἔξεστημι = ἥμισθη Qal or Piel is found nowhere else, while ἥμισθη is rendered with ἔκστασις in 1K 11.7 ἡ κυρίου, and analogously at 2C 14.13, 17.10, 20.29. This semantic relationship between fear and astonishment30 as reflected in the LXX is also testified by correspondences such as ἔξεστημι = ἔκστασις = ἡμισθεῖσθαι (Qal, Nifal, adjective) (very frequent), ἡμισθεῖσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς συνέσει αὐτοῦ.

For the rection with ἐπὶ + dat., see Ex 18.9 ἔξεστη δὲ Ἰσραήλ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἁγαθοῖς, Jd 11.16 ἐρ’ οὐ κατανόειτε τῶν ὁπώρων ὑμῶν, Jb 36.28 ἐπὶ τούτοις πάσιν οὐκ ἔξεσται σοὶ η δίνονα, Wi 5.2 ἐκσταθήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τῆς σωτηρίας; Je 2.12 ἔξεστη τὸ οὐρανός ἐπὶ τούτῳ; Ez 31.15A ἔξεστησαν ἐπὶ αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ἔξωλα.31 Rarely also with acc.: Ju 12.16 ἔξεστη ἡ καρδία .. ἐπὶ αὐτήν, 15.1 ἔξεστησαν ἐπὶ τὸ γεγονός, Is 52.14 ἐκσταθήσονται ἐπὶ σὲ πολλοὶ, and once with gen.: Si 43.18 ἐπὶ τοῦ ἴδιον αὐτῆς

29 Jb 31.23 φύλος κυρίου represents a reading different from the Massoretic punctuation, Ἰακύβ Ἰσραήλ.
30 Cf. BDAG s.v. 2: “more freq. in our lit. is the weakened or attenuated sense be amazed, be astonished, of the feeling of astonishment mingled w. fear, caused by events which are miraculous, extraordinary, or difficult to understand ..” Symmachus’ ἐπαινεσωσιν τον κυριον is probably an attempt to improve on the LXX reading.
31 See Muraoka 1993.88, s.v. ἐπὶ, II, 2, also with other verbs of mental attitude: εἰσχύνομαι ‘to feel ashamed’ Zc 9.5 λυπέω ‘to feel grieved’ Jn 4.9 χαίρω ‘to rejoice’ Hb 3.18; Johannessohn 1926.313 “Gemütsbewegung.” Cf. also Lk 2.47 ἐξεσταντο ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει αὐτοῦ.
ἐκστήσεται καρδία. Thus our translator did not see here, as Radaq and Keil do,32 a pregnant construction, ‘to fear (and go) to.’33 
ἐπὶ τοῖς ἁγαθοῖς] see the above-quoted Ex 18.9.
ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτοις τῶν ἡμερῶν] ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτοι τ. ἡ. V Q-26-407-II ’613 C; the same variant also in Mi 4.1, an attempt to reproduce the singular number of the Hebrew expression. This fixed formula recurs in Ge 49.1, Nu 24.14, De 4.30, Je 23.20 (ἐσχάτοι: A -τῶν), 37.24; 25.19 (ἐσχάτοι BS pau.: τῶν rel.), Ez 38.16, Da 10.14 (LXX sing., Th. pl.).34 Deviations are: De 31.29 τὰ κατὰ ἐσχάτον τῶν ἡμερῶν, Is 2.2 ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις.

32 Keil 1975.73.
33 Ibn Ezra also understood the verb פחד here in the sense of “to move, flow fast.”
34 The New Testament also offers examples for both numbers: sg. Heb 1.2, pl. 2Pt 3.3.
4.1) Ἀκούσατε λόγον κυρίου, υἱοὶ Ισραηλ, διότι κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ πρὸς τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τήν γῆν, διότι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια οὐδὲ ἔλεος οὐδὲ ἐπίγνωσις θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

Hear the word of the Lord, children of Israel, for the Lord has a case against those who inhabit the land, as there is no truth nor compassion nor knowledge of God in the land.

Ἀκούσατε] At least for the translator of XII and Ez whether to choose an Aorist or Present imperative appears to be partly conditioned by morphological consideration, namely to avoid the use of an ambiguous form, here ἀκούετε, which can be either an indic. Pres. 2pl. or an impv. Pres. 2pl. Thus Ho 5.1 starts off with Ἀκούσατε (aor.) ταῦτα, but then goes on with προσέ-χετε and ἐνωτίζεσθε, both of which are, in theory, equivocal, but the context and the parallelism leave it in no doubt that they are meant as imperatives. But for the said morphological ambiguity, the translator would have started with Ἀκούετε. In XII and Ez α,1 which contain a fair number of imperatives of ἄκουε, the sg. and pl. are ἄκουε and ἄκούσατε respectively without a single exception.2 This translation technique, however, must be seen as an idiosyncrasy of our translator, for outside our corpus forms like ἄκουσον and ἄκούετε (Impv.) are not few in number; e.g. Ge 23.5, Is 28.23, 1M 2.65 αὐτοῦ ἄκουετε πάσασ τᾶς ἡμέρας et passim. Indeed the aorist is the right tense when one is asked to hear what is about to be said, and not to hear, say, in the sense of ‘obey’ (a teaching, commandment etc.). However, the last two Impvs. can be understood in their ingressive, imperfective aspect. Especially instructive is the sequence of imperatives like Ez 40.4 ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ἰδε καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὀσί σου ἄκουε καὶ τάξον εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου πάντα; similarly 44.5.

1 We follow Thackeray (1903; 1921.38, 118-29), who argued that XII and Ez α (= Ez 1-27, 40-48) were translated single-handedly.

2 Ἀκούε Am 7.16, Ez 2.8 and 5 more times; ἄκούσατε Ho 4.1, Ez 6.3 and 15 more times. When found suitable, translators and authors elsewhere in the LXX did use ἄκουσον and ἄκούετε (2pl. impv.), e.g. ἄκουσον ἦμων Ge 23.6. Interesting in this respect is an alternation as in ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ἰδε (aor.) καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὀσί σου ἄκουε (pres.) καὶ τάξον (aor.) εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου πάντα Ἰούδεια: ‘With your eyes see, and with your ears hear, and put everything in your heart’ Ez 40.4. See SSG § 28 dfe.
Some Gk manuscripts add οἱ; the anarthrous form is normal with a noun in the vocative case, and this is no Hebraism. This is true also when ὡς has a noun in the absolute state, not construct as here, e.g. Πρόσεχε, οὐρανέ, ‘Pay heed, o heaven!’ De 32.1 (ὡς τῷ θεῷ). In Hebrew, in cases such as this the article is often added. See SSG § 3 d.

κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ ἴμι τινι] A nominal clause of possession or ownership often and optionally makes do without a copula, when the clause is non-preterite or future. See also ὦ μερίς ἡμῖν ἐν Δαυιδ οὐδὲ κληρονομία ἐν υἱῷ Ιεσσαι 3K 12.24', but L reads οὐκ ἐστιν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ. See SSG § 93 c. These bare existential clauses mostly reflect the underlying Semitic syntax, for the use of 'ὁ is rather rare in BH, ca. 140 times, though non-existence usually calls for the use of 'ὁ.

The equivalence κρίσις ῥίβα occurs also in 12.2 (3), Mi 6.2bis, Hb 1.3, whereas at Ma 3.5 κρίσις corresponds to μάνα, which is usually (24 times in XII alone) with κρίμα. Note esp. Mi 7.9, where both Heb. words are used side by side: ἴμι ῥίβα, τοῦ δικαιῶσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου· καὶ ποιήσει τὸ κρίμα μου.

The formula κρίσις τινι πρὸς τινα ‘someone has a case against another’ is also attested in 12.2 (3), Mi 6.2. Cf. κρίσις κρίνει πρὸς (Ῥς) τοὺς ἀντι-δίκους αὐτοῦ Je 27.34.

κατοικοῦντας τὴν γῆν] The verb κατοικέω may be complemented through an accusative noun phrase or a prepositional / adverbial phrase. Thus, e.g. τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτήν Am 6.8 and ὁ κατοίκων ἐν αὐτῇ 8.8.

ἀλήθεια ἔλεος] One MS (764) reverses the sequence. The two corresponding Heb. nouns, when combined as God’s attributes, appear as חֶסֶד אֱמֶת, which may have influenced this particular scribe. When separated, however, the reverse sequence also occurs as in מִשְׁפָּט וְעָשָׂה רִיב יָרִיב τοῦ δικαιῶσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου· καὶ ποιήσει τὸ κρίμα μου.

ἐπίγνωσις θεοῦ ἔλεος] An equivalence also occurring at 3K 7.14A (B: γνῶσις), ἐπ. θεοῦ Pr 2.5, Ho 4.6; 6.6 // ἔλεος. Apart from here, ἐπίγνωσις occurs a mere 7 times in SG, 3 of them in Ho.

4.2) ἄρα καὶ ψεῦδος καὶ φόνος καὶ κλοπὴ καὶ μοιχεία κέχυται ἐπί τῆς γῆς, καὶ αἵματα ἐρ’ αἵμασιν μίσγουσι.

Cursing and deception and murder and theft and adultery have been poured out over the land, and they mix blood upon blood.
The context requires that the Heb. word be understood in its negative connotation rather than neutrally, ‘taking a vow,’ for which latter note the equations אָלָה = ὁρκισμός (Ge 24.41, Le 5.1), ὁρκος (Pr 29.24), ὁρκωμοσία (Ez 17.18f.). Cf. Trg. = and Pesh. /lauttā’. Theophylactus (PG 126.632) understands ἀρά as λοιδορία and διαβολή, and Cyril (PG 71.113) as καταλαλία καὶ ὑβρίς. Rashi: “swore falsely” = Trg.

ψευδός χεὶς Here again our translator interprets the Heb. word as meaning a straightforward lying, not simply denial. Thus Pi. χεὶς = ψεῦδεσθαι in Ho 9.2, Hb 3.17, Zc 13.4; χεὶς = ψευδής Ho 10.13, Na 3.1, = ψευδός Ho 7.3, 11.12 (12.1). Cf. Trg. διαβολής and Pesh. /daggālūtā’/.

In we have a series of five infinitive absolutes. They indicate actions. Thus ψευδός is not ‘a lie,’ but an act of lying; it is a verbal noun, nomen actionis.6 This holds for all the five infinitives.

ψευδός καὶ φόνος] Why MS 46 reverses the sequence is not clear. If the scribe was thinking of the descending alphabetical sequence,7 he should have applied the principle to all the five verbal nouns.

κέχυται פָּרָצוּ a rather free rendering. The figure in is most likely that of water being poured out or overflowing as in כְּפֶרֶץ לְפָנַי אֶת־אֹיְבַי יְהוָה פָּרַץ מָיִם 2Sm 5.20 > Διέκοψεν κύριος τοὺς ἐχθρούς μου τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ ὡς διακόπτεται ὕδατα. Cf. διὰ τῆς διακοπῆς πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν διέκοψαν Mi 2.13 < כְּפֶרֶץ אֱלֹהִים פָּרַץ לְפָנֵיהֶם. The same Heb. verb as here has also been understood as meaning ‘to burst forth (in sinful deeds, and that sexual [!])’ as we are going to see at vs. 10. Be that as it may, the figure of bursting forth is continued with that of mingling blood with blood. Cf. διαχείσεται ὕδατα Ez 30.16 = מָיִם נִפְרְצוּ 8 for ὕδατα. Radaq comments ad our Ho verse: “they broke through a barrier of the law.” Ehrlich’s (1912.172) understanding of ὕδατα as “sind gang und gäbe” is close to that of . Note Vulg. inundaverunt and Pesh. /sgiw/ and Kaddari (2006.883a) "שכיח היה, נפוץ". By contrast, with its vocalisation (פָּרָצוּ instead of פָּרְצוּ)9 and accentuation (פָּרָ֕צוּ)9 does not make the preceding five infinitives its grammatical subject and presumably makes the infinitive absolutes as substitutes for finite verbs. Our translator apparently knew such a usage in Hebrew, as we can see in ἐπεβλέψατε εἰς πολλά ἐν τῷ ἡμέρα ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἰοκέω. For some reason, however, he decided not to go that path here. On the use of the inf. abs. as equivalent to finite verbs, see JM § 123 u - x.10

---

7 On this issue, see Muraoka 1973.26-29.
8 So proposed in Index 320a s.v. פָּרָצוּ. Correct “qal” to “ni.” at id. 30a s.v. διαχείσα.  
9 Nyberg (1935.24) makes note of the athnach on קפר and accentuation (פָּרָצוּ)9 does not make the preceding five infinitives its grammatical subject and presumably makes the infinitive absolutes as substitutes for finite verbs. Our translator apparently knew such a usage in Hebrew, as we can see in ἐπεβλέψατε εἰς πολλά ἐν τῷ ἡμέρα ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἰοκέω. For some reason, however, he decided not to go that path here. On the use of the inf. abs. as equivalent to finite verbs, see JM § 123 u - x.10
The sg. form κέχυται is striking, esp. in view of פָּרָצוּ. There is no question of an error on the part of our translator. Examples are found in which multiple, concatenated noun phrases are viewed as constituting a single whole, e.g. καὶ σεισθήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ. Jl 4.17, see SSG § 77 m.

Wolff (1965.81) and Nyberg (1935.23) assume the Vorlage of Θ to be פָּרְצוּ בָאָרֶץ, Θ being a result of homoioteleuton.

The figurative use of ‘blood’ for ‘murder’ is common to Greek and Hebrew alike. In the former the pl. is normal in that sense (LSJ, s.v. II), but not necessarily so in the latter.

A rather free rendition, involving the transformation of intransitive to transitive. The construction with ἐπί is very peculiar. Probably the preceding figure is continuing: to mingle by pouring blood upon blood. What one could envisage here differs between Θ ‘one person’s blood floating and touching another victim’s,’ bloodbath and Θ, in which the blood of a new victim is brought and poured on that of the first, i.e. endless bloodshed.

4.3) διὰ τούτο πενθήσει ἡ γῆ σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτῆν, σὺν τοῖς θηρίοις τοῦ ἄγρου καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἐρπετοῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ σὺν τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἱχθύες τῆς θάλασσης ἐκλείψουσιν,

On account of this the land will mourn together with all that inhabit it, together with the beasts of the field and together with the reptiles of the earth and together with the birds of the sky, and the fish of the sea will die out.

σὺν] properly used of accompaniment. The translator, we may conclude, views humans as the principal inhabitants of the land.

For the predominance of μετά + gen. over σὺν in later Greek, see Mommsen 1895.256.11 Note also that σὺν is highly frequent in Ez (11x) and XII (6x). Compare these figures with those for books like Is (4), Je (3), Ps (6). Other LXX books which use it often are Ex (15), Le (13), Nu (24), 1M (13), 2M (27), 3M (8), 4M (9).12

The idea of disaster common to mankind and nature is also expressed by St Paul: οἴδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνῳδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν Ro 8.22, where the prefix σὺν- is to be noted.

γῆ] In some manuscripts there follow καὶ ἀσθενήσει and καὶ σμικρούνθησεται. The omission is to be explained by the fact that the translator’s

11 See also Johannessohn 1926.202.
12 Cf. also BDAG s.v. σὺν and μετά.
understanding of the word רְפָאָה (דָּלְלוּ ‘to decline in quantity’) did not fit well into the context. This equivalence is firmly established and applies only to XII: Jl 1.10, 12, Na 1.4a. Thus pace Elliger and Rudolph, the editors of XII for BHS, the Vorlage of the LXX most likely did not read רְפָאָה at Na 1.4. That our translator read רְפָאָה in his Vorlage is confirmed by the significant rendering of the same in Na 1.4b, ἐξέλιπε, which is, pace Dingermann (1948.22), undoubtedly taken over from, or at least influenced by, our passage. Hence the above-mentioned supplantations must be judged as late and secondary, since the text thus completed reads rather awkward in the context. This awkwardness would not stand out if it were not for the preposition σύν, whose choice in itself is a commendable stylistic attainment. Further, the Greek verbs adopted to fill in the lacuna point to the ignorance on the part of the right equivalent and to the lack of wider perspective, ignorance of the related passages. Cf. Ziegler pp. 38, 97.

tοῖς κατοικοῦσιν [the pl. being influenced by the preceding τοὺς κατοικοῦντας in vs. 1, also = בָּהּ; cf. πᾶς ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ θ] of the same in Na 1.4. The pl. is never rendered with the sg. 
αὐτῆν] ἐν αὐτῇ, a correction in line with θ [see our note above on vs. 1. 
καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἐρπετοῖς τῆς γῆς] Omitted in some Greek sources = θ. A similar addition perhaps designed to complete the figure may also be found in 2.12 (14) and 2.18 (20). 
ἐκλείψουσιν [an equivalence attested elsewhere only in ἡ σελήνη σοι οὐκ ἐκλείψει Is 60.20, Ἐκλεῖψει (substantive) ἐκλιπέτω πάντα ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς θέω σφόν Zp 1.2, where ἤσφαλς was read as ἤσφαλτο, and ἐκλείπετω bis ib. 3, where ἤσφαλτο, preceded by ἦ, was taken as a haplography for ἤσφαλτο. There is no need to postulate with Nyberg (1935.24) that the Vorlage read ἤσφαλτο, cf. Pesh. /nsūfūn/. Although one could argue that the Alef in יאספו was taken as a mater lectionis – see the treatment of Hb 1.11 with יא_Right in 1QpHab 4.9-5.1 – such is not the case with Zp 1.2, 3.

4.4) ὅπως μηδείς μήτε δικάζηται μήτε ἐλέγχη μηδείς· ὃ δὲ λαός μου ὡς ἀντιλεγόμενος ἵπερευς.

so much so that nobody pleads a case nor remonstrates any more. My people are like an impeached priest.

אַאָ אֲרֵשׁ אַלַיָּרְבַּה אַלָיְיָדוֹקְחַה אָרֵשׁ אָמַעַק קַרְוָה כָּלָה.

13 The editors’ argument is the acrostic structure, which, however, only imperfectly is followed in the first chapter. BHQ is silent on רְפָאָה.
A court scene is envisaged.

ὅπως [Vulg. veruntamen, Pesh. /meṭṭūl/, Trg. 'א ל י ר]. The Gk conjunction is modal or resultative in force, see GELS s.v. 1 b. Cf. Eth. 'enka/ and Theodor τοσσωτη δε ἀπαντα ἑρημία καθηξει .. (PG 66.148). The Pesh. does not necessarily represent יָ as Nyberg (1935.24) thinks. All the same, Ὁ's interpretation significantly departs from ḫ, in which the verbs are manifestly volitive, prohibitive with יָ and the jussive forms.

μηδείς [Vulg. veruntamen, Pesh. /meṭṭūl/, Trg. 'א ל י ר] omitted in some sources, the reason being that the co-ordinated constituent which is negatived is a verb.

ο δὲ λαος μου .. [Vulg. veruntamen, Pesh. /meṭṭūl/, Trg. 'א ל י ר] Quite a discrepancy. Vollers' (1883.245) reconstruction, ימי כּרִיב, is no Hebrew. At least 'my people' is superior, for 'your people' is too abrupt to fit the context.

The fronting of the participle is unusual, since the sequence <noun phrase - ptc.> is the standard, obviously under the influence of Hebrew and Aramaic, though exceptions are not exactly rare. In any case Ὁ's Vorlage appears to have been identical with, or very close to, ḫ here, for if it had read כהן כּרִיב the change in sequence in Ὁ would be hard to account for.

The sg. of ἀντιλέγόμενος for כּרִיב lends no support to Nyberg's (1935.25) contention that we have here the archaic sg. cst. ending /l/, and not pl. /e/; it is rather conditioned by the sg. nomen regens, ιερεύς ו. He sees in our case here the syntax similar to that presented by examples such as אָדָם פֶּרֶא Ge 16.12, אָדָם נְסִיכֵי Mi 5.4, אָדָם כְּסִיל Pr 15.20, כֹּהֵן כְּמֹרֵד 1Sm 17.40, but we doubt that כהן is collectively used in BH, as Nyberg would be compelled to suppose. Therefore, what we have here is normal syntax, namely 'those who contend with a priest,' a point which was missed by our translator or he omitted the final yod, unless his Vorlage also read so.

For an attempt to get down to the message of the verse in ḫ and Ο alike, see Joosten 85f., a verse justly called by him "une des plus grandes cruces interpretum" of our book.

4.5) καὶ ἀσθενήσεις ἡμέρας, καὶ ἀσθενήσει καὶ προφήτης μετὰ σοῦ νυκτί ὠμόσα τὴν μητέρα σου.

And you shall languish by day, and a prophet also shall languish with you. I have made your mother comparable to night.

κόσμητα ἡμῶν τὰς μακάμις αὐτής ὡς τὴν μητέρα σου: ἀσθενήσεις] A correction of ἠσθένησεν or ἀσθενήσει as introduced by Rahlfs and adopted by Ziegler, but supported by no manuscript evidence.

14 Not final as in Joosten's (85) "pour que," for what follows cannot constitute a purpose of what precedes in vs. 3.

15 See SSG § 31 ce, eg.
Scribes may have wrongly construed the verb with the preceding ἀντιλεγόμενος ἱερεύς, as Cyril does (PG 71.120).

Whilst the Heb. verb primarily means ‘to stumble,’ it also means at times by extension ‘to be frail, fail.’ E.g. יָשֵׁשׁוּ וַעֲצָמַי כֹחִי בַּעֲוֹנִי כָּשַׁל Ps 31.11 (ἠσθένησεν ἐν πτωχείᾳ ἡ ἰσχύς μου, καὶ τὰ δόσμα μου ἔταραθήσαν). Ps 1.14 (ἡσθένησεν ἡ ἰσχύς μου), 1Sm 2.4 (ἀσθενοῦντες περιεζώσαντο δύναμιν). The same meaning persists in Rabbinic Hebrew, e.g. בְּגוּפוֹ כּוֹשֵׁל ‘one who is physically frail’ jKetubboth 33a.

ἡμέρας The adverbial use of ἡμέρας in the sense of ‘during the daytime,’ and not ‘today,’ is unknown to Classical Hebrew, which would instead say יומָם (e.g. Ge 31.39), בָּיְוָם (ib. 31, 40) or לַיְּוָם (e.g. Ps 121.6). However, we do find מְלָאכָה וְהַיּוֹם Mish 4.16, which Θ, however, renders as ἐστὶν οἷς προφυλακὴ καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἔργων. The interpretation offered by our translator of XII is of course due to his desire to see a contrast between ‘day’ and ‘night,’ although that contrast is not manifest (as in the added νυκτός of L5764 Th. and the Three). Some, e.g. Cyril (PG 71.120), took ἡμέρας as acc. pl., ‘for some days,’ i.e. not always.

υνκτὶ ήλθε] Another lamed as a preposition has been prefixed by our translator in keeping with his interpretation of the following verb διμίητ. Nyberg (1935.25) is wrong in thinking that Θ represents מְלָאכָה, as the Pesh.; the analogous use of ב with the verb הפק in mentioned by him (Ho 12.11) is distinct, at least for our translator, who renders with ἐν (χερσί). In other words, the dative νυκτί is not temporal, ‘by night,’ but construed with the verb ὁμοίω. Ziegler’s punctuation is correct. The verb requires a dative noun phrase.

ὡμοιώθη He λαός μου ὡς οὐκ ἐξων γνῶσιν. Ὑμεῖς ἐξεγέρσετε τὴν κατὰ θησαυροῦ ἡμῶν ὑμῶν παράδοτον. ὑμᾶς ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖνος ἡμᾶς. ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖνος ἡμᾶς ἐκεῖνος.

4.6) ὀμοιώθη ὁ λαός μου ὡς οὐκ ἐξων γνῶσιν. Ὑμεῖς ἐξεγέρσετε τὴν κατὰ θησαυροῦ ἡμῶν ὑμῶν παράδοτον. ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς.

My people have become like those who have no knowledge. Because you have rejected learning, I shall also reject you from being priest to Me, and you have forgotten the law of your God, I shall also forget your children.

Ἀλλὰ ἡ ἀναπλήρωσις τοῦ νόμου τοῦ κοσμοῦ ἐπελήσω σοι τοῦ πάσης ἐπιστήμης σοι, καὶ ἐσιώπησα ἐπελάθου νόμον θεοῦ σου, καὶ ἐσιώπησα τέκνων σου.

My people have become like those who have no knowledge. Because you have rejected learning, I shall also reject you from being priest to Me, and you have forgotten the law of your God, I shall also forget your children.

込んだ] Our translator appears to be ignorant of a homonymic root דמם in the sense of ‘to destroy.’ In the other occurrences of the verbal ὁμοιώθη
in XII it is rendered with ἀπορρίπτω Ho 10.7, 15bis, Ob 5, and ὁμοιόω Zp 1.11. As regards the former equivalence it is more likely that the translator assumed a scribal error in his Vorlage rather than the latter actually read המר. Anyway, Θ may be interpreted as meaning ‘the same lot befell my people.’

There is no absolute necessity to think that Θ presupposes the sg. הנなんです; see רדעת אל עם λαός oμ πτοηθῆσεται Am 3.6, ὁμοιόω οὐ μὴ κατασχνυνθῇ ὁ λαός μου Jl 2.26. Then the selection of the sg. form is an adjustment to λαός. See also Dingermann 1948.8.

ὡς οὐκ εἴχων ἥλιον] Θ = ‘on the ground of the lack of,’ cf. Pesh. /меттул д-. The Gk conjunction joined with ὁμοιόω can only indicate similarity, as was understood by Cyril Ἔοικέ δε, φησί, καὶ ὁ λαός ὁ ἐμὸς τοῖς οὐκ εἴχωσιν γνώσιν (PG 71.120). Cf. οὐκ Γομορρα ἄν ὁμοιόθημεν Is 1.9 (Θ πλημμύρα γνώσις).

γνώσις τῆς ηδύνας] Some Gk manuscripts, Theodor, and Theodoret read ἐπίγνωσιν. The differentiation, in translating the same Heb. word, seems to be based on the understanding that the compositum indicates an act of knowing or discovering, seeking to know, whereas the simplex signifies the result of such an act, thus ‘acquired knowledge.’ Then οὐκ εἴχων ἐπίγνωσιν would make little sense. Note that, in the other two occurrences of ἐπίγνωσις in XII, it stands parallel to ἔλεος, ὅλοκαύτωμα etc. as dynamic knowledge in action of God (Ho 4.1, 6.6). If this distinction is to be pressed for the rest of the LXX, the reading of Β would be preferable in 3K 7.2(14) πεπληρωμένος τῆς τέχνης καὶ ἐπιγνώσεως (Β γνώσεως). The other examples of ἐπὶ are found in Ju 9.14, Pr 2.3, and 2M 9.11. See also above at 2.8 (10). This clearcut distinction is not observed in Classical Greek; see LSJ s.v.

ἀπώσω μαστί] In XII this Heb. verb is unexceptionally rendered with ἀπωθέω, so also at 9.17, Am 2.4, 5.21.

καγοῦ] Another instance of our translator’s drive for parallelism even against Θ; see on 2.15 (17), 16 (18), 17 (19), 23 (25). The addition of καί after δότι (L’ group) is in the same vein.

tοῦ μὴ ἱερατεύειν μαστί] The same Heb. construction, כא + dir. obj. + מ + inf., recurs in 1Sm 16.1 נטש את ממלך ועותר לו וירש למלך הם מוקפת ואכלה εἰς εὐδένωκα αὐτόν μὴ βασιλεύειν επὶ Ισραηλ, ib. 8.7 מכה את ממלך וירש לمالك הם מוקפת ואכלה εἰς εὐδένωκה- σיס τοῦ מיה βασιλεύειν επ’ αὐτόν, 15.23 מוקפת ואכלה εἰς εὐδένωκς εἰς κύριος μὴ εἶναι βασιλέα επὶ Ισραηλ, 15.26 מוקפת ואכלה מمالك ועותר לו וירש למלך הם מוקפת καὶ εὐδένωκς καὶ εἶναι εὐδένωκα επὶ τὸν Ισραηλ. Whereas the Gk verb selected in 1Sm differs from that in our Ho passage, contextually and semantically as well as syntactically they are close to each other. The article τοῦ in these cases is most likely ablative in force, not a mere

16 Cf. Kaddari 2006 s.v. המר II.
marker of the infinitive. This ablative force is sometimes underscored by the addition of μή to the infinitive as in all the cases quoted above from 1Sm; for more examples, see SSG 30 ca. In a few instances the notion of deprivation is lexicalised through a preposition: ἀπώσατο ἐξ εἰρήνης ψυχήν μου ‘He shut my soul out from peace’ La 3.17; μή ἀπώση με ἀπὸ τῶν ἐντολῶν σου ‘Do not thrust me away from Your commandments’ Ps 118.10; ἀπώσειν αὐτόν ἐκ φωτός εἰς σκότος ‘May He drive him away from light into darkness!’ Jb 18.18. Hence we prefer Rahlfs’ text here with μή to Ziegler’s without it. Alternatively, when μή is found, we can analyse the infinitive clause as expressing a purpose. Since, however, no instance is found of these verbs, whether in CG or SG, with an infinitive as their second object complement, the text as in Ziegler’s edition can only be analysed as containing the infinitive clause with ablative force. On the infinitival construction here, see also Soisalon-Soininen 1965.100-05.

νόμον, v.l. νόμου, which is most likely an attempt to harmonise with the following τέκνων. In the remaining occurrences in XII of the verb ἐπιλανθάνω it always governs a genitive: Ho 2.15, 8.14, 13.6. That it is always a gen. of person is probably accidental, cf. πάντων τῶν πόνων μου ‘all my miseries’ Ge 41.51. Very illuminating is the parallelism shown by a synonymous verb, λανθάνω: λάθη ἐξ ὀφθαλμῶν τοῦ ἄνδρος αὐτῆς Nu 5.13 // λάθη λάθη τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς vs. 27.18. καγώ ἐπιλήσομαι τέκνων σου] Some manuscripts19 reverse the sequence of the verb and its object. This secondary alteration caused similar ones in our verse: σὺ ἐπιγάγω ἀπώσω (even against ἸΩ), καγώ ἐπιλήσομαι σε (the first part missing in ἸΩ).

Just as its antonym, μιμνῄσκομαι, remembering is often more than temporary loss of memory, but deliberately, knowingly ignoring. See below at 8.13 on memory.

4.7) κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν οὕτως ήμαρτόν μοι· τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀτιμίαν θήσομαι

Their sins committed against Me were as numerous as they themselves. I shall turn their glory into ignominy.

An equivalence unattested elsewhere in the LXX, but a perfectly acceptable rendition. That the syntagm <τίθημι (act. or mid.) +

17 In CG we find cases of a noun of place in the genitive, again with ablative value, e.g. γῆς ἀπῶσαι πατρίδος ‘to throw (me) out of my homeland’ Sophocles, OT 641 and ‘in no way may I thrust forth .. from the house’ οὐ πώς ἐξίστα ἀσύμμετρα ἀπῶσαι Homer, Od. 2.130.
18 For more data, see GELS s.v. ἐπιλανθάνω.
19 To the evidence mentioned by Ziegler add Syh.
acc. + εἰς had stabilised in the sense of “to cause to become,” which is unattested prior to SG, is manifest here in view of ἔπειτα ἡμῖρ, whereas in a case such as ήσσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς μαρτύριον 2.12 above one could account for the syntagm as a Hebraism in view of שֵׁפָּחָה לִבּוֹ.

On the great diversity of government of this high-frequency verb, see GELS s.v. The only other relevant instance in XII is ήμαρτον αὐτῷ (= τῷ κυρίῳ) Mi 7.9.

4.8) ἁμαρτίας λαοῦ μου φάγονται καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἁδικίαις αὐτῶν λήμψονται τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν.

The sin-offerings of My people they will eat and in their iniquities they will take their lives.

A common equivalence in XII except ἁμάρτημα Ho 10.8. One need not suppose that in the Vorlage of G stood the pl. form, because ἁμαρτία regularly appears in the pl. in XII except at Ho 13.12, Zc 14.19bis, Mi 1.5bis (διὰ ἁμαρτιὰν οἴκου Ἰσραήλ .. τις ἡ ἁμαρτία [Ἡ τῷ βście] οἴκου Ἰουδα). At Ho 13.12 we should note that the word ἁμαρτία is the subject, which is the most probable reason why a chain reaction is avoided, since otherwise the verb, too, would have to be written in the pl. against G. As for the last example, the second half of the verse in which the sg. was chosen influenced the first half.

As regards the meaning of the word, Schleusner is undoubtedly right: “vic-timis, quas populus meus pro peccatis offert, vescentur” (s.v. ἁμαρτία, I 179). So already Cyril (PG 71.124), Theodoret (PG 81.1572), Theophylactus (PG 126.640), and Rashi ad loc.

The second half of the verse was completely misunderstood by our translator due to his ignorance of the idiom ἢν ταῖς ἁδικίαις αὐτῶν λήμψονται τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ‘to lift up one’s soul to,’ = ‘to desire, yearn for.’ The idiom occurs nowhere else in XII. Elsewhere, though the exact mode of rendition differs from translator to translator, this basic understanding of the Heb. phrase appears to be reflected. Thus De 24.15 ἢν ταῖς ἁδικίαις αὐτῶν λήμψονται τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν; Ps 24.4 ἢν ταῖς ἁδικίαις αὐτῶν λήμψονται τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν; Je 22.27 ἢν ταῖς ἁδικίαις αὐτῶν λήμψονται τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν; ib. 44 (51).14 ἢν ταῖς ἁδικίαις αὐτῶν λήμψονται τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν. Cf. also ἢν ταῖς ἁδικίαις αὐτῶν λήμψονται τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν.

What we see in 2K 14.14 λήμπεται ὁ θεὸς ψυχὴν is closer to our Hosea passage, though it departs from מְנַשֵּׁה אשֶר יִשָּׂא לְאֶלֹהִים, and the earlier Greek version, Antiochaean, reads οὐκ ἐλπίζει ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ ψυχή.
The Gk phrase λαμβάνειν ψυχήν τινος, as in the just quoted 2K 14.14, signifies ‘to take someone’s life, destroy him. Cf. also λαβὲ (καὶ) τὴν ψυχήν μου ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ Jn 4.3, sim. 3K 19.10, 14, Ez 33.6, Ps 30 (31).14. This understanding in Theodor’s commentary: ὑπὲρ γὰρ ἣν ἡμάρτανον εἰς ἐμὲ, δι’ ἐτέρων δώσουσι δίκην τῶν ἐπιέναι μελλόντων αὐτῶν πολεμίων (PG 66.149), where his lemma has ἄλλοι added after λήμψονται, an addition that removes the ambiguity as to the identity of the subject of the verb. On the other hand, the ambiguity of the Greek text leads another father, Theophylactus, to a rather forced interpretation: τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν αὐτοὶ ἀνεδέχοντο, Ἐπ’ ὑμᾶς, λέγοντες, τὸ κρίμα· ὡσπερ οἱ πρὸς τὸν Πιλάτον εἰπόντες· τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ ἡμᾶς (PG 126.641). The same commentator offers, however, an alternative interpretation: οἱ ἱερεῖς, φησί, τὰ ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ ἐσθίοντες, τὰς ἱδίας ψυχὰς ἀντὶ τῶν ἀμαρτανόντων ἐλάμβανον (= took, conveyed to the altar!), ὥστε προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ ταύτας θυσίας. Μεσίτης γὰρ ὁ ἱερεὺς θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, τὰς ἱδίας ψυχὰς ἀντὶ τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων ἐλάμβανον (= took, conveyed to the altar!), ὥστε προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ ταύτας θυσίας. 

4.9) καὶ ἔσται καθὼς ὁ λαὸς οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἱερεὺς, καὶ ἐκδικήσω ἐπ’ αὐτῶν τὰς ὀδοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ διαβούλια αὐτοῦ ἀνταποδώσω αὐτῷ. And it will become Like people like priest, and I shall requite him for his ways and I shall repay him for his designs.

20 For a more elaborate exposition of the same view, see Cyril in PG 71.124f.

21 See Cyril: .. πλείστην ἔχει τὴν ἁσάριαν ὁ λόγος (PG 71.124).
καὶ om. Aeth. Bas.N. = Μ, which note by Ziegler is correct in a sense, whilst the added conjunction reproduces fairly well the real force of this peculiar Hebrew idiom, "כְּ—כְּ", which expresses "the completeness of correspondence between the two objects" (BDB s.v. כְּ). Note esp. an accumulation of the idiom in a single verse: כְּ—כְּ, which expresses "the completeness of correspondence between the two objects" (BDB s.v. כְּ). Note esp. an accumulation of the idiom in a single verse:

כַּקּוֹנֶה כַּגְּבִרְתָּהּ כַּשִּׁפְחָה כַּאדֹנָיו כַּעֶבֶד כָעָם וְהָיָה בוֹנֹשֶׁא כַּאֲשֶׁר כַּנֹּשֶׁה כַּלּוֹה כַּמַּלְוֶה כַּמּוֹכֵר καὶἔσται ὁ λαὸς ὡς ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ παῖς ὡς ὁ κύριος καὶἡ θεράπαινα ὡς ἡ κυρία, ἐσται ὁ ἄγοραζω ὡς ὁ πωλῶν καὶὁ δανείζων ὡς ὁ δανειζόμενος καὶὁ ὀφείλων ὡς ᾧ ὀφείλει

Is 24.2. See also Ibn Ezra ad loc.: "As I noted earlier, this is an ellipsis for כָעָם וְהַכֹּהֵן כַּכֹּהֵן הָעָם". Similarly Radaq ad loc. Contrary to the opinion of BDB that in this idiom one term is the subject, the other being the standard of comparison, the examples mentioned by them would demonstrate that no such relation is intended between the two terms; the idiom means that one and the same standard applies to both, which otherwise would belong to two different categories. Note the addition in Le 7.7 of לָהֶם אַחַת תּוֹרָה, and see Nu 15.15 יְהוָה לִפְנֵי יִהְיֶה כַּגֵּר כָכֶם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם עוֹלָם חֻקַּת הַגָּר וְלַגֵּר לָכֶם אַחַת חֻקָּה הַקָּהָל. The above-adduced Is 24.2 in its Greek form does introduce such a relationship, but note that this is one of those occasional cases in which the second term is said to be the subject (BDB loc. cit.), while the Greek rendering reverses that relation represented in Ἰ.

ἐκδικήσω] On this verb see above at 2.13.

τὰς ὀδοὺς] τ. ἀνομίας AchSa; τ. αδικίας Cyr. Both of these secondary alterations have been introduced in the fact that the acc. rei construed with this verb indicates crimes for which someone is to be punished, as in Am 3.2 ἐκδ. ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς πάσας τὰς ἀμαρτίας ὑμῶν, Ho 1.4 τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἰ. (bloodshed), 2.13 (15) τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν Βααλιμ, whereas the "ways" was felt to be neutral. The prefixation of κατά in 239 Aeth Arm, also secundum before διαβούλια in La, under the influence of the parallel 12.2 (3), is likewise an attempt to remove this ambiguity. Cf. Trg. ἀνακράνεις.

τὰ διαβούλια αὐτοῦ ἐπιτήδευμα This rare Gk word (only 10 times in LXX) is used four times in our book, and thrice it corresponds to μετὰ τῶν διαβούλων (plurale tantum) (4.9, 5.4, 7.2), whilst in the fourth case (11.6) it renders μετά τῶν διαβούλων. On the other hand, rather strangely, the Heb. word concerned (משלי) appears eight more times in XII (Ho 9.15, 12.3, Mi 2.7, 9, 34, 7.13, Zc 1.4, 6), and their Gk equivalent is ἐπιτήδευμα in all of them. One should also note that משלי often stands parallel to כְּ—כְּ as here (see Ho 12.3, Zc 1.4, 6, and outside XII Je 4.18, 7.5, Ez 36.31 et passim) and that in Ho 12.3 we have the closest possible parallel to our passage (כַּקּוֹנֶה כַּגְּבִרְתָּהּ כַּשִּׁפְחָה כַּאדֹנָיו כַּעֶבֶד כָעָם וְ...) How can one then account for, firstly, this striking distribution of...
the Gk equivalents within the corpus supposedly coming from a single translator, and secondly, the equally striking correspondence διαβούλιον ‘debate, counsel, deliberation’\textsuperscript{23} and מַעֲלָלִים ‘(mostly bad) practices, deeds’\textsuperscript{23}? The only possible answer to the second question that we can think of at present is the influence of Ez 11.5 τὰ διαβούλια τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν ἐγὼ ἐπίσταμαι for יְדַעְתִּיהָ אֲנִי רוּחֲכֶם מַעֲלוֹת. Attention should be paid to the fact that the formally and semantically related עֲלִילָה is rendered with ἐνθύμημα in ib. 14.22, 23, 24.14 (and nowhere else in LXX!), all of which, together with the above-quoted 11.5, occur in Thackeray’s Ezekiel a’ (chap. 1-27).\textsuperscript{24} Such influence becomes possible only under the assumption of a single translator for the two corpora in question, since no inner relationship or even midrashic one is apparent between them. It is also important to remark that such influence can work only in one direction, viz. from Ez to Ho, which implies an earlier date of the former translation.

The first difficulty is not as serious as the second. We can only point to the similar inconsistency in the rendering of עֲלִילָה in Ez α’; see the immediately preceding foot note.

\textit{ἀνταποδώσω} אָשִׁיב an equation found five more times in XII (Ho 12.2 [3], 14 [15], Jl 3 [4.4, 7, Zc 9.12), while the same Gk verb also renders שָׁלֵל Pi. in Ho 4.3, Jl 2.25, 3 [4.4, both in the sense of ‘to requite, repay, punish.’

4.10) καὶ φάγονται καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐμπλησθῶσιν, ἐπόρνευσαν καὶ οὐ μὴ κατευθύνωσιν, διότι τὸν κύριον ἐγκατέλιπον τοῦ φυλάξαι

And they will eat, but will not be sated; they will commit fornication, but will never prosper, because they abandoned the Lord, persisting (in fornication).

Also in conjunction with ἐσθίειν in Mi 6.14, Jl 2.26, but with πίνειν in Am 4.8.

ἐπόρνευσαν νῦν] The difference in stem, Hif. here, not Qal, is irrelevant to the Greek rendering, when ἡμῖν is not real causative. Thus πορνεύω = ἐπορνεύω = ἐκπορνεύω = ἡμῖν in Ho 3.3, 4.14, 9.1, Am 7.17, but ἐκπορνεύω = ἡμῖν in Ho 4.18, 5.3. The sole difference between the two Gk verbs is in their frequency: simplex 19 times, compositum 45, in XII.

κατευθύνωσιν] an equivalence attested nowhere else in LXX. In one of the only two other occurrences of the Heb. verb in XII (Mi 2.13)\textsuperscript{25} it is rendered with διακόστενι, so Aquila here. Our version represents the line

\textsuperscript{23} Cf. Syh. /mahšāvātā/.

\textsuperscript{24} But we cannot explain why the same Heb. word is rendered differently in the middle section of the book, i.e. ἐπιτηδεύματα in 20.43, 44.

\textsuperscript{25} The third example has been dealt with above at 4.2.
of interpretation common to Pesh. /sgiw/, Trg. /neṣlḥūn/, Sym. πληθυνθησοντα. This meaning of the Heb. verb, ‘to increase (in number),’ is well established in BH and correctly understood by Greek translators as in the following examples: Gn 30.30 לָרֹב וַיִּפְרֹץ καὶ ηὐξήθη εἰς πλῆθος, 30.43 הָאִישׁ ἐπλούτησεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, 1C 4.38 ἐπληθύνθησαν εἰς πλῆθος, Jb 1.10 ἐπληθύνθησαν εἰς τὴ γῆς. This is of course related to the fact that κατευθύνειν often corresponds to √צלח ‘to prosper’ in LXX (13 times in all). This is indeed how our text has been understood by Syh. with its /neṣlḥūn/ and Theodor, who writes οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς εἰς δέον ἐκβήσεται (PG 66.149).26 It appears then that our translator failed to get the nuance specific to the context across.

ἐγκατέλιπον עָזְבוּ] In the great majority of examples of the Gk verb in LXX it renders בָּגַד, but in XII Jn 2.9 is the only other instance of that correspondence (5 times in Ez α’), elsewhere בָּגַד Qal (Ho 5.7, Ma 2.10, 11, 14, 15, 16) and בָּשָׁא Qal (Ho 11.9, q.v.). But one must observe that בָּשָׁא is not so frequent in XII: apart from the above-mentioned instances it occurs in Zp 2.4 (הָבָשָׁא διηρπασμένη), Zc 11.17 καταλελοιπότες, Ma 4.1 (3.19) ὑπολειψθῇ, ‘To leave behind, forsake, desert, turn one’s back on (in apostasy)’ is a peculiar Hebraic semantic development associated with ἐγκαταλείπειν through its frequent correspondence with בָּשָׁא, as in Jd 10.6 ἐγκατέλιπον τὸν θεόν, 10 τὸν θεόν. This explains why בָּשָׁא may be rendered with it (see above).27 Cf. our note on 5.7.

tοῦ φυλάξαι λέσχη] Our translator joined this verb with the opening word of the following verse, τῶν πορνείαν.28 The latter is capable of constituting a compound object of ἐδέξατο with the other two, οἶνον and μέθυσμα, while φυλάξαι with no object would be a harsh construction and κύριον can hardly be one, since in the Biblical language God watches or protects a man, but not the other way round. Nevertheless, in LXX, φυλ. with a single object or act as its (grammatical) object regularly means ‘to avoid, guard someone (or: oneself) against it,’ but not ‘to cherish, adhere to it,’29 as φυλ. might mean in Classical Greek (LSJ s.v. Β 3). The only such example is Jn 2.9 φυλασσόμενοι μάταια καὶ πειρατής ἔλεος αὐτών ἐγκατέλιπον μὴ τοῖς ὑπὸ καταφρονηθῆς ἤλεγχοι. Cf. also Ps 30 (31).7 τοὺς διαφυλάσσοντας ματαιότητας διὰ κενῆς ἠστάρας. This connotation, if so intended by our translator, seems to have been captured by some Geek commentators: Cyril (PG 71.128) τετηρήκασι πορνείαν, τουτέστι, σώζοντας παρεσκεύασαν τοῖς ὑπὸ χειρὰ τὴν πλάνησιν,

26 See also Cyril (PG 71.1128).
27 Elsewhere in XII it is rendered with καταφρονεῖν: Ho 6.7, Hb 1.13, 2.5. Cf. Zp 3.4 καταφρονηθῆς.
28 So did Saadia according to Radaq ad loc.
29 Cf. Pesh. /rḥem zānyūtā/.
καίτοι μᾶλλον αὐτὴν ἐκ μέσου διαρρίπτειν καὶ ἀφανίζειν ὅφειλοντες
καὶ 

and Theophylactus (PG 126.644) ἐμμένειν αὐτῇ (scil. πορνείᾳ) ὁμετα-
στάτως .. Δέον ἐκριζοῦν αὐτὴν καὶ ἀφανίζειν οἱ δὲ συνετήρουν ... The
infinitive here is epexegetical, pace Andersen - Freedman 1980.363: “any
continuity between ‘zbw and lšmr is debatable.”

4.11) πορνείαν. καὶ ὀἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα ἐδέξατο καρδία λαοῦ μου.

fornication. And the heart of my people welcomed wine and intoxicating
drink.

[104] μέθυσμα [38] an equivalence attested only here in LXX, whilst the
Gk noun is the regular equivalent of רֶכֶס: Mi 2.11, Jd 13.4, 7, 14, 1K 1.15,
Je 13.13. The root רֶכֶס is also rendered with μέθη in Hg 1.6 and with μεθύειν
in Jl 1.5, Na 3.11, Hb 2.15. On the other hand, we have seen that ὀἶνος, too,
renders שׁכר: 2.8 (10), 9 (11), 22 (24). So eight more times in XII. More-
over, ὀἶνος quite frequently corresponds to מַי (16 times in XII). Hence we
are justified in assuming that the rendering of שׁכר here with μέθυσμα is
rather free, influenced by the familiar collocation, ὀἶνος καὶ μέθυσμα, as
in Jd 13.4, 7, 14B (A: σικερα pro μεθ.), 1K 1.11, 15, Mi 2.11. Otherwise,
intolerable redundancy would ensue: ὀἶνον καὶ ὀἶνον. In another case of
combination of מַי and שׁכר, Mi 6.15, one is simply left untranslated: καὶ
ὀἶνον καὶ οὐ μὴ πίητε.30 Our passage, along with Mi 6.15, happens to be
the only one in the entire OT, where מַי is combined with שׁכר,31 and it is not
impossible that the choice of μέθυσμα is due to the limited range of Greek
vocabulary at the disposal of our translator, for τρύξ could have been chosen.
Did he, however, know precisely what שׁכר meant?32 It is generally thought
to mean ‘new, not yet fermented sweet wine, must,’ hence not intoxicating.33

καρδία λέβε] Η is best interpreted as meaning ‘Wine and intoxicating drink
take intelligence away, so Sym. ὀἶνος καὶ μέθυσμα ἀφαιρεῖται καρδίαν.
Thus Η has reversed the subject - object relation.

λαοῦ μου] The opening word of vs. 12 has been tucked to the end of vs. 11.
The v.l. λαός of 106 233’ would possibly require καρδία as an adverbal
complement of ἐδέξατο and λαός μου to become the subject of ἐπηρώτων
of vs. 12.

30 A similar translation technique was adopted by the translator of Leviticus, when he had
лем and חלה together, both of which were rendered with ἄρτος, namely he omitted one of
them: 8.26. See Fraenkel 1851.127f.
31 This combination is missing in HALOT s.v. שׁכר ad finem.
32 See below ad Mi 6.15.
33 So Ben Yehuda 8.7739a, n. 3, HALOT s.v. שׁכר ad finem C 1 c), and Clines DCH s.v.
שׁכר. Radaq, however, says that it intoxicates fast (מהרה משכר).
4.12) ἐν συμβολοῖς ἐπηρώτων, καὶ ἐν ράβδοις αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγελλον αὐτῷ·
πνεύματι πορνείας ἐπλανήθησαν καὶ ἐξεπόρνευσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν.

They would consult portents and with his rods they would inform him; they were led astray by a spirit of prostitution away from their God.

ἐπηρώτων, καὶ ἐν ράβδοις αὐτοῦ ἀπήγγελλον αὐτῷ·
πνεύματι πορνείας ἐπλανήθησαν καὶ ἐξεπόρνευσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν.

Why the obvious equivalent, ξύλον, has not been chosen is difficult to say. Maybe the first term (σύμβουλον) was meant as general, the second (ῥάβδος) as a particular example. To our best knowledge, the use of ξύλον as a technical term in divination is not known in the general Greek literature. Note further that some witnesses such as Ach Sa Aeth presuppose ξύλον, apparently without direct recourse taken to Ḥ.35 On the other hand, the interpretation which sees in “tree” an omen or portent (σύμβολον) is perfectly in order. It should also be remarked that the personal suffix αὐτοῦ might be slightly awkward with σύμβολον, what is not the case with σύμβουλος. Only in this way its omission, which is striking in view of the perfect parallelism offered by our translator even against Ḥ (ἐν2), can be properly accounted for.

Why the obvious equivalent, ξύλον, has not been chosen is difficult to say. Maybe the first term (σύμβουλον) was meant as general, the second (ῥάβδος) as a particular example. To our best knowledge, the use of ξύλον as a technical term in divination is not known in the general Greek literature. Note further that some witnesses such as Ach Sa Aeth presuppose ξύλον, apparently without direct recourse taken to Ḥ.35 On the other hand, the interpretation which sees in “tree” an omen or portent (σύμβολον) is perfectly in order. It should also be remarked that the personal suffix αὐτοῦ might be slightly awkward with σύμβολον, what is not the case with σύμβουλος. Only in this way its omission, which is striking in view of the perfect parallelism offered by our translator even against Ḥ (ἐν2), can be properly accounted for.
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Greek. Note the hesitation felt by the translator at Jd 1.1 διά (Ἀ: ἐν) τοῦ κυρίου (τῷ Κυρίῳ); 1K 23.2, 30.8 ὃς etc.; so with διά in Sym., Theodor, Theodoret, and Cyril in our place. The classical simple acc. is also instance: e.g. De 18.11 ἐκ τοῦ νεκροῦ.

The Heb. habitual Impf. יִשָּׁאַל is appropriately reproduced with the Greek Impf. So the following ἀπήγγελλον.

ῥάβδοις [‘divining rods’ as in Herodotus 4.67. Cf. Theodor ad loc., κατὰ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἔθος ἐποίουν (PG 66.152).] -τῶν V 407'. The sg. is too mechanical and is out of tune with the pl. verb form. So also αὐτῷ.

ἀπήγγελλον] Cf. Ge 43.7 ἀπηγγέλαμεν αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν ἐπερώτησιν ταύτην.

αὐτῷ] -τῶν B*, under the influence of the preceding αὐτοῦ.

πνεύματι] pr. (* V) ὁτι V 46’ et al. Our translator did not see any causal relationship between the people’s seeking after profane divination and their spiritual fornication. Hence Ὑ ≠ τηρεῖ, i.e. ὃ pro ὃ, as Nyberg (1935.29) thinks.

ἐπλανήθησαν[ν] The same equivalence is attested further in XII in Am 2.4, Mi 3.5 (and Ez 14.11). There is no need to suppose that our translator read Hofal instead of Hifil, which supposition would necessitate the addition of -μ. before ἐπερ. The dative of πνεύματι indicates the cause of deviation as in Is 28.7 οὗτοι ἐπέπλανησαν εἰς ὁδοίς τῆς ζῆς. But this should be distinguished from the dative of reference as in Ps 94(95).10 πλανᾶται τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς καρδίας. Is 53.6 ἄνθρωπος τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπερώτησε, and note esp. ib. 29.24 οἱ τῷ πνεύματι πλανῶμεν τῇ καρδίᾳ τῆς καρδίας. Note that in all these instances the noun in the dat. has the article. Cf. Isocrates 15.52 πλανᾶσθαι διανοίᾳ, Ep. 6.10 ταῖς διανοίαις πλανᾶσθαι.

ἀπό] Cf. 1.2 ἀπὸ ὁπερυθανέων ἡ γῆ, 9.1 ἀπὸ ἣς ἔζησαν, Ez 6.9 ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ .. ὁπίσω τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτῶν ἔστησεν ἑκατάκοπος, 20.30 ὁπίσω τῶν βεβαιωμάτων ἔστησεν, all with (ἐκ)πορευόμενοι. But this should be distinguished from the dative of reference as in Ps 94(95).10 πλανᾶται αὐτῶν ἐκκλίνοντας απὸ τοῦ κυρίου, Ez 14.11 πλανᾶται .. ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ. The combination with μιθῇ with such a connotation, that of deviation and apostasy, does not appear elsewhere.

Note, however, ἀπ’ οὐρανόθεν II. 8.365 and ἀπὸ Τροίῃθεν ib. 24.492.
in XII. This un-Greek collocation of ἐκπορνεύειν and ἀπό has been correctly interpreted by Theophylactus: ἐκπορνεύων αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς καθηκούσης αὐτῷ καὶ φυσικῶς ἁρμοσθείσης πράξεως (PG 126.645), Theodor πρὸς πλάνην ἐιδὸν ἀποστάντες τοῦ θεοῦ παντελῶς (PG 66.152), and Cyril ὡς ἀποτάτῳ γεγόνασι τοῦ θεοῦ (PG 71.132).

4.13) ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὅρεων ἔθυσιάζον καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς βουνοὺς ἔθυον, ὑποκάτω δρυὸς καὶ λεύκης καὶ δένδρου συσκιάζοντος, ὅτι καλὸν σκέπη, διὰ τούτῳ ἐκπορνεύουσιν αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ αἱ νύμφαι ὑμῶν μοιχεύσουσιν.

On the summits of the mountains they would offer sacrifices and on the hills they would slaughter sacrificial animals, under an oak-tree and a white poplar and a tree casting a thick shade, for a shade is lovely. Therefore your daughters will prostitute, and your daughters-in-law will commit adultery.

So also Mi 4.1, Jl 2.5, Ez 6.13A, Jd 9.36A (B: κεφαλῶν). The accusative used here is a sign of the breakdown of the classical rule concerning the distinction between the three cases possible for this preposition, see BDF § 233. For more examples of <ἐπί + acc> indicating a space where some action takes place, not a space to which someone or something moves, horizontally or vertically, see GELS s.v. III 3, where the majority of examples adduced are from XII, among which Zp 1.5 τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας ἐπὶ τὰ δώματα ‘those who worship on the roof-tops.’

The table below shows the pattern of equivalences in XII between ḫ and ᾱ. ⁴⁹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ὀνόματι</th>
<th>ὀνόματός ἐστιν</th>
<th>θυμιᾶμα/ὕζειν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ἱσραήλ | Ho 4.14, 8.13, 11.2, 13.2; Jn 1.16, 2.10; Hb 1.16; Ma 1.14 (Ep 16.20, 20.28) | Ho 11.2; Hb 1.16; Ma 1.11 [Hof. θυμίαμα]
| Ἰσραήλ ἰπ. | Ho 2.13 (15) [Hif. ἐπὶ-θεόν], 4.13 | Ho 4.13, 12.12; Zc 14.21; Ma 1.8 (θυσιά) |

⁴⁹ As regards ἱπ. there is no knowing whether our translator distinguished between Qal and Piel forms, for all the forms vocalised as Piel in ḫ in XII are ambiguous in their consonantal form, all being vocalisable as Qal. For a fairly clear distinction between the two based on the Massoretic vocalisation, see BDB s.v. The Piel forms are found in Ho 4.13, 14, 11.2, 12.12, Hb 1.6. At any rate there is no correlation that is demonstrable between the two Hebrew forms and the two alternative Gk equivalents, θύειν and θυσιάζειν.
For the LXX as a whole the following results emerge according to Hatch and Redpath’s concordance, supplemented with Index:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Qal</th>
<th>Pi. / Pu.</th>
<th>Hif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>הוב</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זקר</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, roughly speaking, הוב = זקר ‘to burn incense,’ הוב / זקר = זקר ‘to offer sacrifice.’ Two questions must be raised in our context:

a) whether there can be found any distinction between הוב and זקר, b) how is one to account for the equivalence הוב = זקר?

Historically speaking, זקר is a late coinage derived from the substantive, יסוד; the earliest example of the former recorded in LSJ is from Strabo comicus I.21 (3rd cent. BCE). The verb does not occur in the New Testament. As far as the meaning is concerned, it is clear that the word is a cultic terminus technicus, whilst הוב may mean ‘to slaughter (in general)’ as in Is 22.13 וְהוֹנֵטָא (שָׁחֹט) πρόβατα (for a feast). In this connection we should note an example like Ho 13.2 וְסָרָא אֲנַחֲרֹסְפּוֹ and the fact that זקר does not, in XII, take animals as its object. Among the examples of זקר, note esp. those of the participle in Ho 12.11 (12) וְהוֹנֵטָא יָסָרָא and Zc 14.21 וְהוֹנֵטָא הַפְּנָצֶס וְזָרְוַתָא וְזָרְנָתָא. Thus in our corpus the verb may be translated with ‘to perform a cultic ceremony of offering sacrifices.’

The correct equivalence sets in at Ho 11.2 הוב // זקר הוב, and likewise at Hb 1.16. Therefore we have no right to charge our translator with ignorance of the right equivalences. In the first occurrence of זקר in 2.13 (15) he wrote אֶפְּרִיָא as a more general term and in our present passage he did the same thing, adding the synonymous זקר to render הוב.

βουνούς, תַּחַת] a correspondence unique to XII - Ez α’, see Mi 6.2.

וּהוֹנֵטָא, תַּחַת] The simplex וּפּוֹפּוֹ occurs only once in XII - Ez α’ (Ho 9.7 for לַשֶּם), and that not with a locative value. When תַּחַת was taken in its locative sense, it was rendered either with וּהוֹנֵטָא (Zc 3.10, Ma 4.3 (3.21), Ob 7, Am 2.13, Jn 4.5) or with וּהוֹנֵטָא תַּחַת (Am 2.9, Zc 6.12, Hb 3.16).

40 Thus a tinge of irony may be perceived in the use of זקר of the slaughter of the prophets serving the high places (4K 23.20), though the Proto-Lucianic version uses הוב.

41 Outside of XII, note 3K 1.9 וְהוֹנֵטָא וְהוֹנֵטָא, 19 מָשָׁךְ וְמָשָׁךְ, 25 מָשָׁךְ. According to Shenkel (1968.17), the two renditions represent in 1 - 4K two different text-types, Old Greek and Proto-Lucanian.
This is characteristic of Hellenistic Greek which coined more and more such composite, so-called “improper” prepositions; see BDF § 116.3, 203, and Sollamo 1979.

δρυὸς (< δρῦς) ἡλίας] an equivalence unique to XII (Am 2.9, Zc 11.2). In Ez 6.13 A δρυὸς ἡλίας is related to ἡλίας, while in 27.6 a different use made of the tree leads to the identification of a different tree, fir (ἱστοὺς ἐλατίνους, preserving a phonetic similarity).

Outside of our corpus ἡλίας is rendered with βάλανος; so Ge 35.8, Is 2.13, 6.13. Leaving aside botanical precision, the choice of δρυς was rather felicitous in this context, since many Greek readers may have easily associated it with the same tree that was sacred to Zeus, who gave his oracles from the oaks of Dodona (Od. 14.328).

λεύκης λιβνή] etymologising (“white poplar”), i.e. ἡλίας = λευκή. In the only other occurrence in OT of ἡλίας, Ge 30.37, it is rendered with στυράκινος. Sym. and Theod. present πεύκη ‘pine.’

dένδρου συσκιάζοντος ἄλοιπ] see Muraoka 1973.23f.

καλὸν σκέπη] ‘a shade is lovely.’ The discord in gender is noteworthy.

A neuter adjective is sometimes used predicatively, when its subject is sg. and anarthrous as here, see BDF § 131 and SSG § 77 ce.

σκέπη ἄλοιπ] same equivalence also at 14.8.

ἐκπορνεύσουσιν .. μοιχεύσουσι] With the use of the future tense our translator understands these acts of licentiousness as actions subsequent to the apostasy just described. So also Pesh. (Pf. - Impf.), Vulg. (Impf. - Fut.), Trg. (Ptc. - Ptc. with the value of the future).

The simplex πορνεύσουσι found in V L’ and C’ is probably a correction due to πορνεύσουσι in the following verse.

αἱ νύμφαι ὑμῶν καλότε] There is no problem with this equivalence. However, both νύμφη and καλότε can be semantically ambiguous. καλότε is generally assigned two senses: ‘daughter-in-law’ and ‘bride.’ Just before, during, or shortly after the wedding, when a man other than a man to get married, or marrying, or just married addresses a woman with this Hebrew word, he might be thinking of her as a daughter-in-law of his or the bride of a son of his. S.v. νύμφη, by contrast, LSJ list three senses: 1) young wife, bride, 2) marriageable maiden, 3) daughter-in-law. For the sense 3) the references given are all (two) from Biblical Greek, 1K 4.19 and Mt 10.35, wherefrom one might infer that this specific sense is unknown outside of the Greek Bible. Presumably in order to counter such an assumption MM (s.v.) mentions Thumb, who argued that this third sense is not Hebraic, but Greek, mentioning that the noun means ‘daughter-in-law’ as well as ‘bride’ in Modern Greek.42

42 Thumb 1901.123. Our competence in Mod. Greek is too elementary for us to say whether the sense ‘daughter-in-law’ is part of legacy from Biblical Greek or not.
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BDB s.v. brings our Ho passage and the next verse under the sense ‘bride.’

The sequence *daughter - wife*, however, sounds a little unnatural. Was Dinah
dearer to Jacob than Leah?

4.14) καὶ οὐ μὴ ἔπισκέψωμαι ἐπὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ὑμῶν, ὅταν πορνεύωσι,
kai επί τὰς νύμφας ὑμῶν, ὅταν μοιχεύωσι, διότι καὶ αὐτοὶ μετὰ τὸν
πορνόν συνεφύροντο καὶ μετὰ τὸν τετελεσμένων ἔθουν, καὶ ὁ
λαὸς οὗ συνίων συνεπλέκετο μετὰ πόρνης.

And I shall never visit upon your daughters when they practise pros-
titute, and upon your daughters-in-law when they commit adultery,
because they, too, would associate with the prostitutes and offer sac-
rifices with the initiates, and the people without understanding would
embrace a prostitute.

This use of ἐπισκέπτομαι with hostile connotation, ‘punitive visit,’ is unknown outside of LXX, reflecting the double meaning of
the underlying Heb. פָּקַד. In XII - Ez a’ such use of ἐπισκέπτομαι is attested
only here and at Ez 23.21. However, the translator of Jeremiah is particularly
fond of it, e.g. 5.9, 29, 9.9 (8), 25 (24) etc. Our translator chooses the unam-
biguous ἐκδίκεῖν to render פָּקַד in sensu malo (13 times in XII, but none in
Ez a’). Not only the meaning, but also the syntax reflect the Hebrew construc-
tion: thus both with the acc. pers. vel rei and with ἐπί c. acc. pers. vel rei,
which latter rection is unknown in the secular Greek. Incidentally, this usage
is unknown in the New Testament, either. All the four Greek commentators
we have looked at take the verb in sensu bono; God will not visit the women
to help them, when they are being violated, the subject of
πορνεύωσι and μοιχεύωσι having been taken as their male captors in the land of the exile!

Another example of breakdown in communication. But both Eth. and Syh.
use the fem. forms to render the two verbs. The subjects are most likely the
priests mentioned earlier.

καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡ] The added conjunction reproduces fairly well the force of
the emphatic ἡ; omitted in B - V and others.

συνεφύροντο] a rare word in LXX, occurring elsewhere only at προ-
σπορευόμενον ἀνδρί ἀμαρτωλῷ καὶ συμφυρόμενον ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις

43 The dictionary adds “just after (emphasis ours) marriage” ad our Ho passages, but how
do we know?

44 We would rectify our entry on the verb, I c, by deleting the reference to Ho 4.14.

45 Though our Ho passage is not discussed, cf. Gehman 1972.201f.

46 It occurs as a variant for συναναφέρο at Ez 22.6, where there is no explicit reference
to sexual vices.
αὐτοῦ ‘goes to a sinner and gets involved in his sins’ Si 12.14 and νίκος μετὰ μητρὸς καὶ πατὴρ μετὰ θυγατρός συνεφύροντο ‘a son with (his) mother and a father with (his) daughter would associate’ PSol 8.9, where it is about a case of incest.

It is hardly likely that the verb פְּרֻדוֹת, which must have stood in his Vorlage, should have presented any difficulty to our translator. Apparently there arose a difficulty from the preposition עִם, instead of which מִן would naturally have been anticipated. At the same time, however, the translator noted that the parallel sentence also had הבט followed by a parallel תָּשִׁית. Hence he decided to supply a suitable verb, in this case one of general application which may be further specified in the coming parallel statement, while keeping the structure of parallelism. Sym. ἡκολούθησαν is an improvement upon Υ, though with no regard paid to Ω. The verb selected by Aq. here, ἐνδιηλαγμένων, is also attested in 3K 22.47A for καδησιμ and πόρνη Gn 38.21f., Dt 23.18 for πορνεύων. 47

The presence of τῶν of ambiguous gender caused some Greek commentators to fail to see that the reference is to harlots: e.g. Theodoret τοὺς τὰ τῆς ἁσεβείας ὀργίας μεμυημένους (PG 81.1573), but Syh. correctly /mšammlāyā'/.

οὐ συνίων λοίφτιν] Ziegler is certainly right in adopting this reading supported by V-239 Q and others against the rest of the uncials, which read ὁ in place of the negator. The error is graphically easy to explain. Joosten (92) refers to vss. 6 and 15, where also the people’s ignorance is mentioned.

συνεπλέκετο ἵνα] a free rendering due to ignorance. Likewise misunderstood and freely rendered in Pr 10.8, 10. These are all the attestations of this rare Heb. verb. The Gk verb which means ‘to twine, plait together,’ may be applied to sexual intercourse as in Sophocles, Fragg. 618 Θέτιδι συμπλέκεις ‘entwined with Thetis [a goddess].’ The phrase μετὰ πόρνης brings out this connotation clearly.

μετὰ πόρνης] Ω read the first two words of the next verse, ημᾶς, as the end of this verse, i.e. Ἐν ἕν οὖν.

47 In XII - Ez a’ only at Ez 1.11, where נדָרָת is rendered as ἔκτεταμέναι, but there is an additional textual problem there.

48 “To be dedicated, offered εἰς τὰ ἱερά” (LSJ s.v.), then a most appropriate rendering.
4.15) Σὺ δὲ, Ἰσραήλ, μὴ ἀγνόει, καὶ Ιουδα, μὴ εἰσπορεύεσθε εἰς Γαλγαλα καὶ μὴ ἀναβαίνετε εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ων καὶ μὴ ὁμνύετε ζῶντα κύριον.

But you, o Israel, do not commit an offence out of ignorance, and o Judah, do not enter Galgala and do not go up to the house of On and do not swear by the living Lord.

אָוֶן בֵּית וְאַל־תַּעֲלוּ הַגִּלְגָּל וְאַל־תָּבֹאוּ يְהוּדָה אַל־יֶאְשַׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל אִם־זֹנֶה: חַי־יְהוָה וְאַל־תִּשָּׁבְעוּ ἀγνόει ἀσάμ.

The use of the 2nd person Imperative does not mean that the Vorlage read ἀπανοεστε; all this derives from the restructuring of the entire verse by our translator. Cf. Wolff’s (1965.89) critical note ad loc.

The remarkable correspondence between “ignorance” and ἀσάμ is shared by Ez α’,49 in which the phrase τὰ υπὲρ ἀγνοῤῥιας renders אָשָׁם ‘trespass offering’ (40.39, 42.3, 44.29, 46.20), while this peculiar understanding of the Heb. word is undoubtedly derived from Le cp. 4 and 5, where שג או or שָׁגָה or שָׁגָה or שְׁגָגָה or שְׁגָגָה are repeatedly associated, which may have led our translator to think that שג in such places is not simply a general term meaning ‘guilty,’ but the name of a specific guilt or sin, and that the sacrifice is to be offered on that account is שג. See, e.g. Le 4.22 שג הבנה ואשׁמ.

On the other hand, it need be stressed that this ignorance is passive lack or knowledge or absence of awareness for which one cannot be legally held accountable or penalised, but rather a misconduct, deliberate disregard and neglect of laws and regulations. Surely in our passage “Do not remain ignorant” would make no sense.

The notion of wilful ignorance, hence some sort of culpable offence, is known from the 5th cent. BCE onwards, first in Hippocrates.50 Thus the use of ἀγνοείν and its congeners in LXX to render שג, שג, שג etc. is nothing surprising.51 But our patristic commentators adhere to the notion of passive ignorance, presenting another example of communication breakdown. Thus Theodor writes δέον εἰδέναι (PG 66.152), whilst apparently being aware of the oddity of such a notion in this passage. Cyril does not go far enough in saying μὴ ἔσο μορός, μηδὲ τῆς εἰς λήξειν ἥκουσης ἀσυνεσίας ἐμπλεως (PG 71.136) nor Theophylactus with his Γνῶσιν λάβε, ἀπόθου τὴν ἀνοησίαν (PG 126.648).

πλημμέλειν of the Three is the accepted rendering of שג in the above-mentioned Le 4-5.

49 Nyberg’s (1935.30) remark ad loc. is not acceptable. See also a criticism by Dingermann 1948.26.
50 See LSJ s.v. ἀγνοέω II, and MM and BDAG s.vv. ἀγνοέω, ἀγνοήμα, ἀγνοία.
Let it be noted that all the four negative Imperatives in this verse are in the imperfective aspect: the people are being told to stop doing what they are already doing or to get out of a condition in which they now find themselves, see SSG § 28 ha, esp. p. 296.

Ων] = νη, ≠ Οη. It seems to us that our translator is well aware that he is bringing the Israelites too far to the south by adapting his translation to his Egyptian Sitz im Leben; he is doing so in the interest of his readership, Jews in the Egyptian diaspora. Likewise in 5.8, 10.5, 8, 12.4 (5), Am 1.5. Cf. Ez 30.17 ης ἡλίου πόλεως. 52 The addition τῆς ἁδικίας in 49 is a doublet. The same reading shown by B mg A''-Qtxt-233-407 etc. is rightly rejected by Ziegler in favour of that of Qmgb Eus. Onom. The majority reading is probably a correction introduced later in Palestine. Og of La w derived from a corrupted Greek text, ΩΓ for ΩΝ.

The bishop in charge of Southern Turkey, Theodor, failed to see the hint, and instead philosophises, when he says προσποιεῖσθαι δὲ τιμᾶν τὸν άιδιον καὶ νότος έντα Θεόν (PG 66.152), which is put right by Theodoret: τὸ Ων δόνυμα ἔστι τοῦ εἰδώλου ἐν Βαπθήλ: οὐ γάρ, ὡς τινες ύπέλαβον, τὸν “ἄιδιον” ἐρμηνεύει, τούτεστι, τὸν έντα: ’Αβραϊκόν ἐστι, οὐχ Ἑλληνικόν ἄνομα (PG 81.1573).

ζόντα κύριον] The fronting of the participle is slavishly faithful to Θυ, in which the phrase is a standing oath formula. 53 The acc. with ὀμνύναι is already Classical; see LSJ s.v. III, e.g. ὀμνυμί θεοὺς καὶ θεάς Xenophon, Anab. 6.6.17. Different constructions are also possible: κατὰ c. gen. (e.g. Am 4.2 κατὰ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ), c. dat. (e.g. Zc 5.4 τῷ ὀνόματί μου), c. acc. (e.g. Is 45.23 τὸν θεὸν), ἐν c. dat. (e.g. Je 5.7 ἐν τοῖς οὐκ οὐσὶ θεοῖς). Cf. Johannessohn 1910.77 and Helbing 1928.71f. In XII once c. acc., 6 times c. κατὰ τινος and twice c. dat.

4.16) ὅτι ως δάμαλις παροιστρώσα παροίστρησεν Ισραηλ· νῦν νεμήσει αὐτοὺς κύριος ως ἀμνὸν ἐν εὐρυχώρῳ.

Israel ran like a stung wild heifer; now the Lord will graze them like a lamb in a spacious place.

πι καθα δάμαλις ισραὴλ θεὸς οὐχ ἕλιος καὶ τρεχεῖ δρακόντες τῇ κεκαθαρισμένῃ[52] δάμαλις τῆς Ερυθράς. 52 The syntax was correctly understood in, e.g. Je 4.2, 5.2, 12.16.

In 10.11 δάμαλις = τῆς, which is a more correct equivalent, whilst δάμαλις = θεός also in Am 4.1, Jl 1.17.

παροιστρώσα τῆς[53] The simplex, οἰστρᾶν, which does not occur in LXX, means ‘stung (by gadfly),’ then figuratively ‘to go mad, frenzy (as if stung by gadfly),’ and its compound occurs only here, in Ez 2.6, and 2K 17.8L. The second instance in particular, coming from the same translator as that
of XII, may be profitably studied. In Ez 2.6 we read παροιστρήσουσι καὶ ἐπισυστήσονται ἐπὶ σὲ κύκλῳ, which is supposed to render סרִבִים וְסַלּוֹנִים אוֹתָךְ. The first Heb. word is a hapax in BH, while the latter appears only once more in ib. 28.24 (םַלּוֹא, if same word, and // מִלָּה), rendered with άκανθά (/σκόλον). Παροιστράν relates the Heb. word to a root common in Aramaic in the sense of ‘to refuse,’ though it occurs in Si 4.25 מִלָּה and // קוֹץ, rendered with अकान (//स्कोल). Παροιστράν τότε ἐπὶ σὲ κύκλῳ, which is supposed to render וְסַלּוֹנִים סָרָבִים אוֹתָךְ.

The first Heb. word is a hapax in BH, while the latter appears only once more in ib. 28.24 (םַלּוֹא, if same word, and // מִלָּה), rendered with άκανθά (/σκόλον). Παροιστράν relates the Heb. word to a root common in Aramaic in the sense of ‘to refuse,’ though it occurs in Si 4.25 מִלָּה and // קוֹץ, rendered with अकान (//स्कोल). Παροιστράν τότε ἐπὶ σὲ κύκλῳ, which is supposed to render וְסַלּוֹנִים סָרָבִים אוֹתָךְ.

The first Heb. word is a hapax in BH, while the latter appears only once more in ib. 28.24 (םַלּוֹא, if same word, and // מִלָּה), rendered with άκανθά (/σκόλον). Παροιστράν relates the Heb. word to a root common in Aramaic in the sense of ‘to refuse,’ though it occurs in Si 4.25 מִלָּה and // קוֹץ, rendered with अकान (//स्कोल). Παροιστράν τότε ἐπὶ σὲ κύκλῳ, which is supposed to render וְסַלּוֹנִים סָרָבִים אוֹתָךְ.

The first Heb. word is a hapax in BH, while the latter appears only once more in ib. 28.24 (םַלּוֹא, if same word, and // מִלָּה), rendered with άκανθά (/σκόλον). Παροιστράν relates the Heb. word to a root common in Aramaic in the sense of ‘to refuse,’ though it occurs in Si 4.25 מִלָּה and // קוֹץ, rendered with अकान (//स्कोल). Παροιστράν τότε ἐπὶ σὲ κύκλῳ, which is supposed to render וְסַלּוֹנִים סָרָבִים אוֹתָךְ.

The first Heb. word is a hapax in BH, while the latter appears only once more in ib. 28.24 (םַלּוֹא, if same word, and // מִלָּה), rendered with άκανθά (/σκόλον). Παροιστράν relates the Heb. word to a root common in Aramaic in the sense of ‘to refuse,’ though it occurs in Si 4.25 מִלָּה and // קוֹץ, rendered with अकान (//स्कोλ). Παροιστράν τότε ἐπὶ σὲ κύκλῳ, which is supposed to render וְסַלּוֹנִים סָרָבִים אוֹתָךְ.

The first Heb. word is a hapax in BH, while the latter appears only once more in ib. 28.24 (םַלּוֹא, if same word, and // מִלָּה), rendered with άκανθά (/σκόλον). Παροιστράν relates the Heb. word to a root common in Aramaic in the sense of ‘to refuse,’ though it occurs in Si 4.25 מִלָּה and // קוֹץ, rendered with अकान (//स्कोल). Παροιστράν τότε ἐπὶ σὲ κύκλῳ, which is supposed to render וְסַלּוֹנִים סָרָבִים אוֹתָךְ.
The Heb. word is regularly so rendered in XII - Ez α’ (6 times), whilst the Gk here may correspond to אֱלִיל as well as in Hb 2.18. 67 ηκεν or הָנה, whilst Aq. and Thdt.’s ὁνείποισεν = הָנה. 57 It is not impossible that, pace Ziegler’s punctuation, a nominal clause without a copula is intended here, i.e. ‘An associate of idols is Ephraim.’

In view of 2.6 (8) σκόλοψ ‘thorn or stake blocking a way,’ one is naturally tempted to assume that our translator read the same word here, too. On the other hand, the usual Heb. equivalents for σκάνδαλον are מֶקֶר (8 times in LXX) or מָכֵשָׁל (3 times). The Gk word occurs only here in XII and never in Ez. If the above assumption be right, there would have been no choice for our translator but to translate freely, guided by the general context. Ez ch. 16, which describes Israel’s apostasy, may have been on his mind, and note esp. vs. 29 כַּשְׂדִּימָה כְּנַעַן אֶל־אֶרֶץ אֶת־תַּזְנוּתֵךְ וַתַּרְבִּי. 58 There is no indication that the translator took into consideration another occurrence of סֹבֶא: Na 1.10 σμῖλαξ ‘bindweed.’ At Ez 23.42 סָבָאִים סִובָאִים מֻבָּאִים ήκοντας the Heb. word concerned was intentionally omitted due to his ignorance or was missing in his Vorlage. This absence of reference between the related passages confirms that we are dealing here with free rendition.

4.18) ἤρετισε Χαναναίους πορνεύοντες ἐξεπόρνευσαν, ἡγάπησαν ἀτιμίαν ἐκ φρυάγματος αὐτῆς.

He favoured Canaanites; they engaged themselves in excessive prostitution. They preferred ignominy through her insolence.

ἡρέθισε] Vollers’ (1883.246) ἤρέθισε ‘provoked (the Canaanites),’ what Jerome with his provocabit had found in his LXX, would say exactly the opposite of what is required by the context.

Χαναναίους] Dingermann (1948.27) maintains that καβᾶς was read as meaning ‘Sabaeans,’ but this name is normally spelled with υ.

ἡγάπησαν ἐκ φρυάγματος αὐτῆς] G undoubtedly read καβᾶς or καβᾶς in view of Zc 11.3, Ez 7.24, 24.21, where the same equivalence is shown. The translator’s dependence on the three related passages seems to suggest that his...

57 Field (1875 ad loc.) also mentions ἐασον Sym. Quinta, which is = Υ, though not mentioned by Ziegler.

58 Υ is remarkably different from Υ: καὶ ἐπλήθωσας τὰς διαθήκας σου πρὸς γῆν Χαλδαίων. If διαθήκας is to be accepted, its association with μέτοχος εἰδολῶν in our Ho passage is apparent.
Vorlage read like Ḥ, for a few verses later (5.5) גאון is rendered with ὕβρις.\(^{59}\) In other words, the homophonous平面“discovered” by Driver (1931.383f.) was not part of the translator’s Hebrew vocabulary.

Two objections raised by Nyberg (1935.32) against postulating that Ḥ read גאון may be removed by observing 1) that there is no absolute necessity to suppose that only in certain combinations גאון can be rendered with φρύαγμα, and 2) that just when our translator manipulates Ḥ, his rendering tends to show variations, i.e. he aims at semantic approximation, but not at verbal identity of translation equivalents. On the second point here, see our note at 4.13. Apart from the non-occurrence of the rare Heb. נפש ‘to low,’ it is not certain that our translator was capable of establishing semantic association between ‘lowing’ and ‘arrogance.’ Nyberg further objects that, in Ho, גאון is translated with ὕβρις, but see our remark above that, in other books of XII, גאון is = φρύαγμα.

The preposition ἐκ here is hardly that of comparison, but indicates a stance or motive, “out of arrogance.”

4.19) συστροφὴ πνεύματος σὺ εἶ ἐν ταῖς πτέρυξιν αὐτῆς, καὶ καταισχυνθήσονται ἐκ τῶν θυσιαστηρίων αὐτῶν.

You are a blast of wind in her wings, and they will be disappointed by their altars.

צָרוּרִים לָיָהָ אֵנִיָּסְתָּ הָוֲהָ מִזִּבְחוֹתָם: The interpretation presented in Ḥ differs in two points from that deducible from Ḥ.

It appears that Ḥ was read as הָיָה, συστροφὴ πνεύματος meaning ‘a mass of wind, whirlwind.’ The same interpretation is represented in 13.12 קֵרֶר, συστρוֹפִּים, καταισχυνθήσονται ἐκ τῶν θυσιαστηρίων αὐτῶν.\(^{60}\) συστροφὴ πνεύματος, cf. also Ez 13.20 συστρέφετε πνεῦμα being read as τῇ συστροφῇ τοῦ πνεύματος. For the phrase συστροφὴ πνεύματος, cf. Si 43.17 καταισχυνθήσονται.συστροφὴ πνεύματος τῇ συστροφῇ τοῦ πνεύματος read as τῇ συστροφῇ τοῦ πνεύματος and LSJ s.v. συστροφὴ II 4.

σὺ εἶ[ = ἡ ἡμέρα, ≠ Ὑπολογία. The v.l. συριεῖ (< συρίζειν ‘to make a hissing noise’) is an inner-Greek improvement starting from σὺ εἶ, influenced by the association with πνεῦμα ‘wind.’

αὐτῆς] To say that our translator blindly rendered the fem. suffix in Ḥ without realising that it refers to הָיוֹר πνεῦμα (neut. noun) would be unfair to him; he consciously referred αὐτῆς to Ephraim.\(^{61}\) The v.l. αὐτῶν in A” testified to this difficulty. Note an improvement shown by Sym. αὐτοῦ.

\(^{59}\) Cf. also Driver 1931.44, 1933.383f.

\(^{60}\) Cf. Yadin 1965.32.

\(^{61}\) Cf. Pesh. /kenfayhōn/, reading רְזָרָה.
The preposition ἐκ must have fallen out in the Hebrew text due to haplography, since an impersonal subject with שָׁב Qal is unheard of.

The use of ἐκ with κατασχύνεσθαι or αἰσχύνεσθαι is a Hebraism. According to LSJ s.v. αἰσχύνεσθαι, it is joined either with a noun in the acc. or dat., or with one of the prepositions ἐπί (τινι), ἐν (τινι), ύπέρ (τινος), περί (τινος).

Furthermore, the connotation attached to the verb, “shame and disappointment that befall one whose faith or hope is shown to be vain” (BDAG s.v. κατασχύνω 3) is peculiar to Biblical Greek. In other words, it is not that they are going to feel guilty about offering sacrifices on the altars, but, more pragmatically, they are going to “be let down” by them or “lose face” on account of the high hopes they pinned on them. This Biblicism apparently misled Theophylactus, who writes: ὑπομενεῖ ταύτην τὴν αἰσχύνην τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας ἐκ τοῦ θύειν τοῖς εἰδώλοις (PG 126.653), though he goes on to say ἐπ’ ἐκείνοις αἰσχυνθήσεται, μετακλαμένη τὴν ἄβουλίαν (ib. 655). In contrast, Theodor displays a better judgement: ὥστε αὐτοὺς τότε αἰσθησίν γνωρίσαι ὡτι ματαίαν καὶ ἅπασαν τῇ περὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια τῶν εἰδώλων ἐξελον σπουδήν (PG 66.153).

62 For the former no evidence is recorded.
63 Cf. Helbing 1928.24, 262.
CHAPTER V

5.1) Ἀκούσατε ταῦτα, οἱ ἱερεῖς, καὶ προσέχετε, οῖκος Ἰσραήλ, καὶ οἶκος τοῦ βασιλέως, ἐνοτίζεσθε, διότι πρὸς υμᾶς ἔστι τὸ κρίμα, ὅτι παγίς ἐγενήθητε τῇ σκοπιᾷ καὶ ὡς δίκτυον ἐκτεταμένον ἐπὶ τὸ Ἰταβύριον.

Hear these things, o priests, and give heed, o house of Israel, and o royal household, give ear! For the judgement concerns you, because you have become a trap for watchers and like a net spread over Tabor

σκοπιᾷ καὶ ὡς δίκτυον ἐκτεταμένον ἐπί τὸ Ἰταβύριον.

On the avoidance of Ἀκούετε, pres. impv., see above at 4.1.

The particle δή, a secondary addition in 26, is highly frequent in the formula ἀκουετε ἡμνισατε δη as in Mi 3.1, 9, 6.1, Zc 3.8; Ez 18.25 (all with κυρίῳ); Am 8.4 Ἀκούσατε δή ταῦτα.

ὁ τού Qmg ll-46'-764 C-68. The addition of the article in the phrase is occasionally attested by Q (Ho 1.6, 6.10, Am 5.1, 6.14, Zc 8.13) and A (Ho 1.6, Am 6.14, 9.9, Zc 8.13), but absent in the entire body of Greek evidences in Ho 1.4, 11.12, Am 5.3, 4, 7.10, Mi 1.5, 3.1, 9, while it is unanimously attested in Am 6.1 (the only exception being 410).

ἐνωτίζεσθε also in Jl 1.2 // ἀκουετε. The reading is partially etymologising. The pair appears in Ge 4.23 for the first time: ἀκούσατε μου τῆς φωνῆς, γυναῖκες Λαμεχ, ἐνωτίσασθέ μου τοὺς λόγους, and later fairly frequently as in Is 28.23, Je 8.6, 13.15, 23.18, Jb 34.16.

πρὸς υμᾶς ἔστιν τὸ κρίμα μου τῆς φωνῆς, γυναῖκες Λαμεχ, ἐνοτίζεσθε μου τοὺς λόγους, and later fairly frequently as in Is 28.23, Je 8.6, 13.15, 23.18, Jb 34.16.

the precise meaning of ἡμνισατε is debated - ‘the indictment concerns you’ or ‘it is your business to administer justice’ (see commentaries). Theodor (PG 66.153), Theodoret (PG 81.1577), and Theophylactus (PG 126.656) are inclined towards the former, and unequivocally so in La“ adversus vos, and Eth ba’enti’akkemu.

ἔστιν] without a copula in κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ πρὸς τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν γῆν 4.1.

An earlier version of what follows was published in 1986.
παγίς] figuratively used also in secular Greek, esp. of women; see LSJ s.v. σκοπιᾷ] was read as מִצְפֶּה. This place-name is analogously taken as an appellative in Jd 10.17B, 3K 15.22; only be it noted that in the latter places such a rendering does make sense: παρενέβαλον ἐν τῇ σκ.; φυκόδομὶς.. πᾶν βουνὸν Βενιαμίν και τῆν σκ. Rather strange is our translator’s failure to notice the parallelism, which failure may also account for the addition of ὡς before δίκτυον. What the translator meant by this Greek word is not immediately apparent. Theodor of Mopsuestia (PG 66.153), on the basis of Ez 3.17 (σκόπος [= מִצְפֶּה]) takes it to mean ‘a group of prophets’ (τῶν προφητῶν τὸν σύλλογον); see also Theodoret (PG 81.1577), Theophylactus (PG 126.656: τὴν τῶν προφητῶν φυλακὴν καὶ τάξιν), and Eth. za vāstaḥāyes.2

dίκτυον τῷ τὶ γ’ Αἰδου ‘some net of death’ id. Agam. 1115.

[The striking transliteration is found also in Je 26(46).18; Josephus, Bell. Jud. IV 1.8; Ant. V 1.22, XIII 15.4.3 The initial vowel defies explanation. We suspect that some kind of midrashic association is behind it; an association which Mount Tabor is likely to arouse for such midrash is the place where Israel won the glorious victory over the Canaanite king Yabin and his general Sisera as told in Jd 4-5. We suggest that the name of the mountain was brought into relation with Aramaic 'תָּבוֹר (note that Tau, and not Theta, is used in the transliteration), and indeed, in the Targum the verb תַּבַּר renders כָּהָה (Jd 4.15) הָמַם (ib. 4.23) describing the victory given by the Lord.4 It is also interesting to note that in the above-mentioned Jeremiah passage allusion is made (in Codex Reuchlinianus) to the lengthy midrashic expansion on Jd 5.5 in the Targum Yerushalmi, and also that in our Hosea passage the Targumist writes רֶשֶׁת for רֶש, the phrase appearing in the above-mentioned expansion in Jd with reference to Tabor, which boasts ‘I am a mountain higher than all other mountains and the divine appeared to me.’ For Theod. ἐπὶ τὸ δρυμὸν, cf. 1K 10.3 ἐως τὴς δρυὸς Ὀδήσωρ τοῦ Λοβόρ. The mountain in Palestine is called Αταβύριον in Polybius 5.70.6. This form of the name indicates a

2 On the formative -ια, see Schwyzter, I 469 and Chantraine 1933 § 62. Cyril (p. 118), who also seems to recognise the collective force of the ending -ια, speaks of ‘a crowd watched over and looked after by the priests.’ (ὑπὸ τοῦ τῶν ιερέων.. ἐπισκοποσεῖται πληθυν). 3 Joosten (97) is not interested in this remarkable discrepancy between Ἰ and Μ. 4 Note also Trg סִיסְרָא תַּבַּר Jd 5.2, סָנְאֵיהוֹן גִבָּרֵי תְּבַר עַמֵּיהו קֳדָם תָּבַר יוי.. עַמָּא גִּבָּרֵי תְּבַר תָּבַר יוי.. יְהוּדָא וְאָ מְרו יְהוּדָא וְאָ מְר שְׁכָנָה קְבּוֹר טָפָר שָפָר קְבּוֹר טָפָר 5.13.
connection between the Hellenised form of Tabor and Mount Atabyris or Atabyrium in Rhodes. For *statum in se* of La, see a discussion by Ziegler 1971.117f. Or is it possible that ῥῆβας was understood as ‘conqueror,’ but the midrashic expansion mockingly altered it into ‘the defeated (by Mt Sinai the Small)?

5.2) ὃ οἱ ἀγρεύοντες τὴν θήραν κατέπηξαν. ἐγώ δὲ παιδευτῆς ὑμῶν.

which the game-hunters laid. I am your chastiser.


See further Eusebius, *Onomasticon*, p. 110, and under תבור in *Enzyclopaedia Biblica.*

6 See Ziegler 1971.81 for an extensive discussion on the later versions.
as an expression of similar thought PSol 8.29 καὶ σὺ παιδευτής ἢμῶν εἶ.
The punitive or corrective aspect was captured by Theodor with his τιμωρία (PG 66.153) and Theophylactus with his παιδείαν .. τὴν τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας (PG 126.657).

5.3) ἐγὼ ἑγνών τὸν Ἐφραίμ, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἦπερτι ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ, διότι νῦν ἐξεπόρνευσε Ἐφραίμ, ἐμιάνθη Ἰσραὴλ.

I have come to know Ephraim, and Israel is not strange to me. For now Ephraim has fornicated, Israel has been defiled.

ἀπεστι v.l. τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, an inferior reading since ‘Israel’ here is a pseudonym of Ephraim, so that it must be the subject of what follows.

ἀπεστι [the word occurs only here in XII-Ez a, and also only here corresponds to דחב Nif.; elsewhere it is rendered with ἐκλείπειν ‘to abandon, desert’ (Zc 11.9 bis), ἐκλιμπάνειν ‘to be missing’ (ib. 11.16). In the light of these renderings in Zc, what is meant here by ἀπεστίν seems to be that Israel is not estranged from God. God is not indifferent to her.

The form ἐξεπόρνευσε was possibly construed as Ptc. as against the MT’s vocalisation (Pf.). Note the Greek present Ptc. employed to render the unequivocal Heb. Ptc. in Zc 11.9 τὸ ἐκλείπον τὴν ἡμᾶς; 11.16 τὸ ἐκλιμπάνον τὴν ἡμᾶς. The variant ἢπεστί of Bc etc. is partially explicable as a corruption from ἢπεστί. Whether the Coptic (Ach) latuit (so also Pesh ksē and Trg. מטמרין are = MT), as Ziegler thinks, is open to question.

διότι ν] The causal conjunction of ἒ is best taken as introducing and positioned ahead of its main clause. Ziegler’s ἐμοῦ, διότι can be improved to either ἐμοῦ· διότι or ἐμοῦ. Διότι. Similar examples are also attested in Jl 2.11, Hb 2.8, De 31.17 etc.7

ἐξεπόρνευσε] No Greek father or daughter version has taken the Greek verb as transitive / causative. The verb, which occurs rather frequently in SG (nearly 40 times), is also transitively used, e.g. ἐκπορνεύσωσιν τοὺς υἱοὺς σου ὑπὸ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν Ex 34.16.8 That is, however, contextually inapplicable to Ho 5.3. The Hebrew הִזְנָה is also used intransitively and transitively alike, the latter confined to Ho. See above at 4.10.

In comparison with ἒ’s 3ms form, one may recognise in ἒ’s 2ms form a more personal touch on the part of God.

---

7 See also SSG § 76 d, p. 629, last paragraph.
8 More examples are mentioned in GELS s.v. 3 ‘to induce to do ἐκπορνεύω.’
5.4) οὐκ ἔδωκαν τὰ διαβούλια αὐτῶν τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν,
ὅτι πνεῦμα πορνείας ἐν αὐτοῖς ἦστι, τὸν δὲ κύριον οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν.

They did not give thought to returning to their God, for a spirit of fornication is in them; the Lord they did not acknowledge.

5.5) καὶ ταπεινωθῆσεται ἡ ὕβρις τοῦ Ἰσραήλ εἰς πρόσωπον αὐτῶν, καὶ Ἰσραήλ καὶ Εφραίμ ἀσθενήσουσιν ἐν ταῖς ἁδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀσθενήσει καὶ Ἰουδας μετ’ αὐτῶν.

The pride of Israel will be brought low before his face, and Israel and Ephraim will languish in their iniquities, and Judah also will languish with them.
The Greek phrase, as its Hebrew counterpart, implies hostility or disadvantage.\(^9\) Thus 7.10, Na 2.2 ἀνέβη ἐνθρόνοι εἰς πρόσωπόν σου (ὃς ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν σου), Nu 12.14 ἐνέπτυσε εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς (ὧν). Ez 3.20 δώσω τὴν βάσανον εἰς πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ (ὃς). Note the interesting periphrasis in Trg. here: חָזַן וְאִנּוֹן 'in their sight,' cf. Theodor's αὐτοὶ θεαταὶ τῆς γίνομεν ταπεινώσεως (PG 66.156, Theodoret’s προφανῶσ ὁρῶνες (PG 81.1577), and Theophylactus’ προφανῶς ὄψονται (PG 126.660).

Even where the Nifal is formally unmistakable (Zc 12.8 ἐν ἐκυσσάει), the same way of rendering is observed (ὁ ἀσθενῶν); elsewhere in Ἠ we find Nif. forms: Ho 14.10, Na 2.6 ἐν ἐκυσσάει. Here a Qal form, ἐκυσσάει, immediately follows. For the semantic question of the Greek verb, cf. on 4.5.

With sheep and calves they will go to seek the Lord, but they will never find Him, because He has withdrawn Himself from them.

The omission of the suffix is a stylistic improvement. The rendering of βοῦς with μόσχοσ is striking, only here in XII Ez α, but elsewhere fairly frequent. The usual equivalent in XII is βοῦς (8 times), also in Ez 4.15, 43.19, 23, 25, 45.18. The rendering in our Ho passage seems to have been inspired by Ez 43.18-27, where the phrase μόσχοσ ἐκ βοῶν for ἐκ βοῶν ἐκ βοῶν ἐκ βοῶν βοῦς ἐκ βοῶν βοῦς βοῦς βοῦς βοῦς βοῦς βοῦς βοῦς ἐκ βοῶν βοῦς βοῦς remains in the description of sacrifices. Indeed, except in the above-mentioned places in Ez 43, βοῦς renders ἐκ βοῶν only where it has no specific reference to sacrifice (so Jl 1.11, Hb 3.17, Jn 3.7, Ez 4.15).

\(^9\) Many, e.g. Joosten 98, take ἐπὶ ἑταῖρον in the sense of ‘to testify against,’ but the preposition in this collocation is usually followed by a person, e.g. ἐπὶ τοῖς ἑταῖροι 2Sm 1.16. More references are mentioned in BDB s.v. ἐπὶ 3 ε.
Hebrew admits of a construction in which the object is lacking, while the same object appears with the preceding co-ordinate verb. This is, however, unknown to Greek; see the identical case in 2.7(9) ζητήσει αὐτοὺς καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρη αὐτοὺς ἀλλὰ πᾶν ἐμπείνα, where the case in the parallel member, provided it be genuine, may have been an influencing factor. Note a different treatment in a slightly different construction: Am 8.12 περιδραμοῦνται ζητοῦντες τὸν λόγον κυρίου καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρῶσιν άτομον ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀλλὰ περιδραμοῦνται ζητοῦντες τὸν λόγον κυρίου καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρῶσιν ἀτομον ἐξ αὐτῶν.

Ez 22.30 ἐς αὐτοῖς ἀνδρα .. καὶ οὐχ εὑρόνον μὴν πέρι τῷ ἀντὶ .. ἠρτα .. λος; 1 Ps 36.10 ζητήσεις τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρῆς (καὶ ἀντὶ .. λος) .. λος οὐχ. 5.7) ὅτι τὸν κύριον ἐγκατέλιπον, ὅτι τέκνα ἀλλότρια ἐγεννήθησαν αὐτοῖς· νῦν καταφάγεται τοὺς κλῆρους αὐτῶν. because they have forsaken the Lord; alien children have been born to them. Now rust will consume them and their estates.

ἐγκατέλιπον ἀλλότριος] an equivalence found only here and in Ma 2.10, 11, 14, 15, 16 throughout the LXX. Note that both our Ho passage and that in Ma talk about an actual or symbolical marriage relationship. Otherwise ἐγκατέλιπον renders יָלָדוּ in XII-Ez α, while the exclusive correspondence in XII-Ez α between יֵלֶדוּ and καταφρονέω suggests that the nuance of disdain- and belittling was possibly, by our translator, read into the Hebrew verb and its derivatives.

αὐτόν [The phrase τέκνον ἀλλότρια does not appear any more in the LXX, while ὑιὸς (ὑιοί) ἀλ. is fairly frequent as in Ge 17.12, 2K 22.45f., 3K 8.41, 2C 6.32, Ne 9.2, Ps 17.44f., 143.7, 11, Is 62.8 (rendering ben [or bne] nēḥār [or noḥrī]). The use of the epithet here will certainly remind the reader of the highly frequent phrase, θεὸς ἀλλότριος, which appears early on in the book at 3.1.

10 יֵלֶדוּ does not occur in Ez.
11 See above on 4.10.
Greek commentators are aware of the ambiguity of the expression τέκνα ἀλλότρια, children born from ethnically foreign mothers or children exposed to influences of religious symbiosis; see Cyril, p. 122, Theodor, *PG* 66.156, Theophylactus, *PG* 126.661. Of course there is no real conflict between the two, but an admixture of both would be closer to the true reality: “an ethico-cultic emphasis” of Wolff (1965.128).

ἐγεννήθησαν probably reading a passive Qal or pseudo-Pual.

ἐρυσίβη borrowing from JI 1.4 and 2.25 to render the difficult שד in this context. In both passages the verb used is קתע[ך] with meaning ‘ravages wrought by military hostilities: Cyril, קкваחט והב הוב [PG 71.145]; Theodoret, תרשקווש .. תוא פול.StatusInternalServerError] (PG 81.1580); Theophylactus, תף דע והב תוא פולא[ון (PG 126.661).

και]> ב, “weil man die Stelle nicht verstanden hat” (Nyberg 1935.37). The addition derives from the translator’s failure to comprehend שד. Nyberg thinks that the suffix of יאכלם is datival.

κλήρους αὐτῶν [חיים] [PG 71.145], a correspondence found nowhere else in the LXX. Both מים and קָלָה may refer to allotted land; on the Hebrew, see Radaq, and cf. Cyril, תא אֲוֹנ בֵי[ת הָרִיעוּ] בָּרָמָה בָּגִּבְעָה בּוֹ שָׁוְר תָּקְעוּ] (PG 126.661).

5.8) Σαλπίσατε σάλπιγγι ἐπὶ τοὺς βουνοὺς, ἁχὴρατε ἐπὶ τῶν ὄψηλῶν, κηρύξατε ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ὁνunateς Βενιαμίν, Blow a trumpet on the hills, make loud sounds on the high places, proclaim in the house of On. Benjamin has been alarmed,

Σαλπίσατε σάλπιγγι] a fixed idiom; see also Jl 2.1, 15.


12 For a recent attempt to tackle this difficult verse, see Andersen - Freedman 1980 ad loc, whose solution had been partly foreshadowed by mediaeval exegetes such as Rashi and Radaq.
τοὺς βουνοὺς .. τῶν υψηλῶν τῆς Κρήνης .. οἱ Βασιλεῖς] ‘in Gibeah .. in Ramah.’ On our translator’s actualising tendency, see Muraoka 1985.55, thus avoiding mention of not so familiar localities in the Holy Land. That this is a deliberate attempt on his part is evident in the use of the plural for the singular in Ἡ. Furthermore, the juxtaposition here with ‘the house of On’ suggests that he is thinking of the hills and heights as the profane cultic centres, not merely as physical elevations from which a warning sounded could travel far; cf. Cyril, pp. 124f., Theodor (PG 66.156), and Theodoret (PG 81.1580).

ἡχήσατε] The possibility is not precluded that the Heb. word was unfamiliar to the translator, hence freely rendered. ἡχεῖν appears only here in XII-Ez, whilst the noun ἡχός renders ןמיה in Am 5.23, JI 3(4).14. Cf. Ps 150.3 αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν ἐν ἡχῶ σάλπιγγος κατὰ ταύτην.

ἐπὶ τῶν υψηλῶν[ we would be asking too much if we looked for any distinction between the different cases used here. For the acc., see also 4.13 ἐπὶ τοὺς βουνοὺς ἐθυον. One may only note that a different case is used when the rendering is freely done; cf. 4.13 ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὁρέων .. ἐπὶ τοὺς βουνοὺς .. Statistically, ἐπὶ c. gen., dat., and acc. is frequent in this ascending order in XII. See BD, § 2 33.

κηρύξατε] a correspondence found only in XII: JI 2.1; Zp 3.14, Zc 9.9, while the same Gk verb also renders in XII-Ez α ἀκούει Qal Mi 3.5, JI 2.15, 3(4).9, Jn 1.2, 3.2, 4, 5 and κραυγή Hif. Jn 3.7. On the other hand, γὰρ Hif. has no other Gk equivalent in XII-Ez α, whilst the noun κηρύσσει is always rendered with κραυγή in XII-Ez α (Ez 21.22[27]). This cross-relation of equivalents underlines the peculiarity of our translator’s vocabulary; the most common equivalent of קהיר is ἀλαλάζειν (so Aq. here).

ἐν] a preposition used most frequently to indicate a place where a proclamation is made: e.g. JI 2.1 ἐν ὅρει ἀγίῳ, Jn 1.2, 3.2 ἐν αὐτῇ (= Nineveh), 3.7 ἐν τῇ Ν. Other prepositions: Es 6.9 διὰ τῆς πλατείας τῆς πόλεως, Pr l.21 ἐπ᾽ ἀκρών τειχέων.

ἐξέστη] The last two words of vs. 8 were joined with the following verse and the whole was understood as referring to the result of the warning of an imminent war. Hence τιθῇ tihye ἐγένετο in the Aorist. Since the Gk verb ἔξεσται always signifies in XII - Ez α ‘to be terrified, appalled,’14 the most probable equivalent here is דְּרָם. Indeed דְּרָם is rendered with ἔξεσται in Ho 11.10, 11. But, that the Vorlage read like the MT or something close to it is confirmed by the transformation carried out by our translator: transitive > intransitive.

13 Note Mi 4.9 κακὰ = κακά = ἁπάσης ἐννοίας.
14 Thus Cyril, who takes it to mean ‘to lose,’ is compelled to supply ἀγαθὴς ἀπάσης ἐννοιας and the like (p. 126). Cp. Theodor ἐκπληττόμενοι (PG 66.156).
5.9) Ἐφραίμ εἰς ἀφανισμὸν ἐγένετο ἐν ἡμέραις ἐλέγχου. ἐν ταῖς φυλαῖς τοῦ Ισραηλ ἠδείξα πιστὰ.

Ephraim has been reduced to ruins in the days of reproach; in the tribes of Israel I have shown trustworthy things.

5.10) Ἐγένοντο οἱ ἄρχοντες Ιουδα ὡς μετατιθέντες ὁρία, ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἐκχεῶ ὡς ὕδωρ τὸ ὀργῆμά μου.

The rulers of Judah have became like those who shift boundaries; upon them I will pour out my outrage like water.

ὁ ὀρχήματι ἐκποτάμησθαι ἐν ψυχῇ θυμοῦ καθέμενοι ἀθανάτως.
outburst of wrath or indignation is also typical of our translator. So also perh. Ex 32.22 (Ziegler 1971.39). Elsewhere De 28.49 ὡσεὶ ὅπ. ἄετου ‘like a swoop of an eagle,’ Ps 45.4 τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὰ δρμήματα ‘rushing streams.’ LSJ, citing our passage, specify as ‘my indignation,’ which would make our translator the first to delimit so narrowly the range of application of the word, which in general signifies ‘strong urge, impulse’; cf. Syh. ἥθη, Ἀηθ. But Cyril paraphrases: τὰ ἐκ θείους ὀργῆς (PG 71.152); Theodoret, χειμάρ-ρου δίκην αὐτοῖς ἐποίσω τὰς τιμωρίας (PG 81.1580); Theophylactus, ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεου επ’ αὐτοὺς ἐκχυθεῖσα (PG 126.665). It is more than likely that these Fathers and Eth. ma’aty are dependent on ‘the Three’ (with χόλος, ῥυγζά etc.).15 However that may be, in view of ὡς ὕδωρ and a classical exam-
ple like βαλάσσης ὀρμήματα (of the tides), the choice of ὀρμήμα must be said to be a felicitous one.

On the other hand, we find other equivalents for the same Hebrew word in XII - Ez α; θυμὸς Ho 5.11, ὀργή Zp 1.15, 18, Ez 21.36, 22.31. The table below will show relationships between Hebrew and Greek synonyms which mean anger as used in XII - Ez α.16 To make the matter simple, nouns only will be considered.

What strikes us most is the unusual multitude of Heb. synonyms as against the Gk.17 This lexical imbalance alone can account for cases like Ez 21.36 ὀργή ἡμεῖς .. ὀργής ἡ νότια parallel to 22.31 θυμός ἡμεῖς .. θυμός ἡ νότια. If so, the use of unusual equivalents like θολερός (Hb 2.15), φρίκη (Am 1.11) and ὀρμήμα must be regarded as sparks of desperate effort on the part of the translator. It is also apparent that he did not work out any rigid scheme of correspondences like A-a, b, c and B-d, e, f (upper case letters representing Greek words and lower case ones Hebrew words). Two further points emerge from the table below.

(1) The preference of the two major equivalents θυμός and ὀργή is precisely reversed in XII and Ez α: θυμός – XII 14, Ez 26, but ὀργή – XII 20, Ez 15.
(2) The three rare equivalents, viz. ὀρμήμα, θολερός and φρίκη, appear only in XII.

These two facts may imply that XII was rendered later than Ez α and that after elapse of a considerable period of time. Otherwise it would be hard to explain why these rare equivalents were not utilised in Ez α.

---

15 For details, see Ziegler’s edition.
16 The only occurrence of ἤθη in Ez 20.28 has no correspondent in the LXX ad loc., while the verb ἠθην is rendered with παραργεῖειν in Ez 16.26 (and perhaps also at Ho 12.14[15]).
17 When we take into account the entire corpus of Biblical Hebrew, there are more syno-
nyms, e.g. סכנה, ירן.
We might note that Aquila’s vocabulary was slightly richer, for he knows such words as μῆνις, ἀνυπερθεσία (both for עֶבְרָה, παραξυσμός (קֶצֶף), χολός (חֵמָה).

5.11) κατεδυνάστευσεν Εφραίμ τὸν ἀντίδικον αὐτοῦ, κατεπάτησε κρίμα, ὅτι ἠρξάτο πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω τῶν ματαίων.

Ephraim has oppressed his plaintiff, trampled justice, for he has begun to go after what is worthless.

κατεδυνάστευσε [עָשׁוֹק] The translator must have seen here an inf. abs. עָשׁוֹק as in 4.2 – or it was spelled defectively עשק, which was read by him as עשק – thus radically reversing the role played by Ephraim – now perpetrator, not victim. Other cases of the equivalence are: 12.7(8), Am 4.1, Zc 7.10, 1K 12.3. The same Hebrew collocation, which also occurs in De 28.33, has now turned up in Qumran: Damascus Document 13.1 набהלית לא עשקך ורצוץ.
The word must mean in this context ‘plaintiff’ as in Lysias 7.13, and not ‘defendant.’ Theodor, citing Mt 5.25, glosses the word with ὁ ἀδικούμενος (PG 66.157), but Cyril takes it in the general sense of ‘opponent,’ more specifically the law to which Ephraim is hostile (p. 129), and this is in line with his understanding of κατεδυνάστευσε = κατηγωνίσατο ‘he won, overpowered’ (ib.); similarly Theoph. (PG 126.668).

κατεπάτησε] a correspondence found here and in Am 4.1 only. For the metaphorical use of the Gk word, cf. already Ilias 4.157 κατὰ δ᾽ ὤρκια πιστὰ πάτησαν, Plato, Leg. 714a τοὺς νόμους.

Just as עָשׁוּק earlier, read by G as רְצוּץ, active, not passive רְצוּץ.

ἦρξατο] the Heb. verb occurs only here in our corpus. It might mean ‘be pleased, determine, δοκεῖ.’ Out of 20 instances of הוֹאִיל in the OT, it is rendered by ἀρέχθησαι ‘to begin’ in eleven places (Ge 18.27, De 1.5, Jos 17.12, Jd 1.27, 35, 17.11, 19.6A, 2K 7.29, 1C 17.27, Jb 6.9). Correctly ἔπεικέως in 1K 12.22, 4K 6.3. Cf. Vulg. coepit, but Pesh. gvā, Trg. ᾳγνωστὸς θείος ὥς λήσθητι ὡς μάρτυς.

Πορεύεσθαι] a verbum finitum may follow הוֹאִיל as in De 1.5 where הוֹאִיל מֹשֶׁה ἠρξατο Μωσῆς διασαφῆς, with a waw in 2K 7.29 and Jb 6.9, יָלְלוֹתָה יְדַכְּאֵנִי אֱלֹהַי ἀρξάμενος ὡς κύριος τρωσάτω με.

ματαίον] A phonetically and graphically probable equivalent is of course שָׁוְא, whether with an aleph or without (as in Jb 15.31). Note Ma 3.14 μάταίος (נִשְׁא) אֲדֻמֶּהוֹן תְוָתּו; see also Ez 21.29(34), 22.28. In the famous Isaiah passage (28.10, 13) θλίψις is used; Sym. ἑντολή, Theod. δεισαλία ‘filth.’ For the Greek idiom, cf. Je 2.5 ἐπορεύθησαν ὁπίσω τῶν ματαίων. מָתָאָה is further specified as εἴδωλα: Cyril, p. 130, Theodor (PG 66.157), Theodoret (PG 81.1580), Theophylactus (PG 126.668).

5.12) καὶ ἐγὼ ὡς ταραχὴ τῷ Εφραίμ καὶ ὡς κέντρον τῷ οἴκῳ Ιουδα.

And I am as upheaval to Ephraim and as an ox-goad to the house of Judah.

וְכָעָשׁ וַאֲנִי ὡς ταραχὴ כָעָשׁ There are three possible explanations for this remarkable correspondence:

i) To suppose that the translator read רעש, although the equivalence רעש = תָּרָאָךְ is attested only in Ps 45.3 ἐταράχθησαν (ταραχα) τὰ ὅρη. On the other hand, the substantive רעש = σεισμός Am 1.1, Zc 14.5,

18 The remaining cases are: Jo 7.7, Ge 18.31, Jd 19.68, Ex 2.21, 1K 17.39, 4K 5.23.

19 See also Muraoka 1982-83.36.
Na 3.2, Ez 3.12, 13; = ὀδύνη, free (cf. = ἔνδεια in the next verse), while the verb ὑπάρχη = σεισθαι (pass.) Am 9.1, Jl 2.10, 3(4).16, Na 1.5, Ez 26.10, 15; = φοβεῖσθαι Ez 27.28; ὑπάρχη = σειεῖν Hg 2.6, 21; = συσσεῖν Hg 2.7. This enquiry then lessens to a considerable degree the plausibility of such identification.

ii) In three places ὑπάρχη is rendered with ταράσσειν: Ps 6.8 ἐταράχθη (ὑπάρχη ἀπὸ θυμοῦ ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου; 30.10 ἐταράχθη ἐν θυμῷ ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου; 30.11 τὰ ὀστά μου ἑταράχθησαν (ὑπάρχη). This enquiry then lessens to a considerable degree the plausibility of such identification.

iii) If one looks for a passage in our corpus which may have influenced the rendering of the Hosea passage concerned, the most probable place is Hb 3.16 בֶּן בֵּית הַיָּהָה יָבֹא, which is rendered εἰσῆλθεν τρόμος εἰς τὰ ὀστὰ μου, καὶ ὑποκάτωθέν μου ἑταράχθη. Here, too, we find the word בֶּן, which was not correctly translated. However, against the suggested possibility of influence of the Habakkuk passage might speak the fact that the regular way of our translator’s utilisation of related passages in his own corpus makes us expect τρόμος or its cognate to render בֶּן in the Hosea passage. Further, we should also point out that the rendering τρόμος in Hb 3.16 is most probably a result of his guess based upon supposed parallelism.

Thus the second solution seems to be the most plausible. Rahlfs also seems to prefer it; see the note in his edition. However, it is not entirely impossible that the translator meant ὑπάρχη, the reason for his not using its usual equivalent being that the poetic imagery of his Vorlage, which would then have read like the MT, was beyond him, providing him with an excuse for free translation. Cyril (p. 130), Theodor (PG 66.157), and Theodoret (PG 81.1580) refer to upheavals and disruptions caused by wars.

κέντρον בֶּן[21] the translator’s ignorance of the Heb. word is proved by the above-noted Hb 3.16. The Gk word appears once again in Ho 13.14 ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου, ἀδὴ, quoted also by Paul in 1Cor 15.55 ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον. Here, too, it seems to be a free rendering of בֶּן, which is missing in the original LXX (as Ziegler rightly judges). Although this sentence is deleted by Cornill, its originality seems to be assured

---

20 The same Hebrew idiom occurs in 1QH 13.36: יְרָקָב נָשֶׁל. LSJ (s.v. ταράχη 2) quote τ. τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ from Theophrastus (iii/iv cent. BCE), De sensu 81.
21 Cf. Pr 12.4 σκώληξ ‘worm,’ 14.30 σής ‘worm,’ 10.7 σβέννυται ‘be quenched’ (יֵקְרַב), Jb 13.28 Ἰσοὶ ἀστὴρ ‘like a hide wineskin’ (ὑπάρχη), 41.19 ξύλων σαθρῶν ‘unsound tree’ (עֵץ רִקָּבוֹן), Is 40.20 ξύλων ἀσημίτοι τὰ ὀστά μου ‘a tree not liable to decay’ (בֶּן בֵּית הַיָּהָה יָבֹא).
22 A word unfamiliar to other translators, too: cf. De 32.24 δόξιθατονος ‘a disease in which the body is drawn back and stiffens,’ Ps 90.6 συμπτωμα, Is 38.2, free rendition.
by its very difficulty,\textsuperscript{23} which compelled the Greek translator to omit it completely. Rather the following sentence must be a later explanatory gloss, which, however, already stood in the \emph{Vorlage} of the translator. Our suggestion is that this once omitted phrase was revived in our Hosea passage; the translator read \textit{דָּרְבָּן} instead of \textit{קָרְבָּן}. Note \emph{βουκέντρον} ‘ox-goad’ in Ec 12.11 and 1K 13.21 Aq. and \textit{בּוֹצָכָּהָּהָּהָּה} \textit{דָּרְבָּן}. It is also not impossible that the \emph{Vorlage} was written with \textit{שׂ} (in MT only in Jb) or was so construed by the translator. Finally, we would like to mention another passage which may have been in the mind of our translator. The passage is Na 3.2 \textit{φωνὴ μαστίγων καὶ φωνὴ σεισμοῦ τροχῶν οὐφαν ρὰμ καὶ κολόννα}. It remains, however, a little strange that none of the Gk words appearing here or its cognate is employed in the Hosea passage. But cf. Pr 26.3 \textit{ὁσπερ μάστιξ ἵππῳ καὶ κέντρον ὀνῳ λάχῳ μετεί λασσόν ρομ ήσει ρομ}. 

5.13) \textit{kai ἐδεῖν Ἐφραὶμ τὴν νόσον αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰουδας τὴν ὀδύνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔπορευθη Ἐφραὶμ πρὸς Ἀσσυρῖους καὶ ἀπέστειλε πρέσβειες πρὸς βασιλέα Ιαριμ καὶ αὐτὸς οὔκ ἦδυνάσθη ἱάσασθαι ημᾶς, καὶ οὐ μὴ διαπαύσῃ ἐξ ὑμῶν ὀδύνη.}

\emph{And Ephraim saw his disease and Judah his pain, and Ephraim went to the Assyrians and sent emissaries to King Yarim, but he could not heal you, and pain will never leave you.}

τὴν ὀδύνην αὐτοῦ ὀποθεί ἤ οὐνادة ὑμᾶς καὶ ἔπορευθη Ἐφραὶμ πρὸς Ἀσσυρίους καὶ ἀπέστειλε πρέσβεις πρὸς βασιλέα Ιαριμ καὶ ἀπέστειλε πρέσβεις πρὸς βασιλέα Ιαριμ καὶ ἀπέστειλε πρέσβεις πρὸς βασιλέα Ιαριμ. It is also not impossible that the \emph{Vorlage} was written with \textit{שׂ} (in MT only in Jb) or was so construed by the translator. Finally, we would like to mention another passage which may have been in the mind of our translator. The passage is Na 3.2 \textit{φωνὴ μαστίγων καὶ φωνὴ σεισμοῦ τροχῶν οὐφαν ρὰμ καὶ κολόννα}. It remains, however, a little strange that none of the Gk words appearing here or its cognate is employed in the Hosea passage. But cf. Pr 26.3 \textit{ὁσπερ μάστιξ ἵππῳ καὶ κέντρον ὀνῳ λάχῳ μετεί λασσόν ρομ ήσει ρομ}. 

\textsuperscript{23} Elsewhere √כעס caused no difficulty: Qal Ez 16.42 μεριμνᾶν Hif. Ho 12.15, Ez 16.26 θυμοῦν παροργίζειν.
The preterite tense sounds logical, following καὶ ἀπέστειλε. Either Γ corrected θ’s or his Vorlage read וַיִּשְׁלַח. There is no knowing whether the translator read the verb as Qal or Piel; cf. Zc 11.16 יָכוֹל. The variant רִועָסְתָּה, which agrees with Syh. /lamfasṣāyūtkōn/ and La\textsuperscript{w} (liberare), may be a Christian gloss.

diapaúσῃ] The intransitive use of διαπαύω in the active voice is unattested elsewhere. Should we possibly correct ὀδύνη to ὀδύνην? Though the Heb. verb is a hapax, our translator may have been familiar with its root, cf. הַכַּרְכָּא оֹוֹכְּיָתִים Na 3.19, where הַכֶּרֶס ‘cure’ may be on his mind. Note κάλλος λευκότητος αὐτής ἐκθαυμάσει ὅφθαλμος καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑετοῦ αὐτής ἐκστάσεται καρδία ‘an eye will marvel at the beauty of its [= snow’s] whiteness and a heart will be amazed at its rain’ in נא 43.18.\textsuperscript{24} By contrast to this rare Heb. verb its Syriac analogue is solidly attested: Pe’al /γῆ/ ‘to be freed, disappear’ and Af’el ‘aghī/ ‘to get rid of.’ This makes the vocalisation in Γ with מַזֹּר as the subject more plausible.\textsuperscript{25} Poetic parallelism between this clause and the preceding one does not have to result in total grammatical convergence with a doctor as the grammatical subject in both.

5.14) διότι ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὡς πάνθηρ τῷ Ἐφραίμ καὶ ὡς λέων τῷ οἶκῳ Ιουδαίῳ καὶ ἐγὼ ἀρπὸμαι καὶ πορεύσομαι καὶ λήμψομαι, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος.

For I am like a leopard to Ephraim and like a lion to the house of Judah; I will seize and walk off and take (it for myself), and there will be none to recover (it).

[The text cited above is that of MS B, which has a marginal reading מַזֹּר for הַכַּרְכָּא, and the Massada manuscript reads מַזֹּר לֹא יְהוּדָה לְבֵית וּכַכְּפִיר לְאֶפְרַיִם כַּשַּׁחַל אָנֹכִי כִּי. מַצִּיל πάνθηρ שַׁחַל so also in 13.7.\textsuperscript{26} The Gk word occurs nowhere else in the LXX, whilst the Heb. noun occurs no more in XII - Ez α. The table below shows us the renderings of different Hebrew names for the species occurring in XII - Ez α.\textsuperscript{27}]

\textsuperscript{24} The text cited above is that of MS B, which has a marginal reading מַזֹּר for הַכַּרְכָּא, and the Massada manuscript reads מַזֹּר לֹא יְהוּדָה לְבֵית וּכַכְּפִיר לְאֶפְרַיִם כַּשַּׁחַל. Segal (1958.298) would not vocalise the form as מַזֹּר ‘to be cured,’ but מַזֹּר, which he takes as meaning ‘to blind’ (יעוור), though we do not know where else such a meaning is attested.

\textsuperscript{25} Pesh. /nahlem/, Trg. /ניִין/ and Vulg. solvere represent the transitive יַגְהֶה. Likewise Rashi and Ibn Ezra (רַבִּי).

\textsuperscript{26} Correct Ziegler’s πανθηρ to πανθηρ.

\textsuperscript{27} לַיִש does not occur in this portion of the OT.
The following observations may be made:

i) Here again, as in the case of the synonyms for “anger” (see above pp. 73f.), the translator was faced with a considerable disproportion of synonyms available in the two languages.28

ii) Here also the translator attempted to enlarge his vocabulary in his second enterprise. i.e. XII; in Ez he had not used σκύμνος for כפיר. Thus the introduction of πάνθηρ in XII for the new synonym σχαλ does not probably represent accurate zoological knowledge on the part of the translator, as far as the fauna of Palestine are concerned.29

iii) אריה / ארי is always rendered by λέων (so also outside our corpus), which, however, corresponds to two more Heb. synonyms. The strictly exact equivalent of דיה ‘whelp’ is σκύμνος, which also renders two other Heb. synonyms; כפיר ‘young lion’ = σκύμνος is an acceptable approximation. The translator’s poor vocabulary betrays itself in a passage containing the whole series of Heb. synonyms as Na 2.12f. λεόντων (האריה) .. σκύμνοις (הכפירים) .. λέων (האריה) .. σκύμνοις λέοντος (גירר) .. λέων (הכפירים) .. σκύμνοις (כפירים) .. λέονσε (הליבים). See also Jl 1.6 and Ez 19.2ff. The difficulty lay in the fact that Heb. has two synonyms for ‘lion’ in general, אריה / ארי and לבי,30 and that it distinguishes three stages of growth - whelp, young lion, grown-up lion.

28 Aquila’s vocabulary is richer, including λίς (לוי - note the phonetic similarity) and λέαινα (לבי, ליבי). On synonyms in XII, see Muraoka 2019.

29 The translator of Pr 20.13 offers ἀποστελλόμενος, i.e. = שולח, in spite of ארי λέων in parallelism.

30 Radaq (ad Jd 14.5) lists some of these synonyms in the order of size: לבי > לבי > אריה > כפיר > גירר.
Emotion is one of those things which are not easy to transfer from language to language; Pesh. is also content with a single /'enē\. Cf. Ge 37.30 ἐγὼ δὲ ποῦ πορεύομαι ἐτεί; אֲנִי, De 32.39 ἐγὼ εἰμι, Is 48.15 ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, ἐγὼ ἐκάλεσα, ἐγώ εἰμι.

ἀρπάγαι] on the form, cf. Helbing 1907.86, 89. The notion of ‘tearing to pieces,’ commonly associated with the Heb. verb, טָרַף, seems to be foreign to the LXX, which normally understands it in terms of capturing a game or prey. The only exception is De 33.20 with συντρίβειν.

καὶ λήμψομαι] om. Ἴδα. Ziegler attributes the absence of the words to homoioteleuton. But logical reasoning may have led to its deliberate deletion: if God has snatched the prey and is gone, there is no sense in talking about taking it. The LXX apparently understood the Heb. verb here (נָשָׂא) in the sense of ‘to take for oneself,’ whereas the prophet most likely meant ‘I shall carry off my prey with nobody coming to your rescue.’ Note the zaqef on כְּ אֵלֵ֔ תָּזְמִיתא] estin in a number of minuscules. The future tense is in harmony with the tense of the preceding verbs.

δ] Even Aquila (together with Theodotion) adds the article. Its omission would not make sense. So Mi 5.8(7) ἀρπάσῃ καὶ μὴ ἤ ὀ εξαιρούμενος, Mi 4.4 οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἐκφοβῶν διδαρμός, ἀπετέλεσα, cf. also Na 2.12, Zp 3.13 et passim outside our corpus.

5.15) πορεύσομαι καὶ ἐπιστρέψω εἰς τὸν τόπον μου, ἐος ὁ ἀφανισθεὶς καὶ ἐπιζητήσουσι τὸ πρόσωπόν μου.

ἐσται] εστιν in a number of minuscules. The future tense is in harmony with the tense of the preceding verbs.

α] the asyndetic structure in which two verbs are imperative as in 1.2 βάδιζε λάβε must be distinguished from the one as here, where the verbs are in a different tense/mood. This structural difference is reflected in the added conjunction καί. So also Mi 7.19 ἐπιστρέψει καὶ σκεπάσαι ἡμᾶς. Thus, pace Wolff (1965.134), G does not necessarily presuppose אֵלֵ֔ תָּזְמִיתא. The general rule is πρός + acc. pers. and εἰς + acc. loci, whether the verb be transitive or intransitive. Examples will be found in: πρός Ho 2.7(9), 5.4 et passim; εἰς Je 39(32).37 εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον, 51(44).14 εἰς γῆν Ιουδα et passim.

ἀφανισθεὶς καὶ ἐπιζητήσομαι] Undoubtedly the translator means < שִׁמַּש Nif., judging from the highly frequent correspondence שִׁמַּש = ἀφανισθεὶς and their cognates. Does this possibly imply that there was an assistant seated by the translator and reading the text aloud? The latter may have then misheard.
Note that in all those places where the MT אָשִׁם is rendered with ἀφ, the MT shows a seghol with a personal prefix and shewa with the Alef: so Ho 10.2 אָשִׁי, 14.1 אָשִׁים, Jl 1.18 אָשִׁים. 31 But cf. Ho 4.15 אָשִׁי, ἀγνοεῖ, see above ad loc.

Words and forms derived from שָׁמֵם are thought to denote notions of “desolate” and “dismay.” These states and conditions, however, are a result of a destructive, violent action wilfully inflicted by a third party. Thus a desert, for instance, is desolate, as defined by Job, בּוֹ לֹא־אָדָם מִדְבָּר Jb 38.26, but one does not speak of שָׁמֵם מִדְבָּר. On the contrary, מִדְבָּר שָׁמֵם is a man-made condition: שְׁמָמָה מִדְבָּר חֶמְדָּתִי אֶת־חֶלְקַת נָתְנוּ Je 12.10, note also the next verse כָּל־הָאָרֶץ נָשַׁמָּה שְׁמֵמָה עָלַי אָבְלָה לִשְׁמָמָה שָׂמָהּ ἐτέθη εἰς ἀφανισμὸν ἀφανίσθη πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, where ἀφανισμός and ἀφανίζω are to be noted. Our Ho example is important in that the victim is not a space or place which is supposed to be occupied or inhabited. The same holds for Ho 2.12(14), Mi 6.16, Jl 1.17, ib. 1.18 with their respective victim(s) being ἄμπελον ‘vine-tree’ and συκαί ‘fig-trees,’ νόμιμα ‘regulations,’ θησαυροί ‘treasures,’ and ποίμνια προβάτων ‘flocks of sheep.’ See also 1Sm 5.6, Ez 30.12.

Unlike in our Ho example, Nif. verbs clearly marked as such with a pre-fix נ are translated with a passive form of ἀφανίζω in τῇ ἡμερῇ καὶ οἰκοδομήσουσιν πόλεις τῶς ἡμαρισμένοις Am 9.14, so also ib. 7.9, Jl 1.17, Zp 3.6, and Zc 7.14. Note also the above-adduced נֶאְשָׁמוּ Jl 1.18.

The question as to how people once annihilated could possibly turn to God does not seem to have bothered Greek fathers; Cyril, who speaks of ἐκτεθλιμμένοι, however, does not take ἀφανίζεσθαι at its face value. ἀφανίζειν, used as often as 16 times in XII, appears to be one of the favourite lexemes in our translator’s vocabulary.

All these data rend support to our assumption of ἀφανισθῶσι = נֶאְשָׁמוּ.

ἐπιζητήσουσι] the change of the moods immediately after ἀφανισθῶσιν (subj.) is highly interesting; the Lucianic group corrects it to -σωσί.

31 Delete in Index 20a s.v. ἀφανίζω 21) שָׁמֵם *f and 370b s.v. שָׁמֵם I hitpo. *ἀφανίζειν.
CHAPTER VI

6.1) Ἐν θλίψει αὐτῶν ὀρθριοῦσι πρὸς με λέγοντες Πορευθῶμεν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωμεν πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἢρπαξε καὶ ίάσεται ἡμᾶς, πατάξει καὶ μοτώσει ἡμᾶς:

In their distress they will eagerly turn to me, saying “Let’s go and return to the Lord our God, for He is the one that has torn away, yet will heal us, He will strike and yet plug our wound with lint.

Ziegler, in his edition, correctly makes 5.15c of the Hebrew text begin a new paragraph or chapter. Thus Ἐν θλίψει αὐτῶν ὀρθριοῦσι πρὸς με λέγοντες is better construed with what follows it rather than with what precedes it. ὀρθριοῦσι [ὀρθριοῦσιν] The Θ translation is etymologically informed, i.e. χαίρω. For our understanding and analysis of this process, see Muraoka 2008. λέγοντες] is possibly a free addition made by the LXX translator.

The imperative of the lead verb ἄρχει is often and idiomatically joined through the conjunction Waw with another verb following immediately in the future. Such a syntagm marks incitement or encouragement. The verb has been grammaticalised and almost lost its original meaning. This is normally rendered in various books of the Septuagint with sg. δεῦρο or pl. δεῦτε: e.g., Ge 37.13 δεῦρο ἀποστείλω; 31.44 δεῦρο διαθώμεθα; 37.20 δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν or syndetically 19.32 δεῦρο καὶ ποτίσωμεν. The change of the 2pl. imperative to the 1pl. hortative subj. indicates that, provided the Vorlage of the Septuagint was more or less identical with the MT, our Greek translator appears to be harmonising this verse with 5.15: Πορεύσομαι καὶ ἐπιστρέψω. It is further highly probable that he was conscious of an even earlier passage, 2.9 (LXX: 2.11), where we read Πορεύσομαι καὶ ἐπιστρέψω πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα μου τὸν πρῶτον ἡμῶν, a passage closer in thought than 5.15 where the affinity is merely formal, since the subject of the verbs is God.

Another question arising from the collocation of these two verbs, both in Hebrew and Greek, is whether we have here to do with a hendiadys, the second verb indicating a backward direction of a single movement: ‘to go back’ rather than ‘to go and return.’ The verb ἄρχει Qal is often used to mark

---

1 An earlier version of a study of this chapter was published in Muraoka 2008a.
2 See JM § 105 e.
3 See GELS s.v. πορεύομαι, I 4.
repetition of a certain action, but significantly in such a case it occupies the first slot as in וַיְחֹפּוּ בַּזְּכָרִים וַיְשָׁב וַיִּשָּׁב 'and Jacob dug once again' Gn 26.18. In view of this we seem to be dealing with two distinct kinds of hendiadic use of שָׁב.

Cf. 2S 3.16 פֹּרֵעְתֻּו וְאָנָּסָרְפֶּהוּ כָּאָן אֶנֶּסָרְפֶּהוּ. Furthermore, the hendiadic structure in our Hoseanic passage also differs from what we see in cases such as Ex 5.8 פֹּרֵעְתֻּו וְתָּעָבְדוּ מִיָּמִים וְתָּעָבְדוּן for MT נְזֵבְּחָה נְלִלָה; De 13.14 פֹּרֵעְתֻּו וְלַעֲרֹעְשֵׁם for MT נְלִלָה תְּעֹרְשֵׁם. Here the second verb in both cases is not a verb of physical movement, and the first verb is not desemantisised or grammaticalised. By contrast, elsewhere in XII, our translator4 did recognise such a desemantisised use of the Hebrew verb: e.g., Jn 1.7 וַנִּפְלְּיָה וַנַּעְבְּדוּ δֶּלֶת דֶּלֶת נְפֹסֶל נְרַיָּה מַיִל מַיִל דֶּקֶט בְּאָלִים קְלָפוּ; Mi 4.2 הַלָּל הַלָּל דֵּעֵה בְּאָלִים קְלָפוּ כּוֹנִיתָם.

ἀρπάζω] as a rendering of נָשָר is somewhat problematic. The context indicates the meaning of the Hebrew verb as ‘to tear away,’ especially with reference to a wild animal, predatory animal as the subject. Indeed, only two verses earlier, at 5.14, the Lord compares Himself to a young lion (πανθήρ σαβαλ) and a lion (λέων κεφαρ), and declares - in an έγώ - εγώ ἀρπάζωμαι. This Greek verb, however, means, first and foremost, ‘to seize (unlawfully).’ What a wild animal does can be described as an act of seizure. However, healing is presented as God’s restoration of the damaged situation. A seized object may be returned to its original owner, but not necessarily healed. Healing presupposes bodily damage, injury or ailment. If the imagery is that of a predatory animal and its victim, the victim is probably envisaged as having part of its flesh torn off, bleeding and calling for medical attention. In the following passages the Greek verb does signify, not just seizure and taking into possession, but tearing away, forcibly removing: 2S 23.21 ‘he snatched (ἥρπασεν) the spear out of the hand of the Egyptian and killed him with his own spear’ (NETS); Mi 3.2 ἀρπάζοντες τὰ δέρματα αὐτῶν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτῶν ‘snatch their skin from them and their flesh from their bones’ (NETS). Therefore the verb appears to be used elliptically with an appropriate direct object to be supplied, referring to part of a body.

The personal pronoun αὐτός underlines the striking identity of the rescuer of the people. At one stage he wounds and harms them, but in the end he restores them to wellbeing. Note ἐγώ at 5.14, which is even more emphatic in the MT with the repetition of אני, see above. This emphatic pronoun, which underlines the striking conduct on the part of God appears in Jb 5.18, which is close in thought to our Hoseanic passage:

4 We assume that the Twelve Prophets of the LXX is to be ascribed to a single translator: see Muraoka 2002.I - XXIII, esp. IX-X. See also Kaminka 1928.7-12.

5 Cf. GELS s.v. 3.
6.2) ὑγιάσει ἡμᾶς μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας· ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστησόμεθα καὶ ζησόμεθα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ

He will restore our health after two days; on the third day we shall be able to stand up and live in His presence.

I owe this reference to Mrs Mayumi Muratsu of Rotterdam.

6 LSJ s.v.

8 Wolff 1965.134, following Wellhausen 1898.116, proposes to emend the text by adding a waw as required (“geboten”) by the parallelism. But the form required by the parallelism should be נפש, not an impossible נפש, an alternative emendation proposed in BHS ad loc. Besides, this emendation is too atomistic, ignoring the analysis of the verse as a whole by the Greek translator, who obviously did not analyse the immediately preceding verb as inverse by translating with ἑστασθη (future). A syntagm such as <qatal - w-yiqtol - wayyiqtol> is abnormal. Two parallel clauses, each consisting of two verbal clauses, need not be syndetic with the conjunction Waw in the middle. <A and B: C and D> is perfectly acceptable. Why Hosea chose to write י instead of נפש is a separate issue. What matters is what he wrote indicates a past event just as its parallel פרא.

Already Rashi was troubled by י, saying that the form is a Present tense form. Ibn Ezra writes that the form is equal to נפש, i.e. נפש, whilst Radaq writes that the form is meant to be a Future, thus equivalent to נפש.

9 For the normally applicable rule concerned, see JM § 61 f. One must of course allow for a measure of flexibility in poetry, and much depends on the vocalisation. Andersen and Freedman (1980.419) go only part of the way, recognising י as preterite.
The athnach at מִים and the absence of the conjunction Waw after it both mark a break between the first event and the two events to happen on the third day. The contrast is between God’s initiative and its effect on ‘us.’ This is made all the more manifest in the LXX by the use of the same inflectional categories, namely 1 pl. future ἀναστησόμεθα καὶ ζησόμεθα, where the translator could have said ἀναστήσει to match MT יִקְמוּ, Hifil, ‘he will raise us.’ The use of a colon in Ziegler’s edition is to be preferred to the comma in Rahlfs’s edition. Joosten thinks that the translator’s text had a Qal form. 10

The choice of ὑγιάζω to render Piel הָיָה is attested only here in the LXX,11 but possibly as Pual at Le 13.24 το ὑγιασθέν for MT הָיָה, which could be revocalised as either Pual or Hofal, neither of which is attested in Biblical Hebrew, most likely accidentally. The Hebrew, in view of the following prepositional phrase, must mean ‘to make alive one who or that which has been virtually dead, utterly exhausted,’ and such an interpretation tallies with the parallel Hebrew verb, which would mean ‘to help to rise again on one’s feet,’ but less likely ‘to resurrect or resuscitate.’ 12 Whether the exhaustion and refreshment is meant literally or also spiritually is a separate issue.

6.3) καὶ γνωσόμεθα· διώξομεν τού γνῶναι τὸν κύριον, ὡς ὅρθρον ἔτοιμον εὑρήσομεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἥξει ὡς ὑπέτος ἡμῖν πρόσωπος καὶ δύσιμος τῇ γῆ·

and we shall gain knowledge; we shall strive to know the Lord. When we meet Him, He will be like a dawn about to break, and He will come to us like early rain and late rain (to fall) on the ground.

The two cohortatives are rendered in the future tense instead of the hortative subjunctive: γνωσόμεθα, διώξομεν instead of γνῶμεν, διώξω-μεν. The future tense is probably meant to indicate a firm determination, which is not too far removed from the value of the Hebrew cohortative, see SSG § 28 gf.

10 Joosten 104: “la LXX a peut-être lu une forme du qal.” That is to say רמא, but followed by הָיָה?
11 The additional two examples mentioned by Joosten ibid. come under a related, but different lexeme, ὑγιάτω, intransitive, ‘to be or become healthy.’ As a matter of fact, Greek ὑγιάτω lexemes are used rather infrequently to render Hebrew or Aramaic יִהְיֶה lexemes: ὑγιάτω – only once at To 6.9 Θ; ὑγίεια only twice; ὑγίες four times including Le 13.10 (to be revocalised).
12 On this less likely interpretation, see Joosten 104. Note, however, that this particular sense of the verb is already attested in Is 26.19 ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροὶ, καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις ‘the dead will rise, and those who are in graves will arise.’ See GELS s.v. II. 4.
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), where the form is of the middle voice: διώκεσθαι τὸ πλέον ἔχειν. The use of an infinitive clause as a direct object is very common, e.g. a case of ζητέω, a synonymous verb in ἐξήτει αὐτῶν ἀποκτεῖναι ‘he sought to kill him’ Ex 4.24.

ὡς ὥρθον ἔτημον εὐρήσκεομεν αὐτῶν] In my Lexicon of (2002) s.v. ἔτημος I translated this clause: ‘we shall find him as ready as morning,’ identifying the adjective as a predicative object of the verb εὑρίσκεομεν. I would like to revise this analysis, for otherwise the verb would be having two separate predicative complements.

Joosten’s translation reads: “comme une aurore certaine nous le trouverons.” For this translation he draws upon an analysis by Harl of Greek ἕτοιμομελεμεσ. 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.

מוצא 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, ביא, a parallelism that has been lost in the LXX. Whatever the Vorlage of the LXX may have looked like, its translation reflects either נמצאנו (indicative) or נמצאהו (jussive).

The encounter between the people and their God is characterised by means of two similes with ὡς. 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 ἥκω here as a rendering of ביא 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 ἡξει instead

13 LSJ s.v. I 2.
14 For a discussion with examples, see SSG 30 bef.
15 Syrohexapla supports our new analysis: מටיבא שׁפרא.
16 Joosten 103.
of ἐλεύσεται. The database Accordance tells us that the verb ἥκω 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 וָבוֹא, and not וָבָא, 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 καὶ ὀψιμὸς τῇ γῇ ἥκω ἁρών. 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 יֹהָר (De 11.14; Je 5.24) or מְלָד (Jl 2.23), מְלָל is always 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 καὶ ὀψιμὸν as a rendering of MT ἀρά χρήσθητε. Our translator’s consistency in this respect made him supply a term which he thought missing in his Hebrew text: Zc 10.1 μᾶς μετακάθισέν μεν ἐσπέραν πρόϊμον καὶ ὀψιμον. The Massoretic vocalisation of the second preposition Kaph with a shva indicates that the Massoretes correctly understood ἀρά χρήσθη 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 ἀρά ἔλθετε γενήματα δικαιοσύνης ὑμῖν ‘(until) the produce of righteousness comes to you.’

6.4) τί σοι ποιήσω, Εφραίμ; τί σοι ποιήσω, Ιουδαί; τὸ δὲ ἔλεος ὑμῶν ὡς νεφέλη πρωινῆ καὶ ὡς δρόσος ὀρθρινῆ 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.

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 Massoreticaccentuation with a disjunctive accent on לְכַטַּל and not לְכַטל indicates that the Massoretes 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 \( לְסָרָה \) but \( חָסְדֶּכם \), 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 ἔξελευσεται.

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

\[ \text{Ulîm ūnqàbàmi mûtqímím qàmràmíymi qamàràmíymi àwá ába} \]

\[ \text{απεθέρισα ὑμῶν} \] The Greek verb ἀποθεριζω 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 חצב 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).\(^{7}\)

\[ \text{אשׁ לָהבוֹת חָצַב} \] ‘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 חצב, 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 חצב Qal usually does not carry any destructive connotation\(^{21}\) whilst ἀποθεριζω can be so used,\(^{22}\) Nyberg’s suggestion is attractive.\(^{23}\)

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 רַהַב הַמַּחְצֶבֶת, 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 ‘suitors, wooers’ as a direct object.

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

\(^{24}\) Jenni 1992.120 (§ 1712).
could object that בְּנִּיָּאִים is parallel to בְּאִמְרֵי־פִי undoubtedly with a *beth* instrumenti, though the two instruments are of different kinds, animate and inanimate.25 We are reminded of a fairly frequent use of this preposition in similar, military contexts, e.g. אִישׁ מָאתַיִם בַּפְּלִשְׁתִּים וַיַּךְ καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις ἐκατόν ἀνδρέας 1Sm 18.27, where the Philistines presumably numbered more than one hundred, and καὶ πατάξω τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους τούτους; καὶ ἔπειν κύριος Πορεύου καὶ πατάξεις ἐν τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις τούτοις ib. 23.2, where the vacillation between the accusative and ἐν τινι is to be noted.

6.6) διότι ἐλεος θελω και ου θυσιαν και επιγνωσιν θεου η ἀλοκαυτώματα.

Because I desire mercy and not sacrifice, and knowledge of God rather than wholly burnt offerings.

θέλω ῼτεθέν] The perfect of a stative verb has been correctly rendered with the present tense. Such a Hebrew form can, of course, refer to a situation that prevailed in the past: e.g., Jn 1.14 ῼσῃ ῼτεθέν δεν τρόπον ἐβούλου πεποίηκας ‘you have done as you wanted.’

ἐπιγνωσιν θεου] The noun, ἐπιγνωσις, is rather infrequent: only seven occurrences in the LXX, three out of which in our book. In all the three cases it does not seem to denote body of acquired knowledge, but an act of seeking to know, to know in more than one sense, that is to say, not merely intellectually. In other words this is a verbal noun of ἐπιγινώσκω. The remaining two cases are: 4.1 ουκ ἐστιν ἀλήθεια οὐδὲ ἔλεος οὐδὲ ἐπιγνωσις θεου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; 4.6 σι ἐπιγνωσιν ἀπώση, καγὼ ἀπώσημαι σε τοι ἰερατεύειν μοι. In the first instance the noun is parallel to ἔλεος just as in our passage. In the latter instance we should note that the clause is preceded by ὁ λαος μου ὃς

25 See further Joosten 106.

26 Cf. "GELS" s.v. 3. Nyberg (1935.41f.) argues for the meaning ‘to vanish’ for ἀπώση here.
6.7) αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰσιν ὡς ἀνθρωπὸς παραβαίνων διαθήκην· ἐκεῖ κατεφρόνησέν μου.

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

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

κατεφρόνησέν μου] 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 ἀνθρωπὸς as an asyndetic relative clause, and 3) a single verbal clause with κατεφρόνησέν μου] as an adverbial adjunct. The second alternative is reflected in the LXX.

ὁς ἀνθρωπὸς] 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 ἀνθρωπὸς, though it must actually be referring to αὐτοὶ, hence our translation.

27 Cf. also Joosten 78 ad 2.20.
28 See GELS s.v. ἡ 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 μη` ἐγκαταλίπῃς. 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, ἀνομος, 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, ταράσσουσα υδωρ,

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

ἐργαζομένη μάταια [ifecycle Μ] The verb ἐργάζεσθαι 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 ἐργάζεσθαι as a direct object of the verb ἐργάζεσθαι 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 בגד.
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 בגד. 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 2.13); 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 רֶפֶן (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, ἄνομος, ἄσεβής, ἄτοπος, ὑφρον, βλάσφημος, κακία, κακός, κακοδράγος, παράνομος, πονηρία. Mi 2.1 is particularly revealing: Ἐγένοντο λογιζόμενοι κόπους καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι κακὰ, translating רָע וּפֹעֲלֵי חֹשְׁבֵי־אָוֶן, where κόπος is parallel to the ethically marked κακός. A close parallel may be found at Ez 11.2: οἱ λογιζόμενοι μάταια καὶ βουλευόμενοι βουλὴν 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 רֶפֶן 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,’ and μάταια often refers to objects of pagan worship, idols, 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 ἡργάσαντο ψευδῆ.39

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

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

36 Probably MT רֶפֶן has been read as רֶפֶן.
37 As in Nu 31.51 σκεῦος εἰργασμένον ‘wrought implement’; Ez 27.19 σίδηρος εἰργασμένος ‘processed iron’; Ps 7.16 εἷς βόθρου, δὲν 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 בַּעַד.
6.9) καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς σου ἄνδρος πειρατοῦ· ἐκρυψαν ἱερεῖς ὁδὸν, ἐφόνευσαν Σικιμα, ὅτι ἁνομίαν ἐποίησαν.

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

καθ' ἁπλή] has been broken down into ἁπλός + an archaic, dialectal 2fem. sg. possessive pronoun ἡ.

ἄνδρος πειρατοῦ] 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 ἄνδρος redundant as in the mechanical rendering of ἁπλός at Ge 46.32 ἄνδρες κτηνοτρόφοι 'cattlemen.'

ἐκρυψαν] indicates a form of ἡχαβ. It is difficult to say what the translator’s Vorlage looked like. The Hebrew phrase in the MT, ἡχερ Κῆνσ, gives good sense, ‘a band of prophets.’

6.10 [H 6.10-11a]) ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ Ισραὴλ εἶδον φρικώδη, ἐκεῖ πορνείαν τοῦ Ἐφραίμ· ἐμιάνθη Ισραὴλ καὶ Ιουδας.

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

φρικώδη from φρικόδης] 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 [ח] ἐποίησε τὰ φρικτὰ, which is rendered φρικτά [ח] ‘shocking things that she did.’ The noun, from which this adjective is derived, φρικτά, 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 שׁשַׁעְרִירת. We would further note a related Greek noun, φρίκη, which occurs at Am 1.11, rendering ἄνθρωπος ἀγέρμος τὴς ἄρτης ἀγέρμος ‘anger,’ and Jb 4.14 for τρόμος ‘terror.’

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

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) Ἀρχον τρυγᾶν σεαυτῷ ἐν τῷ ἐπιστρέφειν με τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν τοῦ λαοῦ μου,

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

חֲתַת קִצֵּר לָךְ בְּשׁוּבִי קָצִיר שָׁת:

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

τρυγᾶν] possibly reflects קִצֵּר rather than MT קִציר.

ἐπιστρέφειν με τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν] is a well-established rendering of the standing phrase in Hebrew, שָׁת שִׁב, 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 ἀποκαλυφθῆσεται ἡ ἁδικία Εφραίμ καὶ ἡ κακία Σαμαρείας, ὅτι ἠργάσαντο ψευδῆ καὶ κλέπτης πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσελεύσονται, ἐκδιδύσκων λῃστής 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

κραταὶ ἀνάμεσα στὸν Ἱσραήλ τὸν Σαμαρίας καὶ οἱ κακοί ἐπὶ πονηρὰς προφητείς περὶ Σαμαρίας τῷ πόλεμῳ τῆς ὅρισθαι

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. Ἑ also uses two different prepositions: βῆσσαριον vs. κρατάι, 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 τὰς δυτικὰς ἔρεις ἕτορκσας Κέρμη καὶ κατέδραμες άλλα 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.

ἀποκαλυφθῆσεται The number discord is more glaring in Ἑ with its second subject being fpl. τῆς. This can be accounted for by remembering that Ephraim and Samaria are not two distinct entities, Samaria being the capital of Ephraim.

ἐκδιδύσκων λῃστής καὶ τῆς κράσας τῇ τρώγειν 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. β V 1 and γ 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.
G's selection of a participle here, immediately following εἰσελεύσεται indicates its circumstantial function, presumably reading Ἡ as ἐστιν. In any case the shift in tense in Ἡ 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 λῃστὴς, whereas the translator would not have viewed פושט 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. פושט. In any case he had to deal with the morphological shift from יבוא to פושט. In our translation we have opted for taking λῃστὴς as a subject complement.4 ἐν τῇ ὀδῷ αὐτοῦ] a free, contextually informed translation. 5

7.2) ὅπως συνῄδωσιν ὡς συνᾴδοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν. πᾶσας τὰς κακίας αὐτῶν ἐμνήσθην. ἓντι εἴκοπλοσσίν αὐτούς τῇ διαβούλια αὐτῶν, ἀπέναντι 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.

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 ἁπλὰ Αἰλίαν Mi 5.7 (Ἑ 6).

ὅπως συνῄδοσιν ὡς συνᾴδοντες τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν] Ἡ represents quite a departure from Ἡ. Where does ὡς συνᾴδοντες come from?6 The translator may have been perplexed, not knowing what the crowd were not to say. ὅπως συνῄδωσιν does not answer that question.7 He may have anticipated something like Ἰσραήλ ἡ ἐλλεῖψαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡμῶν ἔτη, ὃς κυρίος ἦν. ὃς κυρίος ἦν cf. Ps 94.7.

πᾶσας τὰς κακίας αὐτῶν] The use of the pl. in Ἡ is sensible in the context.

4 On this feature, see SSG § 61 b. See, e.g. ἐγὼ ἀπολύομαι ἡτέκνος 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 3e personne sg.”, i.e. γάρ read as γάτη? In BH γάρ takes a suffix pronoun only when the former is in the plural as in γάρ αὐτὸς δοῦσι τὰς ὁδούς Zp 3.6. γάρ is unlikely, since the plural of the word always appears with γάρ, 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 Ἡ’s farther departure from Ἡ.
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.”
The Greek verb γίνομαι can also mean ‘to emerge, make appearance,’ so SD “sind sie gekommen,” and NETS ‘came.’ Were written records opened before the judge?

7.3) ἐν ταῖς κακίαις αὐτῶν εὐφράναν βασιλεῖς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ψεύδεσιν αὐτῶν ἀρχόντας.

*With their evils they gladdened kings and with their lies rulers.*

7.4) πάντες μοιχεύοντες, ὡς κλίβανος καιόμενος εἰς πέψιν καταπαύματος ἀπὸ τῆς φλογός, ἀπὸ φυράσεως στέατος ἐως τοῦ ζυμωθῆναι αὐτὸ.

*all adulterating as an oven burning for baking for Sabbath with a flame, through kneading of dough till it ferments.*

Whilst the verse is clearly about intense carnal passion, more than two millennia on we are still struggling with this notoriously difficult Hebrew text. Of the three words in it the first only makes some sense in the context and has been captured by our translator well, though there is nothing in G that corresponds to εἰς. The other two, both very common words, are not represented in G at all.

καταπαύματος has been conjectured by Ziegler (1971.108) for κατακαύματος ‘heating’ found in manuscripts. SD translates it “(ein Backen) des Aufhörens,” whatever it might mean, though textcritically SD prefers Rahlfs’ καταπαύματος. Joosten (112) also would prefer the latter. κατάπαυμα is a rather rare word: LSJ mentions only two references, γόου κατάπαυμα ‘an assuaging of grief’ Iliad 17.28 and Ιερουσαλημ τόπον καταπαύματος σου ‘Jerusalem, a place for Your rest’ Si 36.18 (מָקוֹם שַׁבָּתִיךָ), with which cp. τόπος καταπαύσεώς μου Is 66.1 (מֵאֹפֶה בָּצֵק מִלּוּשׁ מֵעִיר יִשְׁבּוֹת). We are tempted to suggest that our translator mentally rewrote his H to read שַׁבָּת לְמַאֲפֵה הֵם בֹּעֵר תַּנּוּר ‘they are an oven burning to bake (bread) for Sabbath.’ קַמָּפֶה is a hapax in BH and means ‘something baked,’ but cf. a verbal noun of similar formation pattern מִשְׁתֶּה as in הַיַּיִן מִשְׁתֶּה בֵּית Est 7.8, וְשִׂמְחָה מִשְׁתֶּה יוֹם ib. 9.17, 18. We would also point out that καταπαύω is sometimes used in connection with Sabbath or the background to its institution, e.g. ἐν ἐξ ἡμέραις ἐποίησεν κύριος τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ ἐπαύσατο καὶ κατέπαυσεν Ex 31.17, see also Ge 2.2, 3, Ex 20.11.
7.5) ήμέραι τῶν βασιλέων ήμῶν, ἡρξαντο οἱ ἀρχοντες θυμοῦσθαι εξ 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,

ήμεραι ήλιον] 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?

ἡρξαντο ήλιον] G is obviously a rendition of יהלום. Other than that, both H and G 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 αὐτοὺς, δόλων τὴν νύκτα ὑπνοῦ Ἐφραίμ ἐνεπλήσθη, προὶ ἐγενήθη ἄνεκαύθη 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.

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

αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν] The plural in G does not necessarily presuppose בָּבַל. Though not the rule, Hebrew allows the use of the singular in a case like this, similarly in vs. 14 below.9 Note that בְּלִבּוֹתָם וְלִישָׁרִים לַטּוֹבִים יְהוָה הֵיטִיבָה Ps 125.4, which is interestingly rendered as ἀγάθυνον, κύριε, τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ τοῖς εὐθέσι τῇ καρδίᾳ and ἐν αὐτῶι Is 59.1 // בְּלִי נוֹעָם אָזְנוֹ לֹא כָּבְדָה 1QIsa.

ἐν τῷ καταράσσειν αὐτοὺς] Whilst ἀριστοκράτει τοῖς καταράσσειν is transitive, καταράσσει τοῖς καταράσσειν 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.

Ἐφραίμ = Ἐφραίμ for הָם אִישׁ.
7.7) πάντες ἐθερμάνθησαν ὡς κλίβανος καὶ κατέφαγον τοὺς κρῖτας αὐτῶν. πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς αὐτῶν ἔπεσαν, οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἐπικαλούμενος ἐν αὐτοῖς πρὸς με.

They all became hot like an oven and devoured their judges. All their kings fell, there was none among them who called to me.

7.8) Ἐφραίμ ἐν τοῖς λαοῖς αὐτὸς συνανεμείγνυτο, Ἐφραίμ ἐγένετο ἐγκρυφίας οὐ μεταστρεφόμενος.

Ephraim was there, associating with the peoples; Ephraim became a cake baked, but not turned.

7.9) κατέφαγον ἀλλότριοι τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔπεγνω· καὶ πολιαὶ ἐξήνθησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἔγνω.

Aliens consumed his strength, but he himself did not notice it, grey hair also grew on him, but he himself was not aware of it.
ἀλλότριοι means more than just ‘other than oneself,’ and often with some negative nuance. Likewise זָרִים differs from אֲחֵרִים.

αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰσραήλ This time the pronoun is emphatic, contrastive twice over in both Θ and H; people around Ephraim noticed what had happened, but he was blissfully ignorant, unawares.

καὶ ταπεινωθῆσεται η ὤβρις Ἰσραὴλ εἰς πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐπέστρεψαν πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεόν αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐξεζήτησαν αὐτῶν ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις.

7.10) 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,

καὶ ταπεινωθῆσεται הנני] There is no compelling argument for seeing in הנני a w-qatailtí 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 בְּפָנָיו. Joosten (116) mentions 5.5 as an identical statement as the first clause of our verse, though there the clause is followed by יִכָּשְׁלו. Though it might be an attempt towards harmonisation, two manuscripts, 36 and 49, do read καὶ ἐταπεινώθη, and cf. Pesh. 'etmakkak (Pf.).

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

καὶ ἦν Εφραίμ ὡς περιστερὰ ἄνως οὐκ ἔχουσα καρδίαν· Αἴγυπτον ἐπεκαλεῖτο καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν.

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

καὶ ἦν ἦν] 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 (Θ ἦν).

οὐκ ἔχουσα καρδίαν ὁ Ἰσραήλ] Parallel to ἄνους οὐκ ἔχουσα καρδίαν, both καρδία and ὁ Ἰσραήλ 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, Θ μωρὸς) are interesting.
Though it comes down to the same thing, Keil (1975.108) and Rashi take לֵב as an attribute of Ephraim, though Targum has לֵב לַהּ לֵית and Peshitta /layt bāh lebbā/.

] 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 πορεύονται, ἐπιβαλῶ ἐπ᾿ αὐτοὺς τὸ δίκτυόν μου· καθὼς τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατάξω αὐτοὺς, παιδεύσω αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἂκοῇ 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.

καθὼς ἂν πορεύονται = ἂν άισρέ φυστένει κατάξει φυσικά άποκορόι άρδεν κάμπιμο άρδεν έντατεν καθώς] Here we have a rare use of καθὼς as a temporal conjunction.12 παιδεύσω αὐτοὺς = άισρέ for the difficult άισρέ.

ἐν τῇ ἂκοῇ is not necessarily = ἄφησεν καθὼς or καθὼς ἂν. Even if our translator pronounced his Hebrew text as in ἂισρέ, he could have analysed καθώς as a verbal noun virtually equivalent to an inf. cst. with ἄποκορος or "καθώς with temporal value, not Joosten’s (117) “par,” “en conformité avec” or “comme.”

τῆς θλίψεως αὐτῶν θλίψεως] The equivalence is implausible. In Muraoka 2010.57a s.v. θλίψεως we suggested θλίψθα; this Hebrew noun is at least 15 more times so translated in LXX, including ἄν θλίψει Mi 2.12 (θλίψθα > βεκρίαν) and ἄκθα θλίψεως Na 2.2 (θλίψθα > βεκρίαν).

12 In GELS s.v. we would add under 2 ε two cases of it with Aor. mentioned in BDAG s.v. 4, namely καθὼς δὲ ἀνηλώθη 2M 1.31 and καθὼς ἡκουσα 2E 15.6.
7.13) οὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἀπεπήδησαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· δείλαιοι εἰσιν, ὅτι ἦσέβησαν εἰς ἐμὲ· εγὼ δὲ ἐλυτρώσαμην αὐτούς, αὐτοὶ δὲ κατελάλησαν κατ' ἐμοῦ φεύγοντες.

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.

7.14) καὶ οὐκ ἔβδόμησαν πρὸς μὲ αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἡ ὀλόλυζον ἐν ταῖς κοίταις αὐτῶν· ἐπὶ σίτῳ καὶ ὀἴνῳ κατετέμνοντο.

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

ησεβήσαν εἰς ἐμὲ μὴ εἰς ἐμὲ πέτασαν] 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.

dείλαιοι εἰσιν] 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 Nīνευη שדדה Na 3.7. A similar interpretation is attested in the Nahal Hever scroll of this latter case: τεταλαιπον GELS s.v. ἀσεβέω we noted an example of <+ εἰς τινα> in Herodotus: εἰς τὸν νηὸν καὶ τὸ ἀγαλμα .. ἠσεβήσαν οὗτος 8.129. Hence, when our verse is read as a Greek text, readers may not find εἰς here as odd or anomalous.

ἐλυτρώσαμην αὐτούς ἀπὸ σοῦ] G identified here a preterite yaqtul, probably in view of three straightforward qatal’s in the verse.

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

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 *yaq̄ul* 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 (= H) and ἔβοησεν καρδία αὐτῶν πρὸς κύριον La 2.18 (= H).

On the use of ἐν here, see ἐργαζόμενοι κακά ἐν ταῖς κοίταις τούτων 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 γινόμενοι Mi 2.1.

7.15) ἐπαιδεύθησαν ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ ἐγὼ κατίσχυσα τοὺς βραχίονας αὐτῶν, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ ἐλογίσαντο πονηρά.

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

7.16) ἀπεστράφησαν εἰς οὐθέν, ἐγένοντο ὡς τόξον ἑντεταμένον· πεσοῦνται ἐν ὀρμοῖς οἱ ἀρχούντες αὐτῶν δι᾽ ἀπαιδευσίαν γλώσσης αὐτῶν· οὕτως δὲ ἐπαλληλομένοι ἐν γῇ 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.

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 (Ḥ בֹּשֶׁת שָׂרֵיהֶם) 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 בֵּשׁ, which is intransitive.

εἰς οὐθέν [In no way can ἴθεν be reconciled with Ἰ. A variety of emendations have been proposed: יועיל (Ehrlich), לַבַּעַל (BHS) etc. \(^{18}\)

tοξον ἐντεταμένον [The collocation τὸξον ἐντεταμένον occurs also in τὸξον ἐντεταμένου τόξου Je 4.29 ἐντείνωντες 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 (ἐστράπησαν), scared, once the day of battle arrived. In Ho 7.16, however, the parallelism with εἰς οὐθέν implies that a stretched out bow is a symbol of failure, a strange symbolism, whereas ἴθεν, ‘a deceptive bow, raising false hopes,’ does make good sense.

dι᾿ ἀπαιδευσίαν [How ἴθεν has arrived at ἀπαιδευσία is difficult to fathom. Is it far-fetched to suggest that מזעם was read ממזעם = מימזעם ‘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 \textit{GELS} ibid.

\(^{17}\) Though no verb meaning ‘to disobey’ is found in ἴθεν here, Wevers (1998.234) interprets ἴθεν 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 \textit{GELS s.v. ἐπιστρέφω II 4 b}.

\(^{18}\) We fail to see how Nyberg’s proposed (1935.114) emendation ἐντείνω is supposed to improve ἴθεν.
CHAPTER VIII

8.1) Εἰς κόλπον αὐτῶν ὡς γῆ, ὡς ἀετὸς ἐπ’ οἶκον κυρίου, ἀνθ’ ὄν παρεβήσαν τὴν διαθήκην μου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ νόμου μου ἁσέβησαν.

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.

8.2) ἔμε κεκράξονται ὁ θεός, ἐγνώκαμέν σε.

They will cry aloud to me, o God, we have come to know You.
On the extension of the reduplication characteristic of the Pf. to the Fut. of this verb, see Helbing 1907.90f.

8.3) ὅτι Ἰσραηλ ἀπεστρέψατο ἀγαθά, ἔχθρόν κατεδίωξαν.

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

δότ' no equivalent in Ῥ. It introduces further justification for the predicted punishment.

ἔχθρόν Ἰβρα[1] The pair is clearly antonymic in relation to the preceding ἀγαθά Ἰσραήλ. Whilst in Ῥ both are sg., there is a number shift in Ὑ. Is ἔχθρόν a reference to a hostile human? Who is then that individual? Whilst Ἰρά[2] always has a personal referent, ἔχθρός, though not in SG, can have an impersonal referent as in ἔχθρόν δὲ μοι ἐστιν 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 Ῥ has been reversed in Ὑ, and μετερίσθης has been read as ὑπὲρ.[2]

8.4) ἐαυτοῖς ἐβασίλευσαν καὶ οὐ δότ' ἐμοῦ, ἠρξαν καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώρισαν μοι· τὸ ἄργυρον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ χρυσίον αὐτῶν ἐποίησαν ἕαυτοῖς εἴδωλα, ὅπως ἔξολοθρευθότωσιν.

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.

קְרַת

ἐαυτοῖς ἐβασίλευσαν] The misguided initiative and spirit of independency 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 ἐγνώρισαν μοι. Basically the same tone is conveyed through ἡμ in ἡμέρες ἡμῶν.

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 < קְרַת קָמָם מָלֵם מִלָּה מִלָּה '?

4 On this question, see Le Moigne 1999.
Without reference to Ḥ, the subjects of G here could be understood to be kings implicit in the preceding clause, ‘they ruled.’ But the parallelism makes our translation preferable; “rulers” = ἄρχοντες.

Both conjunctions primarily indicate a purpose of an action expressed in the main clause, but at times end up indicating an unintended result. On ὥπως, see our definition in GELS s.v. 2: “as a consequence of which .. to indicate a result which was not necessarily intended .., but was bound to ensue,” a usage characteristic in XII, other instances found in Ho 7.2, Mi 5.7, 6.16. On לְמַעַן, see BDB s.v. 2 Note 1 (p. 775b).

Joosten’s (121) “pour que” is as objectionable as his “afin que” at 7.2, on which see above.

Get rid of your calf, o Samaria. My anger has been provoked against them. How much longer can they not be cleansed:

ἄποτριψαι τὸν μόσχον σου, Σαμάρεια· παρωξύνθη ὁ θυμός μου ἕπτεν τούτοις· ἐος τίνος οὐ μὴ δύνωνται καθαρισθῆναι

ἄποτριψαι ἥν] He of Ḥ immediately followed by your is harsh. Ḥ represents the Impv. ἥν. This verb occurred earlier in vs. 3, translated as ἀπεστρέψατο. It occurs once more in XII: στῶσαν ἐν > οὐκ ἀπεστρέψαμην αὐτόν. The two Greek verbs, ἄποτρίβω and ἀποστρέφω share the notion of rejection.

παρωξύνθη ὁ θυμός μου ἐπὶ ἡμᾶς] Exactly as in Zc 10.3, also said by God. Cf. παρωξύνθη κύριος· ἐφ᾿ ὑμῖν ἐξολεθρεύσαι ὑμᾶς De 9.19.

ἔος τίνος ἐκεῖνος] So also at Hb 2.6 and Zc 1.12. This Hebrew phrase, often an indication of impatience, frustration or protest, is at times rendered outside of XII also literally with ἕως πότε. Both may occur for stylistic variation as in Ps 12.3.

δύνωνται καθαρισθῆναι] Here we have an extremely rare instance of לְ to used in the sense of ‘to be capable of’ taking a substantive as a direct object. Another instance is לְכָל יִשְׂרָאֵל Jb 42.2, which G translates literally as ὁτι πάντα δύνασαι. Similarly in Wi 7.27.6.

in Israel? And it was manufactured by a carpenter, and it is no god, for your calf was leading (you) astray, o Samaria.

References:

5 Ibn Ezra and Radaq make סֹפְרִים its subject and שֶׁפֶר its object.
6 BDAG s.v. δύναμαι c mentions some instances in the New Testament and non-biblical texts.
ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ; ὃς μῆν ἐξεραύνας | Ἡ is obviously amiss, for, as it stands, it makes no sense.

αὐτὸ ἀνθρώπος] The pronoun in Ἡ 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 εἰδώλον ‘image (for worship).’

οὐ θεὸς ἐστι] The position of οὐ is not merely a mechanical reproduction of Ἡ. 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 ἐν αὐτοί παρεξηλοσάν με ἐπ’ οὐ θεῷ, παρώργισάν με ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν· κάγῳ παραξηλόσω αὐτούς ἐπ’ οὐκ ἔθνει De 32.21. Ἡ is thus distinct from ἦνΑἰεὶ ἴλα; 8

πλανῶν ἦν ὁ μόσχος σου] Given the difficulty of Ἡ, our translator seems to be doing his best guesswork. Joosten (122) mentions a Qumran pesher on Hosea, 4QHosb, where the lemma is given as ἔσπειραν δὲ ἔσπειραν,9 which presents a case of number discord, if the restored ἔσπειραν is to mean ‘vagabonds.’ Joosten (ib.) also mentions ἀπεπλάνησαν αὐτοῦς Je 27(50).6. Here, too, the translator appears to be struggling with καταστροφὴ αὐτῶν, and allowing himself to be guided by the ἔκδεξει earlier in the verse, which he rendered as ἐξώσαν 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 πλανάω, 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 καταστροφὴ αὐτῶν ἐκδεξεται αὐτά· δράγμα οὐκ ἔχον ἢ οὐκ ἔσπειραν δὲ νῦν ἡ ποιήσας ἀλεύρων· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ποιήση, ἀλλότριοι καταφάγονται αὐτὸ.

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.

יִבְלָעֻהוּ 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 λο, see BDB s.v. 2d (p. 519b).

9 So Qimron 2020.261.
The imagery is quite different between the two. ῥοῦχοι must denote something that has no substance, as in ἡ ῥοῦχος ἡ ζωή 'my life is a vanity.' Jb 7.7, cf. θεομბά μου ἡ ζωή. 10

ἠ καταστροφή αὐτῶν ἡ καταστροφή] Both ῥοῦχος and καταστροφή primarily denote atmospheric phenomena, the former generic and the latter more specific. G's καταστροφή accords with its interpretation of the former: your crop results from what you sow, a sheaf of wheat insufficient in quantity and quality alike.

Our translator identified ἔτος 'end' in the noun here, as he also did in τῷ ἔτος συντελείας αὐτῆς Am 1.14 and τῇ ἐν συντελείᾳ καὶ ἐν συσσεισμῷ Na 1.3.

8.8) κατεπόθη Ἰσραηλ, νῦν ἐγένετο ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεῖς ὡς σκεῦος ἀχρηστον.

Israel has been swallowed up, it has now become among the nations something like a useless tool.

8.9) ὡτι αὐτοὶ ἀνέβησαν εἰς Ἀσσυρίους· ἀνέθαλε καθ᾽ ἑαυτὸν Ἐφραιμ, δῶρα ἠγάπησαν·

For they went up to Assyria. Ephraim sprouted afresh in isolation. They loved gifts.

8 Other instances of this meaning of the Hebrew noun are mentioned in BDB s.v. 2 e. Andersen - Freedman (1980.497) think that 'sow grain like wind' is non-sensical, and propose an adverbial value 'when it is windy,' for which they do not produce any evidence.

11 See Muraoka 2010.9a.

12 On this morphological question, see Walters 1973.307.
8.10) διὰ τοῦτο παραδοθήσονται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι. νῦν εἰσεδέξομαι αὐτούς, καὶ κοπάσουσι μικρὸν τοῦ χρίειν βασιλέα καὶ ἀρχόντας.

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.

8.11) ὅτι ἐπλήθυνεν Εφραιμ θυσιαστήρια, εἰς ἁμαρτίας ἠγαπημένα.

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

διὰ τοῦτο παραδοθήσονται] most likely = γὰρ. H’s γὰρ is rather difficult.

κοπάσουσι] = ἔλθη from ἔλθη ‘to be ill.’ H’s ἔλθη ‘they will begin’ is unintelligible. All the same, there is no question of infirmity, whether bodily or mental. Hence G’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 ἔκόπασε τοῦ λαλῆσαι πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐτὶ ‘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. 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, ἀλήθη as lying behind G here.

τοῦ χρίειν] = ἐλαστὶ, ≠ חָמָשׁ. 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 προσθῇς τοῦ προφητεύσαι Am 7.13.

βασιλέα καὶ ἀρχόντας] = בָּרָי וְשָׂרִים; cf. a discussion by Joosten (124).

8.11) ὅτι ἐπλήθυνεν Εφραιμ θυσιαστήρια, εἰς ἁμαρτίας ἠγαπημένα.

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

ὅτι εἶτε] 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 ἀληθής. 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.’

See SSG § 30 c. Cf. καὶ ἐκόπασε το τιεύμα τοῦ βασιλέα τοῦ ἐξελθεῖν δίπλα ἀβεσσαλωμ’ and the king had no mental strength enough to go after Absalom’ 2K 13.39, on which see Muraoka 2015.181f.
εἰς ἁμαρτίας = λαοῦ φάγονται ἀκαλόνια ἁμαρτίας.

8.12) καταγράψω αὐτῷ πλῆθος καὶ τὰ νόμιμα αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἄλλατιν 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.

8.13) διότι ἐὰν ἑσαχθήσατο θυσίαν καὶ φάγωσι κρέα, κύριος οὐ προσδέξεται αὐτῶ· νῦν μην ἔσχεται τὰς ἁδικίας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκδίκησε τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν· αὐτοὶ εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπέστρεφαν 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.

14 On 'sin offering' as one of the senses of ἁμαρτία, a take-off from Hebrew, חַטָּאת, 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 מִזְבְּחֹת from √حب, translating it as “my loved ones” and taking it as a reference to child sacrifice.
The discrepancy between the two is considerable. In H we see nothing that could be translated with the first two words of G. Nor is there in G what would correspond to מִיָּבָא.

αὐτά] What the n.pl. pronoun refers to is not apparent. The object suffix of בַּהָבַי refers to רָצָם, 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. H means ‘they will return to Egypt’ or ‘they kept returning (as diplomatic envoys?).’

νῦν μνησθήσεται ἤρθεν] 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 רָצָם and its Greek equivalents. Note the indicative Pres. as in δίκαιοι μνημονεύουσιν διὰ παντὸς τοῦ κυρίου, ἐν ἑξομολογήσεi καὶ δικαιώσει τὰ κρίματα κυρίου PSol 3.3; ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἀδιαλείπτως ἐν τε ταῖς ἐορταῖς καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς καθηκούσαις ἡμέρας μιμησκόμεθα ύμῶν 1M 12.11. See also our remarks on ἐπιλανθάνω above at 4.6.

8.14) καὶ ἐπελάθετο Ἰσραήλ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτόν καὶ ὕκοδόμησαν τεμένην, 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.

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

tα τεμέλια αὐτῶν ἡμεῖς] Referring to ‘cities’ (πόλεις fem.), ‘their’ is more logical than H’s ‘its.’
CHAPTER IX

9.1) Μὴ χαίρε, Ἰσραηλ, μηδὲ εὐφραίνου καθὼς οἱ λαοὶ· διότι ἐπόρνευσας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σου, ἡγάπησας 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.

The commonly proposed emendation of מֵעַל to לְכִי certainly makes sense; in the Vorlage the verb may have stood spelled לִכּי, plena spelled or anomalously for לִכּי.ēπόρνευσας ἀπὸ See above at 4.12.

ἡγάπησας θεάταρὸς] Though the verb in Υ is parallel to θ, 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.

dόματα θαῖρε καθὼς 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 ληνός οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτοὺς, καὶ ὁ οἶνος ἐψεύσατο αὐτοὺς.

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

1 Andersen - Freedman 1980.522 do their best to defend the MT.
2 On ἐπὶ see GELS s.v. I 3 and III and on ἄλων see BDB s.v. II 6.
With such an unusual collocation as in יִרְעֵם, Ps 49.15, he may have found יִרְעֵם unusually and emended his Vorlage.

Either the harvest was much less than expected or the quality was inferior than wished for. On the equivalence <ψεύδομαι-כִּחֵשׁ>, see διότι συκῆ οὐ καρποφόρησε, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται γενήματα ἐν ταῖς ἀμπέλοις· ψεύσεται ἐργὸν ἐλαίας, καὶ τὰ πεδία οὐ ποιήσει βρῶσιν כִּחֵשׁבַּגְּפָנִים יְבוּל וְאֵין לֹא־תִפְרָח Hb 3.17, where it is also about disappointing crops.

It is not impossible that the Vorlage of G read Pf. כחשׁ, and יְדָעָם could have been read either as Pf. יְדָעֵם or Impf. יֵדָעֵם. However, in vs. 4 we see Impf. translated with Aor. twice: יִסְּכוּ and יֶעֶרְבוּ. See also vs. 3:

They did not dwell in the land of the Lord: Ephraim dwelled in Egypt, and in Assyria they will eat unclean things.

Israelites did not dwell in the land of the Lord, neither did Ephraim dwell in Egypt, and in Assyria they will eat unclean things.

The Greek Aor. in these cases appears to indicate recent events.

Since the verb בָּהּ presupposed by G, does not govern a direct object of dwelling-place, ב was mentally supplied by our translator. ב is sometimes loosely used as synonymous with ב, e.g. בָּאָרֶץ יֹשְׁבֵי Ex 23.21, = בָּאָרֶץ הַיֹּשְׁבִים.

Thus pace GELS s.v. κατοικέω 2: “moved into Egypt and settled there.”
unclean, for their bread is, being for their pleasure, shall not enter the house of the Lord.

οὐκ ἐσπεισαν ὁμιλής... καὶ οὕς ἠδύναν αὐτῷ... [The Impf. of ἧδυνω may be meant as jussive (prohibitive) rather than plain future (prediction), hence 'shall not' rather than 'will not.' On its rendition by means of the Aorist, see above at vs. 2.]

οὐχ ἠδύναν αὐτῷ... From the punctuation in the current LXX versions the subject of the verb can only be personal, Ephraim. Whilst the verb ἠδύνω is not very common in SG (9×), its subject is usually impersonal with the exception of τί ὡραιώθης καὶ τί ἠδύνθης Ct 7.7. Particularly noteworthy in our context is αἱ θυσίαι ὑμῶν οὐχ ἠδύναν μοι λοιπόν Je 6.20. The subject of the following nominal clause can be supplied from the immediate context, i.e. μετὰ αὐτῶν, or what follows it can be analysed as the subject complement of the verbal clause, i.e. 'they being to them like ...'.

ἐσθόντες αὐτὰ... The n.pl. pronoun does not concord with the object suffix of ἐσθόντες, where the reference is most likely αὐτᾶς. The neuter concord such as this is common in the cultic terminology, the pronoun referring to an object offered. For details, see SSG § 77 cb.

ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν λεμψαν] a subject complement, on which see above.

9.5) τί ποιήσετε ἐν ημέρᾳ πανηγυρεῖως καὶ ἐν ημέρᾳ ἑορτῆς τοῦ κυρίου;

What will you do on a day of public festival and on a day of feast for the Lord?

9.6) διὰ τούτο ἵδιον πορεύσονται ἐκ ταλαιπωρίας Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐκδέξεται αὐτοὺς Μέμφις, καὶ θάψει αὐτοὺς Μαχμας· τὸ ἀργύριον αὐτῶν οἷον κληρονομήσει, ἀκανθαι ἐν τοῖς σκηνώμασιν αὐτῶν.

Therefore, behold, they will get out of the misery of Egypt, and yet Memphis will receive them, and Machmas will bury them. Perdition will inherit their silver, (there will grow) thorns in their dwellings.

5 This accords with the Tiberian accentuation with a disjunctive accent in ἦδυναν.
6 On the notion of subject complement, see SQH § 31 t.
7 On our reservations over the frequently expressed view that <ψυχή + suf. pron.> is sometimes equivalent to a reflexive pronoun or a personal pronoun, see Muraoka 2005.60-65 and SSG § 8 g. Cf. BAGD s.v. ψυχή 2 g and Lust - Eynikel - Hauspie 2003 s.v.
πορεύονται καὶ ἐκδέξεται... On account of the shift from the Pf. to the Impf. in Ἡ the chronological sequence of the future events is easy to follow, whereas ᾿Γ highlights the futurity of the events and has added καὶ, ‘even so.’

Marx’s a surprising equivalence, since מַחְמַד must have been well known to the translator. However, he may have struggled with the complicated syntactic structure of the verse on top of the rare word קִמּוֹשׂ. He took it as parallel to מָפוֹ, though Jerome (‘PL 25.892f.) rightly points out the absurdity of locating in Egypt the well-known place, e.g. 1K 14.5 (מִכְמָשׂ). In the two remaining attestations of קִמּוֹשׂ, Is 34.13 and Pr 24.31, the Septuagint is not exactly illuminating. In any event its context shows that the noun does not denote destruction per se, though thistles or nettles are destructive.

The days of punishment are come, the days of your retribution are come, and Israel will suffer. Just as a deranged prophet, a person carried away by an (evil) spirit, under the multitude of your injustices your madness increased.

κακωθήσεται = ἀρρητοτρίχον. One does not know where ὀσπέρ originates nor what has happened to Ἰσραήλ. The translator presumably has seen that the discourse here is cast in a metaphorical language. Hence he is using the article of ὁ προφήτης, just as its Hebrew equivalent, with generic value, not with reference to any particular prophet, see SSG § 1 d.

We would go along with Joosten (129), who maintains that, unlike in the modern LXX editions, the supralinear dot in πνευματοφόρος is to be shifted to the end of Ἰσραήλ.

Ἀρχιπροφήτης ὁ πνευματοφόρος Ἰσραήλ] On the unusual addition of the definite article in ᾿Γ, possibly influenced by προφήτης, see above at 8.12, and SSG § 37 bcc. As unusual is the article in ὁ παρεξεστηκώς, where the syntactic analysis on the part of ᾿Γ departs from what Ἡ means: in the latter we have two self-standing nominal clauses in Ἰσραήλ πνευματοφόροι Zp 3.4, rendering Ἐφραίμ.

8 Joosten (129), relying on Chantraine (1968.1189), prefers πνευματοφόρος.
The end of the verse in H is also syntactically complicated. The Hebrew noun is probably to be construed as an adverbial adjunct with the two preceding nominal clauses. However, the Hebrew verb, הָעֲוֹנְ רֹב, cannot be so analysed as in some modern translations. If we are to retain the MT, the only possible way-out is to see in הָעֲוֹנְ רֹב here a verb, הָעֲוֹנְ רֹב with a penultimate accent, ‘it increased,’ and not an adjective, הָעֲוֹנְ רֹב. In the same vein of analysis our translator deleted the conjunction of הָעֲוֹנְ רֹב and freely added σου.

μανία [The Hebrew noun is known to mean ‘animosity, hostility,’ and it occurs a few times in Qumran documents. G is consistent in its interpretation, when it occurs in the next verse. The sense ‘madness’ is parallel to מְשֻׁגָּע in our verse. The noun does not occur anywhere else in BH. Independently of Joosten (129) we (Index 76b) mentioned √שַׁטי as a possible explanation of G’s μανία here, referring to ματαιότης καὶ μανίας ψευδεῖς ρְהָבִים as in Ps 39.4. We (Index 364c) also mentioned ἐως ἁν ἀπομανῶσιν οὐ πολλοὶ καὶ πλησθῆ ἡ γῆ ἁδικίας Da 12.4 LXX, where also, as in our Ho passage, ἁδικία is brought in.

9.8) σκοπὸς Εφραίμ μετὰ θεοῦ· προφήτης, παγίς σκολιὰ ἐπὶ πάσας τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ· μανίαν ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ κατέπηξαν.

Ephraim is a watcher with God, a prophet, a twisted trap on all his ways. They firmly planted madness in the house of God.

Whether or not G’s Vorlage had the difficult άληθέν in it, the sequence of the words is a perfect match between the two texts.

κατέπηξαν [Though the second half of the verse can be analysed as two asyndetic, verbless, locative clauses, G has turned the second into a verbal clause by shifting the first word of the next verse here. Another grammatical consideration may have played a role here. Namely, the adverbial use of a verb asyndetically linked with another, which latter carries the main meaning, was apparently alien to our translator. Thus in δρόσος ὁ ὀρθρινῇ πορευόμενῃ ‘evanescent dew descending at dawn’ Ho 6.4, 13.3, on which see our discussion above ad 6.4. See also ἐτοιμάζου ὁ ὀρθρισόν, διέφθαρται πᾶσα ή ἐπιφύλλης αὐτών, ἐκδικήσει ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν Zp 3.7.9

9.9) ἐφθάρησαν κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ βουνοῦ· μνησθήσεται ἁδικίας αὐτῶν, ἑκάκιησε ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

They were annihilated as in the days of the hill. He will recall their injustices, He will requite their sins.

9 On this feature in BH, see JM § 177 g.
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 is transliterated as a place-name, Γαβαα. Is our translator using ὁ βουνός as a virtual place-name, 'the hill par excellence'? That παγὶς ἐγενήθητε τῇ σκοπιᾷ 5.1 differs from our case here is evident in view of the revocalisation of לְמִצְפָּה as לַמִּצְפֶּה; σκοπιὰ then is functioning as an ordinary substantive.

On God recalling and requiting, see above at 8.13.

9.10) Ὡς σταφυλὴν ἐν ἐρήμῳ ἔφυρον τὸν Ἰσραηλ καὶ ὡς σκοπὸν ἐν συκῇ πρόιμον εἶδον πατέρας αὐτῶν· αὐτοὶ εἰσήλθον πρὸς τὸν Βεελφεγωρ 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.

Not grapes growing in a carefully maintained vineyard, but wild grapes. 

σκοπὸν ἐν συκῇ πρόιμον] is a reference to early figs not yet fully ripe. By contrast, Θ 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 Θ arrived at σκοπός is a mystery. The same problem arises at συκαῖ σκοποὺς ἔχουσαι ὄντες τῆς ἐν συκᾶ τῆς Ταύρου Na 3.12, where the authors of BA (23.4.9-227) argue that Θ represents הַבָּר, not בַּכָּר. This Semitic root has little to with watchmen or guards. We do not follow their argument, either, that σκοποί 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 πρóιμος, 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 καρποῦς.

11 For a more recent treatment of the issue, see BDAG s.v.
καὶ ἀπηλλοτριώθησαν ρήματι 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) of the equivalence of Θ ἀλλότριος and Ἠ θεοτόκος must have been read as a form of νυνί, say Nif. \( \text{καὶ} \) Definitely noteworthy is τὰς ἀπηλλοτριωμένας ἀπ᾿ ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν αὐτῶν \( \text{בְּגִלּוּלֵיהֶם} \) ἀπ᾿ με \( \text{נָזֹרֵו} \) Ez 14.5, also a reference to idolatry. Another slight possibility is \( \text{נָזֹר} \), but the only relevant case is καὶ ἀπηλλοτριοῦτο ἀπ᾿ αὐτῶν \( \text{אֲלֵיהֶם} \) וַיִּתְנַכֵּר \( \text{Gn 42.7} \), where it has nothing to do with a foreign religion, but feigning.

οἱ ἠγαπημένοι \( \text{אֲהֻבִּים} \) meant for \( \text{אָהֳבָם} \) \( \text{H} \)?

9.11) Εφραίμ ὡς ὄρνεον ἔξεπετάσθη, αἱ δόξαι αὐτῶν ἐκ τόκων καὶ ὀδύνων καὶ συλλήμψεων: Ephraim flew off like a bird, their glories are from births and birth pangs and pregnancies.

Εφραίμ εἶχε οὕτως καθαρὰ φωνὴν καλούμενον εἰς τῆς ματαίως ἔρμα ἔκει. \( \text{אֶפְרַיִם} \) governing the three nouns in the plural, probably in harmony with the preceding αἱ δόξαι αὐτῶν. 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 Θ and Θ. The Tiberian accentuation adds a disjunctive accent to the first word, אֶפְרַיִם, and a conjunctive to the next word, כָּעוֹף. 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 ἔξεπετάσθη (sg.). The thrice repeated preposition ἐκ is assigned ablative value as we can read in Rashi’s commentary ad loc.: Ephraim’s loss of glory will materialise in still births \( \text{ἐκ} \) pre-natal deaths \( \text{玙Δ} \), and sterility \( \text{玙Δ} \). \( \text{Θ} \), 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 ἔγω Ἠσαυ ὁ πρωτότοκός σου \( \text{Ge 27.19} \) // Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ υἱός σου \( \text{σάρξ} \) \( \text{μου} \) \( \text{ἐξ} \) αὐτῶν. 13

12 Cf. \text{Index s.v. ἀλλότριος}; we have proposed to include ἦ in ἀλλότριος \( \Theta \) \( \text{Ma 3.15} \).
13 For a detailed discussion, see \text{SSG § 94 d}.
9.12) διότι καὶ ἐὰν ἐκθρέψωσι τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν, ἀτεκνωθήσονται ἡμεῖς εἰς ἀνθρώπους· διότι καὶ οὐαι αὐτοῖς ἐστιν, σάρξ μου ἡμεῖς εἰς ἀνθρώπους.

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

ἀτεκνωθήσονται] The shift from ‘I’ in Ἰ to ‘they’ in ᾿G lays focus on the fate to meet Ephraim, though it is eventually a divine punishment.

ἐξ] Both are ablative in value, indicating deprivation. Note the use of ἐκ, a synonym of ἐκ in Rebecca’s words – μῇ ποτε ἀτεκνωθῶ ἀπό τῶν δύο ὀμών ἐν ἡμερὴ μιὰ. Ge 27.45, where also ἀτεκνῷ is rendered with ἀτεκνῶ.

ἀνθρώπων] ᾿G has rightly analysed ἄδεια 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.

σάρξ] = ἐκσώμι, ≠ Ἰ. God’s future plan depends on those children successfully nurtured, so that ultimately they are His human representatives.

9.13) Ἐφραῖμ, ὃν τρόπον εἶδον, εἰς θῆραν παρέστησαν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν, καὶ Ἐφραῖμ τοῦ ἔξαγαγεῖν 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.

ὃν τρόπον εἶδον] ᾿G departs quite considerably from Ἰ. 1) εἰς θῆραν = ἔξωθος ἡμεῖς. 2) παρέστησαν = ἔστησαν. 3) There is nothing in ᾿G which would correspond to ἔστησαν. Was ἔστησαν read as ἔστησα for its own sakes’? 4) τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν = ἔξωθος, i.e. ἔξωθος, and an Aramaising form that sometimes occurs in QH, replacing the standard יִשְׁפָּע, e.g. יִשְׁפָּע ‘its foundations’ 1QS 8.8. Theodoret (PG 81.1601) identifies here an agent in the passive construction, but ἐκ is not so used, see GELS s.v. 6.

τοῦ ἔξαγαγεῖν] The syntactic status of this prepositional adjunct in ᾿G is as obscure as that of Ἀβαδίας in Ἰ. König’s (1897 § 339 z) “bestimmt sein zu einem Act” may relate the infinitive to the following ἐλεῖν, but not to what precedes. Our infinitival clause appears to be parallel to εἰς θῆραν and an adverbial adjunct of παρέστησαν, but then the intervening Ἐφραῖμ...
is disruptive. The logical subject of the infinitive would not be Ephraim,\textsuperscript{16} i.e. it proffered his children to be taken out etc.

\textit{εἰς ἀποκέντησιν} [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 \textit{Θ} does not say who did the piercing.]

\textit{אֶל־הֹרֵג} [may have been read as \textit{הֶרֶג}.

\textit{δὸς αὐτοῖς}, κύριε· τί δώσεις αὐτοῖς; δὸς αὐτοῖς μήτραν ἀτεκνοῦ- σαν καὶ μαστοὺς ξηρούς.

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

\textit{μήτραν ἀτεκνοῦσαν} [The same Greek verb used in vs. 12 is here intransitive.]

\textit{πᾶσαι αἱ κακίαι αὐτῶν εἰς Γαλγαλ, ὅτι ἐκεῖ αὐτοὺς ἐμίσησα· διὰ τὰς κακίας τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου μου ἐκβαλῶ αὐτοὺς, οὐ μὴ προσθήσω τοῦ ἁγαπῆσαι αὐτούς· πάντες οἱ ἀρχοντες αὐτῶν ἀπειθοῦντες.}

\textit{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.}

\textit{εἰς Γαλγαλ} [\textit{εἰς} nothing but synonymous with \textit{ἐν}; see \textit{GELS} s.v. \textit{εἰς} 8, not only locative, but also temporal.]

\textit{ἀπειθοῦντες} [In order to differentiate between \textit{ἀπειθέω} and its adjective, \textit{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 ‘Εὰν δέ τινι ᾧ νῖος ἀπειθής καὶ ἐρεθιστῇς De 21.18 // Ο νῖος ἡμῶν οὕτως ἀπειθεῖ καὶ ἐρεθίζεις vs. 20; \textit{Θ} is here basically the same, \textit{σοφρός.}]

\textit{Ἀπειθήσατε 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.

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

\textsuperscript{17} At \textit{ἀπειθοῦντες} \textit{Ητε} τὰ πρὸς κύριον ἀπὸ τῆς ημέρας, ὡς ἐγνώσθη ἡμῖν De 9.24 the translator could have written \textit{ἀπειθεῖς} \textit{Ητε}, but he probably wanted to highlight the contrast \textit{ηπειθήσατε} τῷ ρήματι 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 Ἐφραίμ, τὰς ρίζας αὐτοῦ ἐξηράνθη, καρπὸν οὐκέτι μὴ ἐνέγκῃ, 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.

9.17) ἀπώσεται αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός, οτι 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.
CHAPTER X

10.1) Ἀμπελος εὔκληματοῦσα Ἰσραηλ, ὁ καρπὸς εὐθηνῶν αὐτῇ· κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῆς ἐπλήθυνε τὰ θυσιαστήρια, κατὰ τὰ ἁγαθὰ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ ἕκαστον 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.

The Heb. word is usually considered to be a hapax meaning ‘luxuriant.’ Arabic is the only cognate, in which /baqqa/ is said to mean ‘to abound.’ Ἐ 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 הַאָרֶץ בּוֹקֵק יְהוָה Is 24.1, where Ἐ 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 √בקק as exemplified in the just cited Is 24.1. Trg. is the earliest representative of this approach: בְּזִיזָא גֶּפֶן 'a plundered vine.'

Ḳ 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 καρποῦ] Here is a grammatical transformation: Ἐ transitive > Ἐ intransitive, bringing along a consequential transformation of Ἐ accusative (ὁ καρπὸς) > Ἐ nominative (ὁ καρπὸς). The Heb. verb השׁ is neutral in meaning, ‘to furnish,’ whereas, whatever a modern erudite Greek scholar might say, average readers cannot possibly fail to notice εὐ- of εὐκληματεῖν, 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 השׁ ‘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: רֶק ‘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.² 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 Θ reads יִישָּה, the referent being Jerusalem. Though the Heb. equivalent is different, our translator may have been thinking of Ps 127.3 ה גונת תם וּדְמוּם אֹמְרִים מִן הַרְעֹת, with דְמוּם metaphorically used. Besides, this is not the only departure that our translator makes from Θ in this single verse.

Some take the referent of תָּן as Israel and the subject of יְשַׁוֶּה also as Israel, hence making the suffix pronoun reflexive.⁴ For him תָּן = לַגֶּפֶן, as shown by the fem. gender of the pronoun, אֱלֹּהִים, referring back to דְמוּם, a fem. noun, though it does symbolise Israel.

אֱלֹּהִים Ziegler scripsit. Joosten (133) prefers to read with Rahlfs ὁ καρπὸς αὐτῆς, but what would that represent in Hebrew? ἡ χρήματα? What would one then do with תָּן at the end of the clause? Simply delete it and reconstitute Θ as ὁ καρπὸς יִישָּה? 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 αὐτῆς, for the gen. αὐτῆς separated from ὁ καρπὸς would be no problem in CG, but not in translation Greek of LXX nor תָּן. ἡ χρήματα cannot substitute ἡ χρήματα. We would thus go along with Ziegler⁵ here.

κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῆς ἐπλήθυνε ... κατὰ τὰ ἀγαθά τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ ὁ λογίζεις καὶ κατὰ τὰ κράτα καὶ τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ. Both Θ and Θ 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 κατὰ is attached to a word that designates a quality and the matching quality is expressed by the respective finite verb, so at least in Θ: ὁ λογίζεις and κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὁικτιρμῶν σου ἐξάλειψον τὸ ἁμαρτήμα μου. κράτα is similarly used in BH five more times. However, it is only in our Ho passage that κράτα is followed by the preposition lamed prefixed to a noun. Θ applied the same

³ We doubt that our translator’s Hebrew vocabulary contained a homonym וּשָּׁה “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. ה 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 יִשַׁי בֶּן 1Sm 16.18 instead of יִשַׁי, but not every cst. phrase can be broken up, e.g. מַצֵּבוֹתָם יַעֲרֹף. The examples in our Ho passage do not come under any of the notional categories which, in BH, can be optionally expressed by means of an analytic instead of synthetic structure.

The collocation such as כְּרֹב 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 כָּבָּר and כָּפָר can be analysed as representing <כ (of time) + inf. cst.>, so in Trg. כָּבָּר כָּפָר. כָּבָּר ‘when I multiplied .. when I brought,’ an analysis followed by Radaq with כַַּד..אַסְגִּיתִי כַַּד.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. הַזֶּה בָּהָר שֶׁבֶת לָכֶם רַב 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 ἀκοδόμησαν. The verb is also used intransitively, but here again the parallelism points to transitive value, so Theophylactus (PG 81.1605), for instance.

τὰ θυσιαστήρια οἰκοδόμησαν] The preposition lamed in Υ 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 ἐν.

κατὰ τὰ ἄγαθα τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν ὁ θυσιαστήριον ἀκοδόμησαν] The poetic parallelism in Υ was discarded twice over: 1) בְּהָי analysed as a substantive, בְּהָי (so Joosten 133) or a substantivised adjective בְּהָי and 2) the translator could have written ἡγάθυναν (cf. 4K 9.30) or ἐκόσμησαν (cf. L there).

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

10.2) ἐμέρισε καρδίας αὐτῶν, νῦν ἀφανισθοῦσαν· αὐτῶς κατασκάψει τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτῶν, ταλαιπωρήσουσιν 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.

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 כ is.

ἀφανισθήσονται [יֶאְשָׁמֻ] On this equivalence, see above at 5.15.

אֵין [אֹתָךְ אֲזֶה] It was actually up to them to act, making His intervention superfluous. ∂’s rendition is rather good.

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

tαλαιπωρήσουσιν [רָדִשֶׁ] 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 ταλαιπωρος shows that these lexemes account for the overwhelming equivalents of שָׁדָּד lexemes. This equivalence is rather remarkable because of a discrepancy in meaning between lexemes represented by ταλαιπωρ- on one hand and those represented by שָׁדָּד 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 שָׁדָּד 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 שֹׁד 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.

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?’

יֵצִאָה וְהַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־יְהוָה יָרֵאנוּ לֹא כִּי לָנוּ מֶלֶךְ אֵין יֹאמְרֵו עַתָּה כִּי לָנוּ [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.

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.
λαλῶν דִּבְּרוּ] Though Ḥ may be a description of recent events, וַיֵּלֶךְ in the preceding verse, unlikely a reference to the past, makes such an analysis implausible. Then Ḥ’s Vorlage may have read וַיֵּרָבֵד, a pseudo haplography following נל at the end of the preceding verse.

προφάσεις] This must represent תהלים⁹, an equivalence indicated in our Index 103a; there are three more instances of the equivalence. הֵן can mean ‘oath’ as well as ‘curse.’¹⁰ But then our translator would probably have selected a more straightforward equivalent such as ἀρά.

διαθήσεται כָּרֹת] If Ḥ’s Vorlage accorded more or less with Ḥ, our translator is harmonising a fair bit: תָּרוּ as תָּרֹה Inf. 3ms // שֶׁנֵּרְבָה.

In BH an inf. abs. is at times used with reference to a future action.¹¹ E.g. כָּלָל הָזָה ‘they are going to eat and leave something behind’ 2Kg 4.43. In כָּלָה ‘Are you going to steal .. and then come ..? ’ Je 7.9f. we have a construction similar to what we have in כָּרֹת .. תָּרוּ, namely <inf. abs. - w-qatalti>.

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

ἄγρωστις ρֹאשׁ] The Gk word is defined in LSJ 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 ἄρνης ἐπ᾽ ἄγρωστιν ‘like lambs on grass’ Mi 5.7 for ἄρνης θύειν (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 Ḥ represents אָלוֹת. All the same the selection

⁹ Cf. Pesh. /’ellāṭā/.

¹⁰ Keil (1975.129) identifies in תֶּלֶם an inf. abs. irregularly formed like שָׁתוֹת in lieu of שָׁתוֹה 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 תָּמוּת מוֹת Ez 3.18. We fail to see how Callaham (2010.120) can identify habitual modality in our תָּרֹה.

¹² The word is already used by Homer, though once only: Od. 6.90 ἀγρωστὶν μελιηδέα ‘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 δῆμρος ἐπὶ ἀγρωστὶν ( Disabilities) και ὡσεὶ νιφετὸς ἐπὶ χόρτον (γύψη) 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 Ον παροικήσουσιν οἱ κατοικοῦντες Σαμάρειαν, ὡσεὶ νιφετὸς ἐπὶ χόρτον (עֵשֶׂב) καὶ ὡσεὶ ὡμβρὸς ἐπ᾿ ἄγρωσιν (דֶּשֶׁא) καὶ ὡσεὶ νιφετὸς ἐπὶ χόρτον (עֵשֶׂב).

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.

128 HOSEA

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

παροικήσουσιν] Unless G’s Vorlage had שָׁכֵן (=שככין or שכנ), the pl. is an adjustment to παροικήσουσιν שָׁכֵן. Given its meaning, the collective use of the sg. שָׁכֵן or שכנ is unlikely.

καθὼς παρεπίκραναν αὐτὸν] Our translator probably did not know this rare Heb. noun. Another instance of it occurring in תָּהִרְתָּה מֵאֲרַכְּלָה Zp 1.4 is missing in G και ἐξαρῶ ἐκ τοῦ τόπου τούτου τὰ ὀνόματα τῆς Βααλ καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἱερέων, where τῶν ἱερέων is most likely a rendering of γένεις. The only other attestation of this Heb. noun in BH is at 2Kg 23.5, where we have another translator ignorant of the word, who resorts to transliteration, τοὺς χωμαρίν, though the proto-Lucianic version is more knowledgeable with τοὺς ἱερεῖς and the historic Lucian has sacerdotes.

G is probably an attempt to render כִּמְמֵרָיו, a Hif. m.pl. ptc. of מִמֶּנּוּ or מִמֶּנּוּ כִּי־גָלָה τῷ μόσχῳ. Instead of rendering it mechanically as ὡς παρεπίκραναν αὐτὸν or ὡς παρεπίκραναν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ἰερέων... ἐκ τοῦ τόπου τούτου τὰ ὀνόματα τῆς Βααλ καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἱερέων...

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

ἐπιχαροῦνται 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: ἔπιχαροῦσιν τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἀγαλλιάσθησιν 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 √גילה).

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

μετῳκίσθη The form is best analysed as passive in form only. Just as in בָּרָדָה, who caused the disappearance is not part of the message.15 See also מַטְוָקִיסְתֶּה הַיָּוָדְיוֹ הַיָּהָלֶת 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, μετῳκίσθη as passive here does make sense.

10.6) καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀσσυρίους δῆσαντες ἀπήνεγκαν ξένιαν τῷ βασιλείῳ. Ἐπὶ δέσματι Ἐφραίμ δέξεται, καὶ αἰσχυνθήσεται Ἰσραήλ 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.

בָּשְׁנָה יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיֵבוֹשׁ יַקְח אֶפְרַיִם בָּשְׁנָה לְמֶלֶךְ מִנְחָה יוּבָל לְאַשּׁוּר גַּם־אוֹתוֹ 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 Ἡ, 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 ξένιαν ἡ φυλή ἡ φυλή[ Η] ἡ φυλή represents a fairly common imperfect passivisation as in בָּשְׁנָה יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיֵבוֹשׁ יַקְח אֶפְרַיִם בָּשְׁנָה לְמֶלֶךְ מִנְחָה יוּבָל לְאַשּׁוּר גַּם־אוֹתוֹ καὶ αὐτὸν.16 ἡ φυλή is being impersonally used and the primary object of ἀπῆνεγκαν 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.
This Heb. hapax was probably unknown to our translator, who was compelled to resort to free rendering, for שנה or שנה cannot be made to mean ‘gift (דום).’ As a consequence the grammatical subject of ייקח is now the Assyrian king, not Israel.

One wonders why Θ did not select a standard equivalent for the Heb. preposition; see, e.g. αἰσχύνθητε ἀπὸ καυχήσεως ημῶν Je 12.13 (< מיתوبة ובר). On the other hand, ἐν often, esp. in XII, indicates “an object to which some emotion or thought is directed” (GELS s.v. 9), e.g. τὰ ἅγια κυρίου, ἐν οἷς ἠγάπησεν Ma 2.11 (< יוהו קודש אָהֵב אֲשֶׁר. )

Samaria cast her king as a dry stick (floating) on the surface of the water.

καὶ ἐξαρθήσονται βωμοί Ων, ἁμαρτήματα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ; καὶ ἔροῦσι τοῖς ὀρέσιν Καλύψατε ἡμᾶς, καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς Πέσατε ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς:

And the high places of On, Israel’s sins, will be obliterated. There will shoot up thorns and caltrops on their altars, and they will say to the mountains, “Cover us,” and to the hills, “Fall down on to us.”

Ἀφ’ οὗ οἱ βουνοί, ἡμάρτειν Ἰσραήλ, ἐκεῖ ἔστησαν· οὐ μὴ καταλάβῃ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ βουνῷ πόλεμος; Ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἀδικίας

10.7) ἀπέρριψε Σαμαρία βασιλέα αὐτῆς ὡς φρύγανον ἐπὶ προσώπου ὀδατος.

Samaria cast her king as a dry stick (floating) on the surface of the water.

ἀπέρριψε τὴν κλήσας: See above at 4.7.

φρύγανον ιτής) The meaning of this Heb. word, a hapax, which is distinct from its better known homonym in the sense of ‘anger,’ is still disputed. For Θ it refers to something easy to manipulate, worthless or helpless.

καὶ ἔροῦσι τοῖς ὀρέσιν Καλύψατε ἡμᾶς, καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς Πέσατε ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς:

And the high places of On, Israel’s sins, will be obliterated. There will shoot up thorns and caltrops on their altars, and they will say to the mountains, “Cover us,” and to the hills, “Fall down on to us.”

10.8) καὶ ἔξεσθήσονται βωμοὶ Ων, ἁμαρτήματα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ· ἀκανθαί καὶ τρίβολοι ἀναστήσονται ἐπὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτῶν· καὶ ἔροῦσι τοῖς ὀρέσιν Καλύψατε ἡμᾶς, καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς Πέσατε ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς.

And the high places of On, Israel’s sins, will be obliterated. There will shoot up thorns and caltrops on their altars, and they will say to the mountains, “Cover us,” and to the hills, “Fall down on to us.”

10.9) Ἀφ’ οὗ οἱ βουνοί, ἡμάρτειν Ἰσραήλ, ἐκεῖ ἔστησαν· οὐ μὴ καταλάβῃ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ βουνῷ πόλεμος; Ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἀδικίας

17 In BA ad loc. we are unjustly said to have suggested a Hebraism here. בְּ־ never governs בּ. Its synonyms, קַשׁ and רָצָה, do, cf. e.g. εὐδοκήσω εν αὐτῷ ἐραυνής Hg 1.8. In GELS s.v. εὐδοκέω 1a we did suggest a likely Hebraism. We fail to understand an alternative analysis suggested in BA loc. cit.

18 Though in Index s.v. φρύγανον we suggested 'stubble' as its equivalent, we are not so sure now, seeing this Heb. word is rendered in XII in all of its four occurrences with καλάμη 'stubble': Jl 2.5, Ob 8, Na 1.10, Ma 3.19. We do not know how Joosten (136) has arrived at "écume" as the "sens premier" of קַשׁ.
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

'Ἀφ᾿ οὗ] 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 גבעה] On the non-use of a place-name, Γαβαὰ 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.

ὥμαρτεν] The sudden shift to 2ms in ἤσθεν is abrupt, and also odd in view of the immediately following ὑπέρ.

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, ἠλθον as conjectured by him. See further below.

10.10) ἠλθεν παιδεὺσαι αὐτούς, καὶ συναχθήσονται ἐπ᾿ αὐτοὺς λαοὶ ἐν τῷ παιδεὺσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐν ταῖς δυσὶ ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν.

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

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

ἠλθον] We postulate that this represents ἄνασα [= βὰν], Pf. Qal 3fs. with מלחמה as the subject. In the critical apparatus Ziegler states that his ἠλθον ‘I came’ is nothing but a conjecture, “scripsi,” not supported by any Greek manuscript or version. He is presumably reconstructing Ἰ as ἅνα [= βαίνει]. ἀνασά means ‘my desire,’ which makes little sense here.

παιδεύσαι αὐτούς] Translated back into Hebrew it could be ליסרם [= לְיסְרָם], which can scarcely be reconciled with the form in Ἰ, 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 [= בְּיֻסְּרָם], Pu. inf. cst.?

---

\(^{19}\) For details see *GELS* s.v. δός, ἡ, δό.

\(^{20}\) So *SD* in a footnote ad loc. Cf. also Barthélémy 1992.577f.
συνάχθησονται τοὺς κτήνες. In XII there is found another instance of ἀσφαλείας Pu., also in a military context, but it is rendered as Pl.: καταβιβάσατε Zc 14.14.

10.11) Ἐφραίμ δέμαλλος διδασκαλεμένη ἄγαπαν νεῖκός, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπελεύσομαι ἐπὶ τὸ κάλλιστον τοῦ πραξῆλον αὐτῆς· ἐπιβίβασαν Ἐφραίμ, παρασκυπήσαμεν Ιουδαίον, ἐνισχύσει αὐτῶ Ιακώβ.

Ephraim is a heifer that has been taught to love to quarrel. However, I shall mount the fairest (part) of its neck. I shall ride Ephraim, I shall turn a deaf ear to Judah, Jacob will overpower him.

αἰφραίμ ζήρος Ἰωάννας Λεκάτα, καθάρισον ἐν τῷ πολεμῷ πάντα τὰ ζώα Ἀραβία ἐστὶν.

ἄγαπαν νεῖκα] Whether or not our translator was puzzled by the paragogic /-i/, he would most likely have found the juxtaposition of two participles unusual, because he thought the latter is complementing the former, and decided to convert the second to an infinitive. The two participles can be viewed as independent of each other: ‘an experienced heifer, fond of ..’

νεῖκός [κτήμα] The agricultural activity of threshing has nothing to do with quarrelling. The Heb. verb occurs three more times in XII, and only once its rendition with ἀλοάω at Mi 4.13 is acceptable, but it is used with aggressive connotation, which is totally foreign to innocuous threshing: ἀνάστηθι καὶ ἀλόα αὐτοῦς, better rendered as ‘Get up and keep crushing them [= hostile nations].’ In the remaining two cases it is rendered with πρίζειν ‘to cut with saw’ Am 1.3 and κατάγειν ‘to shatter, break’ Hb 3.12. Is this another indication that the vocabulary for agriculture was a weak spot for our translator? See above at vs. 4.

ἐπελεύσομαι [κτήμα] The prophetic Pf. of ἔπεικα is correctly represented with the Fut.

ἐπιβίβασαν εἰς τῆς θάλασσαν τοὺς ἱπποὺς σου Hb 3.15

21 Given another two examples in XII of this feature in ἁγαλλία Mi 7.14, where he read ἀγαλλία (pl. cst.), translating it as κατασκηνοῦντας καθ' ἐσωτερικοῖς δρυμόν and ἀγαλλίαν ἐν εὐπρόσδεκτα Zc 11.17, likewise ἀγαλλία (ὁ ποιμαίνοντες τὰ μάταια καὶ οἱ καταλελοίποτε τὰ πρόβατα), the paragogic /-i/ of a sg. cst. ptc. may have been unknown to him. On this feature of BH morphology, see JM § 93 n.

22 See Ehrlich 1968.198.

23 BA renders “tu as fait monter vers la mer tes chevaux,” but one wonders what the horses are to ride.
ἐπὶ τὰ υψηλὰ ἐπιβιβᾷ με ib. 3.19. This non-causative ἐπιβιβάζω, however, would better fit Qal ἐπιβαίνει.

παρασιωπήσεις, Quite a difference between the two. G represents שור יק as shown by παρασιωπήσεις ἐν τῷ καταπίπτειν ἀσεβῆ τὸν δίκαιον; Hb 1.13, where, however, the Heb. verb is intransitive, whereas our Ho translator is analysing it as causative, transitive.24 If you turn a deaf ear to someone crying for help, you are effectively silencing him.

ἐνισχύσει Ἰαχρος] Another agricultural Heb. term ἐργάσθη 'to harrow' appears to have been unknown to our translator. His colleagues apparently found it as vague: ἐργάσασθαι τὴν γῆν <אַדְמָתוֹ וִישַׂדֵּד Is 28.24 and ἐλκύσει σου ἀσεβῆ τὸν δίκαιον; מִמֶּנּוּ צַדִּיק רָשָׁע בְּבַלַּע תַּחֲרִישׁ Hb 1.13, where, however, the Heb. verb is intransitive, whereas our Ho translator is analysing it as causative, transitive.24

In Index s.v. ἐνισχύω, we mentioned רָשָׁע as a possible equivalent meant by G. A fresh look at how G has dealt with this verb shows that the translator's understanding of it was exactly opposite to the notion of strength: seven times it is rendered with ταλαιπωρέω 'to be miserable, wretched' (Ho 10.2, Jl 1.10bis, Mi 2.4, Zc 11.2, 3bis, once with δείλαιος 'wretched' Na 3.7,25 and another time with οἰχέομαι 'disappear' [of walled, fortified cities]). See also above at 10.2. The second alternative we mentioned, שׁרר Pi., we would also withdraw, for this lexeme has to do with ruling, as shown by שַׂר 'ruler,' a noun affiliated to it. Instead, we submit that the Heb. verb that lies behind G is Qal שָׂרָה, thus our translator is thinking of שָׂרֶה. Two other places in Ho support this analysis:

בְּבַלַּע תַּחֲרִישׁ 12.4 > ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ ἐπτέρνισεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν κόποις αὐτοῦ ἐνίσχυσεν πρὸς θεόν (12.3)

רָשָׁע 12.5 > καὶ ἐνίσχυσεν μετὰ άγγέλου καὶ ἡδυνάσθη (12.4), where one could postulate רָשָׁע.26

Also contextually it is important to refer to שָׂרֶה שְׁמַע אֲלֵיהָ הַשָּׁרֶה Gn 32.29 > ἐνίσχυσες μετὰ θεοῦ καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατός, though Jacob's human antagonist at the time was not Ephraim, but Esau. Note δυνατός here as against ἡδυνάσθη in Ho 12.4.

In sum, we view this accumulative, intertextual evidence as decisive than to postulate an Aramaism as Joosten (138) does, who refers to שׁרר 'strong.'

אֹתִיו רָשָׁע] On this unusual dative with the verb 'to overpower,' cf. δυνήσομαι αὐτῷ Ho 11.4. See also Je 45.22 and Ps 128.2. On some other sections of δυναμαί in the sense of 'to prevail against,' a sense unknown outside of SG, see GELS s.v. 4 and Helbing 1928.116. The influence of Heb. רָשָׁע is most probable.

---

24 Ad Jb 11.3, one of the very few cases sometimes adduced as attesting the transitive use of שׁור יק Tur-Sinai (1972.115) is adamant in his assertion that it is consistently intransitive.

25 The Nahal Hever text (8ḤevXIIgr) reads τεταλαιπώρηκε[ Νινευη (15.7).

26 On the vocalisation, cf. קָרָה Ru 2.3 (< קָרָה).
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10.12) σπείρατε ἑαυτοῖς εἰς δικαιοσύνην, τρυγήσατε ἑαυτοῖς φῶς γνώσεως. ἐκζητήσατε τὸν κύριον ἕως τοῦ ἑλθεῖν γενήματα δικαιοσύνης ὑμῖν.

Sow for yourselves righteousness, harvest for fruit(s) of life, light for yourselves a light of knowledge, seek out the Lord till produce of righteousness comes to you.

Yet another example of our translator having a difficulty with the agricultural terminology. Precisely the same Heb. clause recurs in 

jectories εἰς 

Israel Je 4.3. One cannot be absolutely certain that its Greek rendition, Νεώσατε ἑαυτοῖς νεώματα 'Plough for yourselves plots of the field,' was known to our translator. His translation derives from another hollow root, נור, as represented by נר 'lamp' and מנורה 'lampstand,' though ניר 'light' is known. All the same, Hebrew does not possess a verb derived from this root.

In Aramaic dialects the root does occur as an Afel or Pael verb in the sense of 'to kindle, light,' esp. in Samaritan Aramaic, see Tal 2000.512. Rather sporadically also in Syriac and Christian Palestinian Aramaic: Sokoloff 2009.260; Sokoloff 2014.904.

Joosten (138f.) also refers to δοκεῖν ὑμῖν τὰ βρῶματα εἰς δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἔρημον ἑρεμίας ἀνακαίνησιν ἐν τῇ προίμῳ II 2.23, and goes on to argue that this instance and ours show that the translators (so Joosten: "les traducteurs") were ignorant of or rejected the notion of "teacher of righteousness," a notion of cardinal importance to the Essene sect of Qumran. But in II 2.21-26 the discourse is about the abundant riches of nature provided by God, which has little to do with piety or morality. Besides, in our Ho passage, if we are to understand ἔρημον as meaning 'he will teach,' its subject is God, not a leader of a faith community to be dispatched by Him. On II 2.23, cf. also BA ad loc.

27 In Aramaic dialects the root does occur as an Afel or Pael verb in the sense of 'to kindle, light,' esp. in Samaritan Aramaic, see Tal 2000.512. Rather sporadically also in Syriac and Christian Palestinian Aramaic: Sokoloff 2009.260; Sokoloff 2014.904.

28 Joosten (138f.) also refers to δοκεῖν ὑμῖν τὰ βρῶματα εἰς δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἔρημον ἑρεμίας ἀνακαίνησιν ἐν τῇ προίμῳ II 2.23, and goes on to argue that this instance and ours show that the translators (so Joosten: "les traducteurs") were ignorant of or rejected the notion of "teacher of righteousness," a notion of cardinal importance to the Essene sect of Qumran. But in II 2.21-26 the discourse is about the abundant riches of nature provided by God, which has little to do with piety or morality. Besides, in our Ho passage, if we are to understand ἔρημον as meaning 'he will teach,' its subject is God, not a leader of a faith community to be dispatched by Him. On II 2.23, cf. also BA ad loc.
10.13) ἵνα τί παρεσιωπήσατε ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς ἁδικίας αὐτῆς ἐτρυγήσατε, ἐφάγετε καρπὸν ψευδῆ; ὡτι ἡλπίσας ἐν τοῖς ἁρμασίν σου, ἐν πλήθει δυνάμεως σου.

Why did you ignore ungodliness, and harvest its (crops) of unrighteousness, and eat deceptive fruit(s)? Because you trusted your chariots, the multitude of your troops.

10.14) καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπόλεια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

And there will emerge perdition among your people, and all that is walled all around will disappear. Like the ruler Salaman from the house of Jerobaal in the days of a war they dashed to the ground a mother along with (her) children.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπόλεια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οίκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.

καὶ ἔξαναστήσεται ἀπὸ λέια ἐν τῷ λαῷ σου, καὶ πάντα τὰ περιτετειχισμένα σου οἰχήσεται· ὡς ἄρχον Σαλαμαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου Ιεροβααλ ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου μητέρα ἐπὶ τέκνων ἡδάφισαν.
This Gk verb rarely has something inanimate, ἀπώλεια here, as its subject. Another instance is found in Ez α: ἡ ὑβρὶς εξανέστηκε Ez 7.10.

ἀπώλεια σαρκί The Heb. word, which signifies ‘very loud voice, roar, din,’ occurs only twice in XII. In its second occurrence, we find מְוֹאָב בְּשָׁאוֹן וּמֵת Am 2.2 > καὶ ἀποθανεῖται ἐν ἀδυναμίᾳ Μωαβ μετὰ κραυγῆς.

Neither Gk substantive has little to do with noise. Our translator may have not known what the Heb. word means. Noteworthy that in Thackeray’s Jer α we come across οἶον, a synonym of ἀπώλεια for שָׁאוֹן at Je 51(§ 28).55 and on (§ 26).17.

On the interpretation of νάρδησ, see above at vs. 2. Joosten (139) finds odd the use of νάρδησθαι with inanimate things as the grammatical subject, but note νάρδησ σοφία αὐτῶν // ἀπώλεστο βουλή Je 30.1.

ἄρχων = שַּר, ≠ H שֹׁד. It is not absolutely certain that our translator read רֹשֵׁה or רֹשֵׁה; for BH the latter is the rule – הָיִן רֹד, not like Engl. ‘King David,’ when King is a title, see JM § 131 k.

ἐπὶ ὑπὲρ, a haplography of the preceding ἐπὶ.

Both particles are often used to indicate addition; see GELS s.v. II 5 and BDB s.v. II 4 c. Especially interesting is לָא עַל־בָּנִים הָאֵם לֹא־תִקַּח Dt 22.6 > οὐ λήμψῃ τὴν μητέρα μετὰ τῶν τέκνων.

The Gk verb ἐδαφίζειν derives from ἔδαφος ‘ground.’ LSJ mentions three senses: I “beat level and firm like a floor or pavement,” II “provide with a floor,” III “dash to the ground,” the last of which appears to be a new development in Biblical Greek, whereas I is known to Aristotle and Theophrastus. Among its six occurrences in LXX it denotes a cruel act with νήπια ‘infants’ (Na 3.10), υποτίθεαι ‘sucklings’ (Ho 14.1) as its object, which is in addition to our Ho passage here, and all translating ρτσו.

Luke appears to be familiar with this usage in ἐδαφίζονται in εἰς Δανία καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου Lk 19.44.

So I shall do to you, o House of Israel, on account of your evil (deeds). Κακὰ ὑπὲρ λαὸς βηθλεέμ Μιχayı'ל ὑπὲρ πύρθικα

30 It is not certain whether this is a rendering of שָׁאוֹן פָּרַח (end of vs. 10) or of קָם הַחֶמָּס (beginning of vs. 11). The word order favours the latter.

31 Index (34b and 345c) suggests that at θαφίζαν Ez 31.12 Θ postulates ρτσו in lieu of ἐδαφίζονται.

32 This is another piece of evidence showing that the Evangelist was familiar with the context in which a given word is used in LXX, cf. Muraoka 2012.
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 ἡδάφισαν in the plural. All this is a result of his reading כְּשֹׁד as כַּשַּׂר. Another consequence is the need to read עָשָׂה as אֶעֱשֶׂה.

ἀπὸ προσώπος κακίων ύμον, a compound preposition which often indicates a cause or reason. In ὀδυνηθήσονται ἀπὸ προσώπος 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 ἕνεκεν τῶν λημμάτων αὐτῶν τῶν ὀρθρινῶν ‘he will get defiled because of their early morning gains.’ Though there is no H for this part of the verse, the translator’s Vorlage may have read for the first clause cited above. Other LXX translators attempted otherwise: e.g. Προσώχθικα τῇ ζωῇ μου διὰ τὰς θυγατέρας τῶν υἱῶν Χετ Gn 27.46, ὡς ἠδύνατο ἢ γη τίς παροικήσας αὐτῶν φέρειν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλῆθους τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῶν ib. 36.7, where the translator paraphrased.

κακίων ύμον] Is the pl. form an attempt to represent the repetition of the same noun in Η? In XII, the same form, כֹּל, 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, כֹּל is also so rendered at Jl 2.13.

33 These two are the only cases in LXX of this causal ἀπὸ προσώπος τινος, see GELS s.v. πρόσωπον 6 a. On the underlying בְּשֶׁה, cf. BDB s.v. בֶשֶׁה 6 c.
34 Sollamo (1979) does not deal with the two examples of ἀπὸ προσώπος 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 שִׁיר ‘the song par excellence.’ Cf. JM § 141 l and SQH § 8 b.

With eagerness they were thrown out, the king of Israel was thrown out. Because Israel was an infant, I also loved him, and recalled his children out of Egypt.

кеφάλιον: ὀρθροῦ καὶ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ:

In ὀρθροῦ εἶπον τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἐστ 5.14ο’ ὀρθροῦ is used as a classic genitive of time, ‘early in the morning.’ GELS s.v. ὀρθροῦ 2 b has a list of eight cases of ὀρθροῦ, in none of which one could say with confidence that the specification of early morning for something being done is an essential ingredient of the message. E.g. καὶ ἐδίδαξα αὐτοὺς ὀρθροῦ Ἰεθ 39.33. Did the Lord conduct an early morning lesson? The eight instances are confined to Ἰο and Ἰε. However, a verb derived from this substantive, ὀρθρίζω,1 is used at times in a related fashion (GELS s.v. 2, 3), and the verb used this way is attested in other LXX books as well. Thus in addition to ἐν θλίψει αὐτῶν ὀρθρίζοι πρός με Ἰο 6.1 we also find, e.g. ὁ θεός μου, πρός σὲ ὀρθρίζο Ἰσ 62.2. Unlike in ὀρθρίζον ὑκέτι εἰμί ‘I shall be no early riser any more’ Ἰμ 7.21 the specification of early morning is nonsensical in a case such as ἐκ νυκτός ὀρθρίζει τὸ πνεῦμά μου πρὸς σὲ ‘since the time when it was still night ..’ Ἰσ 26.9.2 Likewise at οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες πρός αὐτήν [= σοφίαν] ἀμπλησθήσονται εὐφροσύνης Σι 4.12 such an effort could and ought to be undertaken day and night. In our Ἰο passage we cannot think of any argument for thinking that the action must have taken place just around daybreak, cock-crow.

We note that in may examples of ὀρθροῦ and ὀρθρίζω the feature of eagerness has become an integral part of their senses. This semantic development most likely has its origin in the selection of ὀρθροῦ to translate רָכַב once (Ḥo 11.1) and רָכָב six times (all in Ἰε: 7.25, 25.4, 33.5, 39.3, 42.14, 43.5).

1 A Koine Greek equivalent of Classical ὀρθρεύω, which occurs in LXX once only at ὀρθρεύσαν κοίνως καὶ ἤλθοσαν εἰς τὸν γάμον ‘they got up together early in the morning and went to the wedding’ Ἰο 9.6 (ὁρθρεύσαν Θ).

2 “In the night” (NETS) is a translation of בַּלַּיְלָה here. SD has “Nach dem Ende der Nacht,” but we doubt that ἐκ νυκτός can be synonymous with μετὰ νύκτα.
Likewise ὀρθρίζω renders Pi. רָתִּח thrice (Ps 62.2, 77.34, Is 26.9), and Hi. שִׁחֵר thrice (Je 25.3, 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 שִׁחֵר, 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 Volkssetymologie, i.e. non-scientific, amateur etymology. The scientific etymology seeks cognates of שִׁחֵר as a verb root in Jewish Aramaic רָתִּח ‘to seek’ and Akkadian /saḫāru/ ‘to turn towards, go round, seek.’ 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. שִׁחֵר, but also Pi. בִּקֵּשׁ: שַׁחֲרֵיהוּ[=σοφίαν] ὀρθρίζε πρὸς αὐτόν 6.36 // ἡμείς μερικοὶ ὀρθορίζοντες πρὸς αὐτήν 4.12. Note also ὁ ὀρθρίσας ἐπ’ αὐτήν [= σοφίαν] οὐ κοπιάσει Wi 6.14, continuing εὐφράσκεται υπὸ τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν (vs. 12), and Ὀρθριζόν δὲ πρὸς Κύριον καὶ ἐκλαιον περὶ Μεμφίας Test. Joseph 3.6. Luke was familiar with this feature of SG, when he wrote πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ὀρθρίζει πρὸς αὐτόν ἐν τῷ ἑρῶ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ Lk 21.38.  

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 לַכְּרָמִים נַשְׁכִּימָה Ct 7.13 have said ὀρθρίσωμεν εἰς ἁμπελῶνας in lieu of, say, brand ἔλθομεν εἰς ἁμπελῶνας? In using ὀρθρεύω, a synonymous verb, Euripides adds ἦλθον! in ὀρθρεύουσαν ψυχὰν ἐκπληχθεῖς᾽ ἦλθον φρίκαι ‘I came shuddering with my mind wide awake early in the morning’ Tr. 182. The preposition πρὸς often found with this verb in SG does not merely indicate a destination as in Ἡλθομεν πρὸς τὸν ἄδελφον σου Ἡσαυ 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 G; the corresponding references in H are 7.25, 25.4, 26.5, 32.33, 35.14, 44.4.

Though G has not preserved any trace of וְדַבֵּר הַשְּכֵּם in וְדַבֵּר הַשְּכֵּם אֲלֵיכֶם וָאֲדַבֵּר 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 מִשָּׁכַּה need be emended to מִשָּׁכָה.


6 Cf. HALOT 1465b s.v.

7 Cf. BDAG on this instance: “ὁρ. 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 \( \zeta \tau \varepsilon \omega \) never governs \( \pi \rho \varsigma \tau \upsilon \alpha \) or \( \pi \rho \varsigma \tau \iota \). At the above-quoted Wi 6.14 the selection of \( \varepsilon \pi \nu \)9 is most felicitous, highlighting focused attention.

\( \alpha \pi \varepsilon \rho \rho \rho \iota \eta \varsigma \omega \varsigma \nu, \alpha \pi \varepsilon \rho \rho \iota \eta \varsigma \omega \varsigma \nu \) Whether or not \( \Theta \)'s Vorlage actually read the pl. \( \tau \eta \iota \omicron \) or \( \pi \rho \varsigma \tau \iota \) as a temporal conjunction with reference to the past, not including \( \tau \omicron \omicron \rho \iota \omicron \omicron \), is rather rare in BH. BDB s.v. 2 a mentions six places including Ho 11.1.

\( \nu \eta \pi \tau \iota \varsigma \omicron \nu \iota \omega \iota \) The absence of a copula in \( \Theta \) is not necessarily a slavish reproduction of \( \mathbb{H} \). Such a nominal clause is a commonplace in Greek, whether Classical or SG, see SSG § 94 d-da.

The range of age represented \( \nu \tau \rho \iota \) is quite broad. A three-month old baby Moses is so called, Ex 2.6.

\( \kappa \alpha i \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omicron \) The conjunction looks like a rendering of \( \gamma \) in \( \mathbb{H} \), but there is nothing there that would correspond to \( \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omicron \). The Gk conjunction is not linking the two clauses, the one nominal and the other verbal, but relates to \( \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omicron \) only. What is meant, however, is not “I also loved Israel, just as someone else did.” It is like in Kαί κύριος παρεβίβασεν τὸ \( \alpha \mu \alpha \tau \tau \iota \mu \alpha \tau \iota \) σου, οὐ \( \mu \) \( \alpha \pi \rho \theta \omicron \iota \nu \iota \zeta \varsigma \varsigma < \) 2Sm 12.13, i.e. in response to your admission of your guilt, so the Lord in turn.10 Such an analysis accords with \( \Theta \)'s analysis of \( \kappa \iota \) 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 \( \varepsilon \gamma \omicron \omicron \).

\( \tau \alpha \tau \iota \kappa \tau \eta \iota \nu \iota \nu, \neq \mathbb{H} \lambda \nu \beta \iota \alpha \nu \). With “Israel” no single individual was meant. When Moses was told by God to meet Pharaoh, the latter was to hear: καθώς μετεκάλεσα καθώς κάραι. Ex 4.22, when the entire community of Moses’ coreligionists were to go.

11.2) καθώς μετεκάλεσα αὐτοῦς, οὖτως \( \alpha \pi \rho \chi \omicron \nu \tau \omicron \) \( \varepsilon \kappa \) προσώπου \( \mu \omicron \nu \) αὐτοῖ τοῖς Βααλ ἔθουν 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.

\( \kappa \alpha \rho \alpha \alpha \lambda \iota \mu \epsilon \iota \chi \eta \iota \iota \sigma \iota \iota \tau \delta \omega \iota \varsigma \omicron \omicron \) ἐπείκος μεσιτὶς \( \kappa \alpha \rho \alpha \alpha \lambda \iota \mu \epsilon \iota \chi \eta \iota \iota \sigma \iota \iota \tau \delta \omega \iota \varsigma \omicron \omicron \) ξυρί risks:

καθώς μετεκάλεσα αὐτοῦς \( \kappa \alpha \rho \alpha \alpha \lambda \iota \mu \epsilon \iota \chi \eta \iota \iota \sigma \iota \iota \tau \δ \omega \iota \varsigma \omicron \omicron \) appears to be a free addition meant to pair with οὖτως (ἐκ). To restore καθώς \( \kappa \alpha \rho \alpha \alpha \lambda \iota \mu \epsilon \iota \chi \eta \iota \iota \sigma \iota \iota \tau \delta \omega \iota \varsigma \omicron \omicron \) would not do, since that would require changing μεσιτὶς to περιορίζω.

9 Preferred by Ziegler to \( \pi \rho \varsigma \).

10 This use of καί is also recognisable in διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτῶν \( \alpha \pi \rho \chi \omicron \nu \tau \omicron \) ‘therefore God in turn exalted him’ Phil 2.9, i.e. in response to \( \epsilon \tau \alpha \pi \rho \chi \omicron \nu \tau \omicron \) \( \epsilon \omega \alpha \tau \omicron \) γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι \( \tau \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \omicron \) \( \tau \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \omicron \) δὲ \( \sigma \tau \alpha \iota \varphi \omicron \) ib. 2.8.
Rashi identified the subjects of קָרְאוּ as prophets. In זג we could hear a personal ring of God’s communication. Cf. Trg here: לְהוֹן לְאַלָּפָא נְבִיַי 'I sent my prophets to instruct them.'

ἀπώχοντο .. ἐθυν .. ἐθυμίων] 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.

אָדוּתי] זג read מִפָּנַי מֵסְמִיר מֶלְכָּה as correctly noted by Nyberg (1935.84), who defends זג as preferable in preserving the archaic, asyndetic structure, but the asyndesis would be there in זג’s reading as well. 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.

καὶ ἐγὼ συνεπόδισα τὸν Εφραίμ, ἄνελαβον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονά μου, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι Ἰαμαι αὐτούς.

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

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 זג is more painful: ἀδερφἀ ‘and they will pierce him through’ Zc 13.3.

擐 נוכי מַרְנֶה לָאָפְרַיִם קָחָם על-יוֹרְעֵתִי וְאָנֹכִי...

ουκ ἔγνωσαν] Many stative verbs in Hebrew and Aramaic can be used with ingressive value, especially with reference to the past. Thus יד, 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 (יָדָעְתִּי) ἐγὼ ὅτι γυνὴ 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 ἦδει ἐν τῷ κοιμηθῆναι αὐτῆν καὶ ἀναστῆναι 'he was not aware ...' Ge 19.35, a blissful ignorance on the part of Lot. At ἦδει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐν ἥ ἦν ἡμέρα...
When people were perishing I extended a hand to them with My cords of love, and I will be to them like one slapping his cheeks, and I will look on them, I shall prevail against him.

This reminds us of הִשְׁחִית, which is primarily a transitive verb meaning ‘to destroy, ruin,’ mostly physically. However, when the verb carries a sense of moral ruin brought on oneself, it is virtually intransitive. One could argue that an object such as עֲלִילָה or עֲלִילָה is latent, see את־דַּרְכּוֹ כָּל־בָּשָׂר הִשְׁחִית Ge 6.12 (κατέφθειρεν πᾶσα σάρξ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ) and כֹּל הִשְׁחִיתוּ עֲלִילוֹתָם Zp 3.7 (διεφθάρτατο πᾶσα ἡ ἐπιφυλλίς αὐτῶν). But there is no absolute need to postulate such a latent object in cases such as אחרים אלוהים אַחֲרֵי לָלֶכֶת מֵאֲבוֹתָם הִשְׁחִיתוּ Jd 2.19 (διέφθαραν ὑπὲρ τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν πορευθῆναι οπίσω θεῶν ἑτέρων). Note the use of a straightforward intransitive verb in ᾿ at καὶ ἀνομήσητε καὶ ποιήσητε γλυπτὸν Dt 4.25 (פֶּסֶל וַעֲשִׂיתֶם וְהִשְׁחַתֶּם, υἱοὶ ἁνόμοι Is 1.4 (מַשְׁחִיתִים בָּנִים) parallel to several short, condemnatory titles, and הֵמָּה מַשְׁחִיתִים כֻּלָּםJe 6.28 (πάντες διεφθαρμένοι εἰσίν, where the use of a pass. ptc. is to be noted). HALOT s.v. תָּשִׁית hif. 1 c) (p. 1471a) suggests an alternative analysis of these cases as internally transitive or internally factitive, “to behave corruptly.”
“you” are undoubtedly a victim, but whether σου is a subjective or objective gen. depends on what διαφθορά means here. If ‘destruction’ in active sense, it would be objective, but if ‘perdition,’ it would be subjective. The latter is more likely. On the use of the dat. here, see below at 13.9. See SSG § 22 v (xii) and (xiii). Does אָדָם חַבְלֵי refer to cords used by people or used in the best interests of people for their rescue or safety? See SQH 21 b i) and xvi).18

ἐξέτεινα αὐτοὺς is rather obscure of meaning. Who or what are ‘them’ and what does ‘extended them, stretched them’ mean? By contrast, ἐκτείνω αὐτὸν ἐμῆς τοῖς σχοινίοις καὶ ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ λάκκου 45.13 present no difficulty.19 GELS s.v. ἐκτείνω 3 b hesitantly suggests: “to put forth a hand in order to support(?),” though one would rather anticipate ἀυτοῖς. The obj. suf. /-emm/ can be analysed as equivalent to ἐν καὶ and the prep. bet is capable of introducing a direct object as in בָּדָר ונְטֵה, ‘Stretch out the javelin’ Josh 8.18,20

ἐν δεσμοῖς ἀγαπήσεως μου On the surface the combination of the two nouns in both G and H may look strange, since few would willingly apply for cords or fetters. However, it depends on a purpose to which they are applied. A statement such as מִן־הַבּוֹר אֶמְשְׁכֵם אֹתוֹ וַיַּעֲלוּ בַּחֲבָלִים אֶת־יִרְמְיָהוּ 45.13 presents no difficulty.19 GELS s.v. ἐκτείνω 3 b hesitantly suggests: “to put forth a hand in order to support(?),” though one would rather anticipate αὐτοῖς. The obj. suf. /-emm/ can be analysed as equivalent to ἐν καὶ and the prep. bet is capable of introducing a direct object as in בָּדָר ונְטֵה, ‘Stretch out the javelin’ Josh 8.18,20

ἐν δεσμοῖς ἀγαπήσεως μου In H, as is also shown by the following וָאֶהְיֶה, though not vocalised as וָאַט, the Heb. form must have been meant as preterite,21 continuing with מְשָׁכֵם, an Impf. with an archaic preterite value. G, however, is inconsistent: preterite - non-preterite - non-preterite.21 The use of non-apocopated forms in lieu of apocopated ones, in this instance, אַהֲבָה, is not uncommon; see JM § 79 m.

What slapping one’s own cheeks symbolises here is not clear at all.22 Nor is it clear how G arrived at ῥαπίζων.23 Is this possibly a figure of vicarious sacrifice?

---

18 For an example illustrating the latter, see Δέσμη μας ἁμαρτίας, in which the suf. pronoun can be construed with ἡμᾶς alone or with the cst. chain as a whole.

19 How desperate we were is manifest in the question mark in GELS s.v. 3 “+ acc. pers. ‘to put forth a hand in order to support (?)’.” The Gk verb here cannot mean ‘to pull, draw (towards oneself),’ a meaning which would fit the context well and is intended by a v.l. (ἐξ)εἰλκυσά, which, as a lectio facilior, has less claim to originality.

20 For further details, see JM § 125 m and Jenni 1992.93-99.

21 The use of non-apocopated forms in lieu of apocopated ones, in this instance, אַהֲבָה, is not uncommon; see JM § 79 m.

22 Brenton (1078) with “another” and SD (1174) with “jemanden” change the referent of αὐτοῦ, but such an insertion sounds abrupt.

23 Nyberg (1935.85f.) opines that the only slight defect in H can be rectified by vocalising מְרִימֵי as מְרִימִי and translating the resultant text as “sobald ich ihnen das Joch auf die Kinnbacken legte.” He seeks support in a case such as יָדוֹ כְּמֵשִׁיב וַתִּהְיֶה Ge 38.29. However, the two examples
Cf. Is 53.4f. Our translator was not aware that, a couple of centuries later, someone was going to say “Whoever slaps your right cheek (σε ῥαπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιάν σιαγόνα), turn to him the other one, too” (Mt 5.39).

That ἐπιβλέψωμαι πρὸς αὐτόν] = ἐπί αὐτοῖν, and not ἦς τοι. The equivalence ἐπιβλέπω is quite common in LXX, and in XII alone 6 times, of which esp. noteworthy is καὶ ἐπιβλέπονται πρὸς με ἀπὸ ἔρι ἀπὸ τῆς δικαίωμας Zc 12.10. But, who does αὐτὸν refer to? The same question arises regarding αὐτῷ in the next clause.

ἐπιβλέπω πρὸς αὐτόν] = ‘I shall prevail upon him’ ἠλ Αἰγύπτω ἄνθρωπος.25 Besides, Ἐπιστρέψομαι a verse division different from MT, i.e. the first word of vs. 5, ἀλ was read as ἦλ as the last word of vs. 4.

11.5) κατῴκησεν Ἐφραίμ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ Ἀσσουρ ἄνθρωπος ἂντοῦ, ὃτι οὐκ ἦθελησαν ἐπιστρέψαι.

Ἐπιστρέψεις Ἐφραίμ dwelt in Egypt, and Assur, he is his king, because they refused to return.

κατῴκησεν Ἐφραίμ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ] By having read ἦλ as ἦλ and attached it to the end of the preceding line, our translator came to face what he found it difficult to comprehend, namely the notion of Ephraim going back again to the house of slavery. As a consequence, he presumably decided to exercise quite a degree of freedom by mentally restoring: ἔρι μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐλθὼν ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἂντοῦ, i.e. ‘formerly Ephraim dwelt in Egypt as slaves, but now he was to toil and labour under a new overlord called Assur.’

οὐκ ἦθελησαν ἐπιστρέψαι] Exactly as in Je 8.5. This Heb. verb, when complemented with an inf. cst., is often rendered with a negated verb, e.g. ἐπιστράφητε πρὸς με ἀπὸ Ἑλλάς ἀπὸ Ἑλλάς άντοῦ ἄντοῦ ὑπακούειν Je 13.10.

ἔπιστρέψεις] πρὸς με is understood, cf. Ἐπιστράφητε πρὸς με ἀπὸ Ἑλλάς τῆς καιρίας ὑπακούειν Jl 2.12.

are syntactically distinct: in the Ge instance the quoted text serves as a temporal adjunct, continued by ἀγάπην, ἦλτε, whereas in our Ho case is no adverbial adjunct, but a self-standing verbal clause as shown by ἔπιστρέψεις. On the difficulty of the Ge example, cf. Driver 1892 § 135, Ob. 6 and König 1897 § 412 z. On the paragogic i/i added to a sg. cst. ptc., see above on ἄλλοι 10.11.

24 Pace SD: “auf ihn herabblicken,” which does not harmonise with “cords of love”; the alternative rendition “mich um ihn kümmern” is preferable.

25 Nyberg (1935.86) translates: “so neigte ich [die Früchte der Bäume] zu ihm, um ihn essen zu lassen,” where the bracketed addition is little more than a fanciful creation.
11.6) 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.

καὶ ἠσθένησε ῥομφαία ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ φάγονται ἐκ τῶν διαβουλίων αὐτῶν.

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

11.7) 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.

καὶ ἠσθένησε ῥομφαία ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ φάγονται ἐκ τῶν διαβουλίων αὐτῶν.

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

The preposition lamed prefixed to מְשִׁיבָתִי is suspicious, for whether from קֹרֵב or קֹרֵא, the verb in the sense of ‘to hang on’ governs לְ, and never לַ. Accordingly крěмáζо, крěмáн̄н̄мι mostly governs ἐπί, e.g. крěмáн̄н̄мος ἐπί ξύλου De 21.23. There also occur, however, two other cases with ἐκ: ἐκ μαστῶν крěмáσαντες τὰ βρέφη ‘making the babes hang at their breasts’ and more relevantly to our Ho instance in ἐξ ἡμῶν κρέματα ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν ‘their lives depend on us’ Ju 8.24.26 This suggests that ᾿Greek represents מְשִׁיבָתִי.

26 Among examples mentioned in BDAG s.v. крěмáн̄н̄мι (2) we find ἐξ ἡμῶν крěμάµ̄ν̄η πᾶσα ψυχή πολίτου παντὸς ‘on which [= private possessions] every soul of every citizen hangs’ Plato Leg. 8.831c.
τὰ τίμια αὐτοῦ = יְקָרָיו, either from יָקָר or יְקָר, though the latter is attested in BH only in the sg. Another possibility is < יָקִיר, an adjective substantivised.

θυμωθήσεται = יִחַר or יֶחֱרֶה, in any case from חָרָה.

ὑψώσῃ αὐτόν θυμωθήσεται = יַקִּיר, though the latter is attested in BH only in the sg. Another possibility is יָקִיר, an adjective substantivised.

On the whole the message that comes through from G 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 מָרַים, Hif. rather than Pol. 27

11.8) τί σε διαθῶ, Εφραίμ; υπερασπιῶ σου, Ισραήλ; τί σε διαθῶ; ός Αδαμα θῆσομαι σε και ός Σεβωιμ; μετεστράφη η καρδία μου ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, συνεταράχθη η 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.

τί σε διαθῶ, Εφραίμ; υπερασπιῶ σου, Ισραήλ; τί σε διαθῶ; ός Αδαμα θῆσομαι σε και ός Σεβωιμ; μετεστράφη η καρδία μου ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, συνεταράχθη η μεταμέλειά μου.

The use of τί in the sense of ‘How?, In what way?’, unknown prior to SG, started as a Hebraism as exemplified in מַה־נִּצְטַדָּק > τί δικαιωθῶμεν; Ge 44.16. Likewise at Ex 10.26, Nu 23.8, Si 38.25, Mi 6.3. 28 Since Ὁ has here τί, it appears that this innovative SG usage had stablised by the time when the translation of XII was launched. Note that a reviser took offence at this anomaly and improved Τί [= τι] σώσει ημᾶς οὗτος; 1Sm 10.27 to Τίς σώσει ημᾶς; 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.

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 τίς here appears to carry the sense of ‘to give up, not to care about, abandon,’ Σ most probably saw the following as being used as its synonymous parallel. In BH τίς is often so used, as can be seen from quite an extensive listing in BDB s.v. Qal 2 “Put, set, nearly = מָשֹׁה, 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.
ὑπερασπιῶ σου ἑγίμνησε] Θ accords with what it sees as God’s positive, supportive stance, and it is in line with its exegesis of ἄνδρας as indicated above. This Heb. verb that occurs only twice more in BH is said to mean ‘to deliver, hand over’ as at כָּבָּד וַיִּקְרֶא, כַּרְדָּם מִגֵּן Pr 4.9 > στεφάνω δὲ τρυφῆς ὑπερασπισθῇ σου. The third instance is interesting: כָּל שָׁנֶגֶן תִּפְאֶרֶת, Pr 4.9 > παρέδωκεν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου ὑποχειρίους σοι. Are these two translators etymologising, starting from מָגֵן ‘spear’ [ > ἀσπίς five times]?

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. דַוָּי לִבִּי עָלַי ‘my heart is sick’ Je 8.18, יְהוֹוָה קָדָשָׁה: יִלְלָי רְחֵל, ‘Rachel died on me’ Gn 48.7; see JM § 133 f. Though the same phrase translates יֵרָה 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 [ἂν διὰ τοῦ]” 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].’


The Gk word μεταμέλεια occurs only once more in LXX: η χρηστότης σου ἐπὶ ἀμαρτάνοντας ἐν μεταμελείᾳ ‘Your mercy is on those who sinned(, but) are remorseful’ PSol 9.7. Its cognates are more frequent: μεταμελομαι 14× and μετάμελος 3x. Their most frequent Heb. equivalent is וַחֲרוֹם (9x) or מִחוֹם סִיר (1x), see Index 78b.

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.

11.9) οὐ μὴ ποιήσω κατά τὴν ὀργήν τοῦ θυμοῦ μου, οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπω τοῦ ἐξαλειφθῆναι τὸν Ἐφραιμ· διότι θεός ἔγω εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρω- πος· ἐν σοι άγιος, 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.

29 Pace Nyberg (1935.89), who thinks this is a rendition of τὸν άγνοον μου, οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπω τὸν ἐξαλειφθῆναι τὸν Ἐφραιμ· διότι θεός ἔγω εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος· ἐν σοι άγιος, καὶ οὐκ εἰσελεύσομαι εἰς πόλιν.

30 This force of ὁ λόγος seems to have escaped most LXX translators, e.g. שָׁנֶגֶן תִּפְאֶרֶת > ὁ θυμός ἀπέστη ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ Da 6.19 Θ.
κατὰ τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ θυμοῦ μου] The translator may have been uncomfortable with ὀργὴ as a direct object of ποιέω. This Heb. collocation is as uncommon. Another rare instance of it is בַּעֲמָלֵק חֲרוֹן־אַפּו. This Heb. collocation is as uncommon. Another rare instance of it is בַּעֲמָלֵק חֲרוֹן־אַפּו. 1K 28.18, where its literal translation οὐκ ἐποίησας θυμὸν ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ ἐν Αμαληκ has been stylistically improved in the proto-Lucianic revision with οὐκ ἐπείρασε ... ‘you did not vent ...’, cf. ἐποίησας εἰς ἡμᾶς, κύριε ο θεός ἡμῶν, κατὰ πᾶσαν ἐπιείκειαν σου καὶ κατὰ πάντα οἰκτιρμόν σου τὸν μέγαν Ba 2.27.

ἔγκαταλίπω [The discrepancy is considerable. One cannot even begin to guess how “I repeat” could have been interpreted as meaning “I abandon.”]

Since the inf. clause in G can be only exegetical, τὸν Εφραίμ 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 πόλιν is remarkable.

11.10) ὅπισω κυρίου πορεύσομαι· ὡς λέων ἔρευξεται, ὅτι αὐτὸς ὄρυσται, καὶ ἐκστήσονται τέκνα ὕδατον.

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

τέκνα ὕδατον] G’s personal focus. αὐτὸς ἁνα [in contrast to τέκνα ὕδατον.

tέκνα ὕδατον] = μινι βι with homoioarcton. What the phrase, whether in G or Ḥ, is supposed to mean is enigmatic.

ἐκστήσονται ἔρευς] This is a rare instance of ἔξιστημι tinged with a sense of awe. Note καὶ ἔξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα Ex 19.18, where the subject of the verb in Ḥ is Mount Sinai – μὲν ἔρευς, and the occasion was a theophany accompanied by unusual natural phenomena.32

11.11) καὶ ἐκστήσονται ὡς ὄρνεον εἰς Αἰγύπτου καὶ ὡς περιστερᾶ ἐκ γῆς Ἀσσυρίων· καὶ ἀποκαταστήσω αὐτούς 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.

πορεύσομαι πόλιν] Ḥ’s personal focus. αὐτὸς ἁνα [in contrast to τέκνα ὕδατον.

31 How Nyberg (1935.89) could translate G back to ἅσβος 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 ἔρευς to regular visitors at the wailing wall.
ἐξ Ἀἰγύπτου καὶ .. ἐκ γῆς Ἀσσυρίων] “(On their return home) out of ..” is probably meant.

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


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.

כֹּחַ הָאָדָם וֶאֱמָן וְעִם־קְדוֹשִׁים עִם־אֵל רָד עֹד וַיהוּדָה יִשְׂרָאֵל בֵּית וּבְמִרְמָה אֶפְרַיִם בְּכַחַשׁ סְבָבֻנִי:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>וכש</th>
<th>ψευδὸς</th>
<th>Ho 7.3, 11.21 [12.1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ψευδής</td>
<td>Ho 10.13, Na 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מְרַכָּה</td>
<td>δόλος</td>
<td>Mi 6.11, Zp 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδίκια</td>
<td>Ho 12.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδίκος</td>
<td>Am 8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσέβεια</td>
<td>Ho 11.21 [12.1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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: ἀσέβειας καὶ δόλου, though the first term is ψευδής, 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 ἀσέβεια translating מְרַכָּה.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. רָד ר ה identified ᾱ as being equal to רָד ר ה.

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

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 [Ὁ 12.2]) οὐ δὲ Εφραίμ πονηρὸν πνεῦμα, ἐδίωξε καῦσωνα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν· κενά καὶ μάταια ἐπλῆθυνε καὶ διαθήκην μετὰ Ασσυρίων 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.

54 ὁ δὲ Εφραιμ πονηρὸν πνεῦμα

4 ἐδίωξε καῦσωνα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν

κενὰ καὶ μάταια ἐπλήθυνε καὶ διαθήκην μετὰ Ασσυρίων διέθετο, καὶ ἔλαιον εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐνεπορεύετο.

ἢσσαν αὐτοῦ καὶ μετὰ Ασσυρίων διέθετο, καὶ ἔλαιον εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐνεπορεύετο.

The parallelism of ῥοῦχο and καῖδι 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 ῥοῦχ ὡς ῥοῦχ ῥα αἰγύπτιον ὄπη καὶ χρήμα ζῆσε ῥα μετὰ Ασσυρίων καὶ αἰγύπτιον ἐνεπορεύετο.

If we want to retain ῥοῦχ as parallel to καῖδι, then we would need to understand ρα εἰς ῥοῦχ 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, ῥα cannot be an attributively used adjective: for πονηρὸν πνεῦμα we would anticipate ῥα ροῦχ if not ῥα τρακτέον ῥοῦχ. Then ρα 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 μακαρίας ῥα ροῦχ τοῦ ῥαμ ἔως οἱ ἀμώμοι ἐν ἀδῷ Πς 118.1 (< μακαρίας ῥα ροῦχ τοῦ ῥαμ ἔως οἱ ἀμώμοι ἐν ἀδῷ Πς 118.1 (< μακαρίας ῥα ροῦχ τοῦ ῥαμ ἔως οἱ ἀμώμοι ἐν ἀδ Wolff (148) mentions an evil spirit that harassed Saul (1K 16.14-23). One should note, however, that 1) in 1K the phrase is ῥα τρακτέον ῥοῦχ and more importantly 2) this spirit originated with God, Ἰησοῦς ἡμῶν (vs. 14), ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (vss. 15, 16), and ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (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 ῥα τρακτέον ῥοῦχ (1K 16.23) is an adjective, as the phrase in these two verses proves, for one cannot have two nomina regentia without a conjunctive ως linking them.
ἐδίωξεν = ירדף. In spite of ὅλην 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. ἔκλαιεν ὁ λαὸς ὅλην τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην Nu 14.1 with ἔκλαισαν τὸν Ἄαρων τριάκοντα ἡμέρας πάς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ 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 ירדף for G, we would have in this single verse four yiqtol s with no waw prefixed, and one of them, νοικία is perfective.3

μάταιοι] Most likely = שׁנ (= שׁוֹא). שׁוֹא is the most frequent equivalent of μάταιος in LXX.4 For our translator ταλαιπωρία is the most frequent rendition of שֹׁד: 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.

ἔνεπορεύετο יובל] The Gk verb ἐμπορεύομαι is never used in a genuine passive form, whereas יובל is passive with שָׁוְא as its subject. In G, 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 G 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 [H 12.3]) και κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ πρὸς Ιουδαν τοῦ ἐκδικήσας τὸν Ιακωβ κατὰ τὰς ὀδοὺς 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.

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 [H 12.4]) ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ ἐπέτερνισεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν κόποις αὐτοῦ ἐνίσχυσε πρὸς θεόν

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

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.
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 עָקַב is used there, for we are only told that Jacob came out of his mother’s womb, gripping the heel of Esau – ἥ χείρ αὐτοῦ ἐπειλημμένη τῆς πτέρνης Ησαυ· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ιακωβ < ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἐπειλήμμενη τῆς πτέρνης Ἱσαυ· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ιακωβ < ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἐπειλήμμενη τῆς πτέρνης Ἱσαυ· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ιακωβ. 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 Ιακωβ· ἐπτέρνικεν (וַיַּעַקְבֵנִי γάρ με ἢδη δεύτερον τοῦτο· τά τε πρωτοτόκια μου εἶληφεν καὶ νῦν εἶληφεν τὴν εὐλογίαν μου Ge 27.36. Then we seem to have here a new folk-etymology of the name יַעֲקֹב.

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.

κόσπος αὐτοῦ μετά The equation נא / κόσπος, 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 wrestling is expressed with πτέρνη παλαίω.

ἐνίσχυσε πρὸς θεον The equation προς / κόσπος, 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 wrestling is expressed with πτέρνη παλαίω.

ἐνίσχυσε μετά τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μετά τοῦ ἀνθρώπου δυνατός < שָׁרְךָ הָעָנָן הֲשָׁנְךָ עִם־אֱלֹהִים Ge 32.29. We see that three different prepositions are used with שְׁרָךָ: – עִם, עִם, אֵת, אֶל (this last in the next verse). ἡ εἰσαγία is obviously not a nota obiecti. Greek uses two: πρός + acc. and μετά + gen. The selection of πρός here does not mean that the Vorlage of Φ read here אָוֶן as in the next verse showing the equivalence [אֶל / μετά].

12.4 [H 12.5]) καὶ ἐνίσχυσε μετά ἀγγέλου καὶ ἡδυνάσθη· έκλαυσαν καὶ ἐδεήθησαν μου, ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ Ων εὐροσάν 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.

וַיַּעַקְבֵנִי γάρ με ἢδη δεύτερον τοῦτο· τά τε πρωτοτόκια μου εἶληφεν καὶ νῦν εἶληφεν τὴν εὐλογίαν μου Ge 27.36.
else or שָׂרַר, which, however, does not mean ‘to overpower,’ cf. A. ruled... Jd 9.22 (וַיֵּעֶל). See our discussion above at 10.11.

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

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.

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

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

This naturally reminds us of τοῦτο μού ἐστιν ὁ παντοκράτωρ τῶν ἀγίων καὶ μνημόσυνον γενεάς γενεὰς. Ex 3.15, as stated explicitly in Trg here – ἔλεον καὶ κρίμα φυλάσσου καὶ ἔλπιζε πρὸς τὸν θεόν σου διὰ παντὸς.

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

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

What is the value of the preposition in both Greek and Hebrew here? Our Ho passage is mentioned in BDB s.v. בָּא 14 under “often pregnancies with verbs of motion, when the movement to a place results in rest in it, into.” In five of the instances mentioned ס](http://www.example.com) 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 ὑπό + 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 ὡς μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ταῦτα τούτα Jo 23.7, εἰσελεύσονται Ἀσσύριοι εἰς Αἰγύπτον, καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι πορεύσονται πρὸς Ἀσσυρίους Is 19.23, Οὐκ εἰσελεύσεσθε εἰς αὐτοὺς

For a lucid presentation of the difficulty present also in ס}(http://www.example.com), see Wolff 1965.275f.
= τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσελέυσονται εἰς ὑμᾶς 3K 11.2. 8 By contrast we have in our Ho passage one person, God. Rashi’s comment here is illuminating: “on His promise and support with which He reassures you you can depend [commenting on בַּאֲלֵיךָ] and you shall return to Him [adding אָלֵיו].” This reminds us of a use of ἐν that is unique to St Paul: e.g. ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ Ro 9.1 παρακαλῶ τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν κυρίῳ Phil. 4.2. BDAG s.v. ἐν 4 © presents quite an extensive description, characterising this ἐν as “to designate a close personal relation in which the referent of the ἐν-term is viewed as the controlling influence.. expressions for this new life-principle .. to indicate the scope within which something takes place or has taken place, or to designate someth. as being in close assoc. w. Christ.” The Gk preposition here is then basically locative. 9 The two virtues are often found juxtaposed; in XII alone three more times – Ho 2.19, Mi 6.8, Zc 7.9. ἐλπίζει πρὸς τὸν θεόν σου καὶ ἐπιστρέφει πρὸς ὑμᾶς 58. While Rashi does, we should understand πρὸς αὐτόν. Note ἐν τίνι ἐπιστρέψομεν: Ma 3.7, preceded by ἐπιστρέψατε πρὸς με, καὶ ἐπιστραφήσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

Ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίμα The two virtues are often found juxtaposed; in XII alone three more times – Ho 2.19, Mi 6.8, Zc 7.9. ἐλπίζει πρὸς τὸν θεόν σου καὶ ἐπιστρέφει πρὸς ὑμᾶς 58. While Rashi does, we should understand πρὸς αὐτόν. Note ἐν τίνι ἐπιστρέψομεν: Ma 3.7, preceded by ἐπιστρέψατε πρὸς με, καὶ ἐπιστραφήσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

8 BDB ib. mentions also a case such as וַיִּקְוָּהשׁוּב מְאֹד לְאֶלֹהֶיךָ בְּמַעֲשֶׂהוּ Is 52.8, but this is quite distinct, for וַיִּקְוָּה is part of an idiomatic phrase and it is not exactly about a physical movement.

9 One non-Pauline example is וַיְהֵן בָּשָׂם וַיִּקְוָּה בַּיָּמָה יְהוָה בֵּית יִרְאֹת Joh 3.21. In BDAG ib. one finds a considerable number of examples adduced and also quite extensive bibliographical information.

10 Wolff (268) is desperate: “... ist als construction praegnans zu verstehen, wobei mit בָּשָׂמ means בָּשָׂמ and to approach, draw near’ and ‘to assemble, come together’ are two distinct notions. Besides, how is one to parse or vocalise בָּשָׂמ? In BH it occurs only three times, all in Nifal. The attestation in QH of this second homonym is negligible. We endorse Ziegler’s reading.12

12 We shall accordingly revise GELS s.v. ἐγγίζω 1 ad initium and ἐλπίζω 1 ad finem and Index s.v. ἐγγίζω delete 12) πι.
12.7 [H 12.8]) Χανααν ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ζυγὸς ἀδικίας, καταδυναστεύειν ἄγαπτη.

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

Χαναααν] The syntactic status in the verse of this first lexeme is unclear. In Χ what follows, i.e. ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ζυγὸς, can be analysed as an existential clause and an asyndetic relative clause, ‘Canaan, in whose hand there are,’ loved ...′ ≠ G. Alternatively Χ may be an abbreviation for ‘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 ἀναψυχὴ are not exclusively commercial or financial in nature.14

ζυγὸς ἀδικίας] The same Heb. phrase is rendered with a slight variation in ζυγὸν ἄδικον Am 8.5. ζυγὸς 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 Μα, and such does not fit its application to Canaan, either.

cαταδυναστεύειν] 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 ἀναψυχὴ 5 out of 37. Besides, ἀναψυχὴ is the second commonest word in SG translated with this Gk verb (7 times including Mi 2.2), following ἡμοῖος (8 times).

12.8 [H 12.9]) καὶ εἶπεν Ἐφραίμ Πλῆν πεπλούτηκα, εὐρήκα ἀναψυχὴν ἐμαυτῷ, πάντες οἱ πόνοι αὐτοῦ οὐχ εὑρεθήσονται αὐτῷ δι’ ἀδικίας, ἃς ἠμαρτεν.

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.’

Πλῆν] 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] 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. 

Our translator is possibly envisioning a farmer looking over the fertile field and regaining some inner strength after the hard work; note πόνοι in the second half of the verse.

πάντες οἱ πόνοι αὐτοῦ οὐχ ἐὑρεθήσονται αὐτῷ.] = Λύνοντας

One would not know whether or not the translator is attempting to smooth out the difficult text of Ἡ.

πάς 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 negatived. Another example is οὐ μὴ πλημμελήσωσιν πάντες οἱ ἐλπίζοντες ἐπ’ αὐτῶν ‘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 לָל, see JM § 160 oo.

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 synonym and the Heb. word used here, יְגִיעַ. This reminds us of nouns meaning ‘sin’ sometimes mean ‘penalty incurred for committing a sin’; see GELS s.v. ἁμαρτία 4 and ἁμάρτημα 3, developments influenced by Hebrew, in which words such as אֲשֶׁר, תַּחְפָּן, כֹּל 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 κατοικούμενην ‘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. 

ἀδικίας, ἄς ήμαρτεν] Most likely = μὴν ἂν οὐκ ἔγραφα ἡ παρὰ ἢ ἢ ὃς ἴσους κατέστησεν αὐτῷ ἢ καὶ ἔμεθα λάθεμα ἢ χάσαμα ἢ ἔχαθεν ἢ χαράζοντος μοι ἥμαρτος ἳοι ἄν ἐμίκρονοι ἢ ἀλήθεια ἀλλὰ ἢ ἔργα ἢ ἔρις ἢ ἄγνωστον μοι ἀλλὰ ἄλλη ἡ Ὁσα. 

12.9 [῎Ἠ 12.10]) ὡς δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου ἀνήγαγόν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἔτι κατοικίσας σε ἐν σκηναῖς καθὼς ἡμέρᾳ 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.

15 See GELS s.v. d.
16 For a discussion with more examples, see SSG § 22 wo.
ἀνήγαγόν σε. One misses in something like מִכֶּלֶת. It may have dropped out inadvertently. See below at 13.4, for which a 4Q fragment has preserved quite an expanded text which includes אֲנָכִי הָעֵלֵי. Maybe ה means “I the Lord have been your God from the land of Egypt,” so Keil (1975.149). Joosten (152) finds astonishing the notion that the relation between the Lord and Israel was absent prior to the Exodus. Let’s recall, however, that Hosea alluded at vs. 5 to Ex 3.15, where the God of Israel had revealed Himself to Israel for the first time as יהוה.

ἡμέρᾳ ἑορτῆς] The use of the sg. form pace ἔτη is odd; this can hardly be a reference to the passover, the day of the Exodus.

καὶ λαλήσω πρὸς προφήτας, καὶ ἐγὼ ὑπελήθυνα καὶ ἐν χερσίν προφητῶν ὁμοιώθην.

and I shall speak to prophets, and I multiplied visions and was compared through prophets.

καὶ λαλήσω ἃ ἐλάλησα πρὸς προφήτας ἐπὶ προφητῶν καὶ ἐν χερσίν ἑωράσων ὁμοιώθην] The Tiberian accentuation indicates a w-qatálti form, ἐλάλησα.

πρὸς προφήτας ἡμέρᾳ ἑορτῆς] A person spoken to is introduced with either ἐν or σὲ, but not with σὺ, which introduces a topic or subject-matter. The vacillation between ἐν and σὺ is not uncommon.17 ὁμοιώθην ἃ ἐλάλησα] Both and are baffling. If ὁμοιώω and ἐλάλησα do are to retain the primary notion of ‘similar,’ one would like to know “Similar to what or to whom?” The context does not provide any clue. All that can be said is that they probably mean “to speak about A metaphorically or figuratively, likening it to B.”18 Such a use is unknown elsewhere in either language. The passive form of suggests that the translator may be reading as a Hitpael form, ἐλάλησα with /t/ assimilated to /d/, so Pesh. /e(t)ddammit/. Even so the basic problem remains, cf. לְעֶלְיוֹן אֲדַמֶּה חוּם קֹדֶשׁ. Is 14.14. See Cyril PG 71.293: “une imitation de Dieu” (Jan 152).

καὶ μὴ Γαλααδ ἐστίν· ἄρα ψευδεῖς ἦσαν ἐν Γαλγαλ. Unless Gilead is there, rulers in Gilgal then, offering sacrifices, would be false. Besides, their altars are like mounds on a parched field.

17 One could only marvel at the ingenuity of Keil (1975.150): “the inspiration of God came down to the prophets from above.”
18 So Rashi, whose alternative is “I appeared to them under various shapes,” Ibn Ezra, Radaq, HALOT I 1 b), Clines I Pi. b, and Kaddari I 2. Cf. Dorival et al. 1988.307f.
εἰ μὴ Γαλααδ ἐστίν] = καὶ γενέθηκε. G is rather vague. In the light of 6.5 above, where also Gilead is denounced, H’s γενέθηκε is specifically denoting idolatrous practices going on there.

ἄρα [ἄρα here is inferential, introducing an apodosis, a function which is foreign to ἄρα. Our translator’s rendition of this Heb. particle varies: adversative πλὴν Ho 12.9, Zp 3.7, Zc 1.6; ἄρα Jn 2.519; ὅπως Ho 4.4; ὃ Zp 1.18.]

ψευδεῖς] The equivalence ψευδής / שֵׁא occurs also at Ho 10.4, Jo 2.9 and Zc 10.2b.

καὶ [καὶ both of these highly frequent particles relate sometimes to an entire statement that follows unlike in καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς μετ’ αὐτῆς ἔδωκεν Ge 3.6. Cf. Καὶ κύριος παρεβίβασεν τὸ ἁμάρτημα σου ἐπὶ μαίνεται τῷ θεῷ ἑφικτάτικος Ge 2.2.

2K 12.13.

χέλωναι [χέλωνai An equivalence nowhere attested in LXX. BDB s.v. ἵλις “heap of ruins” mentions seven instances including our Ho case; a check of LXX renditions, if it is rendered at all, displays extreme variation. Joosten (153) insists on assigning the primary sense of the Gk noun, ‘tortoise.’

The Gk noun has more meanings: among those mentioned in LSJ III “pent-house or shed for protecting besiegers” and 6 “tomb with arched roof” are relevant to our Ho case. Our translator may be using the noun metaphorically, but the back of a tortoise is flat and low, which does not fit an image of altar.

See Driver 1954.238.

χέρσον [χέρσον ἀγροῦ] As a translation of שָׂדָי תַּלְמֵי ‘furrows in a field’ it leaves something to be desired. The exactly same rendition occurred earlier at 10.4; see our remarks there.

12.12 [H 12.13]) καὶ ἀνεχῶρησεν Ἰακώβ εἰς πεδίον Συρίας, καὶ ἐδούλευσεν Ἰσραήλ ἐν γυναικὶ καὶ ἐν γυναικὶ ἑφυλάξατο.

Jacob withdrew into the field of Syria, and Israel slaved for a woman and for a woman he guarded (cattle).

καὶ ἀνεχῶρησεν Ἰακώβ] An equivalence occurring twice more in LXX (Ex 2.15, Je 4.29), and ἵλις is also so rendered three times (Jo 8.15, Jd 4.17, 19 Pace Joosten (152) this form is different from what we have in Ho 12.11, ἄρα. On ἄρα, see GELS s.v.

20 He mentions that such a sense of ἵλις is known in Aramaic and Late Hebrew. This applies, however, to no Jewish Aramaic, but Syr. /gallā/ and Mandaic /gal/. The only instance in Late Hebrew occurs in Sifra Shmini 4.3, which is perhaps being implied with “nh.” in Cohen s.v. GLL, 5, p. 126.
HOSEA

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, 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: ἀπόδραθί Ge 27.43 (יִרְאָה).

ἐν γυναικὶ ἰσα [bis] The Gk preposition here is a Hebraism, mechanically reproducing the so-called Bet pretii, ‘Bet of price.’ The source text displays a standard Greek usage: ἐδούλευσά σοι δέκα τέσσερα ἰσα τῶν δύο θυγατέρων σου Μεσαρίτικας ἐφεύγεσα ἡ μνήμη καὶ ἔσθητε βασιλείας Ge 31.41. Joosten (154) mentions another source text where a different Gk preposition is found: Δουλεύσω σοι ἐπὶ ἤπα σφήν Χαζής (βραχίον) τῆς θυγατρός σου Ge 29.18, sim. vs. 20. An affiliated usage is evidenced in Classical Greek, e.g. περὶ ἐκεῖνης κινδνεύειν ‘to take risks for that (land)’ Hdt. 8.74.

ἐφυλάξατο [Bet] The source text is most likely πάλιν ποιμανῶ τα πρόβατα σου καὶ φυλάξοι ἄναρχης ἀνής Ge 30.31. Is the shift to the middle voice in G 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.

The absence of an object complement here is striking, whereas in Ge 31.41 the preceding ίσα ἀνής γένεσας makes such superfluous. The Ho version effectively deals with a slight oddity arising from Ge 31.41 Μεσαρίτικας ἐφεύγεσα ἡ μνήμη καὶ ἔσθητε βασιλείας, for Jacob was not aiming to acquire the entire flock of Laban. Hence we read ἰσα for a second time, and not βασιλείας. 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 G’s choice ofἐν at Ge 31.41 may have been meant in its locative sense: ἐν τοῖς προβάτοις σου ‘among your sheep.’

21 Joosten (153) holds that our translator is concerned over the patriarch’s dignity.
22 Interestingly G puts the same in Isaac’s mouth, though Ḥ says יֵל ib. 28.2. Note also ἄνεχωρησα To 1.19 Ḥ // ἀπέδρασα Ḥ.
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.

1K 19.10).
12.13 (Ἑ 12.14)) καὶ ἐν προφήτῃ ἀνήγαγε κύριος τὸν Ἰσραήλ έξ Αἰγύ-πτου, καὶ ἐν προφήτῃ διεφυλάχθη.

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

12.14 (Ἑ 12.15) ἐθύμωσεν Εφραιμ καὶ παρώργισε, καὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐκχυθήσεται, καὶ τὸν ὀνειδισμόν 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.

καὶ παρώργισε ταμρούριν] Confronted by a most unusual collocation ἤτηρέω, ἤτηριν, ἤτηρης in H is probably translating free by paring two common synonyms. A lexeme derived from ἠτηρος is not used with reference to anger, the only exception being ᾦτηρος ἀξιομακρινής Da 8.7 > ἤτηρωθη ἔπ ἀυτῶν LXX, but ἔξηγραν-ἀνθή (‘it became savage’) πρὸς αὐτῶν TH. Ἑ may be elliptical for καὶ παρεπίκρανεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, παρώργισαν αὐτὸν ἐν γῇ ἀνύδρῳ; Ps 77.40.

ἐκχυθήσεται] Far less ambiguous than Ἑ ὄσις.

καὶ παρωργισε ανειδισμον αυτου] The pronoun may refer to Ephraim (subjective genitive) or to God (objective gen.). The suffix pronoun of ἐθύμωσεν is just ambiguous.

27 Then, pace Nyberg (1935.99), παρεπίκρανεν is not serving as a pseudo cognate object synonymous with ἤτηρε.
κύριος אֲדֹנִי As a reference to God אֲדֹנִי is most unusual. We are not aware of any other instance of pl. אֲדוֹנִי with or without a suffix pronoun attached except אֲדוֹנִי as equivalent to יהוה.
13.1) Κατὰ τὸν λόγον Εφραιμ δικαιώματα αὐτὸς ἐλαβεν ἐν τῷ Ισραήλ καὶ ἐθετο αὐτὰ τῇ Βααλ καὶ ἀπέθανε. 

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

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

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

καὶ ἐθετο] = וַיָּשֶׂם.

13.2) καὶ προσέθεντο τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν ἐτι, καὶ ἐποίησαν ἐαυτοῖς χώνευμα ἕκ τοῦ ἄργυριού αὐτῶν κατ’ εἰκόνα εἰδώλων, ἔργα τεκτόνων συντετελεσμένα αὐτοῖς· αὐτοὶ λέγουσιν Θύσατε ἀνθρώπους, μόσχοι γὰρ ἐκλελοίπασιν.

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.”

וַיָּשֶׂם כָּלָה לְהָם מַעֲשֵׂה עֲצַבִּים כִּתְבוּנָם מִכַּסְפָּם מַסֵּכָה לָהֶם וַיַּעְשֻׁו לַחֲטֹא יוֹסִיפוּ וְעַתָּה: יִשָּׁקוּן עֲגָלִים אָדָם زֹבְחֵי אֹמְרִים הֵם לָהֶם כֻּלֹּה συντεִּתְּלֵטֵה לָּהֶם כֻּלֹּה] Translated by Joosten (155) as “achevés par eux,” and he assumes that the verb was read as Pi. כָּלָה. 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: כָּלָה מַעֲשַׂה חָרָשִׁים כִּתְבוּנָם כִּלָּה מִכַּסְפָּם מַסֵּכָה לָּהֶם וַיַּעְשֻׁו לַחֲטֹא.

1 For more examples, see BDB s.v. I כָּלָה 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 τεμάχιον as its Hebrew equivalent here. A more common rendering of τεμάχιον is ὀμοίωμα, e.g. Ex 20.4, often with reference to an object of idol worship, and once μορφή Jb 4.16.

ἐκλελοίπασιν ἵσθην] 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 τούτῳ ἔσονται ὡς νεφέλη πρωΐνη καὶ ὡς δρόσος ὀρθρινῆ πορευόμενη, ὡς χνοὺς 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.

13.4) ἐγὼ δὲ κύριος ὁ θεός σου στερεῶν οὐρανὸν καὶ κτίζων γῆν, οὐ αἱ χεῖρες ἐκτισαν πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιὰν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οὐ παρέδειξαν σοι αὐτὰ τοῦ πορεύεσθαι ὡς ὁμοίωμα καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνήγαγόν σε ἀπὸ ἀκρίδων, καὶ θεὸν πλὴν ἐμοῦ οὐ γνώσῃ, καὶ σῶζων οὐκ ἔστιν πάρεξ 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.

This extensive plus in Θ 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, 4QXIIf (= 4Q78). The verses 3-5 are reconstructed by the editor3 as below:

3 In DJD 15.241.
στερεῶν | 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. נַעֲרָרָם מְבַצֵּר and מָגְרְמֵת De 1.28. With our deplorable skill in epigraphy we wonder if it is possible to read מבצר, i.e. מְבַצֵּר; the verb occurs twice in Piel, meaning ‘to fortify’: הַחוֹמָה לְבַצֵּר Is 22.10 and מֵאִית עֻזָּהּ מְרוֹם תְבַצֵּר וְכִי Je 51.53. Such a Piel could be factitive in value, i.e. ‘to make someone or something בָּצוּר’.

Let’s note that στερεῶ is used with reference to the creation of the universe in κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ πήξας αὐτόν, ὁ στερεώσας τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ Is 42.5, Ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ συντελῶν πάντα ἔξετείνα τὸν οὐρανὸν μόνος καὶ ἑστερέωσα τὴν γῆν Is 44.24 and τῷ στερεώσαντι τὴν γῆν ἐπὶ τῶν ὕδατών Ps 135.6; in all these cases the object of the verb is τὴν γῆν, not τὸν οὐρανὸν, and the verb translates Qal ἔρεθα.

κτίζων | The restoration of בורא instead of בורא is justifiable in view of ὃς ἔκτισεν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐρείπεν 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 στερεώσας Is 42.5 and στερεώσαντι Ps 135.6 as adduced above.

οὗ αἱ χεῖρες ἔκτισαν 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 ברא is unlikely.

πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιὰν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐράμεν | The same equivalence is found in Zp 1.5, 2C 33.3, 5, where it is also about idol worship as here.

τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ζωῆς | The Hif. verb ἔκαμα, 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. τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ζωῆς ἐκ Παισίων 4K 8.13, ἔκαμεν ‘and You showed me toil’ 4Q443 2.5. There are many additional instances of <ναο + suf. pers. + dir. obj.>, e.g. αἰτία πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐπέστηκε Ex 9.16, ἐπέστηκεν ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπον Is 39.4. Alternatively <ναο + suf. pers.> may be used as in ἔκαμα τῷ καὶ ἐπηράματεν ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανόν 4K 11.4. 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. ἔκαμα λαοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἔραμεν Ge 48.11, ἔκαμα λαοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν αἱ ἐρήμω τῶν ἐθνῶν αἱ ἐρήμω 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. ἔκαμα λαοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἔραμεν αἱ ἐρήμω ἐρήμω ἐρήμω ἐρήμω.”


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

A fragmentary context does not help to resolve a difficult text in בֵּיתַה. כֶּסֶר 4Q158 4.6. Qimron (2020.17) justly rejects the original editors’ interpretation of אֲאֵרָה on the ground that a plena spelling would be anomalous here. However, his text is difficult of interpretation. ‘I was shown
Let’s take a look at a related verb of sense perception, namely הִשְׁמִיעַ. Typical examples are אֶת־קֹלוֹ הִשְׁמִיעֲךָ De 4.36, אֶתְכֶם אַשְׁמִיע תִּצְמַחְנָה בְּטֶרֶם Is 42.9. We do not believe thatך אֵלַי in הַגּוֹיִם כְּלִמַּת עוֹד אֵלַיִךְ לֹא־אַשְׁמִיעַ Ez 36.15 contradicts this general picture; we would analyse the preposition אל not as a marker of indirect object, but as a marker of movement, in other words, it could be rewritten as לא או something like that.

What the n.pl. αὐτά refers to is not immediately apparent, probably constituents of the heavenly host.

If the Heb. form is not a plain misprint in lieu of הָרְאָה, it would be an astonishing form. Contamination between Lamed-Yod verbs on one hand and verbs of hollow roots and geminate roots on the other is unheard of. Hence הֲקִימוֹתִי or הֲסִבּוֹתִי producing הַעֲלוֹתִי is extremely unlikely.

The force of the emphatic ἐγὼ ἐν γῇ ἀοίκητῳ is recognisable in Trg here, though its text is as abbreviated as MT: ‘I the Lord your God is the one who brought you up.’ Similarly Pesh.: /nā (’)nā māryā ’alāhāk d(’)asseqtāk /

13.5) ἐγὼ ἐποίμαινόν σε ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐν γῇ ἀοίκητῳ

I shepherded you in the wilderness in a non-habitable land

The second Heb. noun is a hapax. After a long etymological, comparative-Semitic exposition HALOT 1737b comes down to “dryness, aridness, parched land,” which is pretty close to ἀοίκητος here.6 to Abraham? A theophany would scarcely be expressed in this way, cf. יָנָא וַיֵּרָא אֵלָיו theophany is etymological, i.e. לא + הב, but what is one to do with the initial taw?
κατὰ τὰς νομὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐνεπλήσθησαν εἰς πλησμονήν, καὶ ὑψώθησαν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν· ἐπελάθοντό μου.

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

13.7) καὶ ἐσομαι αὐτοῖς ὡς πανθῆρ καὶ ὡς πάρδαλις κατὰ τὴν Ὀσσυρίων·

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

13.8) ἀπαντήσω ἐπί τὴν Ὀσσυρίων καὶ καταφάγονται αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ σκύμνοι δρυμοῦ, θηρία ἀγροῦ διασπάσω ἀὐτοὺς.

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.
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 ἀποροῦμενος with ἄρκος, a noun of common gender,10 as the subject our translator shows his awareness that νάχσω is normally used with a female as its agents. Note a variation in gender in ὅταν φύγῃ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ λέοντος καὶ ἐμπέσῃ 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 αὐτοὺς] = ἑαυτοὺς, i.e. ἑαυτόλευκος. 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 (ς ἀνίλβης).

The reconstruction of the 4Q fragment, ὁ ἄραλός ἔμαρτα,11 is questionable. A w-qatalti can continue a yiqtol, but would not be followed by yiqtol, i.e. ἐκατέρκησε. By contrast the tense sequence in ὧ follows the norm: .. ἐμπέσῃ ἄρκος ἀκάμεροι, namely a series of yiqtol’s with future value.

σκύμνοι δρυμοῦ λίβανοι For the 4Q fragment a word has been added, most likely on the basis of ὧ here: λίβανος. In BH, when a metaphor or figurative expression is prefixed with this preposition, the noun following is usually determinate, e.g. καριανοὶ ν πεψαν λίβανος.12 ‘like a lion he broke all my bones’ Is 38.13, see JM § 137 i. So we could have expected λίβανος. This rule is not water-tight. Even so the parallelism to the following ... ἡ ὄρει ἀπείση renders a cst. phrase highly probable. ἵνα is what is rendered with δρυμός the most frequently, 55 times.

13.9) τῇ διαφθορᾷ σου, Ἰσραήλ, τίς βοηθήσει;

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

9 ὧ [τοῖς] is suspect, and Segal (1958.66) justly emends the noun to τοῖς, i.e. τοῖς.  
10 Pace Joosten (158) not “toujours féminin”; in many cases the gender of this noun cannot be ascertained, e.g. ἄλλο ἂνριον δειωκάνειν ἐχον ἄρκον Da 7.5.  
11 So also Joosten 158.
CHAPTER XIII

13.10) ποῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου οὗτος; καὶ διασωσάτω σε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσίν σου· κρινάτω σε ὅν εἶπας Δός μοι βασιλέα καὶ ἀρχόντα. 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.”

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

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. καί 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 Ḥ, which Ḡ identified in the following verse. The acc. συστροφήν cannot be analysed otherwise. Alternatively, ἁρὰ can mean ‘to remove and take back ἁρὰ, an analysis which Ḡ did not opt for.

13.12) συστροφήν ἀδικίας. Εφραίμ, ἐγκεκρυμένη ἢ ἀμαρτία αὐτοῦ.

a gathering of injustice. Ephraim, his sin is hidden away.

συστροφήν[1] Among the words derivable from √צֶרֶר and identified in Index as equivalents of συστροφή is found ἁρὰ. This can apply to two more instances: Ho 4.19 (Ḥ צֶרֶר) and 2K 17.13L.

Ḡ has not only transformed the first two words of this verse into a direct object of אֶקַּח of vs. 11, but also broken up the cst. chain in Ḥ of אֶפְרָיִם, so that ἀν is now ἀν and συστροφή אֶפְרָיִם is an extraposed constituent of the following nominal clause.

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

13.13) ὠδῖνες ὡς τικτούσης ἥξουσιν αὐτῷ· οὗτος ὡς ὑποστῇ ἐν συντριβῇ 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.

颡ל ἥξουσιν ὡς τικτούσης δὲ τῆς παιδίσκης ταύτης, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐν συντριβῇ τέκνων.

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

The noun ἧξουσιν 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 Ḡ uses the pl. πρὶν ἐλθεῖν τὸν πόνον

We find, however, the sg. even where H has the pl.: ἐπὶ τῇ ὡδίνι αὐτῆς ἐκέκραξεν ἢ ἡ ἄλλη Is 26.17.18
οὗτος οἱ οὗ φρόνιμος οἳ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτήσατε ἢ ἡμᾶς ἀλήθειαν οὐκ ἔλημι ἢ
We have here two distinct syntactic patterns of nominal clause, for ὡδίνα means ‘he is an imprudent son.’

The use of οὗτος is another significant departure from H. Though in SG the fronting of a demonstrative pronoun as here is not unknown, in the overwhelming majority of cases its position agrees with the sequence in Hebrew. G had no Heb. Vorlage, which could have induced him to write οἱ οὗ φρόνιμος οἳ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτήσατε οὐκ ἔλημι ἢ
We owe the negator οὐ to Ziegler’s authoritative scripsi.

This common noun, whose syntactic analysis here is difficult, has left no trace in G. A st. est. form of μῆκος, which latter occurs in 2Kg 19.3 [= Is 37.3], is usually thought to denote an opening which emerges in a womb and through which a baby comes out. Our translator may not have been comfortable with gynaecological technical terms, seeing children being broken into pieces instead of their breaking out.

οὗ ἡ ὑποστῇ] In GELS s.v. ὑφίστημι I c an alternative rendition has been suggested: “unable to bear up, endure [sufferings].” This is, however, debatable, because the clause is meant to explain the son’s imprudence, who gives up instead of striving to protect his children in grave danger.

Out of the hand of Hades I shall rescue them and out of death I shall redeem them. Where is your justice, o death? Where is your goad, o Hades? Consolation is hidden from my eyes.

17 This case enables us to differentiate between this noun and ἄλλη ‘rope, cord.’ In the pl. the two nouns look identical: μῆκος ‘birth-pains’ Is 13.8, ‘ropes’ Ez 47.13.
18 CG also uses this noun mostly in the pl. when it denotes birth-pangs. A few references for its use in the sg. are mentioned in LSJ s.v. οὖς I, e.g. γυνὴ φεύγει πικρὰς ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄφαλος τοῦ φυλακτοῦντος τῆς ἡμῶν παρακλήσεως.
19 We have noted, however, the delaying of the dem. pron. cannot be entirely attributed to Hebrew influence, since this pattern became increasingly popular in Ptolemaic papyri (SSG p. 434, n. 4).
20 Nyberg’s (1935.104) one-member nominal clause, “wenn es Zeit ist,” is questionable.
21 Some later recensions, manuscripts, and patristic commentators have νῦν, which Wolff (287) rightly considers as a rendition of ἄλλη.
22 Kaddari 2006 s.v.: “a condition close to delivery.”
23 We fail to follow “daher” of SD 1176 here.
ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου? A rather free rendering of 'your pronouncement of verdict.' As free is Pesh. /zākūtāk/24 'your victory,' which is how Paul quotes this verse: ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νῖκος; 1Cor 15.55. Nyberg (1935.104f.) maintains that νίκη, a v.l. preserved in a few manuscripts, is original, of which δίκη is an inner-Greek correction. Even so νίκη is quite distinct from H. τὸ κέντρον σου is another pair which is difficult to harmonise the two words with each other. The Heb. noun, together with its homonym, קֶטֶב, occurs in BH only three more times (Dt 32.24, Is 28.2, Ps 91.6), and it lies in the semantic field of destruction. When a goad is applied, an animal may find it painful, but not destructive. According to Nyberg (1935.105) κέντρον represents דָּרְבָן or דרֶב, but such is graphically quite different from קטב.

25 παράκλησις נוח, Cf. λόγους παρακλητικούς νιχυμὶ δὲ דבֶר, Zc 1.13, and see also synetaraphη îa metamæleiaîa μου νεκρα νικη Ho 11.8, on which see above. We see that the notions of regret and consolation or comfort are not mutually contradictory.26

13.15) διότι οὖν ἀνὰ μέσον ἀδελφῶν διαστελεῖ. ἐπάξει καύσωνα ἀνέμον κύριος ἐκ τῆς ερήμου ἐπὶ αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀναξηρανεῖ τὰς φλέβας αὐτοῦ, ἐξερημώσει τὰς πηγὰς αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς καταξηρανεῖ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τὰ επιθυμητὰ αὐτοῦ. Because he will make a division between brothers. The Lord will bring a hot wind from the desert on him, and will dry up his springs. He will dry up his land all things that are dear to him. μητρὸς κορίτσι προφανή: he will make a division between brothers. The Lord will bring a hot wind from the desert on him, and will dry up his springs. He will dry up his land all things that are dear to him. μητρὸς κορίτσι προφανή: Because he will make a division between brothers. The Lord will bring a hot wind from the desert on him, and will dry up his springs. He will dry up his land all things that are dear to him. μητρὸς κορίτσι προφανή.

H as it stands does make sense. Most of the discrepancies between H and G in this verse are explicable in terms of shift between scriptio plena and scriptio defectiva, or between yod and waw with consequential changes in vocalisation. One cannot say with confidence what the Vorlage of G actually looked like. Thus ἀνὰ μέσον = יכ, so Pesh. /bēy/; ἐπάξει = שיב, ἐπὶ αὐτὸν = ימי; ἀναξηρανεῖ = שב, so Pesh. /tahrev/; ἐξερημώσει = ביר, so Pesh. /tawbeš/; τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ = יפק. Besides διαστελεῖ = יפריד, so Pesh. /nefroš/.27

25 דרֶב is unattested in BH. Nyberg rightly mentions Ec 12.11, where דָּרְבָן is rendered with βούκεντρον, which, incidentally, occurs also at 1K 13.21L as a v.l. of δρέπανον.
26 To our translator the notion of “revenge,” an alternative sense mentioned in DCH s.v. בָּאָשׁ, must have been unthinkable.
27 /nefroq/ in Nyberg (1935.106) must be a typo.
There still remain, however, a couple of matters that need to be addressed.

1) The Tiberian accentuation makes a cst. phrase from יהוה רוח, which would then stand in apposition to רוח קדימים. This Heb. word is basically a synonym of מזרח ‘east.’ That it is not an adjective meaning ‘eastern’ is shown in Ez 17.10, 19.12, 27.26, where we have a cst. phrase with the article attached to רוח קדימים alone. The value of this construct phrase is that of origin, i.e. ‘wind originating in the east’; note also ענמון עד תהלוסת ח in 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 קְוָּסְוָה ‘hot wind,’ not an adjective meaning ‘hot.’ In a rendition such as ὡς ἀνέμον καύσων κְוָּסְוָה, Je 18.17 the focus is not on where the wind originates, and קְוָּסְוָה is in apposition. Its appositional status is evident in ענמון ז’est קְוָּסְוָה in Ez 17.10 and ענמון ז’est קְוָּסְוָה ib. 19.12, where the def. article is attached to קְוָּסְוָה alone; this is probably reflecting the Heb. syntax here ז’est רוח קדימים, but its syntactic structure is distinct from that of, and readers ignorant of Hebrew would analyse the Gk. phrase differently. In Hebrew also קְוָּסְוָה began to be used as an ellipsis for יִשְׁסֶה, which is the case in our Ho instance and Ho 12.1(2), so also in מזרח יִשְׁשָּׁה in Jb 27.21 > ἀναλήμψεται αὐτὸν καύσων. In ἀνεμόφθοροι ‘wind-blasted’ Ge 41.6, 23, 27 < שְׁדוּפֹת קדימים, 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 σκεῦη τὰ ἐπιθυμητὰ αὐτοῦ the rendering of ἐπιθυμητὰ with καταξηρανεῖ is striking. The Heb. verb שָׁסָה 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 σκεῦη 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 Θ is not using שָׁסָה this time?

28 So Pesh. /tētē madnḥā rūḥēh d-māryā/. In Syriac, too, the noun /madnḥā/ 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. /šarq/ ‘east.’

30 Cf. SSG § 33 c.

31 Note Vulg. Adducet urentem ventum (‘a hot-burning wind’) Dominus.
14.1) ἀφανισθήσεται Σαμάρεια, ὅτι ἀντέστη πρὸς τὸν θεὸν αὐτῆς· ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ πεσοῦνται αὐτοὶ, καὶ τὰ ὑποτίτθια αὐτῶν ἐδαφισθήσονται, 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.

14.2) Ἐπιστράφητι, Ἰσραήλ, πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου, διὸτι ἡσθένησας ἐν ταῖς ἁδικίαις σου.

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

πρὸς] This preposition is often chosen to go with the verb ἐπιστρέφω to express repentance. The corresponding Heb. preposition can be רָע as here or לָא: רָע also at Am 4.6, 8, 9, 10, 11 and לָא at Ho 5.4, 6.1, 7.10, 14.3. A rare exception is הָיָה רָע > ἐπὶ κύριον De 4.30, 30.2.
14.3) ἔλαβετε μεθ᾽ ἑαυτῶν λόγους καὶ ἐπιστράφητε πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεὸν ὑμῶν. ἐίπατε αὐτῷ ὅπως μὴ λάβητε ἁδίκιαν καὶ λάβητε ἀγαθά, καὶ 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.'

λόγους] Probably meaning 'verbalised thought.'

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

ὅπως μὴ] In H there is nothing that would correspond to ὅπως, and μὴ is most likely = בל. But אשתוعدد cannot be said to God. Already Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and Radaq join עם with ו, but they must know of the syntactic irregularity of such an analysis. The Vorlage of G probably read also בל, which he emended to בל. This, however, necessitated quite a transformation of the text. They could not say to God והתחיה בל יניקה .. אשתוعدد .. בל��שתוعدد, but only והתחיה בל יניקה .. אשתוعدد, which would fit the following נישלח. 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 H reminds one of what Abram said to his wife when they were about to enter Egypt: וְנָשֶׁלָם וְקַח־טוֹב עָוֹן כָּל־תִּשָּׂא אֵלָיו אִמְרוּ אֶל־יְהוָה וְשׁוּבוּ דְּבָרִים עִמָּכֶם קְחוּ: שְׂפָתֵינוּ פָרִים לόγους.

The conjunction ὅπως here "introduces a noun clause of command, instruction, decision and suchlike." The use of the subjunctive mood fits such a semantic connotation. Hence a sentence like εἶπατέ μοι ὅπως τοῦτο γεγραμμένον ἦ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ 'you told me that this is written in the book' is impossible.

1 Though extensive, Nyberg’s (1935.107-09) argument that בל 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 ὅρισμόν, ὅπως .. ἐμβληθήσεται 'a decision that .. is to be thrown in' Da 6.7 τῆ, 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 λέγεται ὅπως .. μηδεμία .. γίγνεται 1E 8.22, as correctly analysed in SD (563) "wird euch mitgeteilt, dass .. keinerlei .. entstehen darf."
καρπὸν χειλέων ἡμῶν] = שְׂפָתֵינוּ פְרִי. The phrase in Gr is very difficult. Gr probably means ‘words of thanks or adoration’ (so GELS s.v. ἀνταποδίδωμι 1 d) or ‘we shall act in line with our pledge.’

14.4) Ασσουρ οὐ μὴ σώσῃ ἡμᾶς, ἐφ’ ἵππον οὐκ ἀναβησόμεθα, οὐκέτι μὴ εἴπωμεν Θεοὶ ἡμῶν, τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν· ὤ ἐν σοι ἐλεήσει ὄρφανον.

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).

οὐ μὴ σώσῃ] 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 ἡμῶν[ Gr did not see here a plural of majesty, which accords with his analysis of ἐργοῖς as pl. (ἔργοις).

This phrase is not vocative, cp. ἐπὶ τοῦ καλουμένου τόπου Βουνός 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] = יְרַחֵם active, ≠ יְרֻחַם passive.

But how does this last clause, in Gr and H 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 אַלְמָנוֹת וְדַיַּן יְתוֹמִים אֲבִי קָדְשָׁו בִּמְעוֹן אֱלֹהִים Ps 68.6, and see also Ex 22.22, Dt 3.24, Ps 10.14. This accords well with H. The message that comes through out of Gr 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 σοι ἐπιστρέψεις· ἐλεόν καὶ κρίμα φυλάσσου εἰς καθιστήματα. ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπίστασιν ἐρσεῖς ἐρνάμιν εἰς καθιστήματα.

14.5) ιάσομαι τὰς κατοικίας αὐτῶν, ἀγαπήσω αὐτοὺς ὀμολογοῦς, διότι ἀπέστρεψεν ή ὄργη μου ἀπ’ αὐτῶν.

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

The reference is not only to their houses and dwellings, but also by implication to inhabitants in them. The verb ἱάομαι can mean ‘to repair’ with τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ κατεσκαμμένον ‘the altar which had been razed to the ground’ 3K 18.32 as the object; similarly with ἄγγος ὀστράκινον ‘earthen vessel’ Je 19.11. As the objects of divine love and the target of divine anger humans here might look more likely at the back of the translator’s mind. But we need to note that מושב mostly means ‘dwelling,’ and only once in BH ‘dweller’: הַמַּלֶּה מֹשְׁבֹתָם מִתרָכָם 2Sm 9.12 (产业集聚ς, v.l.产业集聚 as here).

The primary semantic component of נדבה is not mutual agreement or consent between the two parties involved, but free will not involving compulsion. One could say that God, having observed Israel’s sincere repentance, is feeling Himself to be under inner compulsion to act mercifully and renounce an expression of His anger. Let’s note מושב ירא and נדבהoir ירא נדבה וקד הפることができ וקרוא תודה וקרוא תור מיחץ וקרוא. Am 4.5.8 ἀπέστρεψεν שב] The Gk verb need be analysed as intransitive, though it can be used transitively as in φόβος κυρίου ἀπεστρέψει πάσαν ὀργήν Si 1.21, though ὀργή here means ‘anger (as a sinful act).’ Ziegler is certainly right in following Rahlfis here. Their reading is definitely superior to ἀπέστρεψεν τὴν ὀργήν μου ἀπ᾿ αὐτῶν as read by Swete,9 for who would the subject of the verb be? שב cannot be transitive, either.

I shall be as dew to Israel, it will blossom as a lily and it will put down its roots as Lebanon.

βαλεῖ γ] All the three Greek verbs in parallelism are in the fut., whereas in Heb, γ alone is explicitly marked as volitive as against הב ג. If G’s Vorlage read the same as Heb, it could have been translated with βάλοι (opt.) or βαλέτω (imprv.).10 ὁς ὁ λίβανος καλβῶν] Without reference to Heb, ὁ λίβανος spelled and printed with a non-capital Lambda could mean either ‘frankincense’ or ‘frankincense tree,’ for which Hebrew would say ליבנה. However, the prophet

7 Pace Nyberg (1935.110) with his “indem ich mich ihnen wieder zuwende” the suffix in מושב can be syntactically analysed as in ינתניך ‘you gave to me’ Josh 15.19. On this issue, see IM § 125 ba.
8 Cf. LSJ s.v. ὀμολόγος 2: “confessedly, openly.”
9 Some manuscripts do agree with Swete.
10 Driver (1892.54) assigns a modal value to γ ἵνα ‘let him flourish and strike forth his roots.’
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 ה, there would be no option but to read “Lebanon.”

14.7) πορεύονται οἱ κλάδοι αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσται ὡς ἐλαία κατάκαρπος, καὶ ἡ ὅσφρασία 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.*

This appears to be the only and first instance of πορεύομαι in the sense of ‘to grow’ (of a plant), whereas ה does seem to have such a sense in a figurative expression on the growth of the wicked in נוֹקֵת יֵלְכוּ Je 12.2. However, such a semantic extension is easy to understand; a growing plant is not stationary, its growth means to move forward.

This is the only attestation of this equivalence in SG. As is clear from its etymology, יֹנֶקֶת means “young shoot (of a plant).” Other translation equivalents are βλαστός ‘bud, shoot’ (Jb 15.30), παραφυάς ‘branch, offshoot’ (Ps 79.12), and ράδαμνος ‘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.

Nowhere else in LXX this equivalence occurs. Besides, ה is a fairly common word, and κατάκαρπος as well as its two related lexemes, κατακάρπως and κατακάρπωσις 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 רַעֲנָן. In XII, the adverb, a hapax, meets us in Κατακάρπως κατοικηθήσεται Ιερουσαλήμ ‘Jer. will be densely populated’ Zc 2.4 for מַשֵּׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל 2.8, where the translator may be thinking of רֶשֶׁת.

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 יִשְׁרָאֵל (יה 10.3, 4).
Λιβάνου But for Λιβάνου this could be spelled λιβάνου ‘of frankincense,’ which would fit ὀσφρασία. 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 ἔξανθήσει ὡς ἁμπέλος 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.

| 12 The use of ἐπιστρέφω καί joined with another verb is a mechanical reproduction of a similar use of ἐπιστρέφω καί to indicate repetition of what happened beforehand or restoration to a former state. Similarly ἐπιστρέψωμεν καὶ ἀνοικοδόμησομεν τὰς ἐρήμους Χαρῶν καὶ νιβὴν νασὼν Mi 1.4, see GELS s.v. ἐπιστρέφω II 4 b and SSG § 64, “Hendiadys.” Alternatively we have here a response to the earlier call ἐπιστράφητε vs. 3, sim. vs. 2. Then we would be having to do with an ordinary ἐπιστρέφω.

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

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

ἔξανθήσει = ἔξανθα. Whether the Vorlage of ᾳ 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 atnach with the preceding word, ἔπεμψα is the subject of the following nominal clause, and not of the preceding verb.

12 An example of the latter, asyndetic construction is ἔσχες ἀκράτας τῶν χαίρων Ge 30.31, and ἄρα ἀκράτας τῶν χαίρων. [ntbnwn] in the Leiden Peshitta is probably a typo for [ntpnwn] (= /netpnōn/).

13 Where ἐπιστρέψωμεν is redundant in the light of ἀνοικοδομησομεν.

14 We agree with Joosten (166) pace Coote (1974.165-68), who postulates ἡρῶ (sic!) in Σ’s Vorlage.
14.9) ἀνεπράσσεται ἑαυτῷ ἡ ἕλπις σου; ἠνάγκασε αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπισκέψεως μου τοῦ Σορὰ (ἡμείς) ἐπὶ τήν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Κυρίου. Ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ προσέρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην τοῦ Κυρίου ἐν μέρει τοῦ Θωρᾶ, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην τοῦ Πολιτείας τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ: ἐκείνης τὸ Εφραίμ, τί αὐτῷ ἐτι καὶ εἰδώλοις; ἐγὼ ἐταπείνωσα αὐτόν, καὶ ἐγὼ κατισχύσω αὐτόν. Ἐγὼ ὡς ἄρκευθος βροα, ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὁ καρπὸς σου εὕρηται.

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.

14.10) τίς σοφὸς καὶ συνήσει ταῦτα; ἢ συνετὸς καὶ ἐπιγνώσεται αὐτά; διότι εἰδεχθεί σαρκὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ δίκαιοι πορεύσονται ἐν αὐταῖς, οἱ δὲ ἁσθενεῖς ἁσθενήσουσιν 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 11QP-s.
The Heb. interrogative pronoun here looks like introducing a generalising relative clause and the use of the jussive, יָבֵן, is to be noted:

‘Whoever is wise let him understand these matters.’ See also מִי־יָרֵא יָשֹׁב Ju 7.3, מִי־יָרֵא יָשֹׁב 2C 36.23. The use of the jussive seems to be optional, as can be seen in מִי־בְּכֶם מִכָּל־עַמּוֹ Dt 20.8, i.e. not מִי־בָכֶם. Also with מִי־בָכֶם אֶעֱשֶׂה לְכֶם 2S 21.4. See further in JM § 144 fa. Τίς and τί are used in SG in an analogous manner, e.g. τίνος ἐστίν, αὐτῷ ἀποδώσει ‘whosever 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 Μωρασθῆ ἐν ἡμέραις Ἰωαθάμ καὶ Ἀχαζ καὶ Εζεκίου βασιλέων Ἰουδᾶ, ὑπὲρ ὧν εἶδε περὶ Σαμαρείας καὶ περὶ Ιερουσαλήμ.

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.

Μωρασθῆ [Morashti] The translator probably did not know that the Heb. word is a gentilic of מֹרַשְׁתִי, 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 ὃν 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.

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 κλῆς. The prophet had just mentioned λόγος κυρίου, though the sg. λόγος cannot mean “one word,” but “a message.” 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 Θ, and are restored by Origen as Ἀκούσατε λαοί πάντες, as in our Mi passage.
of a resumptive pronoun to לְלָ is such a common enough phenomenon in BH that could not have caused our translator any difficulty; see כָּל הָלָּא תַּעֲרַ וָאָמַר בְּכָל הָלָּא כֻּלָּם אֵלֶּה ταῦτα πάντα Hb 2.6.

πάντες οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ ἡσυχᾷ A rather free rendering. As free is πόλιν σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτῇ < ταῦτα πάντα Hb 2.6. 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 πλήρωμα αὐτῆς.

ἔσται μαρτύριον ὡς probably understood as a genuine jussive, not a loosely used equivalent of ἦλθεν; the people are being told to accept the Lord as He is going to address them.

κύριος ἡσυχασμένος 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, ἵλεως γενοῦ < ἤμαρτε χάριν ἐφάνεται κύριε Am 7.2 as against ἐδειξέν μοι κύριος < τοις κύριοις ἐράνειν τοῖς κύριοις ib. 7.4.3 When he identified a single title as vocative, he writes κύριε once, e.g. μετανόησον, κύριε, ἐπὶ τούτῳ < ἐνδώρεται κύριε τὰ ἡμέραν ib. 7.3.

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

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

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

τὰ ὑψη τῆς γῆς [καὶ] ἐκ τῶν ὑψη τῆς γῆς 'the foremost leaders of the earth’ Is 24.4 the neut. τὰ ὑψη can only denote ‘high, elevated places.’

---

2 See BDB s.v. לְל 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 DJD 8.33 restores μάρτυρα, though there is no epigraphic reason for not reading μάρτυρον. Note Je 49 (42).5 Ἐστω κύριος ἐν ἡμῖν εἰς μάρτυρα (ῷς) δίκαιον καὶ πιστόν.
5 This example can be added in GELS s.v. μάρτυριον 1 a.
6 Rashi takes the Heb. phrase here as meaning ‘elevated but spiritually crude people’ (חרים והרעו).
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.

This is the only instance of this equivalence, and the selection of σαλεύω to render נמס is striking. The second verb chosen here, τήκω, comes more readily to the mind, cf. τὰ ὄρη ἐτάκησαν ὡς ὕδωρ ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου Ps 96.5 < נמסו כַּדּוֹג הָרִים. Note τὰ ὄρη ἐσείσθησαν (ἠστρ) ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ ἐσαλεύθησαν (היתмагו) Na 1.5.

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


We have here a highly frequent, pseudo preposition, a verbatim reproduction of the underlying Hebrew phrase. The Heb. substantive, פנים, very often combines in the cst. st. with a preposition: apart from, we have בִּפְנֵי, לִפְנֵי, פְּנֵי עַל. Other Hebrew substantives denoting body parts display a similar feature: עין, יָד, אֹזֶן, for instance. 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.


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, Ἰ is not about rainwater cascading down a hillside.

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 τακήσον τα on the basis of “the frequent LXX equivalence of τήκω σαλεύω 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; προσώπου on its own never means “before.”
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.

In Ἡ 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 Ἡ. 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.

Ἀσέβειαν .. ἁμαρτίαν ταῦτα .. χάτοις | In Ἡ no v.l. ἁμαρτίας (pl.)10 nor ταῦτα (sg.) is attested. Is ἁμαρτίαν harmonisation vis-à-vis ἀσέβειαν? “Jacob” here is not a reference to an individual. Hence its absence in the question is not a mechanical imitation of Ἡ. 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.

Ἡ ἁμαρτία τῆς Ἰουδαίας | Ἡ ἁμαρτία [ἡ ἁμαρτία οἴκου Ἰουδα] appears to be amiss, to be emended to ἡ ἁμαρτία τῆς Πατρίδος. The mention of ταῦτα at this point is too abrupt and out of place.

Τίς (2×) | This cannot mean ‘Who?’ This rare use of τίς as equivalent to τι also occurs in τίς σου ἡ ἐργασία ἐστί; ‘What is your occupation?’ Jn 1.8; πόσαι εἰσίν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι μου καὶ αἱ ἀνομίαι μου; δίδαξόν με τίνες εἰσίν ‘How many are my sins and my iniquities? Teach me what they are’ Jb 13.23. Also in an indirect question: ὁψεσθε τὴν γῆν τίς ἐστιν ‘Look at the land what it is like’ Nu 13.19. By contrast, BDB s.v. μὲν ἔνα 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 ὁμοῖοι γὰρ μὲν ἐστιν (Θύμι) Ju 13.17.

Οὐχὶ | 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 ὀπωροφυλάκιον ἄγρον καὶ εἰς φυτεῖαν ἀμπελώνος καὶ καταστάσεις εἰς χάος τοὺς λίθους αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς ἀποκαλύψω.<br>

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.

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 ἁμάρτησιν.
11 Cf. GELS s.v. 1.
The Heb. word means “heap of ruins,” and is not as specific as ὀπωροφυλάκιον. 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 ὀπωροφυλάκιον λύτην φήμῃ ἀραβαλῆμα εἰς ὀπωροφυλάκιον λύτην.

טו is more straightforward in its indication of the consequence of the divine punishment. By contrast, ג 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.

ה is more straightforward in its indication of the consequence of the divine punishment. By contrast, ג 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.

The NH text (4.41) has added the article in line with ט, τοῦ ἀγροῦ. 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, מָשָׂא קָרֶם.

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

The Heb. noun is determinate, which also can be generic as השדה or a reference to a specific location in or near the city. The NH text (4.42) replaces חַיָּלָה with φάραγξ, an equivalent far more frequent in LXX of γ, φάραγ and גי.

καὶ πάντα τὰ γλυπτὰ αὐτῆς κατακόψουσι καὶ πάντα τὰ μισθώματα αὐτῆς ἐμπρήσουσιν ἐν πυρί, καὶ πάντα τὰ εἰδωλια αὐτῆς θήσομαι εἰς ἁφανισμόν· διότι ἐκ μισθώματον πορνείας συνήγαγε καὶ ἐκ μισθώματον 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.

κατακόψουσι τὰς ῥομφαίας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα < λείποντα καὶ θηρίατον κατακόψουσιν ἐν πυρί 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. ἐμπρήσχε (passive). However, since Samaria (and its inhabitants included) is referred to with the 3fs pronoun in both ט and ג, her enemies must be meant, and that fits better the last two sg verbs.

In LXX the noun μίσθωμα always denotes a reward a prostitute receives for sexual services she provides, exactly as
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: זוֹנָה אֶתְנַן. 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 זוֹנָה 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 ἀφανισμὸν τὴν ἡμέραν οὐκ οὐκ ἀνασφαλέσται] The Gk preposition could have been left out as in θήσομαι τὴν Ἴερουσαλήμ λίθον καταπατούμενον ἀνεπίμβαλτον ἐπιτυπωμένον Zc 12.3. The translator is possibly thinking of θήσομαι Σαμάρειαν εἰς ὄπωροφυλάκιον ὶπταμεν ἐκ πυρί in vs. 6.

For θήσομαι the active voice form is restored for the NH text: θῆσομαι (5.1), whilst at vs. 6 the fragment reads θῆσομαι, 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 οὖν] Our translator, finding Ἡ difficult to interpret, may be translating freely, using a synonym of συνάγω. In order not to deviate too widely from Ἡ, he retained הֹוּנָה, but found יָשָׁבוּ impossible, reverting to יָשָׁבוּ 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 Ἡ in the direction of Ἡ: ἐος με[σθόματος πόρνης ἐπιστρέψουσιν. 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) Ἐνεκὲν τοῦτού κόψεται καὶ θρηνήσει, 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 מַעֲמָסָה, because that is what Tyre is going to earn in the new era, for she was compared to מַעֲמָסָה, vss. 15-17.

¹⁴ Κατέστρεψεν and συνέστρεψεν, 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.

κόψεται ἀσπέδα | אָסְפְּדָה | אֶסְפְּדָה | עַל־זֹאת: | כִּבְנוֹת.

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. G 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 H. 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. ἀνυπόδετος.

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 ἀνυπόδετος.

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 τάνιμα and following it: Jb 30.29, Is 34.13, 43.20. In all the six instances יענה occurs as a nomen rectum in יענה בנות, and thrice only (Is 43.20, Je 27[50].39, Mi 1.8) 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 ἐλθὲν ἐως Ιουδα καὶ ἤψατο ἐως πύλης λαοῦ μου, ἐως Ιεροσάλημ.

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

κατεκράτησεν ἡ πληγή | כִּי־בָאָה מַכּוֹתֶיהָ אֲנוּשָׁה | אֲנוּשָׁה | כִּי־בָאָה מַכּוֹתֶיהָ | כִּי־בָאָה מַכּוֹתֶיהָ | אֲנוּשָׁה | כִּי־בָאָה מַכּוֹתֶיהָ | אֲנוּשָׁה | כִּי־בָאָה מַכּוֹתֶיהָ | 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 Hebrew הַפָּלֶגֶתָה אֲנוּשָׁה מַכָּתִי | כִּי־בָאָה מַכּוֹתֶיהָ אֲנוּשָׁה | כִּי־בָאָה מַכּוֹתֶיהָ אֲנוּשָׁה.

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.
The feature of grammatical concord is troublesome in this short verse; הָאְבּ (fsg) followed by צִּנַּה (msg.).

Unlike in vs. 8 the prophet’s identification with his coreligionists is here now manifest in G as well.

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

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

μεγαλύνεσθε] = μεγαλύνῃ.17 cf. μεγαλύνῃ θεῖος καὶ μεγαλύνόντο ἐπὶ τὰ ὁρία μου Zp 2.8 and τὰ μεγαλύνθησαν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον τὸν παντοκράτορα ib. 2.10.18 In view of μεγαλύνῃ θείαν μεγαλύνθησαι ἐπὶ τάντα θεὸν Da 11.36 TH we could postulate ἐμεγαλύνθησαν, which, however, would farther deviate from H; see also ib. 11.37.

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

ἀνοικοδομεῖτε] = ἀνοικίασθε. The rest of the verse in G is utterly difficult to relate to Η, cf. SD loc. cit.

The use of double accusatives with καταστάσσω is unusual. The rectio as found in γῇ τὰς κεφαλὰς κατασάναις 2M 10.25 is Classical.

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

There is no trace of this in G. If our translator pronounced יִקָּח as in Η, he may have got baffled by the fsg Impv. followed by a 2mpl suffix, and have given up.

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

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

18 On הִגְדִּיל ‘to boast,’ cf. Kaddari s.v. לְגַדִּיל Hif. 3. Cf. also JM § 54 d.
οἶκον ἐχόμενον αὑτῆς] = אֶצְלָהּ בַּיִת.  יה 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 יִקַּח this can be understood as having “she” as its subject.

πλῆγην Should this be a rendering of מַכָּה, it would be a double translation of מכם along with הָא בַּיָּתָה. Is it possible to postulate מָרָתוֹ מַכַּת in view of ὀδύνας in the next verse? One would have to account for the letter ע in מַכָּת.

1.12) τίς ἠρξατο εἰς ἀγαθὰ κατοικοῦσῃ ὀδύνας; ὅτι κατέβη κακὰ παρὰ κυρίου ἐπὶ πύλας Ἱερουσαλήμ,

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

ψόφος ἁρμάτων καὶ ἱππευόντων. κατοικοῦσα Λαχις, ἀρχηγὸς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῆς ἦστι τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιων, ὅτι ἐν σοὶ εὑρέθησαν ἀσέβειαι τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

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.

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. δοκεῖν ὧνν ἤρξατο '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 ἤπειροντον κρῆσθαι] The Heb. word usually thought to mean ‘warhorse, 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 δόσεις ἐξαποστελλομένους ἠς κληρονομίας Γεθ ὀνομαίοις ματαίοις· εἰς κενά ἐγένετο τοῖς βασιλεῖσιν 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.

ἐξαποστελλομένους καὶ ἤπειροντον] On the first appearance δοῦμενς looks like δοῦμεν, so “ones being dispatched” (NETS). The meaning of δοῦμεν is agreed to be ‘parting gift(s).’ For this interpretation of ἐξαποστελλομένους we refer to ἐδοκειν αὐτάς Φαραο ἄποστολάς (ἡμᾶς) θυγατρί αὐτοῦ 3K 5.14b [= 1Kg 9.16]. The mpl ending -ους is no reference to males, but due to ὀνομαίοις. 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.

ἐξαποστελλομένους καὶ ἤπειροντον] is usually taken as a place name, but Pesh. and Vulg. also took it as a common substantive with /bāttē da-srīqūtā/ and domus mendacii respectively.22

1.15) ἤς τοὺς κληρονόμους ἀγάγω σοι, κατοικοῦσαν [Λαχίς] κληρονομία, ἤς ὀδηγός ἔξει ὁ 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.

ἵως] = δε. ὀνομαίοις ματαίοις οἶκοι is usually taken as a place name, but as a conjunction of temporal value ἤως can have its verb in the subjunctive, also with ἀν added as in ἤως ἀν παῦσωνται πίνουσιν ‘until they finish drinking’ Ge 24.14. See further in GELS s.v. Β and SSG § 29 c (v).

21 Analogously in the Antiochenean version: 3K 5.2. Cf. also ἀποστεῖλατε ἄποστολάς (ἡμᾶς) τοῖς μὴ ἔχοσιν 1E 9.51 [= Ne 8.10].
Λαχις] Ziegler proposes to delete this place name against all the manuscript evidences, probably because it is not represented in Δ, which may be, however, a result of a scribal error, i.e. ヒラシ > ヒラシ ヌニシ. Otherwise one can hardly make sense of κατοικούσα κληρονομία.

κληρονομία = παρθένος, 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.’

έος] This is a preposition, not a conjunction, pace GELS s.v. Β α.

τῆς θυγατρὸς Ισραηλ.] Whilst ‘the daughter of Zion’ (Ἱσρα else) is a standing formula, ἤ αρα ἦν is unknown to BH.

1.16) ξύρησαι καὶ κεῖραι ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα τὰ τρυφερά σου, ἐμπλάτυνον τὴν χηρείαν σου ὡς ἁτός, ὅτι ἡχιαλωτεύθησαν ἀπό σου.

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.

κεῖρι] 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. Nor is there a good reason for varying the voice in relation to the parallel ξύρησαι 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/.

ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα τὰ τρυφερά σου] The Gk preposition ἐπὶ + 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: οἱ τρυφεροί μου ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδοὺς τραχείας ‘my delicate ones have gone rough ways’ Ba 4.26. Here, however, ‘affording much pleasure’ looks more suitable. Note 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 καλέσεις, a word of the same root as that of ταύτα in our Mi case.

τὴν χηρείαν σου] When our translator has correctly rendered ἤ αρα ἦν ξύρησαι, 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 ἠλίκτην 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 ἄνδρῶν ‘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 κακά ἐν ταῖς κοίταις αὐτῶν καὶ ἦμαι τῇ ἁμέρᾳ συνετέλουν αὐτά, διότι οὐκ ἦραν πρὸς τὸν θεόν 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.

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 G did have the conjunction or not, its presence makes sense and accords with the athnach with the preceding word, κακάμεθα.

οὐκ ἦραν = ἤσαν, i.e. ἦσαν αἰτία, The thought expressed in G radically differs from that of H, ‘they are capable (of it).’ Pesh. reads the same verb, though without a negator: /w-ṣaqlin 'idayhon lwāt 'alāhā/, and yet another thought, that of daring hypocrisy, which is better expressed with the conjunction w- rather than /meṭṭul d-/ ‘because.’ G indicates a gesture of prayer, so in ἐν τῷ με αἴρειν χεῖράς μου πρὸς ναὸν ἁγιόν σου Ps 27.2 κάραρα ὄρ, < ἤ σκαλόρ σοι

The idiomatic combination יָדָם יֶשׁ־לְאֵל could have presented a challenge.2 Here is how other translators handled it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יָדָם יֶשׁ־לְאֵל</td>
<td>ἤσαν</td>
<td>יִשְׂאוּ לֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָדִי יֶשׁ־לְאֵל</td>
<td>ἤσαν</td>
<td>ἀγιόν σου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יָדָם לְאֵל</td>
<td>ἤσαν</td>
<td>ἤσαν αἰτία</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For more references, see GELS s.v. γίνομαι 5 a, and for a discussion of the syntagm, see SSG § 31 flk.
2 For a discussion of where the idiom comes from, see McKane 1998.60.
Our Mi translator’s colleagues have all recognised the idiomatic nature of the expression, not mechanically translating לָ֫שֶׁך. We see that also among Hebrew scribes there was a measure of uncertainty over the grammatical number of יִד, as shown by the Ktiv in Pr 3.27, יִדְרִי.

2.2) καὶ ἐπεθύμουν ἄγροὺς καὶ διήρπαζον ὀρφανοὺς καὶ οἶκους κατεδυνάστευον καὶ διήρπαζον ἀνδρὰ καὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ἀνδρὰ 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.

The Gk Impf., along with three other following verbs, carries on the imperfective aspect of συνετέλουν (vs. 1). This is in keeping with ἐπεθύμουν carrying on four w-qatalí forms in this verse.

ὀρφανοὺς] Probably added by the translator, possibly puzzled by the conjunction waw of ὀρφανοῦ with no verb to go with it in sight. The prophet probably meant it as parenthetical, i.e. not only fields, but also houses.

Our translator was now faced with the verb νασάω with no object. His solution was to ignore it and rewrite ὀρφανοῦ as ἀγροῦ and reuse ὀρφανοῦ as the verb with two parallel objects following. The vs. 2 he has mentally reconstructed may have read:

Let us note that our translator has left οἰκοῦς up front unlike the other three verbs.

οἰκοῦς] Parallel to ἐπεθύμουν and would naturally denote ‘houses, dwellings,’ whereas κατεδυνάστευον takes an acc. of person. Hence our “families,” sim. NETS “households.”

3 Including Theodotion’s somewhat clumsy rendering: διότι ἔχουσιν ἵσχυν τῆς χειρὰ αὐτῶν, cf. Aquila’s διότι (ἐστιν ἐπὶ) ἵσχυν χεὶρ 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: ᴦʀæगेन ḥaqल��态 w-vattē.

5 So Pesh.

6 מְשׁוֹ is a poor fit for καταδυνάστευον, the two most frequent Heb. equivalents are מָשָׂא and מְשָׁא qal (8× including Mi 2.2).
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.

κύριος Ἰδοὺ λογίζομαι ἐπὶ τὴν φυλὴν ταύτην κακά, ἐξ ὧν οὐ μὴ ἄρητε τοὺς τραχήλους ὑμῶν καὶ οὐ μὴ πορευθῆτε ὅρθοι ἐξαίφνης, ὅτι καὶ ράτιον πονηρός ἦστιν.

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.

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.

The Gk verb here, αἱρω, is about an upward movement, whereas ἠμείναι denotes moving away. The Heb. word is a hapax in BH, and thought to mean either ‘haughtily’ or ‘erect.’ As regards ὅρθως, it appears later in our chapter, also with the same verb as here: ὅρθως πεπόρευσαν ‘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.

Where this comes from is not clear at all.

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 cste chain as done in Pesh. /zavnāw d-vištā/ and Trg. /< b-šā’tā bištā/ Ps 37.19 > ἐν καιρῷ πονηρῷ ἐν λιμός ‘in hard times’ // λιμός ‘famine.’ Similarly in ὅτι καὶ ράτιον πονηρός ἦστιν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ λημφθήσεται ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς παραβολή, καὶ θρηνηθήσεται ὅρθως ἐν μέλει λέγων Ῥαλταιπορθήσαμεν· μερίς λαοῦ μου κατεμετρήθη ἐν σχοινίῳ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ κωλύσων αὐτὸν τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι· οἱ ἄγριοι ἠμῶν διεμερίσθησαν.

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

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.'

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' ἀμα Mi 6.10, the translator could have said λήμψεται ... παραβολήν. Note also ἡξελεύσεται 'someone (will) come out' ἀμα 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. See also the immediately following θρηνηθήσεται.

In the context something more than an innocuous discourse form, “parable” (NETS) or “Spruch” (SD) must be meant. See οὐχὶ τάντα πάντα παραβολήν κατ΄ αὐτοῦ λήμψονται (ἀμα κρίσ) Ἰβ 2.6, where κατ´ αὐτοῦ is to be noted, and ἔσονται εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν καὶ εἰς παραβολήν καὶ εἰς μῖσος καὶ εἰς κατάραν εἰς παντὶ τόπῳ, οὐ ἡξόσα αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ Ἰε 24.9. It evidently denotes something that is said in public and hurts those about whom it is said.

The difficult text of Ἰ looks to have three words from the same root, two of which are rendered in Ἰ with two words of the same stem. Whether or not our translator’s vocabulary contained θρήνεωμα, he may have thought that enough had been said, and did not do as Ezekiel did in καὶ λήμψονται οἱ γιοὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ σὲ θρῆνον καὶ θρήνημα Ἰσ Ἰ 27.32, where also the translator recognised two, but not three words from one and the same root – κατεμετρήθη ...

Whatever the Vorlage of Ἰ looked like, it must have been as difficult as Ἰ. Hence the concluding part of the verse presents a fairly free rendition. Even if this particular verb could represent ἗μι, i.e. ἐμι, Nif. of νῦν ‘to measure,’ where does ἐν σχοινίῳ come from? From Am 7.17,

8 On the impersonal 3ms with a personal subject in Ἰ, see SSG § 87 bc.
9 McKane (68) approvingly mentions Carmignac (1955.351), who claims to have identified νῦν in the Qumran War Scroll (17.5), where, however, it is just a Nifal ptc., ‘what is to emerge’ as against Qal ἔμι ‘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, ℒ reads לְחָלֲק בַּחֶבֶל אַדְמָתְךָ. 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 μετρέω, the word used here carries a feature of hostility and advantage, probably marked by the prefix κατα-. Likewise in καὶ ἡ γῆ σου ἐν σχοινίῳ καταμετρήθησει Am 7.17, as part of a long list of painful sufferings about to be inflicted; see for more references GELS s.v.

τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι] The gen. article could be viewed as a remnant of the archaic gen. with ablative force, thus equivalent to ἀπό, and such an analysis does fit the sense of the verb κωλύω, with which this inf. is to be construed. Cr. οὐκ ἐκωλύθησαν τῆς οἰκοδομῆς ‘they were not forced to stop the construction work’ 1E 6.6 with κωλύσαι λαὸν ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας ‘to prevent the people to sin’ Si 46.7. However, the parallelism as in ἐκώλυσέν σε κύριοι τοῦ μὴ ἔλθείν 1K 25.26 and ἧ ἀποκωλύσασά με ἦμι ἔλθείν ib. 33 suggests that the τοῦ 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

dιεμετρήθησαν] = בִּקְהַל בְּגוֹרָל חֶבֶל מַשְׁלִיךְ לְךָ לֹא־יִהְיֶה, though ℒ can be understood as impersonally used 3s (Piel), though the passive form highlights the suffering borne by the victims. There is a v.l. διεμετρήθησαν, which must be a secondary change due to the preceding κατεμετρήθη.

2.5) διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔσται σοι βάλλων σχοινίον ἐν κλήρῳ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ κυρίου.

Therefore you shall have nobody casting a land-measure by lot among the Lord’s congregation.

לכָּל לָא־יִשַׁג לֹא לָא־אֵלֶּה לֹא־יַטִּיפוּ לֹא תַּטִּיפוּן אַל־תַּטִּפוּ:

[βάλλων σχοινίον] 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) μὴ κλαίετε δάκρυσιν, μηδὲ δακρυέτωσαν ἐπὶ τούτοις· οὖ γὰρ ἀπώστει ὀνείδη.

Stop weeping with tears nor let them shed tears over these matters, for He will not remove humiliations.

αἰτήσασθαι ἐν ἀριτίσμοι πάντα ἔξω, οὐκ ἐξέλθοντω:

11 But cf. SSG § 30 e, § 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. מִטִּיף (<\sqrt{טְטַף}>, repeated as often in three different forms. The middle form, not negated unlike the other two, appears untranslated in \( G \). 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 dripping. 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 (δάκρυσιν here, dat. pl. of δάκρυον). In \( G \) here, then, we have a creative application of the primary sense of the verb on the part of its translator.

\( \text{μηδὲ} = \text{אַל} \)? The translator apparently found it stylistically unacceptable to repeat the combination κλαίω δάκρυσιν, hence a shift to δακρύω, which leads to the selection of μηδὲ, not μή.

\( \text{ἐπὶ} = \text{עַל} \), part of the free translation going on here.

\( \text{ἀπώσεται} = \text{כָּפַל} \), Hif. √כָּפָל. The subject of the verb in \( G \) 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 ὅνείον. But ὁ λέγων 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 ὁ λέγων. Without saying it in so many words, \( SD \) removes the full stop and makes ὁ λέγων the subject of ἀπώσεται. This might be a better resolution of the ambiguity.

\[ \text{ὁ λέγων} \text{Οἶκος Ιακωβ παρώργισε πνεῦμα κυρίου· εἰ ταῦτα τὰ ἐπι-} \]
\[ \text{τηδεύματα αὐτοῦ ἔστιν; οὐχ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ εἰσί καλοὶ μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ καὶ} \]
\[ \text{ὅρθοι πεπόρευνται;} \]
\[ \text{He who says, ‘The house of Jacob has angered the spirit of the Lord.’} \]
\[ \text{Are these his deeds? Are not His words agreeable to him for him to walk upright?} \]

\[ \text{ὁ λέγων} = \text{הוֹלֵך}. \]

On analysing this phrase as to be construed with vs. 6, see above towards the end.

\[ \text{παρώργισε} = \text{הָאֲמָר}, \] cf. ἐν τῷ παροργίσαι με τοὺς πατέρας ύμῶν καὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς αὐτοὺς καταβαίνει θαλάσσα ἐπὶ ἐπιφανείᾳ θαλάσσης Zc 8.14.

\[ \text{\text{12 The verb also occurs at Mi 2.11, Am 7.16, 9.13.} \] 
\[ \text{13 But then, pace SD (II 2369), the speaker can hardly be the prophet.} \] 
\[ \text{14 NETS’s “One says,” is odd.} \] 
\[ \text{\( H \) is difficult. We fail to see how König (III § 236b) could view it as meaning dicendumne.} \]
κυρίου] When our translator read רָאִיתָה, 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 ירָעֲרָה instead of רָאִיתָה, which is a far-reaching rewriting. The same complication is inherent in{oχ 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: ἀδελφὴν ἄνθρωπος τῆς Ge 12.13, where αὐτοῦ cannot be referring to same person, but the first is virtually equivalent to μου.

εἰ] We concur with Ziegler, who has added <:> after ἔστιν. The use of εἰ 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 ἕνωμεν as well as τί. For the book of Mi, see 6.6, 7bis, 11, and note esp. ἐὰν φέρητε τὴν θυσίαν, εἰ προσδέξομαι αὐτὰ; ‘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.

οὐ] This must be construed with πεπόρευνται as well.

οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ] = ἀδελφῇ, i.e. ἀδελφῷ.

εἰσι καλοὶ] The NH text has been correctly restored by Tov as ἥν ἔθυναν. μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ὀρθοὶ] = ὕψος ἔχει; In any case the separation of the definite article in δ from the participle is unusual for ἔφυγεν. Wolff (40), relying on Hebraists such as Brockelmann and Gesenius - Kautzsch, suggests that the article is equivalent to ὅρθῳ 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 δ: μ[τε τοῦ ὀρθὰ πορευομένου]. 18

ὀρθοὶ] The collocation ὀρθὸς πορεύομαι here appears to bear a moral, ethical sense, unlike in vs. 3 above, where physically upright, erect stance is indicated, whilst δ there reads differently than here.

πεπόρευνται θυσιά] 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 (אֲחָי וּרְחָם)” 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.

18 In Qumran Hebrew we do find substantivised participles with or without the article. With the article, e.g. יְהוָהִינוּ 'one who errs inadvertently’ IQS 9.1 and יְהוָהִיתָה ‘that which issues forth out of your mouth’ 4Q51 II fr a-d.5, which is a variant reading of יְהוָהִיתָה 1Sm 1.23. For a discussion, see SQH § 17 j.

18 Tov, the editor, restores ὀρθοὶ. 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 ὀρθοίς, perhaps a typo for ὀρθῶς. An example of adverbially used ὀρθῶς is ὀρθῶς κρίνων ‘to judge correctly’ Pr 31.3, sim. ὀρθῶς βλεπέτωσαν ‘Let them look straight’ ib. 4.25.
2.8) καὶ ἐμπροσθεν ὁ λαὸς μου εἰς ἐχθραν εἰς ἔχθραν αὐτοῦ τὴν δορὰν τοῦ ἀποτελέσθαι ἐλπίδα συντριμμῶν 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.

Both Θ and H are full of challenges.

ἔμπροσθεν] This is the sole instance of this equivalence. The usual rendering of ἐτεμολ or ἐτεμολ is ἐχθές. The translator must have had some reason for selecting ἐμπροσθεν, which would refer to a more distant past than yesterday.19

εἰς ἐχθραν] “In order to meet enemy attacks” must be meant.

ἀντέστη] = μισκ,% i.e. μικ%, for κλέπ is transitive.20 This may have caused the translator to read a Qal form here. The pl. ἀντεστησαν of the NH text is a constructio ad sensum due to the sense of λαός.

τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ] = שלוּם.

τὴν δορὰν αὐτοῦ] περιβολαιον ‘garment’ in the NH text (6.5).

ἐξέδειραν] The abrupt shift in H 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 συντριμμῶν πολέμου] ἐλπίδα is probably in a loose relation of apposition to συντριμμῶν πολέμου, i.e. people are hoping to bring about a ruin of their enemies through a war.

συντριμμῶν πολέμου] The NH text has been restored as ἔπι[στραφήσθηκαν] ται πόλεμο[v as a rendering of the putative 쉐브 in H. We would like to know what the reconstructed Gk text is supposed to mean.

2.9) διὰ τούτο ἡγούμενοι λαοῦ μου ἀπορρίφσονται ἐκ τῶν οἰκίων τρυφῆς αὐτῶν, διὰ τά πονηρά ἑπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν ἐξώσθησαν, ἐγγίσατε ὀρεσιν αἰωνίοις.

Therefore leaders of my people shall be thrown out of their pleasure houses, because of their evil practices they were ejected. Approach eternal mounts.

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 ὁ μισκ αὐτῶν, for Θ’s ἐμπροσθεν, Pesh.’s ἐτεμολ(y), and ante unam dicem (Jerome in his commentary) accord with H.

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.”
CHAPTER II 205

διὰ τούτο] > Ὑ.

ηγούμενοι] = ἡγεῖται, i.e. ἡγείται.

ἀπορρίψοντα] = ἀπορρίπτεται τις.

τρυφῆς αὐτῶν, διὰ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν] = מַעַלְלֵיהֶם רֹעַ על תַעֲנוּגֵיהֶם.

This is certainly a fair bit of restitution. πονηρὰ is a free, sensible addition; it is unnecessary to restitute מַעַלְלֵיהֶם רֹעַ על or something like that.

SG proffers a good number of instances of the type <ὁ μέγας ἀνήρ> instead of <ὁ ἀνήρ ὁ μέγας> (SSG § 37 bba) the position of πονηρὰ does not necessarily support such a restitution.

ἐξώσθησα] In Index 45a we see that √נָדַח is the most frequent equivalent of this Gk verb: qal 1x, ni. 5x, hi. 13x, and we include our Mi instance there, thus = והרי. Note esp. τὴν ἑξωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι Mi 4.6 and και ἑγγίσατε ἑκατέρων γῆν ἀνυδρον τῇ ἐπὶ ἡρέτις Jl 2.20.

ἐγγίσατε] = יִכְרְבוּ.

ὁρᾷς, מַעַלListItem מַעַל. In BH a noun in st. cst. may be subordinate to a prepositional phrase, e.g. מְשַׁפֵּהַת וְלֶחֶר Jb 45b.21

2.10) ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι σοι αὕτη ἡ ἀνάπαυσις ἔνεκεν ἀκαθαρσίας. διεφθάρετε φθορᾷ,

Ἀριστερὰ 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 ἡ ἀνάπαυσις] This could mean, as in Ὑ, ‘this is not ..’ 22 The selection of the fem. pronoun would be due to the gender of ἀνάπαυσις; cf. SSG § 77 1.23 Though not often, a bare demonstrative pronoun can be attributively used and precede, e.g. ἡ τῆς θαλάσσης Ps 104.25; cf. JM § 143 i. The position of οὐκ, not before αὕτη, is as in Ὑ ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ὡς καὶ οὐχ ἄλλο ἡ πόλις 4K 6.19L < ὡς οὖν οὐκ ὡς οὐκάν εἰς θαλάσσην θάλασσὴν ή πόλις ή πόλις ή πόλις η ἡ οὐκάν.<

διεφθάρετε] = תִּתְחַבְּלוּ.

φθορᾷ] ‘grievous’ is left untranslated; the translator may have thought that the notion of intensity is sufficiently expressed through the cognate dative.

καθισμὸν πέντε ὑμῖν ἡμῖν κεκομένη κατὰ ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ἔχθεσιν ὑπάρκσιν: 21 For a discussion with more examples, see JM § 129 m-n.

22 So Trg.: נִמְרָץ וְחֶבֶל וְתְּחַבֵּל טָמְאָה בַּעֲבוּר הַמְּנוּחָה לֹא־זֹאת כִּי וּלְכוּ קוּמוּ.

23 Cf. SD: “nicht ist für dich dies die Ruhe.”
2.11) κατεδιώχθητε οὐδενός διώκοντος· πνεῦμα ἔστησε ψεῦδος, ἐστάλαξέ σοι ἐις οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα. καὶ ἔσται ἐκ τῆς σταγόνος 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

κατεδιώχθητε] Nothing in Ψ corresponds to this. οὐδενός] = ἀιτο. So also in the Murabbaat text, XII 29. On οὐδενός, for which μηδενὸς could have been said, see SSG § 83 bd.

ἔστησε] Nothing in Ψ corresponds to this. For the meaning of the verb ἱστημι here, see GELS s.v. II 5.

ψεῦδος] One is not certain whether this is a rendering of שֶׁקֶר as in Zc 5.4, Ma 3.5 or כזֵב as in Ho 7.13.

ἐστάλαξέ] = נטף or יטוף.

ἔσται] According to SD Ιακωβ 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 Ιακωβ in this verse.

ἐκ τῆς σταγόνος] = מִנְּטַף. For נטף / σταγών, see Jb 36.27. What is meant by Θ is perhaps that the national restoration is going to be a very modest beginning.

2.12) συναγόμενος συναχθήσεται Ιακωβ σὺν πᾶσιν· ἐκδεχόμενος ἐκδεχόμενος ἐκδεχόμενος τοὺς καταλοίπους τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ θήσωμαι τὴν ἀποστροφήν αὐτῶν· ὡς πρόβατα ἐν θλίψει, ὡς ποίμνιον ἐν μέσῳ κοίτης αὐτῶν ἔξαλοῦνται 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.

συναχθήσεται] = στησται.

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 Θ possibly read ποῦκρι in lieu of ποῦκρι. Cf. אֲרִיצֶנּוּ Je 49.19 > ἐκδιώξω αὐτούς ib. 29.20 (Θ).
The immediately following ἐκδεχόμενος represents the same feature.

τὴν ἀποστροφήν] A free, contextually motivated addition? Since θησομαι is a rendering of אָשִׂימֶנּוּ, אֲשִׁיבֶנּו would not come into the picture.

ἐν θλίψει] = הַבָּצְרָה, arsing. 'sheepfold.' The translator probably saw here a parallelism of אָשִׁיבֶנּו, הבצרה.

κοίτης αὐτῶν] An unusual equivalence occurring nowhere else. דֹּבֶר is thought to mean 'pasture.'

ἐξαλοῦνται] 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.'

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.

But לִפְנֵיהֶם can scarcely indicate a space through which one moves.

καὶ ἔξηλθον] By selecting the verb which is nearer (ἔξηλθον ἀνατα) G 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 בְּצָרָה, irrespective of its vocalisation, cannot be a participle.
CHAPTER III

3.1) Kai èreî Ακούσατε δή ταῦτα, αἱ ἁρχαὶ οἴκου Iακωβ καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι οἴκου Ισραηλ. οὐχ ὑμῖν ἐστί τοῦ γνώναι 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?

και ερει ακουσατ δη ταυτα ηαι αρχαι οικου ιακωβ και οι καταλοιποι οικου ισραηλ ουχ ιμιν εστι του γνωναι το κριμα:

Kai èreî] = ἠκούσατε.1

ὑμῖν ἐστι τοῦ γνῶναι] G is a verbatim reproduction of H, 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, ἁρπάζοντες τὰ δέρματα αὐτῶν ἀπ᾿ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτῶν.

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] In view of Μεμισήκαμεν τὰ πονηρὰ καὶ ἠγαπήκαμεν τὰ καλὰ 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 = ἠιμαρ, i.e. ἤιμαρ.
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) ὃν τρόπον κατέφαγον τὰς σάρκας τοῦ λαοῦ μου καὶ τά δέρματα αὐτῶν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἐξέδειραν καὶ τά ὀστέα αὐτῶν ἑμέλισαν ὡς σάρκας εἰς λέβητα καὶ ὡς κρέας 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.

οὕτως κεκράξονται πρὸς κύριον, καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούσεται αὐτῶν · καὶ ἀποστρέψει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἑκεῖνῳ, ἀνθ’ ὅν ἐπονηρεύσαντο ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν ἐπ’ αὐτούς.

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.”

οὕτως] Together with ὃν τρόπον at the beginning of vs. 4 there is formed a long clause of comparison.

ἀποστρέψει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἐπ’ αὐτούς] G most likely read here τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἐπ’ αὐτούς, 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 נא as here, a particle not represented in G. In the preceding, coordinate verse all the four verbs are qatal. The consistent use of the Fut. in G in this verse makes sense in its own way.

The equivalence ἀποστρέψω / יָסִר is also attested elsewhere, e.g. ἀποστρέψω τὸ πρόσωπον μου ἀπ’ αὐτῶν יָסִר 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 רָס or רָס, hi. from וָרָס.  

3 See JM § 113 i. The only sure case in BH of נא + short yiqtol with preterite value is וַיִּקְהֵל אָז וְיָסִיר אִז 1Kg 8.1.

4 Correct Index 16a accordingly.
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. Our translator’s analysis of it as intransitive is underlined with the addition of ἐν, when he could have said τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα (nom.). Moreover, הֵרֵעַ never takes a deed as its grammatical subject.

A free addition with the pronoun referring to victims. Wolff (61) thinks of an infelicitous haplography, i.e.

3.5) τάδε λέγει κύριος ἐπὶ τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πλανῶντας τὸν λαόν μου, τοὺς δάκνοντας ἐν τοῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσοντας ἐπὶ αὐτῶν εἰρήνην, καὶ οὐκ ἐδόθη εἰς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν, ἤγειραν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν 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.

In neither language the pronoun is unlikely a reference to Micah. 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. A similar problem meets us in vs. 6. Supposing that God is speaking, how would we account for the shift from ὑμῖν to τοὺς προφήτας .. αὐτοὺς? 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 πιστὲ, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἡ πιστὸς,
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 .. 
eἰρήνην as the title of the oracle.

δάκνοντας[2] Not a threatening figure as in δάκη αὐτὸν (נשך) ὁ ὀφίς ‘the snake bites him’ Am 5.19, but “as long as they are provided enough 
to eat.”

κηρύσσοντας[3] König (III 517 m-n) analyses the Heb. verb as inver-
sive, but G is right in seeing it as parallel to the preceding two participles, 
though out of respect to ה (?), the translator refrains from adding the article, 
tοὺς. Analogously he saw a non-inversive form in the following reshok, 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[4] There is no absolute need to assume that G represents קנה. 
A passive, 3sg verb is sometimes used impersonally, e.g. προσέταγη τῷ 
κήτει ‘a command was issued to the giant fish’ Jn 2.11 (וְקִדְּשׁו).11 
However, קנה here is not impersonal. קדה ought to have been analysed as an 
antecedentless relative pronoun, ‘one who ...’12 and the relative clause is extra-
posed and joined with the main clause with an apodotic וְקָרְאוּ and the inherent 
antecedent is resumed in עָלָיו, whereas in G αὐτὸν can be understood only as 
referring back to τὸν λαόν μου earlier in the verse, hence our against them, not 
him. Alternatively, G represents קנה = קנה.

must mean ‘they declared the war holy (sanctioned by God).’13 The collocation 
γειρῶ πόλεμον is also met with in 1E 1.23.

3.6) διὰ τούτο νῦς ὑμῖν ἐσται εξ άράσεως, καὶ σκοτία ὑμῖν ἐσται 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.

לכָּלָל לָכֶם מַחְטָサイズָה לָכֶם מַכָּסָר תָּכָיָה מֶשֶׁר עָלֵיהֶם עָלֵיהֶם מַכָּסָר לָכֶם

10 In Japanese there is nothing unusual at all about a father saying to a son of his: おとう san wa iku/ ‘the father goes,’ when what is actually meant is ‘I go.’
11 Cf. SSG § 87 a.
12 So Pesh. ḫmn d-lā ../.
13 On the declarative-estimative value of Piel, see JM § 52 d.
The preposition, just like its Heb. equivalent here, indicates absence, lack, or deprivation. Another example is "ἡ γῆ ἀφανισθήσεται .. ἐκ διοδεύοντος καὶ ἐξ ἀναστρέφοντος (ὡς) ἐκ ἐκδιοδόντος καὶ ἐξ ἀναστρέφοντος τῆς γῆς .. the land will be annihilated .. with none journeying through it and returning (thereafter)‘ Zc 7.14.14

σκοτία ἡ σκοτία] NH (6.41) is said to read σκοτισθήσεται. It probably reflects the passive verb as a noun in Ἑ. 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 σκοτίζω ‘to make dark.’ The latter, however, can be used in a pseudo-passive voice: ἐως ὅ μη σκοτισθῇ 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 σκοτισθῆσεται. On the other hand, Ἑ, apparently reading the passive, reproduces a perfect poetic parallelism in Ἑ:16

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, ἐκ and ἐπί, as synonymous. We submit that they both carry a negative connotation. In ὑμῖν (twice < ὑμῖν) we could recognize 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 נב with נב as its subject to express the notion of sunset occurs 1917 times in BH, mostly with no preposition following, e.g. נב, עַד נב Ex 17.12. In one case נב is used: ἐπί πᾶς τῆς γῆς ἐπὶ πᾶς τῆς γῆς 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 נב De 24.15.18 Another value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A = noun</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C (מ)</th>
<th>a = noun</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C (מ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>νυξ</td>
<td>ἐσται</td>
<td>ὑμῖν</td>
<td>νυξ</td>
<td>ἐσται</td>
<td>ὑμῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡλιος</td>
<td>λειμ</td>
<td>μαντείας</td>
<td>ἡλιος</td>
<td>λειμ</td>
<td>μαντείας</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Hardly ‘instead of’ (Brenton) and ‘statt’ (SD). Cf. GELS s.v. ἐκ 11 and BDB s.v. ממן 7 ba-b. Ibn-Ezra and Radaq take ממן 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 ἑπιστρέψωσιν τὰ νέφων ‘the clouds return.’
16 There is no absolute need to impose ‘our’ grammatical concept of substantive and read מקס לכ in lieu of the inf. est. in Ἑ.
17 In BDB s.v. ממן Qal 1 i “18 săw” should read “2Ch 18:34.”
18 This instance is, along with the two cases in our Mi passage, mentioned in BDB s.v. לוע 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
of ἐν is exemplified in ἐν ἑτέρῳ φθείρᾳ ‘Rachel died on me’ Ge 48.7; ‘they cry to my annoyance’ Nu 11.13. It is about imposition, whether deliberate or otherwise, of a burden, not only physical, but also mental, pain or inconvenience. This last value of ἐν could be applied to our present Mi passage: the sun set early in the morning or mid-day as a blow to the prophets. In GELS s.v. ἐπί III + acc. 7 we mention, under the label “to the disadvantage of somebody,” our Mi passage is mentioned along with a good number of additional examples. One such is close to our Mi passage: πάντα τὰ φαίνοντα φῶς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ συσκοπᾶσον ἐπὶ σέ (Ῥήμα) Ez 32.8, and note the use of dativus incommodi in ἐπέδυε ὁ ἡλίος αὐτῷ (Ῥήμα ἀρκεῖ) ἐτεί μεσούσης τῆς ἡμέρας ‘the sun set on her still in the prime of her life’ Je 15.9.

3.7) καὶ κατασχυνθήσονται οἱ ὀρῶντες τὰ ἐνύπνια, καὶ καταγελασθήσονται οἱ μάντες, καὶ καταλαλήσονται κατ’ αὐτῶν πάντες αὐτοί, διότι οὐκ ἔσται οἱ εἰσακοῦντος αὐτῶν.

you, unlike that of the sun rising over or above you, sounds a bit odd. Oder still it is, because the suffix pronoun of σέ is usually thought to refer to τῇ ψυρί ‘his hire, pay for the day’s labour.’ One should perhaps make the pronoun refer to the labourer; the whole intent of the regulation is probably that a day-labourer is not to be kept working after sunset, but is to be sent home while it is still light and with the day’s hire in his pocket. Then the preposition can be assigned the value of dativus incommodi. The LXX, however, apparently referred the pronoun to the field will rust your bones’ Hom. 4.175. In GELS loc. cit., though a case of sunrise, we included ἐνύπνια as in our Mi passage, is to be noted, cf. GELS s.v. ἐπί II 14: ‘indicates an action which should already have been performed or an (undesirable) state which should have been dealt with.’ Incidentally this usage is already known to CG, hence remove the asterisk from ‘14’: σονται καὶ διότι αὐθημερὸν ἐπί ἡμέρας, ἐπί δὲ ἡμέρας οὐκ ἔσται as you lie in Troy with your task unfinished the field will rust your bones’ Hom. II 4.175. In GELS loc. cit., though a case of sunrise, we included ἐπί δὲ ἀνατείλῃ ὁ ἡλίος ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ‘should the sun rise while he was still at it [= διόργαμα “boring a wall”].’ In ὁ ἡλίος, however, the pronoun can only refer to the burglar, where τῆς καταλαλήσεως (> ) is a fem. noun. The burglar may have arrived at the scene only shortly before the sunrise. Whilst ἐν can have the value of dativus incommodi, <ἐπί + dat.> does not indicate ‘physically above, over,’ for which <+ gen.> or <+ acc.> is used, e.g. φαίνειν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ‘to shine above the earth’ Ge 1.17 (of the celestial luminaries), θείαι λίθον ἐπὶ λίθον ‘to set stones over one another’ Hg 2.15.

19 In JM § 133 f this kind of ἐν was analysed as equivalent to dativus incommodi. Cp. the use of on in colloquial English as in “Her husband walked out on her.” The notion of annoyance and molestation is lexicalised in יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים, יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּо הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּмִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו הַיָּמִים יָבַגּו Hg 2.15.

20 In BDB s.v. ἐπί I 1 b we read “Of what rests heavily upon a person, or is a burden to him,” but on Ge 48.7 they write ‘idiomatically,’ presumably thinking that this example does not quite fit their definition of the preposition.

21 When Jesus was about to breathe his last, the whole earth was covered with darkness from noon to 3 p.m. (Mt 27.45, Mk 15.33, Lk 23.44f.).

22 Pace Wevers’ Göttingen edition we prefer to adopt a v.l. at one of the above-cited instances: κλαίοντι ἐπὶ ἐμὲ Nu 11.13, where ἐπὶ ἐμοί might mean ‘beside me.’ BA’s “vers moi” would represent πρὸς ἐμὲ.
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.

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 καταλάλησον 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 anything remotely equivalent to עָטָה, a fairly common verb meaning 'to envelop or wrap oneself,' and to שָׂפָם 'moustache.' H is no less puzzling.

What is the gesture supposed to mean? The last clause in H is straightforward: ‘there is no response from God.’ αὐτῶν[ = ἐὰν] Whilst the equivalence μὴ εἰσακούω / εἰσακοῦω does not occur elsewhere, ἐὰν Qal is often rendered with εἰσακοῦος, e.g. εἰσάκουσόν μου, κύριε ο ἡ θέται Ps 68(69).17. Where εἰσακοῦον 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 εἰσακοῦον does not have a determining value, but fulfils a useful function of averting syntactic ambiguity, for without it ἐσται εἰσακοῦον could be misunderstood as a periphrastic construction; see further in SSG § 1 c (pp. 7f.).

3.8) ἐὰν μὴ ἐγὼ ἐμπλήσω ἱσχὺν ἐν πνεύματι κυρίου καὶ κρίματος καὶ δυναστείας τοῦ ἀπαγγείλαι τῷ Ἰακωβ ἀσεβείας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Ἰσραηλ 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.

ἐὰν μὴ] = ἐὰν ἡ, a typically Hebraic expression of confident assertion, which has been mechanically reproduced in G, cf. GELS s.v. εὰν III b, c.24

23 Pesh. /sefwāthōn/ suggests ‘they will cover their lips, not daring to speak any more,’ but is a shade too removed from עָטָה. Likewise Sym. ἐπὶ τῶν χειλέων αὐτῶν. According to Trg. with כהן, it is a gesture of mourners.

24 In GELS s.v. εἰ 7 εἰ μὴ, a new subsection * needs be added: “particle of asseveration, ‘ assuredly’: εἰ μὴ (H 20.23 κραταούομεν ‘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 θείον 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, ἀπὸ τινος or ἐν τινὶ.25 The same can be said of מָלֵא Qal when used in the sense of ‘to fill’ and מִלָּא Piel.26

ἐν πνεύματι [Here מ can be taken as the object marker. Then יהוה ה ר would be in apposition to מ.27 By contrast, means מ as a preposition. In spite of its rendition with ἐν it cannot, unless Engl. with, indicate an instrument, for which Hebrew uses ב. It retains its basic sense of “together with,” synonymous with ἐν. BDB, s.v. מ, I a mentions Mi 3.8 along with Ge 4.1 with a gloss “with the help of.”28 Many delete יהוה ה מ ב as secondary, e.g. Wolff (61): “nachgetragener Kommentar.” It does damage the tripartite parallelism here, but, Pesh., Trg., Vulg., and Murabbat text are also all in agreement with מ.

κρίματος καὶ δυναστείας] To make מ ב dependent on ה ר sounds rather odd.

יסחנ .. δυναστειαζ מ ב .. מ] It is not immediately apparent whether or not the two terms in both מ and מ are to be understood as complete synonyms. In two instances we find the two closely joined as מ ב 1C 29.12 (יסחנ καὶ δυναστεία) and 2C 20.6 (יסחנ δυναστεια). 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 (ἐντιθήματι). 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. ἐμπίμπλημι 2. See also under synonymous verbs such as δέμπλημι 1, and πληρόω 1. The sole possible exception in SG is ὁ πιμπλῶν ὡς Φισων σοφίαν Si 24.25, where the subject of the ptc. can only be the Mosaic law (ὕμων δὲ διὸ), not God, in view of the fem. תמרלפת, i.e. מ אמרלפת. Then πιμπλήμα here may be pseudo-intransitive as ἐμπίπλημα 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. πληρόω I.

26 See BDB s.v. מ מ 2 and Piel.

27 Pace Wolff (61) the absence of the conjunction waw would not then be anomalous.

28 On מ מ מ מ Ge 4.1 Rashi has an enlightening observation: “וְוַיָּכָה: 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 οἰκου Ἰακωβ καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι οἰκου Ἰσραηλ οἱ βδελυσσόμενοι κρίμα καὶ πάντα τὰ δρθὰ διαστρέ- 
φοντες,

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,

κατάλοιποι κατάλοιποι] A strange equivalence noted above at vs. 1.

βδελυσσόμενοι βδελυσσόμενοι] In SG is βδελύσσω is the most frequent (14×) rendering of חבק נופי Am 6.8 (במקס > ממקס). 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 ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν Ps 106.18.

3.10) οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες Σιων ἐν αἴμασι καὶ Ιερουσαλημ ἐν ἁδικίαις.

those who build Zion with murders and Jerusalem with injustices.

οἰκοδομοῦντες] = ἐν. The shift to the pl. is in keeping with what precedes in vs. 9.

ἀδικίαις] = ἁδικίαις. The pl. of this Heb. noun occurs in BH only twice. By contrast, the sg. דם can be ambiguous, since it can indicate blood of sacrificial animals, whereas the pl. form clearly indicates multiple acts of murder. The pl. ἁδικίαις can be understood in a similar fashion.

3.11) οἱ ἡγούμενοι αὐτῆς μετὰ δώρων ἐκρινον, καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς αὐτῆς μετὰ μισθοῦ ἐκρινον, καὶ οἱ προφῆται αὐτῆς μετὰ ἀργυρίου ἐκρινον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐπανεπάνουν λέγοντες Ὁχί κύριος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστιν; οὐ μὴ ἐπέλευῃ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς κακὰ.

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.”

κατὰ δώρων κατὰ δώρων] The Heb. preposition is here used in the manner of beth pretii, but its rendering with μετὰ 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 καί οὐ μετά ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεθε ‘For no payment you were sold and you will be redeemed not in return for any silver’ < תִּגָּאֵלוּ בְכֶסֶף וְלֹא נִמְכַּרְתֶּם חִנָּם. This kind of μετά is rendered in a number of ways, but not with μετά τίνος except in the two cases just mentioned. E.g. μεμίσθωμαι γάρ σε ἀντὶ τῶν μανδραγόρων τοῦ υἱοῦ μου ‘I have hired you in return for my son’s mandrakes’ Ge 30.16; ἐκτήσατο Δαυίδ τὸν ἄλωνα .. ἐν ἀργυρίῳ σίκλων πεντήκοντα ‘David bought the threshing floor .. for 50 shekels of silver’ 2K 24.24; dative – πρωτότοκον ὑποζυγίου λυτρώσῃ προβάτῳ ‘you shall redeem the firstborn of a draft animal with a sheep’ Ex 34.20.

[Απεκρίνοντο ύρων] A striking equivalence not attested elsewhere, although the notions expressed by the two words are not so widely apart from each other.

[ἐπανεπάυοντο ἵστρον] The bracketed “unconcerned” is a negative nuance emerging from the context. In ἐπανεπάυσατο τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπ᾿ αὐτούς ‘the spirit rested on them’ Nu 11.25 no such nuance is evident.

3.12) διὰ τούτο δι’ ὑμᾶς Σιων ὡς ἀγρός ἀροτριαθήσεται, καὶ Ιερουσαλήμ ὡς ὑποφυλάκιον ἔσται καὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦ οἴκου ὡς ἀλσος 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.*

A thought very similar to what we have here is expressed in Σιων ὡς ἀγρός ἀροτριαθήσεται, καὶ Ιερουσαλήμ εἰς ἅβατον ἔσται καὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦ οἴκου εἰς ὀφωροφυλάκιον ὑποζυγίου ἔσται. Je 33.18 ἡ ἐπηρεάσθη ἡ θάρσος ἡ ἡφαίστεια τῆς θησαυροῦ τινής μετὰ τῆς βίβλου νεορωσίας 26.18. The LXX rendition is remarkably similar between the two passages. The mutual influence is likely. The phrase ἡ θάρσος τῆς ἡφαίστειας τῆς ἡθνείας ἡ ἡφαίστεια τῆς βίβλου νεορωσίας occurs in these two passages only. The equivalence ὡς ἀλσος / ὡς ὑποφυλάκιον does not occur elsewhere.

[ὁ ἀγρός] The addition of ὡς to the subject predicate is sensible. The particle is used twice more, making the whole statement metaphorical.

[ὁ υποφυλάκιον] 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.

[ὁ ὡς ὧς] 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 Ἡ’s ἡθνείας; the same preposition is also added to ἅβατον against Ἡ.
CHAPTER IV

4.1) Καὶ ἕσται ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐμφανές τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου, ἔτοιμον ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὄρων, καὶ μετεωρισθῆσεται 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,

Almost an identical Hebrew text appears in Is 2.2:

מִגְּבָעוֹת הָוְּא וְנִשָּׂא הֶהָרִים בְּרֹאשׁ נָכוֹן בֵּית־יְהוָה הַר יִהְיֶה הַיָּמִים בְּאַחֲרִית וְהָיָה:

Its Gk version reads:

Ὅτι ἕσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐμφανές τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν ὄρων καὶ ὑψωθῆσεται ὑπεράνω τῶν βουνῶν· καὶ ἥξουσιν ἐπὶ αὐτὸ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη

The same equivalence is found at Ho 3.5; cf. our remarks there. This rendition is closer to Ὁ than that in Is 2.2.

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 Ὁ. Its position in Is 2.2 scarcely suggests that it is a rendering of ἔτοιμος, but 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 <νῦν - temporal expression - yiqtol> which introduces an event that is to take place at a specified time in the future. E.g. יִקְרָא יְהוָה בַיָּמִם הַהָוָּא הַיָּמִים הַיָּמִים הַיָּמִים הַיָּמִים הַיָּמִים הַיָּמִים H2 1.18 [καὶ ἕσται ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, λέγει Κύριος, καλέσαι με 2.16], see also 2.33(31). He, however, decided to assign the initial νῦν (καὶ ἕσται) its plain meaning. Wolff (83) suggests that the translator probably did not wish to repeat ἕσται and substituted ἐμφανῆς for νῦν, but the addition merely for such a purpose would represent too radical a departure from Ὁ.

2 Pace McKane (122) ἐτοιμὸς as a rendering of ἔτοιμος is perfectly accurate, attested a total of 16 times in SG, including 1.21 δύσκολον ἐτοιμόν Ὁ 6.3. This would seriously affect his text-critical argument comparing Mi and Is.
τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου = θυνή ἡ. This shorter Heb. phrase occurs only twice, both in the Pentateuch long before the building work undertaken by Solomon: ἀνεφήγη τοῦ κυρίου > Ἐν τῷ ὄρει [= ὑψηλῷ Ge 22.14 and θυνή ἡ > Καὶ ἔζηκαν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους κυρίου Nu 10.33 (with reference to Mt Sinai). Why this shorter form was selected in G is not apparent. The three-term long form occurs once more at βῆθι β. 2C 33.15 = ἐν ὄρει ὁίκου κυρίου.

The formulation in Is 2.2 represents farther departure from Ἡ. The translator does not appear to be concerned about the resultant number discord: sg. ἔσται with two coordinate subject phrases.

κορυφὰς ῥοσ = θαύμαρ. 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 = μικρώματα. Not a single instance of νάρ/σπεύδω is to be found in SG. ἡξουσίν in Is 2.2 is rather prosaic.

πρὸς αὐτὸ τῆς = οἰκίας. possibly = ἐνθάμνησις. On the other hand, with σπεύδω we find ἐπεισεν Ἀβρααμ ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν πρὸς Σαρραν Ge 18.6 [πρὸς αὐτὴν = Babylon] and σπεύσουσιν ἐπὶ τὰ τείχη Na 2.6 [καὶ τῇ κυρίῳ ἐκ τῆς ἐκ]. We are inclined to view τῆς in Is 2.2 as more authentic. However, its rendering with ἐπ′ αὐτό is closer to ἐπί, and 1QIsa actually reads ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν, an Aramaised equivalent. The Vorlage of Ἡ may have read τῆς after all.

4.2) καὶ πορεύσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ καὶ ἔρουσι Δεῦτε ἀναβώμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακώβ, καὶ δείξουσιν ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πορευσόμεθα εἰς ταῖς τρίβοις αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἐκ Σιὼν ἐξελεύσεται νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἰερουσαλήμ.

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.”

The parallel Isaiah passage (Is 2.3) reads:

καὶ πορεύσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ καὶ ἔρουσι Δεῦτε καὶ ἀναβώμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακώβ, καὶ ἀναγγέλει ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πορευσόμεθα ἐν αὐτῇ· ἐκ γὰρ Σιὼν ἐξελεύσεται νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἰερουσαλήμ.

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.
Δεῦτε ἀναβόμεν τῇ Μεγαλάτῃ αὐτῶν τῇ Ἀλώσει τῆς ἁγίας τῆς Εὐαγγελίας τῆς Θεοτόκου καὶ τῆς Παναγίας. Ἡ μεγάλη ἀγάπη μᾶς ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ τῆς Θεοτόκου καὶ τῆς Παναγίας.

5 Only twice in SG δεῦτε is used as a plain verb: γυναῖκες ... δεῦτε ‘O women .., come here’ and ἔξελθε 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 νῦν vs. volitive νῦν. 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.

The affinity with Is continues (Is 2.4):

καὶ κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἔθνων καὶ ἐλέγξει λαόν πολύν, καὶ συγκόψουσι τὰς μαχαίρις αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα καὶ τὰς ζιβύνας αὐτῶν εἰς δρέπανα, καὶ οὐ λήμψεται ἔτι ἔθνος ἔτι ἔθνος μάχαιραν, καὶ οὐ μὴ μάθωσιν ἔτι πολεμεῖν

ἐλέγξει] So Ziegler and = Is 2.4; the majority reading is ἐξελέγξει.

ἔθνη ἱσχυρὰ] In this Mi version the anti-armament message comes over more clearly than λαὸν πολύν in Is 2.4. Analogously Mi’s κατακόψουσι for κτίττουσι sounds more powerful and destructive than Is’s συγκόψουσι.

τὰς ῥομφαίας αὐτῶν θερίσεις] The translator of XII prefers ρομφαία as a rendering of בֶּשֶׁ, using מְחָאֵר only once (Zc 1.17), which is a most preferred choice with the translator of Is, who uses ρομφαία only once (Is 66.16). In Ez we find only מְחָאֵר. Since the two Greek nouns show no difference in meaning, we have here an example of personal preference among different translators.

NH showing its affinity with Is at a number of places: μαχαίρας, συγκόψουσι, τὰς σιβύ[νας, μ[άχαιραν.10

Here again the orthography in NH is somewhat unorthodox, e.g. συγκόψουσι, ἀνθάρῃ, ἐφ’ in lieu of ἐπ’, σιβύ[νας in lieu of ζιβύ[νας.11

8 Segal (146) translates the LXX reading into קְלַפְּרִים, דר, without mentioning Mi 4.3 Ḥ. Barthélemy (1992.744) prefers the rendering in Traduction accuinéenne de la Bible (1976), “même au loin.”

9 LEH s.v. מְחָאֵר: “alternating with ρομφαία as stereotype rendition of בֶּשֶׁ.” See also Muraoka 1970.499f.

Whilst Trench deals with neither noun as used in NTG, BDAG differentiates them: ρομφαία ‘a large and broad sword’ used by non-Greek speaking peoples, esp. the Thracians vs. מְחָאֵר ‘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, 

וּמַזְמְרֹתֵיכֶם לַחֲרָבוֹת אִתֵּיכֶם כֹּתּו

Jl 4.10, which he renders

συγκόψατε τὰ ἄροτρα ὑμῶν εἰς ρομφαίς καὶ τὰ δρέπανα ὑμῶν εἰς σειρομάστας.

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.

ἀναπαύσεται καθίσ οἶκοι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος ἔσται ὁ ἐκφοβῶν, διότι τὸ στόμα κυρίου παντοκράτορος ἐλάλησε ταῦτα.

καὶ ἀναπαύσεται καθεῖλαν ἕκαστος τὸν μάρσιππον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἤνοιξαν ἕκαστος τὸν μάρσιππον αὐτοῦ Ge 44.11, where the number of the verb in Ἰ is adjusted to that in Θ; ἕκαστος τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ 1C 16.43, where the real subject of the verb is added.12

In Θ 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 Ἰσραηλ ἀνήρ ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ τάξει < ἐν τῷ μαχανείῳ Ἰσραήλ Nu 1.52, or through ἄνθρωπος, e.g. πάντες οἱ βασιλείς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ ἀνθρώπος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ < ἐν τῷ μαχανείῳ Ἰσραήλ Is 14.18. Likewise in NH in our Mi passage. This distributive use is also observable with ἔσται as in ἔσται ἐπὶ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς ἡ κόμη Ἰούδας > ἀποστράφητε ἐκάστη εἰς οἶκον μητρὸς αὐτῆς Ἰούδας Ἰουδαίος 1.8.

A substantivised ptc. can be anarthrous as in σῶζειν οὐκ ἔστιν πάρεξ ἔμοι < ἐν τῇ μνήμῃ Ἰσραήλ 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. See also הָרָא פִּיה > ὁ συγκρίνων οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτὸ Ge 40.8, 41.15. The anarthrous form in NH formally accords with ב. So is ἔστιν.

The selection in ᾨ of the fut. ἔσται is more sensible than οὐκ ἔστιν in NH; the statement is part of a prediction. διὰ τῶν ὀτι 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 over in the fragment.

παντοκράτορος צבאות 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. אֱלֹהִים. NH is consistent (9×) in its use of δυνάμεων, which is formally closer to צבאות. This relatively rare equation occurs twice in XII: Zp 2.9, Zc 7.4.

ταῦτα Most likely a free addition conditioned contextually.

This verse does not seem to follow naturally out of what precedes it. Hence the difficulty of what to make of the introductory ὅτι ς.

ἔκαστος ἄνω On the distributive value of this construction agreeing with a pl. verb, see on vs. 4. In this construction, ἄνω or ἄνω, 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 (Ἄλλοι) has correctly analysed this construction. Similarly, in the NRSV: “... every tribe of the children of Israel, to which the Lord has given their inheritance.”

13 Hence οὐκ ἔστιν ἄφιων αὐτῶν τοῦ ὑπνῶσα 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 ha - bb.

14 According to Tov (DJD 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.
A discrepancy difficult to see where it originates. NH follows Θ: πορε[υσονται ἐν ὀνόματι θε]οῦ αὐτῶν.

4.6) ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, λέγει κύριος, συνάζω 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,

συνάζω .. εἰσδέξομαι] A rendition of the synonymous parallelism of ἐκτεθλιμμένη καὶ τὴν ἐξωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι 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 ἁφηθ, cf. LBH כנס = ἁφηθ. 17

τὴν συντετριμμένην καὶ τὴν ἐξωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι] 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 Θ. One possibility is, though, צאן, 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 Καρμήλου Mi 7.14, where πρόβατα, a metaphor of Israel, is further expanded with a masc. pl. ptc. and ἑαυτοὺς. This inflectional selection in Θ then must be more likely due to the two fem. sg. participles in Θ. Unlike in Greek, the fem. sg. can be applied in Hebrew to a group of individuals as in הָאָרֶץ דַּלַּת > οἱ πτωχοὶ τῆς γῆς; the poor of the land’ 4K 24.14B (L τῶν πενομένων τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς γῆς). The last clause beginning with ἀσφάλεια renders oὖς (m.pl.) confirms this analysis of ours. 18 See also below at 7.8. 19

The equation συντρίβω passive / ἐκτεθλιμμένη 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, συντρίβω 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’: ἐκτεθλιμμένην τῆς τὸν ἤχος τῆς ἡμέρας

16 GELS s.v. 2.
17 Cf. Leviticus Rabbah s. 9 and tShav 35. Note Wolff (55): “כִּסְכַּת hat hier einen tröstlichen Klang”; one of his references (p. 42), “Jes 20,4” should read “Jos 20,4,” and his translation reads “will ich das Lahme heimholen.”
18 NH reads ἡ, an obviously secondary adjustment to the preceding τὴν.
19 Cf. JM § 134 δ and SSG § 20 δ.
20 Tov restores ἐκτεθλιμμένην for NH solely on the basis of a reading in Justin, whilst elsewhere in LXX this Gk verb never translates הָלַךְ.
καὶ σώσω τὴν ἐκπεπιεσμένην καὶ τὴν ἀπωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι

Whilst the verb ἠργυρος is translated with diverse Gk verbs, the Heb. equivalent of εἰσδέχομαι is only this Heb. verb. 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.

Here is the only instance of this striking equivalence, ἀπωθέω 'to reject' vs. ἡράρα ‘to afflict, cause pain.’ The translator is obviously conscious of the synonym just used, ἐξωθέω, both derived from ὀθέω ‘to push with considerable physical force.’

καὶ θήσομαι τὴν συντετριμμένην εἰς ὑπόλειμμα καὶ τὴν ἀπωσμένην εἰς ἔθνος ἰσχυρόν, καὶ βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐπ᾿ αὐτοὺς ἐν ὀρέι Σιων ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ ἠως 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.

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, ש, as here. The preposition εἰς indicates transformation, entry into a certain state, not a physical 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 τέθεικά σε Ge 17.5 // θήσω σε εἰς ἔθνη ib. 17.6.

A word occurring eight times in LXX, half of which in XII. Two other times as ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ιακωβ: 3 37, 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, קַבּוֹצ. 22 Note also καθὼς εἰσδέχεται ἀργυρος < κępτ ἔπτ Ez 22.20, where in the immediate context Qal יֹבְקָה is rendered twice with εἰσδέχομαι.

Tov (DJD 8.41, 88) restores ἀθρόισω: “adapted to MT ἀκοβ.” but MT reads ἀκοβ. From the plate concerned of the scroll we cannot say with certainty whether or not εἰσδέχομαι is a little too long for the space available.

23 ἐκάκουσα of NH is an obvious adjustment to Ἕ.

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.
The Heb. word is a hapax in BH and thought to derive from נָהֲלָאָה ‘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 אֶת־הַצֹּלֵעָה וְהוֹשַׁעְתִּי אֲקַבֵּץ וְהַנִּדָּחָה καὶ σώσω τὴν ἐκπεπιεσμένην καὶ τὴν ἀπωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι Zp 3.19 adduced under the previous verse, but unrelated to his choice of the same verb to render הֵרֵעַ there. 

ἐπ’ αὐτῶς μὴ λίθω] NH 8.6 reads ἐπ’ αὐτῶν. There is no comparable case in XII, but in SG both ἡβασιλεύω τίνα and ἡβασιλεύω τίνος pers. are attested, e.g. Βασίλευσον ἐφ’ ἡμῶς L ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς.

ὁρεῖ Σιων μὴ ρῦ] NH 8.6 adds the article: ἐν τῷ ὁρεῖ Σιὼν, but is not consistent, for in the next verse it reads θυγατέρι [Σιὼν, and see also ἐν τῇ ἐπάρσει οἴνους ὁ θεὸς θεοῦ [αὐτῶν] 8.40 for ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ οἴνου κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ἡ ἡ βασιλεία τῆς κυρίου Μη 5.4(3). On the frequent absence in SG of the article in the syntagm substantive + genitive, see SSG § 3 b.

ἔως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μὴ ἐκπεπιεσμένη] Whilst NH 8.7 reads ἐκπεπιεσμένης τοῦ αἰῶνος (= Ἡ), ἔως is often followed in SG by another preposition, e.g. ἔως εἰς μακρὰν 4.3 and ἔως ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν Ez 47.8, cf. GELS s.v. ἔως Α. Ἰ.

καὶ σὺ, πῦργος ποιμνίου αὐχμώδης, θυγατέρ Σιων, ἐπὶ σὲ ἦξει καὶ εἰσελεύσεται ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ πρώτη, βασιλεία ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος τῇ θυγατρί Ιερουσαλήμ.

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.

For various attempts to explicate this phrase, cf. McKane (131-33).

αὐχμώδης μὴ ρῦ] 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 ἔπερθαι has been suggested in Index 20a as an underlying equivalent.

θυγατέρι] NH (8.8) does not admit here a vocative, and then σὺ ἡθὲ would be extraposed, a case of casus pendens, resumed with a pronoun in ἐπὶ σὲ ἡθὲ, an analysis which is syntactically acceptable.

25 Tov (DJD 8.41, 88) restores ἐκπεπιεσμένην at NH 8.5 on the basis of a reading found in Justin, but in the space available the form cannot be accommodated.
εἰσελεύσεται] Tov (DJD 8.41, 88) restores ἐλεύσεται as “the regular equivalent of the root בָּא.” 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 ἡ 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 מַמְלֶכֶת as being in st. cst., and supplied a missing nomen regens, so מַמְלֶכֶת בָּבֶל. As in בַּקָּצִיר שִׂמְחַת ‘joy at harvest time’ Is 9.2; הַנּוֹתָרִים לִבְנֵי־קְהָת מִשְׁפַּחַת ‘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 NḤ.

4.9) Καὶ νῦν ἵνα τί ἔγνως κακά; μή βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἦν σοι; ἢ ἢ βουλή σου ἀπώλετο ὅτι κατεκράτησάν σοι ὠδῖνες 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?

ἔγνως κακά] = μετὰ ἄρα. Η means ‘you cry bitterly.’ Our understanding of κακά is similar to that in SD: “warum erfuhrst du Unheil?.” Cf. Aq. Syh. ἕκάκωσας, which is probably = ἐκάκωσας, i.e. Hif. of συγκόνθημα, as in ἕκάκωσαν ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν.28

σοι] = σε. Η means ‘in your midst.’

ἡ ἁ] On ἡ introducing a disjunctive question, see GELS s.v. 1 b. At NḤ 8.12 Tov (DJD 8.41, 88) restores ἐὰν in conformity with Η.29 The interrogative ἃ is a commonplace, but ἐὰν is not so used, see GELS s.v.

ἵνα] = ‘your counsellor.’

ὀδῖνες ὡς τικτούσης ἡ ὀδύνη] A well-known metaphor for excruciating pains. Here the sufferer is presented as female, but it can be also male as in ὀδῖνες ὡς τικτούσης ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ὡς γυναικῶς 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. ὀδύν is used thrice in the context of childbirth – Is 26.17, where the Heb. pl. נַפְתָּח is to be noted, ib. 37.3 (a rather free rendering), and ἐπὶ τῇ ὀδύνιν αὐτῆς ἐκέκραξεν Od 5.17 –

26 The translation of this example in GELS s.v. πρῶτος ε need be corrected.
27 See JM § 129 n.
29 Tov mentions Hb 2.3 in NH, but there ἐὰν rendering τοι is an ordinary conditional particle, ‘if.’
and Ἰούδες uses sometimes a pl. noun as in the just mentioned Is 26.17 and חֶבְלֵי Ho 13.13, for instance, the pl. ὀδῖνες 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 Ἰούδες, and it can be indicative of intensity or high frequency.

4.10) ὀδῖνε καὶ ἄνδρίζου καὶ ἐγγίζε, θύγατερ Σιων, ὡς τίκτουσα· διότι νῦν ἔξελεύσῃ ἐκ πόλεως καὶ κατασκηνώσεις ἐν πεδίῳ καὶ ἥξεις ἔως Βαβυλῶνος· ἔκειθεν ρύσεται σε καὶ ἐκεῖθεν λυτρώσεται σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἐκ χειρός ἔχθρών 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.

ἀνδρίζου] All the three imperatives are in the imperfective aspect, but in Ἰούδες we have only two verbs.30 In Index 10b ἔγγίζε is suggested. In theory Ἰούδες could be translated “Be a man,” which is, however, inappropriate in an address to “daughter of Zion.”

ἐγγίζε γε] If ἐγγίζε is a form of a hollow root, ἐγγίζε γε if of √ἐγγίζε. In two passages the verb has to do with a baby coming out and being born: ἔγγίζε γε τὸ παιδί πρὸς τοὺς γυναῖκας (ἐν τῇ ἑρμήνευσι τῆς ἐβδομάδος) ἐκ ἐγκατάληψης μητρὸς αὐτῆς ἕκαστον τῆς γυναικείας ἐπορευομένην. But as an address to a mother figure we would expect a transitive verb. Either way it has little to do with ἐγγίζε ‘approach.’ In Index 34a we have suggested Qal שָׁכַנְתָּ, thus שָׁכַנְתָּ. But approach where or what? A new dwelling in the countryside? Ἰούδες is as difficult as Ἰούδες.

4.11) καὶ νῦν ἐπισυνῆχθη ἐπὶ σὲ ἐθνη πολλὰ οἱ λέγοντες Ἕπικαρούμεθα, καὶ ἐπόψονται ἐπὶ Σιων οἱ ὁφθαλμοὶ ημῶν.

30 Wolff (102) holds that ἄνδρίζου is a second translation derived from √χίλ ‘power,’ but the status of this verb in BH is rather insecure.

31 BHS suggests two alternative emendations: רָסָם and רָסָם. The former, ‘Take it easy,’ is incompatible with יְסִלָה. 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.”

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 הַקֹּדֶשׁ עִיר is now being threatened. A wording such as הב זוחת תֶּחֱנָף could have been less ambiguous.

On the collectively used Heb. verb in the sg., see JM § 150 d.

They, however, did not recognise the Lord’s thinking and did not understand His design, for He gathered them as sheaves of threshing-floor.

The disjunctive personal pronoun in G and H alike underscores the enemies’ failure to see who they were up against.

Wolff (102) holds that the sg. in G is a harmonisation to the parallel βουλὴ עֶצָּתוֹ.

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.

Verbs of physical movement such as בָּא, קָם, הָלַךְ, in the impv. in particular and often followed by another verb without the conjunction ו—connecting them, are used to incite and encourage. Hence Jacob, when he said to his aged father, קָם נָאקוּמִי וְאָכְלָה שְׁבָה גֶּדֶרֶת נָא Ge 27.19, was not suggesting that

Exactly so in Pesh.
physical exercise was needed before the meal. In colloquial English we might say, “Come on, sit up and eat.”

τὰ κέρατά σου] Some animals have only one horn. The pl. in Ἑ is probably a harmonisation with the parallel τὰς ὁπλὰς σου. 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 = מִשְׁמַרְתּוֹ, and the fact that κατατήκω is a more generic term of destruction than λεπτύνω indicating a more particular form of destructive action may suggest the first as being independent of Ἑ here.

ἀναθήσεις] Our translator, who was most likely familiar with Aramaic, had no difficulty in parsing the Heb. verb here as 2fs. 34

tὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν] Our analysis of πλῆθος can be assisted by looking at the other two occurrences of בּ in XII and Ἑ there:

Hb 2.9 ὁ δὲ πλεονεκτὸν πλεονεξίαν κακὴν τῷ οἶκῳ αὐτοῦ

Ma 3.14 Μύταιος ὁ δουλεύων θεῷ, καὶ τί πλέον ὅτι ἐφυλάξαμεν τὰ φυλάγματα αὐτοῦ

The second instance is particularly illuminating, showing that the Heb. word is understood with reference to the increase in material possessions. Possible ethical implications of increased possessions are not in view unlike in the other instance with κακήν. We could then take τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν as indicated in our translation above. 35 Thus the use of the Gk substantive here differs from what we find in πατὴρ πλήθους ἐθνῶν Ge 17.4 // πατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν vs. 5.

τὴν ἵσχυν αὐτῶν] Parallel with πλῆθος as discussed above we would understand ἵσχυς 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 לְ. 37 Cf. συνάξει τὴν ἵσχυν πάντων τῶν λαῶν (ὁ θεὸς κυκλόθεν, χρυσίον καὶ ἀργύριον καὶ ἱματισμὸν εἰς πλῆθος σφόδρα Zc 14.14; κατέφαγον ἄλλοτροι τὴν ἵσχυν αὐτοῦ θέων) Ho 7.9. Not surprisingly, δύναμις, a synonym of ἵσχυς, also bears this meaning.38

33 Cf. BA “Viens t’asseoir et mange.” קָהַדְּסַר קְהַדְּסַר, and קָהַדְּסַר are also so used, see JM § 105 e.
34 See Kutscher 1974.25, 188-90, and JM § 42 f (p. 122).
35 Cf. SD “ihr 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 ἐμφραχθήσεται θυγάτηρ ἐμφραγμῷ, συνοχὴν ἔταξεν ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς, ἐν ράβδῳ πατάξουσιν ἐπὶ σιαγόνα τὰς φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

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.

5.2 (5.1) Καὶ σὺ, Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθα, ὀλιγοστὸς εἰ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ιουδα· ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἔξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἀρχονταὶ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ αἱ ἔξοδοι αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ ἁρχῆς 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.

σὺ τῇ Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθα] = = Βηθλεεμ, oikos tou Ephraam. The subject fronted, there is a focus on it, and the same applies to the equally fronted ἐκ σοῦ ἣμας.

οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθα] In the OT the combination ἐκ τῆς Ἐφραθα does not occur. NH possibly read another variant: σοῦ, οἶκος ... Ἐφραθα 8.32, where the lacuna is said to have room for Βηθλεεμ.

ὀλιγοστὸς] Whilst the superlative can function with the value of elative, it can also substitute the comparative as in πλειότητι ἢ ἐμπροσθεν ... ἐζουσίαν

1 For further details, see JM § 155 d-e, SSG § 87 c, eb, 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. τοῦ is not a mere marker of the infinitive, but is a genitive of comparison as in Μείζων ἡ αἰτία μου τοῦ ἀφεθῆναι με ‘My guilt is greater than for me to be forgiven’ Ge 4.13.

μοι ἐν A case of dative commodi. Fitzmyer (1956.12f.), pointing out that he does not know of a case of such a dative preceding a verb, opts for reading τοῦ 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 sceptical about an emphatic lamed for BH.

ἐξελεύσεται τῶν] On the impersonal use of the 3ms, see above at verse 1. εἰς Missing in NH in keeping with Θ, which makes the infinitive clause ungrammatical, because ἄρχοντα can scarcely function as the subject, and the predicate is to remain nominative if without εἰς, e.g. ἔγω εἰμί κύριος ὁ ἀναγγέλων ὑμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου εἶναι ὑμῶν θεός ‘.. who led you up from the land of Egypt to be your god’ Le 11.45.

5.3 (5.2) διὰ τοῦτο δώσει αὐτοὺς ἐως καιρὸν τικτούσης τέξεται, καὶ οἱ ἐπιλοίποι τῶν ἄδελφων αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέφουσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ.

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.

5 See SSG § 23 bb, p. 197.

6 See SSG § 30 cc. Whilst it is true that in most cases of this kind the Heb. infinitive is prefixed with מ from rather than with ל, there is at least one exception: כְּהִתְכַּנֵּס צָרָה הַמַּסֵּכָה αὐתֵיהֶם δὲ ἀσθενοῦμεν τοῦ ἡμᾶς συναχθῆναι ‘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.
The selection of ἐπὶ does not have to be viewed as a mere mechanical reproduction of עַל. See e.g. ἐὰν ἐπιστραφῇς ἔπι (ץ וַ) κύριον τὸν θεόν σου De 30.10; ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐκ πάντων τῶν τόπων ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς (ץ יְ) Ne 4.6.9

5.4 (5.3) καὶ στήσεται καὶ ὄψεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἰσχύι κυρίου, καὶ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ του ὀνόματος κύριου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ὑπάρξουσι. διότι νῦν μεγαλυνθήσεται ἔως ἂν 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.

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] = וְרָעָה וְנָא. NH = י. δόξη] δόξα, an equivalence occurring four times in LXX, but only here in XII.

tοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ὑπάρξουσι] = יש בְּעֹז וְרָעָה וְרָאָה. The pl. αὐτῶν fits the pl. verb. For NH (8.40) the sg. αὐτός has been restored, which makes sense, since there begins after it a pl. verb with καὶ: καὶ ἐπιστρεφόμενοι = וְשָׁבוּ.

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. ὅσπερ γὰρ σκεῦος ἀνθρώπου συντριβὲν ἄχρεῖον 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 αἱ κρίσεις ὑπάρχουσιν (מַצְלִיחַ) ‘your many judgments are true’ To 3.5.

Another question that need be addressed here concerns יש. Just like ὑπάρχω, this Heb. word primarily indicates existence. Though not very often, it does function as a copula. (1) μεγαλυνθήσεται יִגְדַּל יָשָׁבוּ אֱלֹהָיו יְהוָה שֵׁם בִּגְאוֹן יְהוָה בְּעֹז וְרָעָה וְעָמַד ‘Is it right with your heart as my heart is with your heart?’ 2Kg 10.15; 2) μεγαλυνθήσεται οἱ αἱ κρίσεις ὑπάρχουσιν ‘if you do prosper my way’ Ge 24.42.

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 μεγαλυνθήσεται יִגְדַּל.

9 Cf. GELS s.v. ἐπί II 2 and ἐπιστρέφω II 1 b.
10 Cf. GELS s.v. ὑπάρχω 2.
11 There are another four examples of <ץ + suffix pronoun - participle>; see Muraoka 1985,78. In Biblical Aramaic we find an analogous construction, e.g. לְהוֹדָעֻתַנִי כָּהֵל הַאִיתָךְ חֶלְמָא ‘Are you really capable of telling me the dream?’ Dn 2.26. In נִדְהָה שֶׁקְרֶשׁ מְדָרְהוֹן דִּי אֱלָהִין אִיתוֹ ‘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) καὶ ἔσται αὕτη εἰρήνη. Ἀσσουρ δὲν ἐπέλθη ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῇ ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐπεγερθῆσονται ἐπὶ αὐτὸν ἐπτὰ ποιμένες καὶ ὁκτὼ δήγματα 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.

αὕτη δὴ] Already Ibn-Ezra and Radaq understood the Heb. pronoun as a reference to the Messiah on the way. The selection of the fem. demonstrative pronoun in ἐίρηνη is a case of assimilation to the predicate, εἰρήνη.12

Ἀσσουρ ῥας[?] A constituent of the following subordinate clause taken out and fronted; for other examples, see SSG § 84 c.

ὅταν [ב] Rashi and Ibn-Ezra saw in ὅταν an equivalent of ἢμι, NH provides a more conventional rendering, ὅτι (9.1), which, in combination with εἰρήνη, a subjunctive form, creates a grammatical impossibility. The same holds for next line: ὅτι ἐπιβῆ.

ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν ἀνακρίνεται: [The Heb. preposition can be taken in a plain, locative sense, ‘to enter our land,’ as understood by NH (εἰρήνη [ἐ]ς [τὴν ἐπὶ γῆν ἡμῶν]), but with the selection of <ἐπὶ + acc.> ἔπι 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 = ἀνακρίνεται or ἀνακρίνονται. NH reads βάρ[εις, pl. of βαρὶς ‘citadel.’

ἐπεγερθῆσονται νὴνπολύ] Who Assyria is going to be up against is underlined. It is difficult to say whether ἐπεγερθῆσονται is meant as genuinely passive13 or pseudo middle; on this intriguing question, see SSG § 27 db. NH ἐπεγεροῦμεν = ὅντα ἐπεγερθῆσονται sound rather odd. NH ἔρχοντας = ὅντα ἐπερχόμενος.

δήγματα] = νῆσος.14 ‘Bites’ parallel with ‘shepherds,’ and not ‘those who bite,’ as the subjects of ἐπεγερθῆσονται sound rather odd. NH ὑγραντάς = ὅντα ἐπερχόμενος.

5.6 (5.5) καὶ ποιμανοῦσι τὸν Ἀσσουρ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ τὴν γῆν τοῦ Νεβροδ ἐν τῇ τάφρῳ αὐτῆς καὶ ρύσεται ἐκ τοῦ Ἀσσουρ, ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῇ ἐπὶ τὰ ὅρια 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. ἐκεῖνη σου ἡ μερίς, οὖν σου ὁ κλῆρος ‘that is your portion, this is your lot’ Is 57.6 < קְלָלִים חוּם הֵם חֶלְקֵךְ.
13 So SD: ‘werden .. erweckt werden.’
14 Pace Wolff’s בּישׁ, which means ‘Beißer,’ not ‘Bisse.’
The absence in G of any equivalent of אֶרֶץ is difficult to account for. NH = Ὁ.

ἐν τῇ παραξιφίς 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 פְָתָחֶיהָ becomes a particular type of landscape inside the land of Nimrod. פֶּתַח 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 παραξιφίς has been restored with no space available for a pronoun. 15 The text may be identifying a form of פְָתָחֶיהָ '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 Ὁ reads χειρίζεται, which does not denote any piece of weapon. 16 The second attestation is at Jd 3.22 L 17 for Ὁ βλέπει rendered φλόξ R 'flame' in perhaps the shining blade of a sword.

5.7 (5.6) καὶ ἔσται τὸ ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ιακώβ ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεῖς ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν πολλῶν ὡς δρόσος παρὰ κυρίου πίπτουσα καὶ ὡς ἄρνες ἐπ᾽ ἄγρωστι, ὡς μὴ συναχθῇ μηδὲ ὡς μὴ ὑποστῇ 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.

υπόλειμμα] See above at 4.7. NH has κατάλοιπον. In XII the noun ἀσέρβος occurs 16 times, always in the st. cst. followed by the name of a tribe or οἶκος and suchlike. Its Greek equivalents are κατάλοιπος (12×), περιλοίπος (1×), and ὑπόλειμμα (3×). The third is always used in the sg., and the other two always in the pl., whereas ἀσέρβος is always sg. Hence the sg. κατάλοιπον in NH is striking. In Zp 2.9 κατάλοιπον 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 Ὁ here, ἐπὶ χειρίζεται, 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 υπόλειμμα [= Ὁ].
ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] Probably imported from the next verse. There is no space for it in NH.

πίπτουσα] > Ὡ. For the use of πίπτο with ‘dew’ as the subject, see μὴ πέσοι ἕρ’ ὑμᾶς μῆτε ὑπέσος μῆτε υπετός 2K 1.21L.19

ἀρνεὶς Ῥῒβῖμ [The Heb. word, parallel with ἱς, means ‘copious showers.’ In Index 17a ἱβίρ 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.

ἀγρωστὶν ὑπὲρ] This rare Gk word, ἀγρωστίς, 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 noun instead of such common words as βοτάνη or χόρτος to translate an as common Heb. word, ὑπὲρ. NH (9.11) does read χόρτον.

ὅπως ἦν) This Heb. particle can certainly indicate a purpose, e.g. καὶ φυλάξῃ τὰ δικαιώματα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, μήτε δρόσος μήτε ὑετός 2K 1.21 L.19

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.

5.8 (5.7) καὶ ἔσται τὸ ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ἰακώβ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν πολλῶν ὡς λέων ἐν κτήνεσιν ἐν τῷ δρυμῷ καὶ ὡς σκύμνος ἐν ποιμνίοις προβάτων, ὅπως ἀποστῆσαι καὶ διαστείλας ἁρπάσῃ καὶ μὴ ἔχωμεν ἀνατρέψῃ.

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.

19 In GELS s.v. πίπτω 1 a “2K 1.21” is to be corrected to “2K 1.21L.” R reads καταβῇ < καταβαίνω.

20 Its English translation given above follows its definition in LSJ.

21 Some more examples are mentioned in BDB s.v. יחל 8 b.

22 In Index 123a s.v. ὑφίστημι, we would place 1) ἦν ἐπ᾽ οὐδὲν ἄντι, 2) ἔσται τὸ ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ἰακώβ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.
κτήνεσιν [κτήνος] used mostly in the pl., just as בַּהֲמוֹת, denotes landed animal, whether domesticated or not. In view of the parallelism here, <ὅς - animal name, sg. + locative ἐν - animal name, pl.> κτήνεσιν, 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 [κυθήρ] The Gk word can denote young of any predatory animal. Here the preceding λέων suggests ‘lion’s cub.’ In אַרְיֵה גּוּר Na 2.12 we have a two-word definition of κυθήρ, rendered analogously σκύμνος λέοντος, sim. in Ge 49.9 and De 33.22.

ὅταν τρόπον = ὡς ἄν. 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, 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 ὅταν there are some in which ὅταν is almost redundant and the main value of the clause is that of comparison, e.g. ἡ ὀψίς αὐτῶν ὁμοίωμα ἑν τοῖς τέσσαρις, ὃν τρόπον ὅταν ᾖ τρόχος ἐν μέσῳ τροχοῦ ‘they four looked like one image as if one wheel were inside in the other wheel’ Ez 10.10 < καὶ ἐξήγειρέν με ὅταν ἐξερθήτω ἄνθρωπός ἐξ ὑπνοῦ αὐτοῦ.

Am 3.12 ὃν τρόπον ὅταν ἐκπάσῃ ὁ ποιμὴν ἐκ στόματος τοῦ λέοντος δύο σκέλη ἢ λοβὸν ὀστῶν, οὕτως ἐκπασθήσονται οἱ υἱοὶ Ισραηλ.

Am 5.19 ὃν τρόπον ὅταν διέλθῃ καὶ διαστείλας ἁρπάσῃ καὶ μὴ ᾖ ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος καὶ οὐκ ἔχει μεθ’ αὐτοῦ γὰρ τέκνα ἡμῶν.

Mi 5.8 ὃν τρόπον ὅταν διέλθῃ καὶ διαστείλας ἁρπάσῃ καὶ μὴ ᾖ ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος καὶ οὐκ ἔχει μεθ’ αὐτοῦ γὰρ τέκνα ἡμῶν.

Zc 4.1 καὶ ἐξήγειρέν με ὅταν τρόπον ὅταν ἐξεγερθήν ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑπνοῦ αὐτοῦ.

Is 7.2 καὶ ἐξήγειρεν ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅταν τρόπον ὅταν ἐν ὁλοφανείᾳ ὑπὸ πνεύματος σαλευθῆ.

Ez 10.10 ὃν τρόπον ὅταν ὁ τροχὸς ἐν μέσῳ τροχοῦ 'τροχόςἐνμέσωτροχοῦ.'

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 ε should better read:

c. preceded by ὅταν τρόπον and almost pleonastic: ὃν τρόπον ὅταν τροχὸς ἐν μέσῳ τροχοῦ Ez 10.10(-); ὃν τρόπον ὅταν ἐκπάσῃ Am 3.12(-), where ὅτα οὐκ ἔχει μεθ’ αὐτοῦ γὰρ τέκνα ἡμῶν.

v.l., cf. Mi 5.8(a), Zc 4.1(-), Is 7.2(-).
In Na 3.14 we find a correct translation of this Heb. verb, ‘to trample’: רָמַס > 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. Διαστέλλω 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) υψωθησεται ἡ χείρ σου ἐπὶ τοὺς θλίβοντάς σε, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἔχθροι σου ἔξολεθρησθονται.

Your hand will be raised above those who afflict you, and all your foes will be annihilated.

υψωθησεται χείρ] ἡ is optative26 as against σος. If our translator recognised the form as such and wished to reproduce its full value, he could have used a desiderative optative, υψωθείη, and continued with ἔξολεθρεύειη-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. υψωσας την δεξιαν των εχθρων αυτω Ps 88.43.

5.10 (5.9) Καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνη, λέγει κύριος, ἔξολεθρεύσω τοὺς ἵππους σου ἐκ μέσου σου καὶ ἀπολῶ τὰ ἀρματὰ 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.

5.11 (5.10) καὶ ἔξολεθρεύσω τὰς πόλεις τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἔξαρῳ πάντα τὰ ὀχυρώματα σου.

I shall annihilate the cities of your land and obliterate all your fortresses.

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. διαστέλλω “20) רמס qal” had better be moved under “Del.”
26 But not “Erhebe deine Hand” (Wolff 123), which should be סמר.
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 הקרה, הִאֶבְד, הָרָס, נָתַש, and הִשְׁמִיד. The list can be prolonged.\(^{28}\) The translator’s Greek vocabulary competes rather well: ἐξολεθρεύω, ἀπόλλυμι, ἐξαιρώ, ἐκκόπτω, ἀφανίζω.\(^{29}\) These are verbs denoting destruction.

5.12 (5.11) καὶ ἐξαρῶ τὰ φάρμακά σου ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου, καὶ ἄποφθεγγόμενοι οὐκ ἔσονται ἐν σοί.

And I shall take your magic charms off your hands, and there shall be no diviners amongst you.

Further to our remark on the preceding verse, we note that the verb קרה appears in three\(^{30}\) consecutive verses, 10-12. Our translator, however, does not mechanically render it, but in this verse uses a different verb, ἐξαιρῶ 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.

ἄποφθεγγόμενοι μαστύνημα] 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 ἄποφθεγγάματα ‘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 (χρησμόζ), e.g. Diodorus Siculus 16.27 and Lucian, Alexander 25.
\(^{32}\) The Antiochene version (L) reads προφητεύοντας ‘those who prophesy’ for הנביאים.
5.13 (5.12) καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω τὰ γλυπτά σου καὶ τὰς στήλας σου ἐκ μέσου σου, καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ προσκυνήσῃς τοῖς ἥργοις 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.

5.14 (5.13) καὶ ἐκκόψω τὰ ἁλση 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.

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 ee.
And I shall, with anger and with fury, execute vengeance against the nations, because they did not listen.

ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν ἔνας ἀνθ᾿ ὑπὲρ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀσχολεῖ ἄνθρωπος δὲ καὶ ἄσχολος ἐν τῷ ἐθνῷ ἀκροβατικός ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη. BDB 668a s.v. ἐν analyses ἀς as a direct object marker. ἔνας with ὑπὲρ and the like can be combined with a variety of prepositions to mark somebody affected by such a deed: ἀνθ᾿, ἔνας, ἀτε καὶ ἄνθρωπος. Only with ἀνθρωπίνη we find three indisputable cases of combination with ἀς as a direct object marker, e.g. ἐν ἐθνοῖς ἐν ἀνθρωπίνης ἀνθρωπίνης ἀνθρωπίνης Je 1.16, so ib. 4.12, 12.1, but in ἀνθρωπίνης ἀνθρωπίνης ἀνθρωπίνης Je 39.5 we have a distinct syntagm with ἀς as a preposition, sim. ib. 52.9. With ἐν ἀτε or ἀνθρωπίνη ἐν ἀνθρωπίνης we find only ἔνας or ἀνθρωπίνης Ps 149.7, sim. Je 50.15, Ez 25.14, 17 and ἔνας ἐν ἐθνοῖς ἐν ἀνθρωπίνης Jd 11.36, sim. Je 11.20, 20.10, 46.10. In view of these data we are inclined to view ἀς in Mi 5.15(14) as a preposition.

ἀνθ᾿ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρωπίνης] The causal value of ἀνθρωπίνης is well established. The first instance mentioned in BDB s.v. 8 is: ἐν ἐθνοῖς ἐν ἀνθρωπίνης ἐν ἀνθρωπίνης ἐν ἀνθρωπίνης Ge 30.18 > Ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν μισθὸν μου ἀνθ᾿ ὑπὲρ ἐδωκα τὴν παιδίσκην μου τῷ ἀνδρὶ μου. The use of the compound conjunction is felicitous because of its first constituent, ἀνθ᾿, which “precedes a noun of deed(s) which is requited, whether positively (reward) or, mostly, negatively (punishment)” (GELS s.v. ἀνθ᾽ 3).
CHAPTER VI

6.1) Ἀκούσατε δὴ λόγον κυρίου κύριος εἰπεν Ἀνάστηθι κρίθητι πρός τὰ ὁρα, καὶ ἀκοουσάτωσαν βουνοὶ φωνήν σου.

Do hear the word of the Lord: the Lord has said, “Arise, challenge the mountains, and let hills hear your voice.”

6.2) ἰκούσατε, λαοί, τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ αἱ φάραγγες θεμέλια τῆς γῆς, ὅτι κρίσις τοῦ κυρίου πρός τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ 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.

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 Η.

φάραγγες A most unusual equivalence. A look at the only other occurrence of תָן (יתנ) seems to suggest that for some reason or other our translator struggled with this Hebrew word: רַחֵל כִּמָּשַׁפְתִּי וְעַמִּים קָנָה אֵתָן וְקִילָּסֵהּ֛ וּדָאָרָכָה וְקִדָּוִסָה וּדְקָאִוָתָה; 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. Clefts or chasms in the ground can scarcely be called the foundations of the earth. 2

6.3) λαὸς 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.

Neither λυπέω nor παρενοχλέω is a doubly transitive verb. Hence the interrogative τί is adverbal here, meaning “In what manner?”. 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 נב. 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) πριν Ez 6.3 is to be restored, and under 2) י Mi 6.2 is to be deleted.
From the meanings of the two Greek verbs concerned the second appears to be a rendering of הֶלְאֵתִי, but then where does the first come from? 3

On the use of the preposition in a description of exchange in court, see above at vs. 1.

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.

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.

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 Trgךְ עֲלָא סְגִיתִי קַשְׁיָא מְרוּעָא.

In Index 75b s.v. λυπέω we would delete 7) ולאו hi. and accordingly λυπεῖν ib. 239a s.v. ולאו 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 ἡμῶν ‘my predecessors’ Thucydides 1.97.
but in the other attestation in XII we have the same equivalence as here: τὸν χειμάρρουν τῶν σχοίνων < σύν με τόν κύριον JI 4.18.

The pl. of ἡ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ κυρίου 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 times – applied to humans, indicating manifestations of their character. E.g. οἱ ποιοῦντες ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ δικαιοσύναι πλησθήσονται ζωῆς To 12.96.

6.6) ἐν τίνι καταλάβω τὸν κύριον, ἀντιλήμψομαι θεοῦ μου υψίστου; εἰ καταλήμψομαι 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?

ἐν τίνι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ κυρίου. 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 Тί ἀντιλήμψομαι τῷ κυρίῳ; ἦ τι λαλήσωμεν ἦ τι δικαιοθῶμεν; Ge 44.16.8 It is about an attempt to secure God’s favour.

ἀντιλήμψομαι 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 υψίστου] ‘Ὑψιστος is often used on its own, substantivised, e.g. ὁ γονιμός τοῦ υψίστου ‘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 ἔλεος σου τὸ ἔσχατον ‘your latest mercy’ Ru 3.10 and τὰ ἔλεη σου τὰ ἄρχαία ‘your former mercies’ Ps 88.50. As regards מָרוֹם the following three instances are instructive, all in Ez:

5 Including ὅν αὐτὸ 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: “einnnehmen .. erreichen.”
9 See also Pesh. /'ešpar/, i.e. ‘I may be considered good enough.’
10 More examples are mentioned in GELS s.v. 1.
a) 17.23 ἐν ὄρει μετεώρῳ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ
b) 20.40 ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τοῦ ἁγίου μου, ἐπὶ ὄρους υψηλοῖς ὄρους Ἰσραήλ
c) 34.14 ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ὑψηλῷ Ἰσραήλ

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) μετεώρος cannot be anything other than an attributive adjective. Our document does not attest to the use of עֶלְיוֹן as in יֹדֵעַ דַּעַת עֶלְיוֹן 'he who knows the knowledge of the Most High' Nu 24.16.11

6.7) εἰ προσδέξηται κύριος ἐν χυλιάσι κριῶν ἢ ἐν μυριάσι χειμάρρων πιόνων; εἰ δῶ πρωτότοκα μου ἁσβείας, καρπὸν κοιλίας μου ἀπέρ ἀμαρτίας 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?

Thus the translation: εἰ ἢ] On εἰ introducing a question, see above at 2.7.

προσδέξηται] 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 χυλιάσι κριῶν] 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. מְנַהֵג נִקְסָם מִיֵּדְכֶם מִנְחָה εἰ δῶ προσδέχομαι αὐτὰ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν υμῶν Ma 1.10; ib. 13.

Since G did not take ב as an object marker, he must have understood the preposition as instrumental, which is affiliated with bet pretii, and it is necessary to understand μέ or έμέ as direct object. Though no such Heb. manuscript is known, the translator might be mentally reconstructing בְּ as מְנַהֵג נִקְסָם or suchlike. These remarks equally apply to the second ἐν in the verse.

The syntagm <num. st. est. - 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 Widderren annehmen" (SD) is questionable. NETS's "receive favourably among thousands of rams" is as questionable, for the Gk prep. here is scarcely locative.
In view of the parallel χιλιάσι this larger number is likely to refer to πῖονον. “Tens of thousands of lines of fatted animals” would not be accepted even for poetic licence, although the syntactic hierarchy is <a - [b - c]>.

πῖονον [πιόνων] is unattested in LXX. 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 שָׁמֶן as adj. meaning ‘fat’ occurs in הַשְּׁמֵנָה Ez 34.16, where is understood, and MH amply testifies to the word applied to animals, e.g. דָּגִים שָׁמִים ‘fat fishes.’14 Our translator probably mentally reconstructed here שְׁמֵנִים.

πρωτότοκά μου ἀσεβείας πεσόντος [πρωτότοκος] Assuming what follows, πεσόντος, is in explanatory apposition, πρωτότοκος and πεσόντος 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 ἀνθρώπων τῶν υἱῶν σου λυτρώσῃ Ex 13.13, τά πρωτότοκα τῶν υἱῶν σου δώσεις ἐμοί 22.28 and others. Though the genuine masc. form is still found, e.g. Υἱὸς πρωτότοκὸς μου Ισραήλ ‘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 G and H alike? HALOT 982b s.v. שלש 3c writes: “to give my first-born because of my crime (causal acc., see GK § 118 l.” Such an analysis was attempted in the Vulg., “pro scelere meo,” Rashi (רבקה למשות), Ibn Ezra and Radaq (רשביה משות). 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. שלש 6 suggests “offering for transgression,” though the only reference is our Mi case. On the other hand, such an extension is securely attested for הַשֶּׁם, e.g. נְעָה הַשֶּׁם Ps 40.7, and perhaps suggests that its Vorlage may have read, or the translator may have mentally reconstructed, .. שֶׁם מִיַּרְאַת. In any event, for the subject ofתָבוֹא is יִרְאָה, pace GK “thou shall not come thither for fear of briers.” See also Vulg. non veniet illuc terror spinarum, Trg. נָל וְנִיט וָסָרֶא, and Pesh. /lā’ te’ël l-tammān deḥltā’ d-ya’rā’/. Willis (1968.274) follows Lescow’s (1966.46) “für meine Bosheit .. für mein verfehltes Leben”, seeing here an acc. of cause.

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; θ’s προσgeom was probably read as κεφαλή.

14 For more examples, see Jastrow 1903, s.v. שלש II.

15 Once applied to a daughter: ὄνομα τῇ πρωτοτόκῳ Μεροβ, καὶ ὄνομα τῇ δεύτερᾳ Μελχ. 1K 14.49, where the Lucianic version, taking offence at this, emended the adjective to τῆς πρεσβύτερας.

16 The sole instance mentioned by GK loc. cit. is .. ἐν τῷ πλήθῳ παραβάτων ἀγαθῶν לִשֵׁם מֵא לָא Ls 7.25, where οὐ μή ἔπληθή Ἐκλή υφόβος, ἔσται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς χέρσου καὶ ἀκάνθης εἰς βοσκημα προβάτου perhaps suggests that its Vorlage may have read, or the translator may have mentally reconstructed, .. όπερ τόμπρελ. In any event, for the subject ofτόμπρελ is προβάτος, pace GK “thou shalt not come thither for fear of briers.” See also Vulg. non veniet illuc terror spinarum, Trg. נָל וְנִיט וָסָרֶא, and Pesh. /lā’ te’ël l-tammān deḥltā’ d-ya’rā’/.
innumerable references listed in BDB s.v. חַטָּאת. An analogous shift, most likely under Hebrew influence, is observable in ἁμάρτημα as in ἐπιθήσει τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ ἁμαρτίματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ σφάξουσιν τὴν χίμαιραν τῆς ἁμαρτίας (767 2χ) ‘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 ἁμαρτίας (767) ‘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 τῆς ἁμαρτίας and τὸ μοσχάριον τῆς ἁμαρτίας 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, ἁμαρτία, is preceded by a preposition, ὑπέρ, probably added in Θ independently of Η, but ἀσέβεια not. On this use of ὑπέρ τινος, note τὰ ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας ‘the sin-offerings’ Ez 40.39 and ἐρίφους δῶο αἰγῶν ἁμώμους ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας ‘two impeccable young goats for sin-offering’ ib. 43.22.19

The parallelism here also suggests that ἀσέβειας is sg., not ‘manifestations of impiety,’ though that could stand in apposition to the pl. προτότοκά 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 ἁμαρτία applied to illicit sexual acts in ἐκαστός τὴν νύμφην αὐτοῦ ἐμίαινεν ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ Ez 22.11.

ἀμαρτίας ψυχῆς μου ἴνα ἀπαντήσῃ] According to Wolff (138) ψυχή 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 ἁμαρτία? 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 πρωτότοκα used here.21

6.8) εἶ ἄνηγγέλη σοι, ἄνθρωπε, τί καλόν; ἢ τί κύριος ἐκζητεῖ παρὰ σοῦ ἄλλα; ἢ τοῦ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ ἄγαπάν ἐλέος καὶ ἐτοιμόν εἰναι 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. ἁμαρτία 3.
19 Cf. Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν 1Cor 15.3, and for further examples, see BDAG s.v. ὑπέρ A 1 b.
20 More examples are adduced in SSG § 22 v (xxi).
21 On this important, though complicated, question, see above at Ho 9.5.
A heh may have dropped out, i.e. haplography: חֵסֶד > חֶסֶד.

By using the passive form the translator might be averting the question that might arise as to who said it. Hence there is no absolute need to assume that his Vorlage actually read וּמָה־יְהוָה = נַחֲד. Of course it is possible that he parsed the defectiva spelled הנד as Hofal. In both Hebrew and Greek the third ms verb form is occasionally used impersonally.

The parallelism with עֲשׂוֹת shows that here is functioning as an inf. cst. just as בְּאֵלֹהֶיךָ Ec 3.8. Its syntactic status differs in Ps אֱלֹהִים אֶת־חַסְדֵּי אֶת־חַסְדִּים 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 חֶסֶד אַהֲבַת 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.

A rather unexpected rendering. The root צנָע commonly thought to have to do with humility occurs only once more in BH, and correctly rendered in G: חָכְמָה אֵת־צְנוּעִים στόμα δὲ ταπεινῶν μελετᾷ σοφίαν Pr 11.2. The root occurs four times in Ben Sira, but its Gk translations are problematic:

a) 16.25 ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἀπαγγέλω ἐπιστήμην ‘I shall express my unexaggerated view’
   ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἀπαγγέλω ἐπιστήμην ‘I shall tell a view with accuracy’

b) 35.3 ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἐπιστήμην ‘with accurate knowledge’
   ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἐπιστήμην ‘Keep (your talk on) science under control’

b) 35.3 ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἐπιστήμην ‘with accurate knowledge’
   ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἐπιστήμην ‘Keep (your talk on) science under control’

c) 34.22 ‘whatever you do, be humble’
   ‘whatever you do, be humble’
   ἐν πάσι τοῖς ἔργοις σου γίνου ἐντρέχεις ‘in all your works be skilful’
   ἐν πάσι τοῖς ἔργοις σου γίνου ἐντρέχεις ‘in all your works be skilful’

d) 42.8 ‘a humble man in the presence of every living one’
   ‘a humble man in the presence of every living one’
   δεδοκιμασμένος ἵναντι παντὶ ζῶντος ἐντρέχεις ‘acceptable before every living one’
   δεδοκιμασμένος ἵναντι παντὶ ζῶντος ἐντρέχεις ‘acceptable before every living one’

We see this translator also struggling. Our Mi translator might be doing his own best.

---

22 Both Vulg. and Pesh. got out of the problem by making the prophet speak: Indicabo and ḥawwītāk/, quite a departure from ג. 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 τῇ πόλεὶ ἐπικληθῆσεται, καὶ σώσει φοβουμένους τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. ἄκουε, φυλή, 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?

6.10) μὴ πῦρ καὶ οἶκος ἀνόμου θησαυρίζων θησαυροὺς ἀνόμους καὶ μέτρον ὑβρείας ἁδικίας;

Fire and the house of a lawbreaker hoarding ill-gotten treasures and a measure of arrogance, injustice?

μὴ πῦρ καὶ οἶκος = τὰ τῆς ἁριστής ἡμέρας τῆς ἁριστής ἡμέρας. 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.

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 Θ 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.
CHAPTER VI

θησαυρίζων] Ziegler encloses the word with square brackets. Though only one Gk manuscript lacks this word and Ḥ 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 ἄνομους?

θησαυροὺς ἄνομους ἥρθαν] Following his predecessors, Ziegler rejects an important v.l., ἄνομιας. In the overwhelming majority of its instances ἄνομος refers to a person, e.g. οὗτ ὄφελήσον μι σήμερω ἄνομος ‘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, רֶשַׁע אֹצְרוֹת is unthinkable. The reading θησαυροὺς ἄνομιας merits further consideration, not only because of its greater conformity with Ḥ here.

μέτρον ὕβρεως] Ziegler’s reading is an indisputable improvement on the traditional μετὰ ὕβρεως in view of אֵיפַת.

In Index 120a s.v. ὕβρις γλῶσσα 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 δικαιωθῆσεται ἐν ζυγῷ ἄνομος καὶ ἐν μαρσίππῳ στάθμια δόλου;

Can someone unlawful as regards scales and falsified weights as regards bags be justified?

дает камчатке ложку капиллярной палочки:

dikaiowthēsetai] = ἔκα. The translator read ἔκα, which forced him to manipulate מָאָרִי, reading it מָאָרִים and not doing justice to the parallelism of the two prepositional phrases.

6.12) εἰς όν τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν ἀσεβείας ἐπλήσαν, καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτῶν 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.

חרס האש יישר מלחמה דרדרים קנונים ברמת פשלים:

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 ἄνομος: “[Speichert] etwa das Feuer und das Haus .. unrechte Schätze ..?”

31 The most frequent among eight equivalents. As the eighth is to be added רְשָׁע Jd 5.22L; cf. Schreiner 1957.122.

32 None of the four patristic commentators consulted offers any hint on the matter.
The antecedents of ὧν are most likely the immediately preceding στάθμια δόλου, which served as instruments for unlawful accumulation of wealth. The Heb syntax, however, makes us anticipate ἐν ὑπόθεσις or something like that inside the relative clause.33

ὁ τῶν πλούτων αὐτῶν ἁμαρτίας ἐξελέφθη = ἕμπορες. In Hebrew both Qal מלא and Piel מילס can take two zero-objects. E.g. מָלֵא אֲשֶׁר הָיָה כָּפָר נֶגֶר 1Kg 18.34; מִלְּאַהוּ אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ רָחַל הָאֲמָלַח מִשְׁמַת מִלְּא, Ex 31.3. By contrast, מִלְּפָלַת, when it takes two objects, enters only one syntagm, <vb - acc. - gen.>, and never <vb - acc. - acc.>. Hence ἁμαρτίας in our Mi passage is sg. gen., not pl. acc. Interestingly, a synonymous verb, ἐμπλημάζω, attests to both syntagms: ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα θείον σοφίας Ex 31.3, where σοφίας is to be construed with πνεῦμα θείον, and not with the verb as against ἐνέπλησαν 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 ἁμαρτίας as a gen. of quality, i.e. ‘their wealth obtained through acts of impiety,’ for Hebrew does not allow מָלֵא 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 = ἐνέπλησα from μερ. The verb is indicative of arrogance,34 cf. ὑψωθῆ ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ῥομ—λήβων 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’ בינה אני Pr 8.14 in lieu of a more prosaic מֵבִין אני. This may have been missed by the translator, hence G’s attempt to restructure H.35

The 3fs pronouns must be referring to the city (πόλις) in vs. 9 above.

6.13) καὶ ἐγὼ ἔρχομαι τοῦ πατάξαι σε, ὅφαινός σε ἐπὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις σου.

I on my part shall begin to strike you, I shall exterminate you on account of your sins.

καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνέγνωσάμην] The ubiquitous particle ταῦτα cannot mean here that two persons do the same thing. Hence not to be rendered ‘I, too.’ An analogous case is ἦσατε γνώσκετε Ἰ δύο ἐστιν 2Sm 12.13.36

33 An argument presented by Wolff (160) for viewing ἁμαρτίας as causal in value. So many modern translations.
34 Cf. ὑπερηφάνῳ κεχρημένοι διανοίᾳ ‘having taken recourse to arrogant thinking’ Theodore 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 indigenous people sick who are robbed by you through your deceptions,” though no such incident is
The selection of the fut. in G, however, is anomalous. ἄφανιῶ σε is one of the most frequent equivalents of the verb root והשת. It is not easy to say precisely how the translator parsed והשת. 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 ἄφανιῶ suggests that he identified והשת as a non-finite verb form.

You may eat but will never 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.

The morphologically redundant pronoun in Greek and Hebrew alike is comparable to an accusing finger pointed at a person. The Heb. word here is a crux interpretum. G 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.

Comparison with another occurrence of the same verb root in Mi could be illuminating. In οὐ γὰρ ἀπώσεται ὁνείδη ‘for He will not remove humiliations’ Mi 2.6 G must have read Hif. יַסֵּג as against יִסַּג, though he leaves the identity of the subject vague, maybe deliberately: “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 כ we could see here “assertive” force of the independent personal pronoun, on which see SSG § 7 be. But in view of כ that could not have been our translator’s intention.

Pace Harper (2016.85) we have not here an inf. abs. following a weqatal form.

For Greek see SSG § 7 be, and for Hebrew Muraoka 1985.50f., 58 (3).

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.

Note our remark below on παραδοθήσοντα. 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.
διασωθήσεται

Ez 7.16. Would one then postulate תפלו in lieu of קפלת?

Some modern Bible translations translate את as “that which,” “what,” etc., but things you manage to rescue would not be handed over to a sword. The mpl. את can only refer to animate beings, humans. The person being addressed here, according to ס, is in some leadership position, attempting to rescue coreligionists or compatriots of his.

παραδοθήσονται = מתן. 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 ἀμήσῃς, 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,

σὺ τὴν] On the value of these pronouns which are morphologically redundant, see at vs. 14 above. In this verse it is even repeated.

πιέσεις κρήνη] The Heb. verb makes it plain that it is about treading fresh olives on a floor, which may escape readers of ס, 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 σμύρνινῳ ἐλαιῷ Es 2.12 o’, where it might not be a Hebraism (אַרְעַסֶךָ בְּשֶׁמֶן) in view of a case in CG such as ἀλειψαμένω λίπ’ ἐλαιῷ ‘when the two anointed themselves richly with oil’ Homer II. 10.577.

וְתִירוֹשׁ] Once in XII this noun occurs in conjunction with יַיִן and both have been translated: בְּלִי יָּיִן וְתִירוּשׁ יַיִן 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, יי left untranslated.

The equivalences in LXX of the words in question look as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>שֶכֶר</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>שֶכֶר</th>
<th>142</th>
<th>שֶכֶר</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>שֶכֶר</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μέθυσμα</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>οἶνος</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>μέθυσμα</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>μέθυσμα</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἶνος</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>γλεῦκος</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>οἶνος</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>μέθη</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>μέθη</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 שִׁירִי / μέθυσμα is יַיִן και μέθυσμα Ho 4.11. This is striking since the above table shows that οἶνος is the standard rendering of both יַיִן and שִׁירִי. 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 שִׁירִי 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 שִׁירִי meant? His knowledge of this detail of the agriculture in the Holy Land may not have been good enough as to suggest to him τρύξ 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 και יַיִן 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 Ḥ 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 Ḡ the generic term alone was mentioned: “Not food alone, but also οἶνος would not be available for you to enjoy with others.”

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.

42 This is probably what is meant in “The Bible called it [= יַיִן] שִׁירִי” (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 יַיִן, grape juice, as distinct from intoxicating שִׁירִי.

43 On potential implications of our translator’s probably urban upbringing, see above at p. 127.
ἀφανισθήσεται] In Index 20a s.v. ἀφανίζω has been suggested.\(^{44}\) However, our identification at ἵππος (> ἀφανισθῶσι) Ho 5.15 as ἵππος renders ἵππος more likely. Note also ἵππος / ἀφανισμός here.

λαοῦ μου] = νῦν. Pace Rahlfs Ziegler justly adds a full stop after μου, making the clause continue vs. 15, for otherwise καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα οἴκου Αχααβ would end up hanging in the air, not linked backwards or forwards.

After μου Rahlfs adds καὶ ἐφύλαξας [= וַתִּשְׁמֹר] τὰ δικαιώματα Ζαμβρι, which is roughly equivalent to ה, 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.

tοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτῆς] 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 Ιερουσαλημ 2C 20.20.\(^{45}\)

λαῶν] = עַמִּים, which gives a message totally different from ה, 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 שׁמד 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.
7.1) Oἰμμοι ὦτι ἐγενόμην ὡς συνάγων καλάμην ἐν ἅμητῳ καὶ ὡς ἐπιφυλ-λίδα ἐν τρυγήτῳ ὑπάρχοντος βότρυος τοῦ φαγέιν τῷ πρωτό-γόνασ. οἴμμοι, ψυχή.

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,

οἴμμοι

אִוְּתָה

An equivalence that occurs only twice, the other occurrence in Jb 10.15.

συνάγων] = אֹסֵף
καλάμην ἐν ἅμητῳ] Obviously too long for Ψ, and קַשׁ ‘summer’ has nothing to do with Ἄμητος here. In Index 8a s.v. ἅμητος, the dagesh of קַשׁ has been proposed, though this must be rather tentative, given its considerable departure from Ψ. The equivalence καλάμη / קַשׁ occurs nine more times in LXX.

τα 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. In Ψ הבכרה is the object of the following verb, ‘(my soul) desired.’ Once our translator analysed בכרה as we are suggesting here, there remained not much scope for him to do as he did, admitting here an equivalent of נפשו, maybe אֲהָהָה, a word he appears to be fond of. In another passage in XII he repeats it three times, when Ψ uses it only once: οἴμμοι ἑλεθη ἑλεθη οἴμμοι εἰς ἡμέραν Jl 1.15.

1 The difference between Ἄ and Ἄ is not, pace SD (II 2378), that of sg. // pl., but between two different lexemes, Qal ptc. sg // cst.pl. of אֹסֶף, 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 Ψ reads קַשׁ for καλάμη.

3 In Index 119b s.v. τρύγητος, delete 2) a. קַשׁ.

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 Ψ an asyndetic relative clause, an analysis that would be analogous to that in Ἄ. We would, however, not equate נפשו with נפשו, see above (p. 115) ad Ho 9.4.
7.2) ὅτι ἀπόλωλεν εὐλαβὴς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ κατορθῶν ἐν ἄνθρωποις οὐχ ὑπάρχει· πάντες εἰς αἷμα δικάζονται, ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ ἐκθλίβουσιν ἐκθλιβῇ.

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.

[76x621]258 MICAH

[99x595]formulario = ἐκθλίβη. Here emerges a message quite different from that of Ḥ, in which people are lying in wait to commit murders, whereas in ᾿G 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 ἐκθλίβει] 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 Ḥ reads ῥῆη. On the other hand, our translator makes use of an alternative, also Hebraising, expression as in Ḥ יָצוּדוּ אֶת־אָחִיהוּ אִישׁ יֶאֱרֹבוּ לְדָמִים כֻּלָּם אָיִן בָּאָדָם וְיָשָׁר מִן־הָאָרֶץ חֵרֶם אָבָד: (Index 36b s.v. ἐκθλίβω we suggested Qal ῥῆ as a Heb. equivalent. But on second thoughts, its Hif. looks a better candidate in the light of an example such as καὶ ἐκθλίψον τοὺς ἄνθρωπους ὑπὲρ ἐναώτης ἔλεος και οἰκτιρμόν ποιεῖτε ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ Zc 7.9; four more times in XII. One wonders whether or not ᾿G's Vorlage read ἐκτίθη here.6 ἐκθλίβουσιν] In Index 36b s.v. ἐκθλίβω we suggested Qal ῥῆ as a Heb. equivalent.7 But on second thoughts, its Hif. looks a better candidate in the light of an example such as καὶ ἐκθλίψον τοὺς ἄνθρωπους ὑπὲρ ἐναώτης ἔλεος και οἰκτιρμόν ποιεῖτε ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν ἄδελφον αὐτοῦ Zc 7.9; four more times in XII. One wonders whether or not ᾿G's Vorlage read ἐκτίθη here.6 ἐκθλίβη] This can be analysed as an instance of the well-known cognate dative.8 However, in Ḥ there is no matching figura etymologica, something like ῥῆ or ῥῆ. Though one could dismiss it as freely translated, the translator might have in his mind ἄρθρο 'fishing net' as in Ḥב 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)yl, Trg. יֵשָׂהוּ, and Vulg. fratem suum = Ḥ.
7 Wolff (175) suggests יָצוּר, i.e. < צָר 'to besiege, shut in.'
8 For details, see SSG § 22 wr.
7.3) ἐπὶ τὸ κακὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἑτοιμάζουσιν· ὁ ἄρχων αἴτει, καὶ ὁ κριτὴς εἰρηνικοὺς λόγους ἐλάλησεν, καταθύμιον ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ ἐστι· καὶ ἔξελούμαι τὰ ἁγαθὰ 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

σύνέρχεται...=linebreak

ἔτοιμαζον] The translation is Aramaising. In Aramaic Pael means ‘to prepare.’

eἰρηνικοὺς λόγους] Unlike in λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλῆσιον αὐτοῦ καὶ κρίμα εἰρηνικὸν κρίνατε ἐν ταῖς πύλαις ὑμῶν Ze 8.16 the adjective here must be taken in sensu malo. κρίνατε of Ἁ must have been read as μάθησιν, and δὲν as δὲρ, but even so the rendition is rather expansive. What has happened to לֹוַלְדָו?

ἔξελούμαι] Another free rendition of a hapax in BH.

τὰ ἁγαθὰ αὐτῶν] This is the first word of vs. 4. The neut. adjective here is substantivised.9 As implied in n. 9, ἁγαθὰ 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 ἐκτρώγων καὶ βαδίζων ἐπὶ κανόνος ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σκοπίας σου. [οὐαί οὐαί] αἱ ἐκδίκησις σου ἥκασι, νῦν ἔσονται 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.

σύνερχεται] Here again our translator appears to be struggling with features of the landscape of the Holy Land.11 Is he aware of: סְלֻלָה יְשָׁרוֹן וּאֵרוֹחַ חֵדֶק כִּמְשֻׂכַת עָצֵל דֶּרֶךְ Pr 15.19? There, however, no moth is around. מְזוּכָתָם תִהְיֶה עַתָּה בָאָה פְּקֻדָּתְךָ מְצַפֶּיךָ יוֹם מִמְּסוּכָה יָשָׁר כְּחֵדֶק טוֹבָם σῇς ἐκτρώγων καὶ βαδίζων ἐπὶ κανόνος] Here again it is difficult to decide whether or not the translator read the pl. מְצַפֶּיךָ, but elsewhere in XII we note ἡμέρα ναὶ ἡμέραι τῆς ἐκδίκησεως < מְבֻּכָתָם תִהְיֶה עַתָּה בָאָה פְּקֻדָּתְךָ מְצַפֶּיךָ יוֹם מִמְּסוּכָה יָשָׁר כְּחֵדֶק טוֹבָם

9 The entry in question in GELS 2a s.v. ἁγαθὸς 6 is in need of emendation: “articual and” > “subst.”; “goods, possessions” > “good, valuable possessions; treasures”; “their goods” > “their good things.”

10 So in NTG, e.g. πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἁγαθῶν ‘He filled the hungry with good things’ Lk 1.53 and CG, e.g. ἦν οἱ ἄλλα τε ἁγαθὰ 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 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 πέντευ τοῦ πατρός μου ‘the days of mourning for my father’ Ge 27.41. The same analysis applies to σκοπιᾶς σου. With its pl. form differs slightly: ‘the day when those who watch you are out there.’

A number of equivalents are possible: בְּכוּתָם, cf. בָּכוּת אַלּוֹן בַּלְבַּנְו πένθους Ge 35.8, and בְּכִיָּתָם in MH.

7.5) μὴ καταπιστεύετε ἐν φίλοις καὶ μὴ ἑλπίζετε 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.

7.6) διότι ύιὸς ἀτιμάζει πατέρα, θυγάτηρ ἐπαναστήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς, νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτῆς, ἔχθροι ἀνδρὸς πάντες οἱ ἀνδρεῖς 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 <ἀπό τοῦ - inf.> is attested, see SSG § 30 aba. Hence ἀπό τοῦ ἀναθέσθαι is unlikely here.
14 Pace Wolff (175) פִּתְחֵי 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.

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.

This is the only instance of the equation ἀτιμάζω // בֵּיתוֹ. The lack of grammatical parallelism with τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς is a mechanical reproduction of יִשְׁמוּא.

I, however, would look to the Lord, continue to count on God my saviour, my God will listen to me.

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.

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 ἐπίχαιρέ.

As rightly pointed out the suffix /-i/ cannot mean ‘my,’ 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 G has analysed the form differently. The fem. gender may be compared to the standing expression ציון בַּת. 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. אֶרֶץ, מְלוּכָה or מַמְלָכָה 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. מַמְלָכָה. אֶרֶץ or מְלוּכָה 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. הָאָרֶץ. In order to express a usual causal idea our translator skillfully changes the conjunction in this very verse: διότι.

7.9) ὅτι ἡμιρράον τοῦτο τήν δίκην μου· καὶ ποιήσει τὸ κρίμα μου καὶ ἔξαξει με εἰς τὸ φῶς, διασκορπίζει τήν 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.

ὅτι ἡμιρράον τοῦτο τήν δίκην μου· καὶ ποιήσει τὸ κρίμα μου καὶ ἔξαξει με εἰς τὸ φῶς, διασκορπίζει τήν 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.

The concessive כִּי is not very frequent in BH. HALOT s.v. 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 καί or εἰς καί, but in SG they mean “even if.”

The concessive כִּי is not very frequent in BH. HALOT s.v. 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 καί or εἰς καί, but in SG they mean “even if.”
Whilst Keil (500) points out that יְצִיאֵנִי is not governed by אֲשֶׁר and, starting with יְצִיאֵנִי, “the hope takes the form of the certain assurance,” the vocalisation instead of יְצִיאֶנִּי might be indicative of a wish. Cf. our remarks above ad 7.7 above. A volitive value can be applied to אֶרְאֶה.

The collocation בְּצִדְקָתוֹ אֶרְאֶה 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. בְּ—רָאָה תֵבִיא תָּמוּד לִרְאוֹת τοῦ ἱδεῖν ἐν τῇ χρηστότητι 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.

καὶ δύνεται ἢ ἐξάρῃ μου καὶ περιβαλεῖται αἰσχύνην ἢ λέγουσα πρός με Ποῦ κύριος ὁ θεός σου; οἱ δραλμοί μου ἐπόψονται αὐτήν· νῦν ἔσται εἰς καταπάτημα ὅς πηλὸς ἐν ταῖς ὀδοῖς

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

See above at vs. 8. περιβαλεῖται αἰσχύνην ἢ λέγουσα τичесκι βιβλία ἐπάνω αὐτὴς ἐν τῇ παραστάσει τῆς ηθικής. Ποῦ κύριος ὁ θεός σου;

On this metaphorical use of περιβάλλομαι, cf. περιβαλέσθωσαν αἰσχύνην καὶ ἐντροπήν οἱ ζητοῦντες τὰ κακὰ 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 Ἡ: ‘shame will cover her.’

ἀυτήν] Instead of ἐν αὐτῇ. See at vs. 9 end.

ἡ λέγουσα βιβλία] A substantivised ptc. with the article attached can refer to a past event or condition,21 as in ἐνετείλατο Ἰωσήφ τῷ ὁπίς 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 ἡ εἰποῦσα ‘she who once said’ could have been used.

19 BDB s.v. בָּר Qal 8 a.
20 For more examples, see GELS s.v. εἶδον *2 b and ὁράω I 2 a. Under the former verb, the asterisk is missing.
21 See SSG § 31 ba-bba.
22 As captured by Pesh. /d-(')āmrā (h)wāf/ and Trg. דַּה חバラ.
ἐπόψονται αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ πατήρᾳ] On the collocation ἐν τῇ πατήρᾳ, see on the preceding verse. In Ḡ and Ḥ alike the fem. pronoun can be referring to her shame.

cαταπάτημα μὲν πρὸς] The Gk word refers to a result of καταπατέω ‘to trample,’ whereas מִרְמָס here indicates the action itself, for which SG has κατα-

πάτης as in εἶς καταπάτησιν (שֶׁלֶם) 4K 13.7. A somewhat loose use of this substantive is exemplified in ὁ θεὸς ἀπέστρεψεν χείρα 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 (רֹצְצוֹת) πένητας Am 4.1 // καταπατοῦ-

ντες (רֹצְרֵי) δίκαιον ib. 5.12, where the second Heb. verb in particular has nothing to with feet.

καταπάτημα] The word is unlikely to mean “that which is trampled under foot.”

7.11) ἡμέρας ἀλοιφῆς πλίνθου. ἔξαλειψις σου ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη, καὶ ἀπο-

τρίψεται νόμιμα ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη:

*οἱ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ἡμέρας* on the day of daubing (and making of) brick. That day is your oblitera-

tion, and that day shall annul regulations.

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 ἡμερα should be accent ἡμέρα, a temporal dative.24 In yet another variant, ἐν ἡμερα, i.e. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, the temporal value is explicitly marked with the preposition.25

ἀποτρίψεται] = ρήξ.

The message of the main part of the verse in Ḡ is very difficult to fathom in relation to Ḥ, in which latter we can identify nothing that would be equivalent to ἔξαλειψις. Nor do we see what difficulty ὁδὸς τῶν ἱδων could have caused.26 In Ḡ we hear a doomsday prophecy instead of a gospel message.
over a rosy future.\textsuperscript{27} It must be admitted, however, that the wording of \( \mathcal{H} \) is not quite normal: \( \text{אֲגַדֵּעַ} \) and also \( \text{אָבֹדֶי} \) at the start of the next verse.

7.12) καὶ αἱ πόλεις σου ἐξουσιασάται εἰς ὁμαλισμὸν καὶ εἰς διαμερισμὸν [Ἀσσυρίων] καὶ αἱ πόλεις σου αἱ ὁχυραὶ εἰς διαμερισμὸν ἀπὸ Τύρου ἑως τοῦ ποταμοῦ, ἡμέρα ὀδατός 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.

The comparison with the following εἰς διαμερισμὸν λίμνη suggests that, for whatever reason, \( \mathcal{G} \) reversed \( \text{מִן} \) and \( \text{אַשּׁוּר} \). \( \mathcal{G} \) was familiar with the compound preposition \( \text{לְמִן} \) equivalent to \( \text{מִן} \), as we can see in \( \text{לְמִן־הַיּוֹם} \) ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας \( \text{Hg 2.18} \). But \( \text{לְמִנִּי} \), a hapax in BH and an equivalent to \( \text{מִן} \), may have been unknown to our translator.\textsuperscript{29} His solution was ἡνεκ 'part, portion.'

Now the selection of ὁμαλισμός is possibly due to \( \mathcal{G} \) deriving from \( \text{יאשֵׁר} \). Particularly interesting is the word order: ἔμπροσθέν σου ἀνακρίνεται καὶ ὁρη ὁμαλισμός, ἀνακρίνεται καὶ ὁρη ὁμαλισμός, συντρίβονται καὶ μοχλοὺς καὶ ὁμαλισμός ἀνακρίνεται καὶ ὁρη ὁμαλισμός. \( \text{Is 45.2} \), where ὁρη ὁμαλισμός represents \( \text{יאשֵׁר} \) and all the last three verbs are about destructive activities.\textsuperscript{30} Cf. an idiomatic Dutch expression: \textit{met de grond gelijk maken}.

\( \text{αἱ πόλεις σου} \) \( = \) \( \text{ךָעָרֶי} \).\textsuperscript{28} The possessive pronoun is a harmonisation with the preceding \( \text{ךָעָדֶי} \), for \( \text{ךָעָדֶי} \) is impossible in Hebrew here.

The article has been sensibly added, as the reference is to Euphrates.

The first half is obviously \( \text{יְמִי} \) \( = \) \( \text{יְמִי} \) \( \text{ךָהָר} \), but what lies behind θορύβου is quite a mystery, but it must be admitted what it is.
is supposed to mean is as mysterious. Is a day of flooding and disarray in a battlefield meant?

7.13) καὶ ἐσται ἡ γῆ εἰς ἀφανισμὸν σὺν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτῆς ἐκ καρπῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτῶν.

And the land will become a ruin along with its inhabitants because of the fruits of their (mal)practices.

καὶ ἔσται ἡ γῆ εἰς ἀφανισμὸν σὺν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν 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᾿ ἑαυτούς δρυμὸν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Καρμήλου· νεμήσονται τὴν Βασανίτιν καὶ τὴν Γαλααδῖτιν καθὼς 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.

πρόβατα κληρονομίας σου κατασκήνων] 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.”

κατασκηνοῦντας καθ᾿ ἑαυτούς] 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 it may have been read as σκῆνιον instead of the archaic sg. form with a paragogic yod (JM § 93 n). 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. "those who dwell in the land of utmost darkness’ Is 9.1; see further JM § 129 m - o.

καθ᾿ ἑαυτούς] 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᾿ ἑαυτούς καὶ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις τοῖς συνδειπνοῦσιν μετ᾿ αὐτοῦ καθ᾿ ἑαυτούς ‘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?
δρυμόν] 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 I 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 ημέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος 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 ημέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος κατοικοῦσα καλῶς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς 1.11, cf. GELS s.v. κατοικέω 1 c. See also the immediately following νεμήσονται τὴν Βασανίτιν.

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 ημέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος κατοικοῦσα καλῶς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς 1.11, cf. GELS s.v. κατοικέω 1 c. See also the immediately following νεμήσονται τὴν Βασανίτιν.

7.15) καὶ κατὰ τὰς ημέρας ἐξοδίας σου ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ὄψεσθε θαυμαστά.

And you will see wonders comparable to those in the days of your exit out of Egypt.

ἐξοδίας] The same event is also called ἔξοδος, e.g. Ex 19.1, Nu 33.38 +. ὄψεσθε] = ἀρέα. 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. (ὦτα) is not quite right. But for the sake of fairness, ὦ is also problematic: why “I will show him (or: them = Israel),” and not ἀρεά? Then God would be the speaker.34

7.16) ὄψονται ἐθνι καὶ κατασχυνθήσονται ἐκ πάσης τῆς ἱσχύος αὐτῶν, ἐπιθήσουσι χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν, τὰ ὦτα αὐτῶν ἀποκωφωθήσονται.

33 For more examples of <καθώς + nom.>, see GELS s.v. 1.
34 Whilst Vulg. = ὦ, 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 δείξω αὐτοῖς. Some modern scholars (Wellhausen 1898.150, Wolff 189) propose emending the last word to ἔξοδιον ‘show us’ (Impv.), but we fail to see how that helps. Wolff almost says that the MT gives an impression as if “ἐξοδίας den Auszug des Volkes meint und nicht den Jahwes.” MT cannot mean anything other than that; otherwise we would expect ἀναρρήτος. We cannot make a head or tail of a short remark by Ehrlich (1912.291): “Statt ἄναρρητος lies ἀναρρήτος, vulgäre Aussprache für ἀναρρήτος.”
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.

In terms of the sheer military strength they had no rivals.

Apparently in order to stress their complete astonishment and inability verbally to react Θ uses the pl., whereas the use of the sg. is idiomatic in Ḥ. This contrasts with שבתא. The selection of the dual in this case makes sense. Cf. χεῖρα θῆσαι ἐπὶ στόματί μου Ἰε 40.4.

A verb unknown prior to SG. What Θ wants to say is probably that heathens put their fingers into their ears, not being able to stand triumphant shouts of Israelites.

As shown by the preposition kaf, the pl. participle must be referring to crawling animals, and the verb ἁπλά 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 κανάχασ is not meant to be a reference to the serpent in Ge 3, but in metaphors introduced with the preposition ἐκ the article is idiomatically used, see JM § 137 1.

The respective primary meaning of συγκέω ‘to mix together’ and ῥά ‘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: συγκέθησαν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν ῥαθμὸν Ἰε 2.1, and in πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν συγκείχεται ἡ γῆ καὶ σεισθήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐκ τῆς ἱσχύος αὐτῶν] In terms of the sheer military strength they had no rivals.

συγκέθησαν κανάχασ] As shown by the preposition kaf, the pl. participle must be referring to crawling animals, and the verb ἁπλά 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 κανάχασ is not meant to be a reference to the serpent in Ge 3, but in metaphors introduced with the preposition ἐκ the article is idiomatically used, see JM § 137 1.

συγκέθησαν κανάχασ] As shown by the preposition kaf, the pl. participle must be referring to crawling animals, and the verb ἁπλά 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 κανάχασ is not meant to be a reference to the serpent in Ge 3, but in metaphors introduced with the preposition ἐκ the article is idiomatically used, see JM § 137 1.

[35] Peshitta ‘their hands’ is probably due to the plurality of the people involved. In Ḥ 40.4 it reads ‘my hand.’ The Trg. is Hebraic, as far as the number is concerned: “their hand .. their mouth.”
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ib. 10 the verb is parallel with σείω expressing physical shaking. 36

ἐν συγκλεισμῷ [ ] 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 [ ] The two Heb. verbs are synonymous, but not their Gk renderings. Note καὶ ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ φοβηθήσονται ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τούτων Ho 3.5, where the subjects are Israelites and the occasion for their consternation also differs – ἐπὶ τοις ἀγαθοῖς αὐτοῦ.

ἀπὸ σοῦ μοι [ ] Since G retains ὢ’s the pronoun cannot refer to God, but only to Israel.

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?

7.18) τίς θεὸς ὥσπερ σὺ; ἐξαίρων ἀδικίας καὶ ὑπερβαίνων ἁσεβείας τοῖς καταλοίποις τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ συνέσχεν εἰς μαρτύριον ὡς ἀντικείμενον θελητής 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?

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?

τίς θεὸς ἐλαίων αὐτοῦ [ ] The interrogative pronoun in Gk and Heb. alike, when followed by a substantive, could be analysed as adjectival. 37

ἀδικίας .. ἁσεβείας [ ] 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.

eἰς μαρτύριον [ ] = ὡς.

The segmentation of the verse in G is complicated. The question mark added after σὺ leaves the following two participial clauses syntactically hanging loose. By adding καὶ G 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 היל.

θελητής [ ] Almost adjectival, just as ὥς here. 40

36 Cf. γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς τούτης συνήλθεν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ συνεχύθη, ὧν ἰδοὺν εἰς ἔκχωστος τῇ ὑδάτι διαελέκτος λαλοῦντον αὐτῶν Acts 2.6.

37 BDB admits the attributive use of τίς s.v. 1 a a. We wonder whether or not such an analysis can be extended to τίς. 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 της, see Muraoka 2005.66f.
7.19) ἐπιστρέψει καὶ οἰκτιρήσει ἡμᾶς, καταδύσει τὰς ἁμαρτίας 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.

ἐπιστρέψει καὶ οἰκτιρήσει] The verb ἐπιστρέφω joined with καί 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] 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] In H with the verb in the second person the prophet’s oracular statement is shifting to a personal prayer, for which “our sins” is more fitting.

7.20) δώσεις ἀλήθειαν τῷ Ιακώβ, ἔλεος τῷ Αβρααμ, καθότι ὡμοσάς τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἐμπρόσθεν.

You will grant truthfulness to Jacob, mercy to Abraham, as You swore to our forefathers as on the former days.

dώσεις] H continues the speaker’s personal prayer, which now collaborators joins in.

ἀλήθειαν] Faithfulness as regards pledges and promises made rather than truth as against falsehood.

καθότι] = ἐκάστῳ.

41 Cf. Trg. יראמ, Vulg. proiciet, and Pesh. /nešdē/.
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