

Takamitsu Muraoka

**The Books of Hosea and Micah
in Hebrew and Greek**

PEETERS

**THE BOOKS OF HOSEA AND MICAH
IN HEBREW AND GREEK**

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

Founded by Othmar Keel

Editorial Board: Susanne Bickel, Catherine Mittermayer, Mirko Novák,
Thomas C. Römer et Christoph Uehlinger

Published on behalf of the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies and the
Bible+Orient Foundation

in cooperation with
the Institute of Egyptology, University of Basel,
the Institute de Archaeological Sciences, Near Eastern Archaeology section, University
of Berne,
the Department of Biblical Studies, University of Fribourg,
the Institut romand des sciences bibliques, University of Lausanne,
and the Department of Religious Studies, University of Zurich

Author

Born in Hiroshima in 1938, educated in Tokyo Kyoiku University (BA, MA), and The Hebrew University, Jerusalem (PhD 1969). Taught at Manchester University (1970–80), Melbourne University (1980–91), and Leiden University (until 2003). Awarded in 2017 by the British Academy the Burkitt Medal in recognition of his research products in the fields of Hebrew syntax and Septuagint studies, many of which have been published by Peeters, among which *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (2009), *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek* (2016), *A Syntax of Qumran Hebrew* (2020) and numerous other monographs and articles.

The Books of Hosea and Micah in Hebrew and Greek

by

Takamitsu Muraoka

Peeters

Leuven - Paris - Bristol, CT

2022

Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis publishes monographs, multi-author volumes and conference proceedings in the fields of Biblical Studies (Hebrew Bible and Septuagint), Ancient Near Eastern Studies and Egyptology broadly understood (including archaeology, history, iconography and religion). The editorial board and affiliated institutions reflect the series' high academic standards and interdisciplinary outlook. Manuscripts may be submitted via a member of the editorial board. They are examined by the board and subject to further peer review by internationally recognized scholars at the board's discretion. The series is committed to worldwide distribution, notably through open access publication (Gold or Green). Past volumes are archived at the digital repository of the University of Zurich (www.zora.uzh.ch).

Senior editor: Christoph.Uehlinger@uzh.ch



The open access publication of this book has been facilitated by the Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-90-429-4473-2

eISBN 978-90-429-4474-9

D/2022/0602/22

© 2022, Peeters, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage or retrieval devices or systems, without the prior written permission from the publisher, except the quotation of brief passages for review purposes.

אֲשֶׁת־חַיִל מִי יִמְצָא וְרָחֵק מִסְּוֵינִים מִכֶּרֶה: Prov. 31:10

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	IX
PREFACE	XI
HOSEA	
Chapter I	3
Chapter II	11
Chapter III	27
Chapter IV	35
Chapter V	63
Chapter VI	82
Chapter VII	95
Chapter VIII	105
Chapter IX	113
Chapter X	123
Chapter XI	138
Chapter XII	151
Chapter XIII	163
Chapter XIV	174
MICAH	
Chapter I	185
Chapter II	197
Chapter III	208
Chapter IV	218
Chapter V	231
Chapter VI	242
Chapter VII	257
BIBLIOGRAPHY	271

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 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ 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

PREFACE

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 canonised 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 consonantal, no vowel signs, Tiberian accents, end-of-verse colon. As for Greek we would note that in the Greek Minor Prophets found in Naḥal Ḥever, written 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 Sinaiticus. 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 manuscripts 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 Judaeen 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 identical 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 Naḥal Ḥever fragments² 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, ὃς ἐγενήθη πρὸς Ὡσηε τὸν τοῦ Βεηρι ἐν ἡμέραις Οζίου καὶ Ἰωαθαμ καὶ Αχαζ καὶ Εζεκιίου βασιλέων Ἰουδα καὶ ἐν ἡμέραις Ἰεροβοαμ υἱοῦ Ἰωας 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.

דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה אֶל־הוֹשֵׁעַ בֶּן־בְּעָרִי בַיָּמֵי עֲזִיָּה עֲזִיָּה יוֹתָם אָחִז וְיֹחָזִקִיָּה מְלָכֵי
יְהוּדָה וּבַיָּמֵי יֵרֻבָעָם בֶּן־יֹאָשׁ מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל:

The LXX neatly joins the names of the four kings by means of καί, whereas the MT is unusual not using ו 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. בְּנֵי־לֵוִי לְתַלְתְּלָתָם גְּרִשׁוֹן וּמְרָרִי 1Ch 5.27 with וּמְרָרִי גְרִשׁוֹן קָהָת וּמְרָרִי Ex 6.16, see *JM* § 177 o.

- 1.2) Ἀρχὴ λόγου κυρίου ἐν Ὡσηε· καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Ὡσηε Βάδιζε λαβὲ σεαυτῶ γυναῖκα πορνείας καὶ τέκνα πορνείας, διότι ἐκπορνεύουσα ἐκπορνεύσει ἢ γῆ ἀπὸ ὀπισθεν 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, deserting the Lord'

תְּחִלַּת דְּבַר־יְהוָה בְּהוֹשֵׁעַ פּ וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־הוֹשֵׁעַ לֵךְ קַח־לְךָ אִשָּׁת זְנוּנִים וְיִלְדֵי
זְנוּנִים כִּי־זָנָה תְּזַנֶּה הָאָרֶץ מֵאַחֲרַי יְהוָה:

A syntactic pattern which is rare in BH was presumably unknown to our translator, who took דְּבַר 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 φωνῆς ἀλώσεως Βαβυλῶνος Jr 27.46 (מְקוֹל נְתַפְשָׁה בְּבָל) MT 50.46); πόλις Αριηλ, ἣν Δαυιδ ἐπολέμησεν ἰὺד חֲנָה קְרִית אַרְיֵאל אַרְיֵאל Is 29.1, where the Hexaplaric tradition uses a straightforward substantive – Αρ πολίχνη παρεμβλήσεως Δαυιδ and Sym πόλις παρεμβλησέως Δαυιδ.

¹ As done by Joosten (2002.63) on his own bat and with no comment.

ἐν Ὡσηε עֲשׂוּשָׁה] If the Vorlage of Θ was identical with MT, πρὸς 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, בִּ prefixed to an interlocutor, though securely attested, is not very common, either. E.g. הָרַק אֶת־בְּמִשְׁהָ דְבַר יְהוָה הֲלֹא גַם־בָּנוּ דְבַר Nu 12.2, where two early Jewish traditions divert from each other – Θ Μουσιῆ .. ἡμῖν vs. TO עֲמַנָּא .. עַם מִשָּׁה 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 ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐν τοῖς προφήταις ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν σίῳ* Heb 1.1f., where the dative and the instrumental ἐν are contrasted twice. We are not, however, certain that the construction <verbum dicendi + ἐν τινι> was common in contemporary non-biblical Greek.²

Βάδιζε λαβὲ κῆ ἡ] The asyndesis of two imperatives is common in both languages. In Θ 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 (לְכוּ הַבְּיָאוּ), the only exceptions being βάδιζε καὶ ποίει 2K 7.3 (לֵךְ עֲשֵׂה) and βάδισον εἰπόν De 5.30 (לֵךְ אָמַר). 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 הִלֵּךְ, as in our lemma here, is very often asyndetically followed by another imperative. This process of grammaticalisation is evident when הִלֵּךְ is said to a woman as in הִלֵּךְ וְשָׁקָה אֶת־אֶבְיָנוּ Ge 19.32 and it is followed by a 1pl. verb as in הִלֵּךְ וְנִכְרְתָהּ בְּרִית Ge 31.44.⁴

ἐκπορνεύουσα ἐκπορνεύσει וְנָה תְּנָה] 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. λαλέω 2 γ, does not mention any instance of λαλέω ἐν τινι; apparently they are not aware of any. In another instance, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν Mt 10.20 F. Delitzsch, in his Hebrew translation, hesitates mechanically to translate into Hebrew: הִמְדַּבֵּר 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 ἐκπορνεύουσα is imperfective.

ἐκπορνεύσει ἢ γῆ ἀπὸ ὀπισθεν τοῦ κυρίου יהוה מֵאַחַר יְהוָה In contrast to מֵאַחַר הַיְהוָה the added preposition indicates desertion, cf. μήποτε θῆς διαθήκην τοῖς ἐγκαθημένους πρὸς ἀλλοφύλους ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐκπορνεύσωσιν ὀπίσω τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν אַחֲרֵי אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וְנָגוּ אַחֲרָיָךְ לְיוֹשְׁבֵי בְרִית לְיוֹשְׁבֵי בְרִית Ex 34.15.

The use of יהוה here is indicative of a mixture of direct and indirect speech, what is called *discours indirect libre* in French grammar. In pure direct speech we would anticipate מֵאַחֲרָיָךְ ὀπισθέν μου. See below at 2.16.

- 1.3) καὶ ἐπορεύθη καὶ ἔλαβε τὴν Γομερ θυγατέρα Δεβηλαιμ, καὶ συνέλαβε καὶ ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ υἷόν.

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

וַיֵּלֶךְ וַיִּקַּח אֶת־גֹּמֶר בַּת־דְּבַלַיִם וַתְּהַר וַתֵּלֶד־לּוֹ בֵן:

αὐτῷ ἰ] can be construed with both of the preceding verbs. Against the traditional translation of וַתְּהַר לּוֹ as exemplified in καὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔλαβεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ Gn 38.18, we argued that ~~ל~~ can only mean 'she became pregnant for him, in his best interest.'⁵

- 1.4) καὶ εἶπε κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν 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

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלָיו קְרָא שְׁמוֹ יְזַרְעֶאל כִּי־עוֹד מְעַט וּפְקַדְתִּי אֶת־דְּמֵי יְזַרְעֶאל עַל־בֵּית יְהוּא וְהִשְׁבַּתִּי מַמְלַכּוֹת בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל:

ἔτι μικρὸν καὶ ἐκδικήσω וּפְקַדְתִּי מְעַט עוֹד] This apodotic καὶ 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

⁵ Muraoka SSG pp. 67-69 and id. 2020b.23-25.

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 **הַשְׁבִּיחַ**] The same equation between **⊗** and **⊘** recurs at καὶ ἀποστρέψω πάσας τὰς εὐφροσύνας αὐτῆς Ho 2.11 (**הַשְׁבִּיחַ** **כְּלִמְשׁוֹ** **⊘** 2.13). In the following verse we see this Greek verb is parallel to ἀφανίζω: καὶ ἀφανιῶ ἄμπελον αὐτῆς (**הַשְׁבִּיחַ** **גַּנְּזָה**). We may conclude that ἀποστρέψω in our verse denotes an action more drastic than Joosten’s (65) *repousser*. Cf. also οὗτος ἐξολεθρεύσει αὐτούς, καὶ οὗτος ἀποστρέψει αὐτούς ἀπὸ προσώπου σου **הַשְׁבִּיחַ** **יְכַנְיִעַם** **וְהוּא** **יְשַׁמְדֵם** **וְהוּא** Dt 9.3, where the parallelism between ἐξολεθρεύσε and ἀποστρέψει is to be noted. Then our ἀποστρέψω may be a translation of **הַשְׁבִּיחַ** after all than **הַשְׁבִּיחַ** postulated by Ziegler (59) and Joosten (65).

1.5) καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκεῖνῃ συντρίψω τὸ τόξον τοῦ Ἰσραηλ ἐν τῇ κοιλάδι τοῦ Ιεζραελ.

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

הַיְהִי בַיּוֹם הַהוּא וְשִׁבְרֹתַי אֶת־קִשְׁתֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעַמְקֵי יוֹרְעָאֵל:

The **⊗** translator refrained from reproducing the typical Hebrew syntagm with a consecutive Waw of **וְשִׁבְרֹתַי**, 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 ἐκεῖνῃ ἐξελεύσεται ὕδωρ ζῶν **יִצְאוּ מִיַּם־חַיִּים** **וְהוּא** **יִצְאוּ** **בַיּוֹם הַהוּא** **וְהָיָה** **וְהָיָה** Zc 14.8, though **⊘** has no consecutive *waw*.

1.6) καὶ συνέλαβεν ἔτι καὶ ἔτεκε θυγατέρα. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Κάλεσον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Οὐκ ἠλεημένη, διότι οὐ μὴ προσθήσω ἔτι ἐλεῆσαι τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Ἰσραηλ, ἀλλ’ ἢ ἀντιτασσόμενος 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.

וְתָהָר עוֹד וְתִלְדַּד בַּת וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ קְרָא שְׁמָהּ לֹא רַחֲמָה כִּי לֹא אוֹסִיף עוֹד אֶרְחַם אֶת־בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי־נִשְׂאָ אֶשְׂאָ לָהֶם:

διότι οὐ μὴ προσθήσω **כִּי** **לֹא** **אוֹסִיף**] This is the first occurrence in Ho of the double negator οὐ μὴ. This combination occurring some 750 times

⁶ For more details, see *GLS* s.v., 11.

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.”⁷ In NTG it is virtually confined to sayings of Jesus and quotations from LXX. This οὐ μὴ is used with a verb in the subjunctive, but, as here, its use with the fut. is not uncommon. In Ἡμέρας πολλὰς καθήσῃ ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ καὶ οὐ μὴ πορνεύσης οὐδὲ μὴ γένηαι ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ 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 ὑποστῆ 13.13, also a causal clause, but with an aor. subj. form.⁸

ἀλλ’ ἢ כִּי] By changing διότι to ἀλλ’ ἢ ⚭ clearly sees an opposition between the two concluding clauses of the verse, equating כִּי to אִם כִּי, cf. Joosten’s (65) “au contraire.”

ἀντιτασσόμενος ἀντιτάξομαι αὐτοῖς אָשַׁף אֲשַׁף] The striking selection of ἀντιτάσσομαι to render a common Hebrew verb אֲשַׁף can be accounted for by postulating that the translator mentally supplied דָּ or דִּי. An object complement is sometimes omitted from an idiomatic combination. דָּ אֲשַׁף, which denotes a rebellious action, occurs in 2Sm 18.28, 20.21, and note especially אֲשַׁף יְדֵי הָהָם לְהַפִּיל אוֹתָם בְּמַדְבָּר Ps 106.26. An analogous example is: אֲשַׁף קוֹלִי: לֹא יִצְעַק לֹא יִשָּׂא וְלֹא יִשְׁמִיעַ בְּחַבֵּץ קוֹלִי: Is 42.2, where אֲשַׁף = אֲשַׁף קוֹלִי.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 אֲשַׁף אֲשַׁף 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 σέ ἢ? יְכַלֶּךְ אֶתְּךָ Ob 7 mentioned by Joosten.

1.7) τοὺς δὲ υἱοὺς Ἰουδα ἐλεήσω καὶ σώσω αὐτοὺς ἐν κυρίῳ θεῷ αὐτῶν καὶ οὐ σώσω αὐτοὺς ἐν τόξῳ οὐδὲ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ οὐδὲ ἐν πολέμῳ οὐδὲ ἐν ἄρμασιν οὐδὲ ἐν ἵπποις οὐδὲ ἐν ἵππευσιν.

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.

וְאֶת־בַּיִת יְהוּדָה אֲרַחֵם וְהוֹשַׁעְתִּים בַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וְלֹא אוֹשִׁיעֵם בְּקִשְׁתּוֹ וּבַחֶרֶב
וּבְמִלְחָמָה בְּסוּסִים וּבְפָרָשִׁים:

The use of δὲ in lieu of the mechanical καί for ׀ 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 𐤁 by the direct object being fronted, which is followed in 𐤂, too.

ἐν κυρίῳ θεῶ ἀπτῶν אֱלֹהֵיהֶם בַּיהוָה is another example of *discours indirect libre*; see above at vs. 2.

οὐδὲ ἐν ἄρμασιν] There is no equivalent for this in 𐤁. What easily springs up in one's mind is בְּרֶכֶב. בְּרֶכֶב and סוּס or סוּסִים is a very common combination in either sequence, e.g. סוּסִים וְרֶכֶב 2Kg 6.14, רֶכֶב וְסוּס Ps 76.7. רֶכֶב is consistently used in the sg., the only exception occurring in רֶכְבֵּי Ct 1.9. We do not know if this word formed part of 𐤂's Vorlage. Another question is whether it was prefixed with the conjunction ׀ or not. The preceding three substantives are so connected. The meticulous repetition of οὐδὲ may suggest וְרֶכֶב, and then וּבְסוּסִים.

1.8) καὶ ἀπεγαλάκτισε τὴν Οὐκ-ἠλεημένην καὶ συνέλαβεν ἔτι καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱόν.

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

וַתִּגְמַל אֶת־לֹא רַחֲמָה וַתְּהַר וַתֵּלֶד בֵּן:

1.9) καὶ εἶπε Κάλεσον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Οὐ λαός μου, διότι ὑμεῖς Οὐ λαός μου, καὶ ἐγὼ οὐκ εἶμι ὑμῶν.

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

וַיֹּאמֶר קְרָא שְׁמוֹ לֹא עַמִּי כִּי אֶתֵּם לֹא עַמִּי וְאֲנֹכִי לֹא־אֶהְיֶה לָכֶם:

ἐγὼ οὐκ εἶμι ὑμῶν] The addition of εἶμι is not only a reflection of 𐤁 אֶהְיֶה, but also serves to show that, unlike Οὐ λαός μου, it is not a name. Οὐ λαός μου is, just like Οὐ λαός μου, nothing but a name.¹⁰ Hence Ziegler's use of the capital letter is questionable in ἐγὼ οὐκ εἶμι ὑμῶν. As debatable is "ich (bin) nicht > Ich bin euer<" (*SD*). Hence we would use a capital letter in ὑμεῖς Οὐ λαός μου as against Ziegler's οὐ. Otherwise we could have anticipated ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἐστε λαός μου [= vous n'êtes pas mon peuple, Joosten 67]. See also Joosten 67f. He refers to Ex 3.14, but there in Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ὢν we have a standard nominal clause, and God is declaring that ὁ ὢν is His name, as we see from its sequel: καὶ εἶπεν Οὕτως ἐρεῖς τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραηλ Ὁ ὢν

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 *הַיְיִי־לִי עַם וְאֲנִי אֶהְיֶה לָּהֶם לְאֱלֹהִים בְּאַמְתּוֹ וּבְצַדִּיקָהּ* Zc 8.8, which he translates *καὶ ἔσονται μοι εἰς λαόν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεὸν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*, 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 [Ⲙ 2.1]) Καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, ἣ οὐκ ἐκμετρηθήσεται οὐδὲ ἐξαριθμηθήσεται· καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὗ ἔρρέθη αὐτοῖς Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος.

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

הָיָה מְסָפֵר בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּחוֹל הַיָּם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמָּד וְלֹא יִסָּפֵר וְהָיָה בְּמִקְוֶה אֲשֶׁר־יֵאמְרוּ לָהֶם לֹא־עַמִּי אַתֶּם יֵאמְרוּ לָהֶם בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים:

Καὶ ἦν .. καὶ ἔσται *הָיָה* .. *וְהָיָה*] 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 *וְהָיָה* or regarded it as being loosely and impersonally, namely what is told in the sequel is going to *happen*.

ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὗ *אֲשֶׁר* *בְּמִקְוֶה*] We do not know whether or not the translator read *אֲשֶׁר* *בְּמִקְוֶה*. However that might be, *pace* Joosten (68) Ⲙ is not necessarily “façon peu concrète,” for a measure of ambiguity is in the nature of the Hebrew construct state: *בֶּן הַמֶּלֶךְ* 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.

ἐρρέθη *יֵאמְרוּ*] not *נֵאמְרוּ*. 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 αὐτοῖς] 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 to introduce an element of surprise or something unexpected.¹²

1.11 [Ⲙ 2.2]) καὶ συναχθήσονται οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰουδα καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ θήσονται ἑαυτοῖς ἀρχὴν μίαν καὶ ἀναβήσονται ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Ἰεζραελ.

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.

וְנִקְבְּצוּ בְּנֵי־יְהוּדָה וּבְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל יְהָדוּ וְשָׂמוּ לָהֶם רֹאשׁ אֶחָד וְעָלוּ מִן־הָאָרֶץ כִּי גְדוֹל יוֹם יְיָ אֵל:

ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἡδῆ.] 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 Ⲙ it could be understood in the sense of ‘at the same time.’ At οὐκ ἐκδικήσει δις ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν θλίψει ‘He will not penalise the same (offence) twice with a distress’ Na 1.9, however, Ⲙ הַרְצֵם פְּעָמַיִם אֶל־תְּקַח has nothing that corresponds to it, and the preposition indicates a ground for a penalty brought down.¹³

ἀρχὴν μίαν δῆξ ῥאַ] For ‘one leader’ ἀρχηγὸν ἓνα 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 οἴκου Ἰακωβ (ῥאַשֵׁי יַעֲקֹב) καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ Mi 3.1, where the parallel κατάλοιποι is to be noted. See also Ἀρχὴ ἐθνῶν Αμαληκ 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 [𐤁 2.3]) εἶπατε τῷ ἀδελφῷ ὑμῶν Λαός-μου καὶ τῇ ἀδελφῇ ὑμῶν Ἥλεημένη.

Say to your brother 'My people' and to your sister 'Pitied.'

אמרו לאחיהכם עמי ולאחיותיכם רחמה:

When unpointed, אהיכם can be read as sg., אהיך, but not so with אחותיכם. However, אהיותיכם is anomalous; אהיותיך is expected.¹ Why did 𐤁 opt for the sg. τῷ ἀδελφῷ? Harmonisation with τῇ ἀδελφῇ ὑμῶν Ἥλεημένη?

2.2 [𐤁 2.4]) Κρίθητε πρὸς τὴν μητέρα ὑμῶν κρίθητε, ὅτι αὐτὴ οὐ γυνή μου, καὶ ἐγὼ οὐκ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· καὶ ἐξαρώ 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,

ריבו באמכם ריבו כִּי־היא לא אשתי ואנכי לא אישה ותסר ונוניה מפניה ונאפוניה
מבין שדיה:

Κρίθητε does not necessarily imply a juridic battle in a court of law. Likewise רב is mostly about a verbal strife or contest, e.g. καὶ ἐλοιδορεῖτο ὁ λαὸς πρὸς Μωσῆν ἡ ψη-עם-העם וירב Ex 17.2, where the selection of πρὸς τινα as in our Hosea passage is to be noted.

By translating as if 𐤁 read אַסְרָהּ וְנוֹנִיָּהּ מִפְּנֵי² the translator highlights the strong will on the part of God: ‘I shall see to it that she removes ..’³ In that process the common compound preposition מִפְּנֵי had its nuance changed: מִפְּנֵיָּהּ implies that she is showing off her shameful behaviour of whoredom, whereas with מִפְּנֵי God is saying “I can’t stand the sight!”

τὴν πορνείαν αὐτῆς .. τὴν μοιχείαν αὐτῆς נאפוניה .. ונוניה] The sg. number in 𐤁 relates to the character of her behaviour, whereas the pl. in 𐤁 indicates its manifestations. The same can be said of γυναῖκα πορνείας אשת ונונים 1.2 above.

¹ This noun attests to other anomalous forms: אחותי Josh 2.13 for אחיותי, אחותך Ez 16.51 with Q אחותיך. The confusion must be due to תי- of the sg. form.

² מִפְּנֵיָּהּ must be a scribal slip for מִפְּנֵיָּהּ.

³ Joosten (70) suggests a possible influence of Ho 2.17 (𐤁 19).

- 2.3 [ח 2.5] ὅπως ἂν ἐκδύσω αὐτήν γυμνήν καὶ ἀποκαταστήσω αὐτήν καθὼς ἡμέρα γενέσεως αὐτῆς· καὶ θήσομαι αὐτήν ὡς ἔρημον καὶ τάξω αὐτήν ὡς γῆν ἄνυδρον καὶ ἀποκτενῶ αὐτήν 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

כִּי־אֶשְׁפֹּטֶנָּה עַרְמָה הַצְּנִינִי כִּי־וְהָיָה לְהַלְדָּה וְשָׁמַיְתִי כַּמְדָּבָר וְשָׂתִי כְּאֶרֶץ צָרָה
וְהָיָה לְהַמָּצָא:

ὅπως [כִּי] To assign ὅπως a final sense, ‘in order that,’ as our contemporary translations do, makes little sense in this context. כִּי also can be final in force, but then with a negative value, ‘so that .. not.’ The modal value of ὅπως is well established in Classical Greek, e.g. οὕτως ὅπως ἂν αὐτοὶ βούλωνται ‘in such a way as they will’ Plato, *Symp.* 174b.⁴ Since the standard usage of כִּי must have been known to our Greek translator, he must have had a reason for translating as he did. Our translator’s use of ὅπως is rather varied. In addition to the final-purposive value, a variant on its modal value is exemplified in ὅπως μηδεὶς μήτε δικάζηται μήτε ἐλέγχη μηδεὶς ‘(the land will mourn .. the fish of the sea will fail) so much so that neither anyone may plead, nor anyone may reprove’ Ho 4.4, where in ח we find כִּי.⁵ Our translator thought that children were being exhorted to do everything to avert the dreadful outcome for their mother and for themselves as depicted here and in the following verse.

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

- 2.4 [ח 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.

וְאֶת־בְּנֵיהָ לֹא אֶרְחַם כִּי־בְנֵי זְנוּנִים הֵמָּה:

οὐ μὴ [לֹא] 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 concurring 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 ἐθελήσιν ‘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 our 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] ὅτι ἐξεπόρνευσεν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτῶν, κατήσχυνεν ἡ τεκοῦσα αὐτά· ὅτι εἶπε Πορεύσομαι ὀπίσω τῶν ἐραστῶν μου τῶν διδόντων μοι τοὺς ἄρτους μου καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ μου καὶ τὰ ἱμάτιά μου καὶ τὰ ὀθόνιά 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.'

כִּי זָנְתָה אִמָּם הַבִּישָׁה הַזֹּרֶתָם כִּי אָמְרָה אֶלְכֶּה אֶחָרֵי מֵאֲהָבֵי נִתְנָי לְחָמִי וּמִימֵי צִמְרִי
וּפְשָׁתִי שְׂמֹנִי וְשִׁקְוִי:

κατήσχυνεν [הַבִּישָׁה] Whilst the Hebrew form cannot be derived from בָּשׁ 'to be dry,' its intransitive use of הוֹבִישׁ, an alternative form of Hi. הִבִּישׁ from √בּוּשׁ, is firmly established.⁸ 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.

Πορεύσομαι [אֶלְכֶּה] In view of the cohortative אֶלְכֶּה we submit that the future tense here in 2 carries a deliberative modality. Some certain examples are identifiable, e.g. τί ἀντεροῦμεν ..; 'how could we gainsay, we wonder .. ?' Ge 44.16.⁹

τῶν ἐραστῶν μου [מֵאֲהָבֵי] 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 אהב 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 main stream Judaism and Christianity there attaches a negative connotation to the ἐρ- words.

τὰ ἱμάτιά μου [צִמְרִי] This equivalence occurs in SG only once more, later in our book, 2.9, also in the same combination with ὀθόνια פְּשָׁת. Since the ignorance on the part of our translator as to what this common Hebrew substantive means is unthinkable, the selection of ἱμάτιον is most likely due to his understanding that food, water, and clothes are three essential commodities for humans.

τὰ ὀθόνιά μου [פְּשָׁתִי] Though the Hebrew noun is attested in the sg. and pl. alike, the pl. ὀθόνια does not necessarily suggest that the translator read

⁸ Ibn Ezra, sensing the complexity, postulated הַשִּׁנְיָה '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.

יִתְּשֶׁוּ. The pl. form is most likely influenced by τὰ ἰμάτια, whose pl. number is idiomatic in Greek.

πάντα ὅσα μοι καθήκει יִתְּשֶׁוּ] The Hebrew word here is generally understood to be derived from the common root הִקְשׁ 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 מִיָּמִי, odd and have decided to take some freedom, which appears to be manifest in the addition of πάντα. Referring to the rendition in Syrohexapla, /hāšhān/ ‘needs’ here¹² 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 τούτω 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 ㉔^{II}, preceded by Δεδικαίωταί σοι λαβεῖν αὐτήν ‘you are in the right to take her.’¹³ 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. ㉔ concatenates all of them syndetically and neatly by means of καί, whereas ㉕ 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.

2.6 [㉕ 2.8] διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῆς ἐν σκόλοπι καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς, καὶ τὴν τρίβον αὐτῆς οὐ μὴ εὔρη·

Therefore, behold, I build a hedge around her way with thorns and I shall rebuild her ways, and she will never find her route

לְכֵן הִנְנִי־שֹׁשֶׁבֶת אֶת־דַּרְכֶּיךָ בְּסִירִים וְנִדְרַתִּי אֶת־גְּדָרְךָ וְנִתְיַבֹּתִיָּהּ לֹא תִמְצָא:

ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ φράσσω ἡ־נִנְיָ] Joosten (71) translates: “(C’est pourquoi) voici, moi, j’obstrue.” We are not sure that the pronoun ἐγὼ is emphatic. The syntagm <נִנְיָ - ptc.> 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, <הִנְנִיָּהּ - ptc.>

¹² Peshitta’s /w-kol meṭb’ē/ is obviously influenced by this and the LXX here. Earlier we (Muraoka 1979.183) noted פְּרֻנְסִי ‘my provisions’ in Targum here.

¹³ Cf. *Vetus Latina* quoted by Fitzmyer (2003.213): “scit tibi maxime aptam esse haereditatem illius.”

is rendered in the same manner, e.g. ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι הִנֵּה אֲנִי מְצַוֶּה Am 9.9, so also Zc 11.6, 16, Ma 4.4. See also how הִנֵּה followed by no verb has been rendered: ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐπὶ σέ ἡ־לִי אֲנִי Na 2.14, similarly ib. 3.5. We conclude, therefore, ἐγὼ is merely reproducing יָגִ-; there is no other way.

A strange mixture in \mathfrak{H} of *your* and *her / she* has been straightened out in \mathfrak{G} , unless its *Vorlage* read כַּכֵּךְ.

καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς הִרְדָּתְךָ וְהִרְדָּתִי \mathfrak{G} widely departs from \mathfrak{H} . Our translator chooses the same Greek verb to render the same Hebrew verb once again in καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς הִרְדָּתִי וְהִרְדָּתְךָ 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 ἐκεῖνη ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτὴν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι 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 σκόλῳ 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 גָּדַר in ἐμφραχθήσεται θυγάτηρ Ἐφραὶμ ἐν φραγμῶν בַּת־גָּדַר מִיִּבְרַת־מִי Mi 5.1 (\mathfrak{H} 4.14).

The sg. הִרְדָּתְךָ has been transformed to the pl. τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῆς. Whichever way she turns, she would find her way blocked. Conversely the pl. הִיבְרַתְךָ has been transformed to the sg. τὴν τρίβον αὐτῆς; there will be found no route for her to follow.

2.7 [\mathfrak{H} 2.9]) καὶ καταδιώξεται τοὺς ἑραστὰς αὐτῆς καὶ οὐ μὴ καταλάβῃ αὐτούς· καὶ ζητήσῃ αὐτούς καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρῇ αὐτούς· καὶ ἔρει Πορεύσομαι καὶ ἐπιστρέψω πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα μου τὸν πρότερον, ὅτι καλῶς μοι ἦν τότε ἢ 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 ἐμφράσσω, and the whole verse resembles our Ho case very much: ἀνοικοδόμησεν ὁδοὺς μου, ἐνέφραξεν τρίβους μου, ἐτάραξεν, which translates עָנָה בְּנִיבְרַתִּי עָנָה בְּנִיבְרַתִּי בְּנִיבְרַתִּי. 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: \mathfrak{H} reads עָלַי (3.7) and בְּעָדַי (3.5).

וְרָדְפָה אֶת־מֵאֲהָבָיָהּ וְלֹא־תִשְׂיֹג אִתָּם וּבְקִשְׁתָּם וְלֹא תִמְצָא וְאִמְרָהּ אֶלְכָה וְאֶשׂוּבָה
אֶל־אִשִּׁי הָרֵאשׁוֹן כִּי טוֹב לִי אֲזוּ מֵעַתָּה:

καταδιώξεται [רָדְפָה] 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.

καλῶς μοι ἦν [טוֹב לִי] טוֹב is equivocal, for it can be a Pf. 3ms or an adjective with הָיָה understood.

2.8 [ח 2.10] καὶ αὐτὴ οὐκ ἔγνω ὅτι ἐγὼ δέδωκα αὐτῇ τὸν σῖτον καὶ τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον, καὶ ἀργύριον ἐπλήθυνα αὐτῇ· αὐτὴ δὲ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ ἐποίησεν τῇ Βααλ.

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.

וְהִיא לֹא יָדְעָה כִּי אֲנִי נָתַתִּי לָהּ הַדָּגָן וְהַתִּירוֹשׁ וְהַיַּצְהָר וְכֶסֶף הַרְבִּיבִיתִּי לָהּ וְזָהָב
עָשְׂוֹ לְבַעַל:

αὐτὴ [הִיא] 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 [יָדְעָה] The Greek Aorist here indicates a process, not a state of ignorance, ‘she was unaware,’ which could be expressed with οὐκ ἤδει, cf. ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι πλὴν ἑμοῦ θεός, καὶ οὐκ ἤδεις με ‘.. you are not acquainted with Me’ Is 45.5.

ἐγὼ [אֲנִי] Opposed to her lovers.

δέδωκα [נָתַתִּי] Not ἔδωκα, aorist, once upon a time. She is still surviving, which she owes to God.

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

ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ ἐποίησεν τῇ Βααλ [עָשְׂוֹ לְבַעַל] The dative τῇ shows that ל cannot indicate transformation, “machen zu.”¹⁷ It is rather equivalent to dativus commodi. The use of the n.pl. adjectives suggests that εἶδωλα is understood, cf. τὸ ἀργύριον αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ χρυσίον αὐτῶν ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς εἶδωλα [עָשְׂוֹ לְהֵם עַצְמֵיהֶם] Ho 8.4. The addition of ἀργυρᾶ is understandable, given the frequent mention of the two metals together. Indeed the absence of ἑρμῆ 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.

¹⁶ Cf. Keil 1975.55: “*piel* in an intensive sense, to pursue eagerly.”

¹⁷ KBS s.v. I הִשָּׂא 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 1.4.¹⁸ Most of the time, however, its gender is masculine, if explicitly indicated at all.

2.9 [¶ 2.11]) διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιστρέψω καὶ κομιοῦμαι τὸν σῖτόν μου καθ' ὄραν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν οἶνόν μου ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀφελοῦμαι τὰ ἱμάτιά μου καὶ τὰ ὀθόνιά μου τοῦ μὴ 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

לְכֵן אֶשׂוּב וְלִקְחֵתִי דְגָנִי בְעֵתוֹ וְתִירוֹשִׁי בְמוֹעֵדוֹ וְהִצַּלְתִּי צְמָרִי וּפְשָׁתִי לְכַסּוֹת אֶת־עֲרוֹתֶיהָ:

τοῦ μὴ καλύπτειν [לְכַסּוֹת] The negator in ¶ is required by the context, though its Vorlage may have read *מְלַכְסוֹת*, as in 4Q166 [= 4QpHos^a] 2.9.¹⁹ Even so an inf. cst. can be used to complement a substantive, e.g. *מְקוֹם לְלִין* Gn 24.23, *שָׂרֵת כְּלִי שָׂרֵת* 2Ch 24.14.²⁰

2.10 [¶ 2.12]) καὶ νῦν ἀποκαλύψω τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν αὐτῆς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἐραστῶν αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐδεὶς οὐ μὴ ἐξέλῃται αὐτὴν ἐκ χειρός μου·

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

וְעַתָּה אֶגְלֶה אֶת־נְבִלְתָהּ לְעֵינֵי מְאֵהָבֶיהָ וְאִישׁ לֹא־יִצִּילֶנָּה מִיָּדִי:

τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν αὐτῆς [נְבִלְתָהּ] The noun *נְבִלּוֹת* is a hapax in BH. It is attested in QH, e.g. *לֹא יִשְׁמַע בְּפִי נְבִלּוֹת וְכַחַשׁ עוֹן וּמְרֻמוֹת וְכֹזְבִים לֹא יִמְצָאוּ* ‘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 ¶ appears to come closer to the truth.²¹ It is most likely a euphemistic reference to *puđenda*, cf. *δείξω ἔθνεσιν τὴν αἰσχύνην σου* *וְהִרְאִיתִי גֹיִם מֵעָרֶךָ* 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 *בַּשׁ*, which is *αἰσχύνη*, a fem. noun, in LXX.

¹⁹ So noted by us (Muraoka 1979.185).

²⁰ So Muraoka 1979.184 and id. *SQL* § 18 i, see also Neef 1986.202.

²¹ Cf. *DCH* V 596b. For an older view, see Olyan 1992.

- 2.11 [𐤅 2.13] και ἀποστρέψω πάσας τὰς εὐφροσύνας αὐτῆς, ἑορτὰς αὐτῆς και τὰς νουμηνίας αὐτῆς και τὰ σάββατα αὐτῆς και πάσας τὰς πανηγύρεις αὐτῆς·

and I shall do away with all her merry-makings, her holidays, her festivities on new moon, and her sabbaths and all public festivals

וְהִשְׁבִּיתִי כָּל-מְשׁוֹשׂוֹת הַחַג הַדְּשִׁי וְשַׁבְּתֶיהָ וְכָל מוֹעֲדֶיהָ:

ἀποστρέψω וְהִשְׁבִּיתִי] See our analysis on this equivalence at 1.4 above.

εὐφροσύνας מְשׁוֹשׂוֹת] As all the following substantives, the sg. in 𐤅 is converted to the pl. in 𐤅. It is all about recurrent occasions for merry-making and joy to be experienced whether individually or communally.

The addition of כָּל with the first and last noun only, so in 𐤅, might be intentional: all occasions when joy could be experienced and all public events, not only the three mentioned before it. The addition of the conjunction וְ with מְשׁוֹשׂוֹת alone supports such an analysis. 𐤅 apparently found it neat to join all the three substantives syndetically.

- 2.12 [𐤅 2.14] και ἀφανιῶ ἄμπελον αὐτῆς και τὰς συκᾶς αὐτῆς, ὅσα εἶπε Μισθώματά μοι ταῦτά ἐστιν ἃ ἔδωκάν μοι οἱ ἔρασταί μου, και θήσομαι αὐτὰ εἰς μαρτύριον, και καταφάγεται αὐτὰ τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ και τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ και τὰ ἔρπετὰ τῆς γῆς·

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

וְהִשְׁמַתִּי גִפְנֶיהָ וְתִאֲנָתֶיהָ אֲשֶׁר אָמְרָה אֶתְנֶנָּה הֵמָּה לִּי אֲשֶׁר נָתַנּוּ-לִי מֵאֵהָבָי וְשִׁמְתִּים לְיַעַר וְאֶקְלָתֵם חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה:

ἄμπελον αὐτῆς και τὰς συκᾶς αὐτῆς תִּאֲנָתֶיהָ גִפְנֶיהָ] The disagreement between 𐤅 and 𐤅 in terms of number and determination is noteworthy. It is difficult to fathom a reason for it. גִּפְנֵי appears in the pl. at בְּגִפְנֵים Hb 3.17 and translated accordingly with ἐν ταῖς ἀμπέλοις.

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

μισθώματα תִּאֲנָתֶיהָ] Joosten (74) mentions a study by Spicq (1991.1040), according to whom μίσθωμα 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 και σὺ

²² See SSG § 77 I.

δέδωκας μισθώματα πᾶσι τοῖς ἔρασταῖς σου καὶ ἐφόρτιζες αὐτοὺς τοῦ ἔργεσθαι 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.

θῆσομαι αὐτὰ εἰς μαρτύριον [לְיַעַר שְׂמֵתִים] The syntagm <τίθημι (act. or mid.) + acc. + εἰς> is unattested prior to SG, see *GELS* s.v. τίθημι **I 3 b**, **II 4**. See also below at 4.7.

εἰς μαρτύριον [לְיַעַר] another noteworthy discrepancy; ⚭ = לְעָד. Her husband warned that a carefully fenced round plot of land with vine-trees and fig-trees planted in it would be turned into a land easily accessible to animals and birds, which is, according to ⚭, going to become a witness against her debauchery.

הַשָּׂדֶה הַחַיִּית [is considerably expanded in ⚭. Did its *Vorlage* read as in *הַמְּאָרְזִים הַרְמָשׁ וְרַמְשׁ הַשָּׂמִים וְעַם-הַשָּׂדֶה הַחַיִּית הַשָּׂדֶה* (μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τοῦ ἀγροῦ καὶ μετὰ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἔρπετων τῆς γῆς) vs. 18 (20)? The sg. form καταβάγεται might speak against it, for the sg. verb concurring with three n. pl. subject nouns is rather unlikely. Cf. *הָאֲבָל הָאֲרָץ וְאֲמַלְלָל כָּל-יְשׁוּבָה*. Ho 4.3. In our passage *fishes* are absent for the obvious reason.

2.13 [⚭ 2.15]) καὶ ἐκδικήσω ἐπ’ αὐτήν τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν Βααλιμ, ἐν αἷς ἐπέθυσεν αὐτοῖς καὶ περιετίθετο τὰ ἐνώτια αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ καθόρμια αὐτῆς καὶ ἐπορεύετο ὀπίσω τῶν ἔραστῶν 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.

יִפְקְדֵנִי עֲלֶיהָ אֶת-יְמֵי הַבְּעָלִים אֲשֶׁר תִּקְטִיר לָהֶם וְתַעַד נֹזְמָה וְחִלְתָּהּ וְתִלְךָ אַחֲרַי
מֵאֲהַבָּיהָ וְאֵתִי שְׂכָחָה נְאֻם-יְהוָה:

ἐκδικήσω ἐπ’ αὐτήν τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν Βααλιμ] 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 פָּקַד. The rection occurring here, <ἐκδικέω τι ἐπί τινα>, recurs five more times.²³

τῶν Βααλιμ הַבְּעָלִים] 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, בְּעַל,

²³ See *GELS* s.v. **I**, where other rection patterns are also mentioned.

²⁴ Cf. *HALOT* s.v. **I** בְּעַל **B 1 b**.

הַפָּאָל עַל אֶפְרַיִם > τὰ ἐνώτια Ge 24.47. Note the use of the sg. at the above-cited Ez 16.12 and Pr 11.22.²⁷

2.14 [¶ 2.16]) Διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ πλανῶ αὐτὴν καὶ κατὰξω 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

לְכֹן הִנֵּה אֲנִי מְפַתֵּיָהּ וְהִלְכֹתִיהָ הַמְדַבֵּר וְדַבַּרְתִּי עַל-לִבָּהּ:

πλανῶ αὐτὴν הַמְפַתֵּיָהּ] As we (*Index* s.v. πλανῶ) indicated, this equivalence occurs four times in LXX,²⁸ of which twice in καὶ ὁ προφήτης ἐὰν πλανηθῆ καὶ λαλήσῃ, ἐγὼ κύριος πεπλάνηκα τὸν προφήτην ἐκεῖνον Ez 14.9, where the translator presumably read ¶ הַמְפַתֵּיָהּ as הַפַּתֵּיָהּ.

It is unlikely that πλανῶ as well as הַפַּתֵּיָהּ 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 אֲנִי, which he knows is indispensable in Hebrew.²⁹

κατὰξω] 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 κατὰ appears to retain its etymological value.

καὶ λαλήσω ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῆς הַבְּלִיָּהּ וְדַבַּרְתִּי] This idiomatic Hebrew expression means ‘to speak affectionately, touchingly or persuasively,’ and is similarly rendered in SG also at Jd 19.3AL, 2Ch 30.22, 32.6. This Greek rendition, however, is not idiomatic Greek.³⁰

2.15 [¶ 2.17]) καὶ δώσω αὐτῇ τὰ κτήματα αὐτῆς ἐκεῖθεν καὶ τὴν κοιλάδα Ἀχωρ διανοῖξαι σύνεσιν αὐτῆς, καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται ἐκεῖ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας νηπιότητος αὐτῆς καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἀναβάσεως αὐτῆς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου.

²⁷ By Dr M. Theocharous 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. הַפַּתֵּיָהּ) that διαπλανῶ ‘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

וְנָתַתִּי לָהּ אֶת־כַּרְמֶיהָ מִשָּׁם וְאֶת־עֲמֻק עֲכוֹר לְפָתַח תְּקוּהָ וְעֲנָתָה שָׁמָּה כִּי־מִי
נִעֲוָרְיָהּ וְכִי־וָם עָלְתָה מֵאֶרֶץ־מִצְרָיִם:

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

διανοιῶσαι σύνεσιν αὐτῆς הַתְּקוּהָ] Whereas our translator undoubtedly identified הַתְּקוּהָ in his Hebrew text, he is unlikely indulging in a somewhat complicated etymological game of II √קה ‘to assemble’ and σύνεσις < σύνειμι 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 הַתְּנֻנָּה] Of multiple homonymous roots ט represents one from which תְּנֻנָּה is derived. However, *pace* Joosten (76), no painful punishment need be implied, which would not harmonise well with κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας νηπιότητος αὐτῆς. Nor need the rendition presuppose הַתְּנֻנָּה. 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. ταπεινώ **1 f**), a position she would have taken in the presence of parents and other adults.³³ Cf. εἶπατε 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 Αἰγύπτου הַתְּנֻנָּה] Even on their way to the bright future in the promised land

³¹ Already in Muraoka 1993 s.v. we preferred ‘landed property’ to ‘possessions.’ At Jl 1.11 *SD* renders the word as “Sklaven.” Though our noun is the subject of θρηνεῖτε, a passage such as πεινήσει ἡ γῆ אֶרֶץ חֵלְבָל 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 Χαναανίους ἐκβαλοῦσα, τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν κατεκληρόνομησε “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.

³² Cf. κατοικῶ σε ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι 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 הַנָּח is rendered with κακῶω ‘to put through difficulties.’

2.16 [¶ 2.18]) καὶ ἔσται ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, λέγει κύριος, καλέσει με Ὁ ἀνὴρ μου, καὶ οὐ καλέσει με ἔτι Βααλὶμ·

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

הָיָה בַיּוֹם-הַהוּא נֹאמְרָהּ הִיא תִקְרָא אִישִׁי וְלֹא-תִקְרָא לִי עוֹד בַּעֲלִי:

καλέσει με יִקְרָא] 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 יִקְרָא as the suffix for ‘me,’ for which one would expect יִקְרָאנִי, and cf. the immediately following לִי יִקְרָא.

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

2.17 [¶ 2.19]) καὶ ἐξαρθῶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν Βααλὶμ ἐκ στόματος αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθῶσιν οὐκέτι τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν.

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

וְהִסְרֹתִי אֶת-שְׁמוֹת הַבְּעָלִים מִפִּיהָ וְלֹא-יִזְכְּרוּ עוֹד בְּשֵׁמָם:

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

Unlike ἀνα-, ὑπομιμνήσκω this high-frequency verb never appears in SG in the active voice form, but always as μιμνήσκομαι, even where the meaning is not middle nor passive. However, if our translator’s consonantal *Vorlage* looked like the MT, with the preposition -ב in particular, יִזְכְּרוּ must be understood by him as passive Nifal. זָכַר בְּשֵׁם ‘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 [רָמַזְהָּ רָמַזְהָּ]] καὶ διαθήσομαι αὐτοῖς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ διαθήκην μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τοῦ ἀγροῦ καὶ μετὰ τῶν πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἔρπετῶν τῆς γῆς· καὶ τόξον καὶ ῥομφαίαν καὶ πόλεμον συντρίψω ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ κατοικιῶν 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

וְכָרַתִּי לָהֶם בְּרִית בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא עִם־חַיֵּי הַשָּׂדֶה וְעִם־עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וְרִמָּשׁ הָאֲדָמָה
וְקִשְׁתׁ וְחֶרֶב וּמִלְחָמָה אֲשַׁבֵּר מִן־הָאָרֶץ וְהַשְּׂפָכֹתַיִם לִבְטָח׃

μετὰ τῶν ἐρπετῶν τῆς γῆς [וְרִמָּשׁ הָאֲדָמָה] If *ἡ*'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 Ho 4.3.

πόλεμον συντρίψω [מִלְחָמָה אֲשַׁבֵּר] Πόλεμος as direct object of συντρίβω also occurs in συνέτριψεν (שָׁבַר) τὰ κράτη τῶν τόξων, ὄπλον 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 ὄπλα πολέμου. Perhaps an end to armed conflicts is meant.

ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς [מִן־הָאָרֶץ] Whilst Theophylactus³⁵ remarks that ἡ γῆ can denote the land (of Israel) well as the earth and the opposition in our verse between אָרֶץ and אֲדָמָה 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 κατοικιῶν σε ἐπ' ἐλπίδι [וְהַשְּׂפָכֹתַיִם לִבְטָח] Three things stand out. Firstly, σε as against ים. Our translator sees the woman as representing the whole community of Israel. Secondly, this is the only case in LXX where בִּישְׁבִי corresponds to κατοικίζω. Joosten (77f.) holds that this Greek verb represents הוֹשִׁיב. True, שָׁבַב and יָשַׁב are two distinct concepts. In certain contexts, however, they are interrelated and close to each other. See, for instance, בְּשָׁלוֹם יִהְיֶה אֲשַׁכְּכֶנּוּ וְאִישׁן כִּי־אַתָּה יְהוָה לְבָדָד לְבָטַח תּוֹשִׁיבֵנִי Ps 4.9. When one can look forward (ἐπ' ἐλπίδι) 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 σύ, κύριε, κατὰ μόνας ἐπ' ἐλπίδι κατόκισάς με. Cf. also וְנָתַתִּי שָׁלוֹם בְּאָרְץ וְשִׁכְכֶתָם וְאִין מִחְרִיד וְהַשְּׁבַתִּי יֶרֶחַ לֵאמֹר בְּאֲצָרְכֶם וְנָתַתִּי שָׁלוֹם בְּאֲצָרְכֶם לֵאמֹר בְּאֲצָרְכֶם Le 26.6, the second half of which reminds us of our Hosea verse.³⁶ In XII we find relevant αὕτη ἢ πόλις ἢ φαυλίστρια ἢ κατοικοῦσα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι Zp 3.1 אֵת הָעִיר הַעֲלִיזָה הַיּוֹשֶׁבֶת לִבְטָח (ἡ 2.15) and καὶ κατοικήσει Ἱερουσαλημ πεποιθότως לִבְטָח יְרוּשָׁלַם לִבְטָח זְכַרְיָהוּ Zc 14.11. Note a case with רָבַץ, a synonym of שָׁבַב in אֲבִיּוֹנִים לִבְטָח יִרְבְּצוּ Is 14.30.

³⁵ PG 126.617: Τουτέστι, τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἢ καὶ τὰ ὕστερον 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 *וּבְטַחְתָּ כִּי־יִשַׁקְהוּ וְחַפְרָתְךָ לְבָטַח תִּשְׁכַּב: וְרַבְצָתָ וְאִין מַחְרִירִי* Jb 11.18f.³⁷

2.19 [ח 2.21]) και μνηστεύσομαι σε ἑμαυτῶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ μνηστεύσομαι σε ἑμαυτῶ 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

וְאֶרְשָׁתִּיךָ לִי לְעוֹלָם וְאֶרְשָׁתִּיךָ לִי בְצַדִּיק וּבְמִשְׁפָּט וּבְחַסֵּד וּבְרַחֲמִים:

ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ [בְצַדִּיק] Joosten (78) rightly rejects the notion of *ב* *pretii*, betrothal price, as sometimes applied here and to the following three prepositional phrases.³⁸

2.20 [ח 2.22]) και μνηστεύσομαι σε ἑμαυτῶ ἐν πίστει, καὶ ἐπιγνώσῃ τὸν κύριον.

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

וְאֶרְשָׁתִּיךָ לִי בְאֱמוּנָה וְיָדַעַתָּ אֶת־יְהוָה:

ἐπιγνώσῃ [יָדַעַתָּ] 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*, *GELS* s.v. 1.³⁹ 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 [ח 2.23]) και ἔσται ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, λέγει κύριος, ἐπακούσομαι τῶ οὐρανῶ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπακούσεται τῇ γῆ,

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

וְהָיָה בַיּוֹם הַהוּא אֶעֱנֶה נְאֻם־יְהוָה אֶעֱנֶה אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהֵם יַעֲנֶוּ אֶת־הָאָרֶץ:

³⁷ Hence we disagree with BDAG s.v. ἐλπίζ **1** βα, where it is stated that ἐπ' ἐλπίδι in ἡ σάρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι Ac 2.26 (< וּבְטַחְתָּ וְיִשְׁכַּן לְבָטַח Ps 16.9) is a Hebraism, meaning "in safety"; see already in 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.

ἐπακούσομαι הַעֲנֶה] 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 ἐπακούσαντί μοι ἐν ἡμέρα θλίψεως Ge 35.3.

The first הַעֲנֶה is missing in Θ 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 הַעֲנֶה 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 הָ] ‘it in turn.’ This is a reading replacing ὁ οὐρανός in Rahlfs.

2.22 [Ⲙ 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

הָאָרֶץ תַּעֲנֶה אֶת־הַדָּגָן וְאֶת־הַיַּיִן וְאֶת־הַיַּשְׁמֵן וְהָיָה יַעֲנֶנּוּ אֶת־יִזְרְאֵל:

2.23 [Ⲙ 2.25] καὶ σπερῶ αὐτήν ἐμαυτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐλεήσω τὴν Οὐκ ἠλεημένην καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ λαῶ μου Λαός μου εἶ σύ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐρεῖ Κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἶ σύ.

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.’

וְרָעַתִּיהָ לִּי בְּאָרֶץ וְרַחֲמֵתִי אֶת־לֹא רַחֲמָהּ וְאֶמְרָתִי לֹא־עַמִּי עַמִּי־אֶתָּה וְהָיָה יֹאמֵר אֱלֹהֵי:

καὶ σπερῶ αὐτήν ἐμαυτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς בְּאָרֶץ לִּי] She is to be sowed as seeds to produce abundant and right crops.⁴⁰ Cf. σπερῶ αὐτοὺς ἐν λαοῖς ἰσραὴל καὶ ἐλεήσω τοὺς οὐκ ἠλεημένους καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ οὐ λαὸς μου λαός μου εἶ σύ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐρεῖ κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἶ σύ Zc 10.9. On variety of prepositions to go with this Greek verb, see Mt 13.19-24 in the parable of the sower.

Κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἶ σύ אֱלֹהֵי] The Θ version is expanded, presumably an attempt to harmonise with what precedes.

⁴⁰ Two patristic commentators make her a farmer (γεώργος): Theodoretus (PG 81.1568) and Theophylactus (PG 126.624).

CHAPTER III

3.1) Καὶ εἶπε κύριος πρὸς με Ἔτι πορεύθητι καὶ ἀγάπησον γυναῖκα ἀγαπῶσαν πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλίν, καθὼς ἀγαπᾷ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀποβλέπουσιν ἐπὶ θεοῦς ἀλλοτρίους καὶ φιλοῦσιν πέμματα μετὰ σταφίδων.

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.'

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי עוֹד לְךָ אֶהְבֵּא-אִשָּׁה אֲהַבֶּתָּ רַע וּמְנַאֲפֶת כְּאֲהַבֶּת יְהוָה אֶת-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהֵם פְּנִים אֶל-אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וְאֲהַבֵי אֲשֵׁשִׁי עֲנָבִים:

ἀγάπησον] 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.

καὶ^{2]} According to the Massoretic cantillation the adverb עוֹד is to be construed with what precedes it. עוֹד as well as ἔτι are equally flexible as regards their position: e.g. 1.6 עוֹד וַתֵּהָרַע καὶ συνέλαβεν ἔτι; 12.9² עַד אוֹשִׁיבָהּ ἔτι κατοικῶ; Zc 11.15 .. עוֹד קָח לְךָ ἔτι λάβε σεαυτῶ, where an athnach is found on the preceding Hebrew word. Thus there is no linguistic clue for settling the question.

The use of καὶ 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 לְךָ 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 βádιζε λάβε σεαυτῶ γυναῖκα for .. לְךָ קָח לְךָ אִשָּׁת. See also Am 7.12, 15.⁴

ἀγαπῶσαν] The MT form אֲהַבֶּתָּ is generally revocalised in conformity to the LXX reading and the Peshitta /rāhmā/.⁵ But it is not absolutely necessary to read אֲהַבֶּתָּ for a passive participle can also indicate a state as in אֲחֻזֵי חֶרֶב '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 רַע so the Peshitta /bīšātā/. He may have been aware of the traditional reading, רַע אֱהָבָה, and of the application of רַע to husband as in הַרְעֵהוּ τὸν συνόντα αὐτῆ Je 3.20,⁷ but may have wished to see a more explicit expression such as אֱהָבָה 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, רַע or הַרְעֵהוּ.

μοιχαλίην] for the more usual μοιχαλίδα.⁸

ὁ θεός יהוה] If one excepts innumerable cases of κύριος ὁ θεός, Ma 2.17 is the only other instance in which the tetragrammaton in the MT is rendered with ὁ 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 ὁ θεός may be due to the desire to contrast it with the following θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους.

αὐτοί] ‘they in contrast.’

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 פנה see De 31.18 ἐπέστρεψαν ἐπὶ θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους, 20 ἐπιστραφήσονται ἐπὶ θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους, Le 19.4 οὐκ ἐπακολουθήσετε εἰδώλοις.

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

φιλοῦσι] On the semantics of this controversial verb, see esp. Swinn 1990, *GELS* s.v., and Muraoka 2020b.89-92.

As Keil (1975.68) correctly points out, אהבי does not refer to idols who love such fruits, but is parallel to פנים¹¹, 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 ἀλλότριος, see *GELS* s.v. 3.

¹¹ On the syntax of the participle in the construct state, see JM § 121 k.

πέμματα) אָשִׁישִׁי. Note that the Greek word πέμμα is elsewhere in the LXX attested only in Ezekiel (11×), where it renders אִיפָּה. Otherwise, אָשִׁישִׁי is rendered variously: ἀμόρα ‘sweet cake’ Ct 2.5, λάγανον ἀπὸ τηγάνου 2K 6.19, ἀμορίτη 1C 16.3. Aquila (παλαιά) seems to have read אָשִׁישִׁי ‘aged, ancient.’¹²

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.

וְאָכְרָהּ לִי בַחֲמִשָּׁה עָשָׂר כֶּסֶף וְחֹמֶר שְׂעִרִים וְלֶתֶף שְׂעִרִים:

ἐμισθωσάμην] אָכְרָהּ must have been read as אָכְרָהּ or אִכְרָהּ.¹³ The absence of an object is awkward.¹⁴ Aquila’s ἔσκαψα is a rendering of a homonym, כָּרָה ‘to dig.’

LXX translators seem to have had some difficulty with this rather uncommon verb.¹⁵ Even when it is parallel to שָׁכַר Qal in De 2.6, where it is translated with a straightforward equivalent, ἀγοράζω, the synonymous כרה is rendered with a colourless λαμβάνω. Is our translator, with the choice of μισθόω, referring to a prostitute?¹⁶ But Ehrlich (1912.171) wishes to interpret the unusual dagesh of the *kaf* in וְאָכְרָהּ as indicating that the Massorettes wanted to read the form as וְאִשְׁכְּרָהּ.¹⁷ He further refers to Ge 30.16 for this peculiar use of the verb שָׁכַר, which the LXX translates with our verb, μισθόω. Whether our translator actually read וְאִשְׁכְּרָהּ 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.¹⁸

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

¹³ On the dagesh of the *kaf*, cf. König 1881.545.

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 וְאִשְׁכְּרָהּ was what the translator had in mind, as mentioned below, the final *heh* does not have to be an object suffix, for *wa-’eqtla* without being a genuine cohortative is well known. See JM § 47 *d-e*. On the other hand, וְאִכְרָהּ as a non-apocopated *way-yiqtol* is unlikely, for such is virtually confined to forms which are immediately followed by a guttural, e.g. וַיִּשֶׂה עָמְרִי 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.

νεβελ οἴνου [שְׁעָרִים]. Pace Nyberg (1935.23) and Wolff (1965.70), there is no need to postulate a variant reading in the *Vorlage* of the LXX. The rendering is most probably due to the translator's ignorance of the word לְתֶרֶךְ, a hapax, and in order to fill in the lacuna which would otherwise have resulted, he freely supplied the stuff that is commonly combined with other kinds of food; for the combination of שְׁעָרָה (κριθή) and יַיִן (οἶνος), see 2C 2.14.¹⁹

3.3) καὶ εἶπα πρὸς αὐτήν Ἡμέρας πολλὰς καθήσῃ ἐπ' ἔμοι καὶ οὐ μὴ πορνέυσης οὐδὲ μὴ γένη ἀνδρί, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπὶ σοί.

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,'

וְאָמַר אֵלֶיהָ יָמִים רַבִּים תִּשְׁבֵּי לִי לֹא תִזְנֶי וְלֹא תִהְיֶי לְאִישׁ וְגַם-אֲנִי אֶלֶיךָ:

εἶπα] εἶπον L'-613 Th. Bas.N., a very common Atticistic correction; so also at Zc 4.11f.

πρὸς αὐτήν] The general pattern of equivalence seems to be -ל אָמַר = + dative and אָמַר אֵל = + πρὸς τινα. The only exception in XII is Ho 14.3 אֲמָרוּ אֵלַי εἶπατε αὐτῶ. The former equivalence is attested at Ho 1.6, 2.1, 10.8, Am 6.10, Jn 1.6 (the variant πρὸς αὐτόν in A is probably influenced by the preceding προσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτόν for אֵלַי וַיִּקְרַב אֵלָיו); and Zp 3.16.καθήσῃ ἐπ' ἔμοι [תִּשְׁבֵּי לִי ἔμοι] The sense of the verb may be defined as “to remain, and not move away or abandon.”²⁰ The preposition with dat. pers. indicates physical proximity.²¹ Cf. Mi 7.7 ὑπομενῶ ἐπὶ τῶ θεῶ.²² The Heb. *lamed*, however, probably has the force of *dativus commodi*.

Manifestly our translator took אֵל at the end of the verse as parallel to -ל towards its beginning, mentally supplying אֲשַׁב, although the collocation אֲשַׁב + אֵל + pers. is otherwise unknown. Ibn Ezra completes the elliptical clause as גַּם אֲנִי לֹא אֲבֵא אֵלֶיךָ, taking the preceding לֹא as double-duty negative,²³ whereas Wolff (1965.77) would read אֲנִי לֹא אֲלֶיךָ אֵלֶיךָ. On Ibn Ezra's exegesis here, see also Lipschitz 1988.43, n. 26.

καί²] om. Thph. = MT. The addition of the conjunction renders it impossible to construe לִי with the second verb, תִּזְנֶי, which is perfectly possible in the Hebrew, though one would then have to postulate a haplography for תִּשְׁבֵּי לִי לִי לֹא תִזְנֶי.

¹⁹ For a discussion of this unique rendition, see Muraoka 1991.214f.

²⁰ *GELS* s.v. κάθημαι 2. Wolff (1965.77) defines אֲשַׁב as: “zu Hause bleiben und – statt herauszugehen – ganz den häuslichen Pflichten hingegeben sein.”

²¹ See *GELS* s.v. II, 1. Ibn Ezra rewrites לִי with עִמִּי, and see Old Latin: *apud me ... apud te* (Dold 1940.266).

²² For a remarkable reading of Symmachus προσδοκησεῖς με, see Ziegler 1943.353.

²³ Cf. also Wolff 1965.77, where he mentions Am 2.7 אֵל הָלַךְ.

οὐ μή] on this forceful and solemn negation, see *GELS* s.v. οὐ, **g**.

ἀνδρί] Many witnesses add ἐτέρω apparently for the sake of clarity. Cf. De 24.2 καὶ ἀπελθοῦσα γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρω (רְחַא שִׂאִי לְהִיְתִיבָהּ הַלְכָהּ) and Je 3.1 ἀπέλθῃ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρω (שִׂאִי לְהִיְתִיבָהּ מֵאִתּוֹ הַלְכָהּ רְחַא). The phrase γίνομαι ἀνδρί with a woman as subject means “to enter intimate relationship with a man.” Thus Ru 1.13 γενέσθαι ἀνδρί; Ez 16.8 ἐγένου μοι. In this negatively worded statement, however, categorical negation is probably intended: ‘no man whosoever,’ which applies to both 𐤀 and 𐤅.²⁴

ἐπὶ σοι] The identity of construction (ἐπ’ ἐμοί) suggests that our translator saw here a case of ellipsis: καὶ ἐγὼ [καθέσομαι] ἐπὶ σοί, thus אֵלַיךְ = לָךְ. It also indicates that the verb to be understood is not אֵיךְ, but אֵשׁב.

3.4) διότι ἡμέρας πολλάς καθήσονται οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ὄντος βασιλέως οὐδὲ ὄντος ἄρχοντος οὐδὲ οὔσης θυσίας οὐδὲ ὄντος θυσιαστηρίου οὐδὲ ἱερατείας 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.

כִּי יָמִים רַבִּים יֵשְׁבוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵין מֶלֶךְ אֵין מִזְבֵּחַ אֵין שָׂר וְאֵין זָבַח וְאֵין מִצְבֵּה וְאֵין אֹפֶד וְאֵין יְהוֹדָעִים:

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 Ὡφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς πρὸς τῆ δρυὶ τῆ Μαμβρη καθημένου αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς for הוּא יֵשֵׁב פֶּתַח לְהֵאָר.

In Hellenistic Greek, μή is normal with the participle and infinitive.²⁶

ἄρχοντος] always = שָׂר in XII, except at Mi 5.2, where it renders מוֹשֵׁל. The Greek noun ἄρχων 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. **1**.

οὐδέ²] οὐκ A-Q* etc., perhaps because the following pair is to be grouped differently from the preceding one (of persons).

θυσιαστηρίου [מִמְצָבָה] an equation attested only here in LXX. Even in Hosea (10.1,3, both // θυσιαστήριον = מִזְבֵּחַ), 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 אַפּוֹד] 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 אַפּוֹד, and the equation is unique in the entire LXX, while ἱερατεία renders either קָהֵן or the Piel infinitive construct of כָּהֵן. The Hebrew word אַפּוֹד is usually translated with ἐπωμῖς, e.g. Ex 25.7 (23× in all), ποδήρης only at Ex 28.31, στολή in 2Ki 6.14, and 1Ch 15.27, and also transliterated at Jd 17.5 et passim (13×). Seeing that the Greek translators understood אַפּוֹד as a kind of garment, we might be permitted to regard the rendering ἱερατεία ‘priesthood’ as a free rendering, a case of metonymy.

דָּהָלֹן תְּרַפִּים] This Hebrew word occurs also at Zc 10.2 and is translated οἱ ἀποφθεγγόμενοι. Its other renderings in the LXX are: γλυπτά Ez 21.26, εἶδωλα 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 emphasises 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 אֹרִיִם (Nu 27.21, 1K 28.6) or תְּמִים (De 33.8, 1K 14.41). The combination of אַפּוֹד and תְּרַפִּים occurs also at Jd 17.5, 18.14, 17, 18, 20, each time transliterated in Codex A, B, and L.

3.5) καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιστρέψουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπιζητήσουσι κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν καὶ Δαυὶδ τὸν βασιλέα αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτοῦ 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.

אַחַר יָשְׁבוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבִקְשׁוּ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם וְאֵת דָּוִד מְלֶכְכֶם וּפְחָדוּ אֶל־יְהוָה וְאֶל־טוֹבוֹ בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים:

ἐπιστρέψουσιν יָשְׁבוּ] The change of tense, Imperfect > Perfect, indicates that the verb יָשָׁב 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 καὶ 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. /madbhā/.

²⁸ This enquiry is based on the list given in BDB s.v. שׁוּב Qal 8. See also *GELS* s.v. 4, b.

(a) ἐπανερχομαι + inf. – Jb 7.7; (b) ἐπαναστρέφω + inf. – De 24.4; (c) ἐπιστρέφω – De 30.9 (+ inf.), 3K 13.33 (οὐκ ἐπέστρεψεν Ιεροβοαμ ἀπὸ 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 + καὶ and verb. fin. – 4K 1.11, + inf. 4K 1.13.

ἐπιζητήσουσι] ζητήσουσι VL' 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 וְשָׁבוּ אֶל־יְהוָה לֹא בְּשִׁבְבוּ אֶל־יְהוָה לֹא καὶ οὐκ ἐπέστρεψαν πρὸς κύριον .. καὶ οὐκ ἐξεζήτησαν ..

ἐκστήσονται] The same rendering is found in Mi 7.17 ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ ἡμῶν ἐκστήσονται καὶ φοβηθήσονται ἀπὸ σοῦ וַיִּרְאוּ יְפָתְדוּ יְהוָה אֶל־יְהוָה פָּתַח. The peculiar construction of פָּתַח with אֶל, which is attested elsewhere in LXX only²⁹ at Je 2.19 (יְהוָה תִּירָתֵי) and 43.16 (יְהוָה אֶל אִישׁ יְהוָה), was not correctly understood: εὐδόκησα ἐπὶ σοί and συνεβουλεύσαντο ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ.

The equivalence ἐξίστημι = דָּחַפ Qal or Piel is found nowhere else, while דָּחַפ is rendered with ἕκστασις in 1K 11.7 ἕ. 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 ἐξίστημι = דָּרַח (Qal, Nifal, adjective) (very frequent), דָּחַח Ni. 1K 17.11, and דָּחַח Ez 2.6.

For the rection with ἐπί + dat., see Ex 18.9 ἐξέστη δὲ Ιοθορ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, Jd 11.16 ἐφ' οἷς ἐκστήσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ, Jb 36.28 ἐπὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν οὐκ ἐξίσταται σου ἡ διάνοια, Wi 5.2 ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ τῷ παραδόξῳ τῆς σωτηρίας; Je 2.12 ἐξέστη ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐπὶ τούτῳ; Ez 31.15A ἐξέστησαν ἐπ' αὐτῷ πάντα τὰ ξύλα.³¹ Rarely also with acc.: Ju 12.16 ἐξέστη ἡ καρδία .. ἐπ' αὐτήν, 15.1 ἐξέστησαν ἐπὶ τὸ γεγονός, Is 52.14 ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ σὲ πολλοί, and once with gen.: Si 43.18 ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑετοῦ αὐτῆς

²⁹ Jb 31.23 φόβος κυρίου represents a reading different from the Massoretic punctuation, אֶל דָּחַח:

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. ἐπί, II, 2, also with other verbs of mental attitude: αἰσχύνομαι ‘to feel ashamed’ Zc 9.5 λυπέω ‘to feel grieved’ Jn 4.9 χαίρω ‘to rejoice’ Hb 3.18: Johannes-sonn 1926.313 “Gemütsbewegung.” Cf. also Lk 2.47 ἐξίσταντο ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει αὐτοῦ.

ἐκστήσεται καρδία. Thus our translator did not see here, as Radaq and Keil do³², a pregnant construction, ‘to fear (and go) to.’³³

ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς] see the above-quoted Ex 18.9.

ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν] ἐπ’ ἐσχάτου 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 (ἐσχάτου: A -των), 37.24; 25.19 (ἐσχάτου BS pau.: τῶν rel.), Ez 38.16, Da 10.14 (LXX sing., Th. pl.).³⁴ Deviations are: De 31.29 τὰ κατὰ ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν, Is 2.2 ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις.

³² Keil 1975.73.

³³ Ibn Ezra also understood the verb פָּחַד 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.

CHAPTER IV

4.1) Ἀκούσατε λόγον κυρίου, υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ, διότι κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ πρὸς τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν 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.

שְׁמַעוּ דְבַר־יְהוָה בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי רִיב לַיהוָה עִם־יְשֻׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ כִּי אֵין־אֱמֶת וְאֵין־דַּעַת אֱלֹהִים בְּאָרֶץ׃

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 προσέχετε 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 ἀκούω, the sg. and pl. are ἄκουε and ἀκούσατε 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 ἀκούετε (Impv.) are not few in number; e.g. Ge 23.5, Is 28.23, 1M 2.65 αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε πάσασ τὰς 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 ἴδε καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶ 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 Ἄκουε Am 7.16, Ez 2.8 and 5 more times; ἀκούσατε Ho 4.1, Ez 6.3 and 15 more times. When found suitable, translators and authors elsewhere in the LXX did use ἄκουσον and ἀκούετε (2pl. impv.), e.g. ἄκουσον ἡμῶν Ge 23.6. Interesting in this respect is an alternation as in ἐν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ἴδε (aor.) καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶ σου ἄκουε (pres.) καὶ τάξον (aor.) εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου πάντα ‘With your eyes see, and with your ears hear, and put everything in your heart’ Ez 40.4. See SSG § 28 dfe.

υἱοὶ בְּנֵי] Some Gk manuscripts add οἱ; the anarthrous form is normal with a noun in the vocative case, and this is no Hebraism.³ This is true also when \mathfrak{H} has a noun in the absolute state, not construct as here, e.g. Πρόσεχε, οὐρανέ ‘Pay heed, o heaven!’ De 32.1 (\mathfrak{H} הַשָּׁמַיִם הַשְּׁמַיִם). In Hebrew, in cases such as this the article is often added.⁴ See *SSG* § 3 d.

κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ ליהוה ריב] 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 Οὐ μερις ἡμῶν ἐν Δαυιδ οὐδὲ κληρονομία ἐν υἱῷ Ἰεσσαί 3K 12.24^t, but *L* reads οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ. See *SSG* § 93 c. These bare existential clauses mostly reflect the underlying Semitic syntax, for the use of שׁ is rather rare in BH, ca. 140 times, though non-existence usually calls for the use of אין .

The equivalence κρίσις ריב occurs also in 12.2 (3), Mi 6.2bis, Hb 1.3, whereas at Ma 3.5 κρίσις corresponds to טפֿשׁמ , which is usually (24 times in XII alone) with κρίμα. Note esp. Mi 7.9, where both Heb. words are used side by side: $\text{מִשְׁפָּטֵי מִשְׁפָּטֵי רִיבֵי רִיבֵי וְשָׁשָׁה מִשְׁפָּטֵי}$ τοῦ δικαίῳσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου· καὶ ποιήσει τὸ κρίμα μου.

The formula κρίσις τιμὴ πρὸς τινα ‘someone has a case against another’ is also attested in 12.2 (3), Mi 6.2. Cf. κρίσιν κρινεῖ πρὸς (את) τοὺς ἀντιδίκους 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 κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ 8.8.

ἀλήθεια οὐδὲ ἔλεος] One MS (764) reverses the sequence. The two corresponding Heb. nouns, when combined as God’s attributes, appear as דְּקָה תְּמָנָה , which may have influenced this particular scribe.⁵ When separated, however, the reverse sequence also occurs as in $\text{תַּתְּנֵה אֶמְתָּ לִּיעֲקֹב דְּקָה לְאַבְרָהָם}$ Mi 7.20, where there is no comparable textual variation in \mathfrak{H} .

ἐπίγνωσις תְּעִי] 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) ἀρὰ καὶ ψεῦδος καὶ φόνοσ καὶ κλοπὴ καὶ μοιχεῖα κέχυται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ αἵματα ἐφ’ αἵμασιν μίσγουσι.

Cursing and deception and murder and theft and adultery have been poured out over the land, and they mix blood upon blood.

אַלֶּה וְכַחַשׁ וְרִצָּה וְגָנֹב וְנָאֵף פָּרְצוּ וְדָמִים בְּדָמִים נָגְעוּ:

³ The same variant reading is attested at Am 2.11, 9.7.

⁴ Hence, *pace* BDF 147.3 the presence of ὁ is not Semitising in a case such as ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἔθνων Rev 15.3.

⁵ For references in BH, see BDB s.v. דְּקָה II 2.

ἀρά ἠλᾶ] 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 ἠλᾶ = ὄρκισμός (Ge 24.41, Le 5.1), ὄρκος (Pr 29.24), ὄρκωμοσία (Ez 17.18f.). Cf. Trg. רָשָׁן לְיָמֵי and Pesh. /lauṭtā/. Theophylactus (*PG* 126.632) understands ἀρά as λοιδορία and διαβολή, and Cyril (*PG* 71.113) as καταλαλία καὶ ὕβρις. Rashi: “swore falsely” = Trg.

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

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

ψεῦδος 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 פָּרְצוּ] a rather free rendering. The figure in \mathfrak{H} is most likely that of water being poured out or overflowing as in פָּרַץ יְהוָה אֶת־אֵיבֵי לְפָנַי כַּפָּרַץ מִן מִן 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 < פָּרְצוּ לְפָנַי הַפָּרֵץ עָלַי. 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. διαχυθήσεται ὕδατα Ez 30.16 = מִן פָּרְצוּ מִן⁸ for \mathfrak{H} וְהָצַר יוֹמָם רָדָאק comments ad our Ho verse: “they broke through a barrier of the law.” Ehrlich’s (1912.172) understanding of \mathfrak{H} as “sind gang und gäbe” is close to that of \mathfrak{G} . Note Vulg. *inundaverunt* and Pesh. /sgiw/ and Kaddari (2006.883a) “נפוי, היה שכיח.” By contrast, with its vocalisation (פָּרְצוּ instead of פָּרְצוּ) and accentuation (פָּרְצוּ)⁹ \mathfrak{H} 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 πολλὰ אֶל־הַרְבֵּה Hg 1.9. 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

⁶ Cf. Harper 2016.83.

⁷ On this issue, see Muraoka 1973.26-29.

⁸ So proposed in *Index* 320a s.v. פָּרַץ. Correct “qal” to “ni.” at id. 30a s.v. διαχέω.

⁹ Nyberg (1935.24) makes note of the athnach on וְהָצַר, and maintains that the verb can mean here only “Gewalttaten üben.”

¹⁰ The inf. abs. may function as equivalent to the preceding verb, which, however, does not apply to our case, for vs. 1 ends with a nominal clause, and the only verb there is an Imperative, וְשָׁמַע. This feature is typical in late books in particular. Though our book is not late, the Masorettes could have been influenced by LBH.

The sg. form κέχυται is striking, esp. in view of פָּרְצוּ. 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 γῆ ἡ ἄρְצָ שְׁמַיִם וְרַעְשׁוּ J1 4.17, see SSG § 77 m.

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

αἷματα דְּמַיִם] 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.

μίσγουσι וְנָעַז] 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 ⚡ ‘one person’s blood floating and touching another victim’s,’ bloodbath and ⚡, in which the blood of a new victim is brought and poured on that of the first, i.e. endless bloodshed.

4.3) διὰ τοῦτο πενθήσει ἡ γῆ σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτήν, σὺν τοῖς θηρίοις τοῦ ἀγροῦ καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἐρπετοῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ σὺν τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλάσσης 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.

עַל-כֵּן תִּאָבֵל הָאָרֶץ וְאֵמְלֵל כָּל-יְיֹשֵׁב בָּהּ בְּחַיֵּית הַשָּׂדֶה וּבְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם וְגַם-דְּגֵי הַיָּם
יִאָסְפוּ:

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 σύν is highly frequent in Ez (11×) and XII (6×). 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: οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν Ro 8.22, where the prefix συν- is to be noted.

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

¹¹ See also Johannesson 1926.202.

¹² Cf. also BDAG s.v. σύν and μετά.

A court scene is envisaged.

ὄπως ἦ] Vulg. *veruntamen*, Pesh. /mettūl/, Trg. עַל ד־. The Gk conjunction is modal or resultative in force, see *GELS* s.v. **1 b**.¹⁴ Cf. Eth. /'enka/ and Theodor τοσαύτη δὲ ἅπαντα ἐρημία καθήξει .. (*PG* 66.148). The Pesh. does not necessarily represent כִּי as Nyberg (1935.24) thinks. All the same, 𐤄's interpretation significantly departs from 𐤊, in which the verbs are manifestly volitive, prohibitive with אַל and the jussive forms.

μηδεὶς שִׂי^{2]} omitted in some sources, the reason being that the co-ordinated constituent which is negated is a verb.

ὁ δὲ λαός μου .. [עַמִּי כְּמֶרְדְּ כְּהֵן] Quite a discrepancy. Vollers' (1883.245) reconstruction, עַמִּי כְּמֶרְדְּ כְּהֵן, 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.¹⁵ In any case 𐤄's *Vorlage* appears to have been identical with, or very close to, 𐤊 here, for if it had read כְּהֵן כְּכֹהֵן מְרִיב, the change in sequence in 𐤄 would be hard to account for.

The sg. of ἀντιλεγόμενος for מְרִיבִי lends no support to Nyberg's (1935.25) contention that we have here the archaic sg. cst. ending /i/, and not pl. /ē/; it is rather conditioned by the sg. nomen regens, ἱερέυς כְּהֵן. He sees in our case here the syntax similar to that presented by examples such as פָּרָא אָדָם Ge 16.12, אָדָם נָסִיבִי אָדָם Mi 5.4, אָדָם כָּסִיל אָדָם Pr 15.20, הַמְשֵׁה לְקִי אֲבָנִים 1Sm 17.40, but we doubt that כְּהֵן 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 𐤊 and 𐤄 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·
 νυκτὶ ὁμοίωσα 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.

וְכָשַׁלְתָּ הַיּוֹם וְכָשַׁל גַּם־נְבִיא עַמִּי לַיְלָה וְדָמִיתִי אִמִּי:

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, cg**.

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. כָּשַׁל בְּעֵינַי כְּחֵי וַעֲצָמֵי עָשָׂו Ps 31.11 (ἠσθένησεν ἐν πτωχείᾳ ἢ ἰσχύς μου, καὶ τὰ ὀστέα μου ἐταράχθησαν), כְּחֵי הַכְּשִׁיל La 1.14 (ἠσθένησεν ἢ ἰσχύς μου), וְאֶרְוֶה אֶרְוֶה אֶרְוֶה 1Sm 2.4 (ἀσθενούντες περιεζώσαντο δύναμιν). The same meaning persists in Rabbinic Hebrew, e.g. כּוֹשֵׁל בְּגוּפוֹ ‘one who is physically frail’ jKetubboth 33a.

ἡμέρας הַיּוֹם] The adverbial use of הַיּוֹם in the sense of ‘during the daytime,’ and not ‘today,’ is unknown to Classical Hebrew, which would instead say יוֹם (e.g. Ge 31.39), בְּיוֹם (ib. 31, 40) or יוֹמָם (e.g. Ps 121.6). However, we do find הַיּוֹם מִלְּאֲחָרָה נֶחֱמָה נֶחֱמָה Ne 4.16, which Ⓞ, however, renders as ἔστω ὅμιν ἢ νύξ προφυλακῆ καὶ ἡ ἡμέρα ἔργον. 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 *L*-⁵¹764 Th. and the Three). Some, e.g. Cyril (*PG* 71.120), took ἡμέρας as acc. pl., ‘for some days,’ i.e. not always.

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

ὁμοίωσα] = דְּמִיתִי, ≠ דְּמִיתִי. The Qal form is rendered with passive ὁμοιούμαι, e.g. Ez 31.8, 18, cf. אֶל־מִי דְּמִיתִי Tίνι ὁμοίωσας σεαυτὸν ib. 2. For the active ὁμοιόω = Pi. דָּמָה, see Ct 1.9, Is 40.25, 46.5, La 2.13. The later versions saw here the formerly resembling דָּמָה: Aq., Th. ἐσιώπησα, Sym. σιωπήσω. So Pesh. /šetqat/ and Vulg. *tacere feci*.

4.6) ὁμοιώθη ὁ λαός μου ὡς οὐκ ἔχων γνῶσιν· ὅτι σὺ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀπόσω, κἀγὼ ἀπόσομαι σὲ τοῦ μὴ ἱερατεύειν μοι· καὶ ἐπελάθου νόμον θεοῦ σου, κἀγὼ ἐπιλήσομαι 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.

נְדָמוּ עַמִּי מִבְּלִי הַדַּעַת כִּי־אֲתָה הַדַּעַת מְאֹסָתָ וְאֶמְאָסָאָהּ מִכְּהֵן לִי וְתִשְׁכַּח תּוֹרַת אֱלֹהֵיךָ אֲשֶׁכַח בְּגִיךָ גַם־אֲנִי:

ὁμοιώθη [נְדָמוּ] Our translator appears to be ignorant of a homonymic root דָּמָה in the sense of ‘to destroy.’ In the other occurrences of the verbal √דמה

in XII it is rendered with ἀπορρίπτω Ho 10.7, 15bis, Ob 5, and ὁμοιώω Zp 1.11.¹⁶ 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 רמה. Anyway, ⚡ may be interpreted as meaning ‘the same lot befell my people.’

There is no absolute necessity to think that ⚡ presupposes the sg. מהך; see ודך לא עץ לאδός οὐ πτοηθήσεται Am 3.6, לא־יבשו עמי, οὐ μὴ καταισχυθη 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 ἔχων [מְבִי] ⚡ = ‘on the ground of the lack of,’ cf. Pesh. /mettūl d-/. The Gk conjunction joined with ὁμοιώω can only indicate similarity, as was understood by Cyril Ἐοικέ δε, φησί, καὶ ὁ λαός ὁ ἐμὸς τοῖς οὐκ ἔχουσιν γνῶσιν (PG 71.120). Cf. ὡς Γομορρα ἂν ὁμοιώθημεν Is 1.9 (⚡ הַמְּבִי לַגְּמִי).

γνῶσιν [תְּבִי] 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 ἔχων ἐπίγνωσιν would make little sense. Note that, in the other two occurrences of ἐπίγνωσις in XII, it stands parallel to ἔλεος, ὄλοκαύτωμα 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 B would be preferable in 3K 7.2(14) πεπληρωμένος τῆς τέχνης καὶ ἐπιγνώσεως (B γνώσεως). The other examples of ἐπι. 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.

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

κάγω¹] Another instance of our translator’s drive for parallelism even against ⚡; see on 2.15 (17), 16 (18), 17 (19), 23 (25). The addition of καὶ after ὅτι (L’ group) is in the same vein.

τοῦ μὴ ἰερατεύειν [תְּבִי] The same Heb. construction, <תְּבִי + dir. obj. + תְּבִי + inf.>, recurs in 1Sm 16.1 על־יִשְׂרָאֵל מְלִי מְסִי עֶזְרוּדֵנוּκα αὐτὸν μὴ βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ, ib. 8.7 מְלִי מְסִי אֶתִי עֶזְרוּדֵנוּκα-σιν τοῦ μὴ βασιλεύειν ἐπ’ αὐτῶν, 15.23 מְלִי מְסִי עֶזְרוּדֵנוּσε σε κύριος μὴ εἶναι βασιλέα ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ, 15.26 על־יִשְׂרָאֵל מְלִי מְסִי עֶזְרוּדֵנוּκα καὶ εֶזְרוּדֵנוּσε σε κύριος τοῦ μὴ εἶναι βασιλέα ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰσραηλ. 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. מהך II.

acc. + εἰς> had stabilised in the sense of “to cause to become,” which is unattested prior to SG, is manifest here in view of ח בִּי הַמִּירָה , whereas in a case such as θήσομαι αὐτὰ εἰς μαρτύριον 2.12 above one could account for the syntagm as a Hebraism in view of $\text{שִׁמְתִים לְיַעֲרֵךְ}$.

ἡμαρτόν μοι] On the great diversity of government of this high-frequency verb, see *GELS* s.v. The only other relevant instance in XII is ἡμαρτον αὐτῶ (= τῶ κυρίῳ) Mi 7.9.

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

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

$\text{חטאת עמי יאכלו ואֶל־עֲוֹנֵם יִשְׂאוּ נַפְשׁוֹ:}$

ἁμαρτίας חטאת] A common equivalence in XII except ἁμαρτημα Ho 10.8. One need not suppose that in the *Vorlage* of ח 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 ἁμαρτίαν οἴκου Ἰσραηλ .. τίς ἢ ἁμαρτία [ח בְּמוֹת] 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 ח . 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, vescuntur*” (s.v. ἁμαρτία, I 179). So already Cyril (*PG* 71.124), Theodoret (*PG* 81.1572), Theophylactus (*PG* 126.640), and Rashi ad loc.

ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν λήμψονται τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν יִשְׂאוּ נַפְשׁוֹ] The second half of the verse was completely misunderstood by our translator due to his ignorance of the idiom נָשָׂא נַפְשׁוֹ ‘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 $\text{יִשְׂבֹּגְתָּ וְנָשָׂא הוּא אֶלְיוֹ}$ ἐν αὐτῶ ἐχει τὴν ἐλπίδα; Ps 24.4 $\text{לֹא־נָשָׂא לְשׁוֹן}$ οὐκ ἔλαβεν ἐπὶ ματαίῳ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; Je 22.27 $\text{עַל־הָרְחֹקִים אֶרְצֵהְרָשָׁה}$ εἰς δὲ τὴν γῆν, ἣν αὐτοὶ εὐχονται ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν; ib. 44 (51).14 $\text{אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ מְנַשְׂאִים הַמְּהַרְשָׁה}$ εἰς γῆν Ἰουδα, ἐφ’ ἣν αὐτοὶ ἐλπίζουσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν. Cf. also $\text{אֶל־הַמִּיתוֹת אֶל־תִּשְׂא נַפְשׁוֹ}$ εἰς δὲ ὕβριν μὴ ἐπαίρου τῆ ψυχῆ σου Pr. 19.18.

What we see in 2K 14.14 λήμψεται ὁ θεὸς ψυχὴν is closer to our Hosea passage, though it departs from $\text{לֹא־יִשְׂא אֶל־הֵים נַפְשׁוֹ}$, and the earlier Greek version, Antiochaeae, reads οὐκ ἐλπίζει ἐπ’ αὐτῶ ψυχῆ.

καί²] om. Aeth. Bas.N. = 𐤀𐤋 , which note by Ziegler is correct in a sense, whilst the added conjunction reproduces fairly well the real force of this peculiar Hebrew idiom, כִּי-כִּי , which expresses “the completeness of correspondence between the two objects” (BDB s.v. כִּי 2). Note esp. an accumulation of the idiom in a single verse: $\text{וְהָיָה כְּעַם כִּכְהֵן כְּעַבְד כְּאֲדָוָיו כְּשֹׁפְהָה כְּגַבְרֵתָהּ כְּקוֹנָהּ}$ $\text{וְהָיָה בּוֹ כְּנֶשֶׂא כְּאֲשֶׁר נִשְׂא בּוֹ}$ $\text{כְּמוֹכָר כְּמִלְוֶה כְּמִלְוֶה כְּמִלְוֶה כְּמִלְוֶה}$ $\text{καὶ ἔσται ὁ λαὸς ὡς ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ παῖς ὡς ὁ κύριος καὶ ἡ θεραπαινὴ ὡς ἡ κυρία, ἔσται ὁ ἀγοράζων ὡς ὁ πωλῶν καὶ ὁ δανειζὼν ὡς ὁ δανειζόμενος καὶ ὁ ὀφείλων ὡς ὁ ὀφείλει}$ Is 24.2. See also Ibn Ezra ad loc.: “As I noted earlier, this is an ellipsis for $\text{כְּעַם כְּכְהֵן וְכְהֵן כְּעַם}$.” 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 לְהֵם אַחַת לְהֵם , and see Nu 15.15 $\text{וְהָיָה לְפָנַי יְהוָה כְּכֹהֵן לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם כְּכֹהֵן עוֹלָם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם עוֹלָם}$ $\text{הַקְּהָל קִקְהָ אַחַת לְכֶם וְלִגְר הַגֵּר חֲקַת חֲקַת עוֹלָם לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם כְּכֹהֵן לְפָנַי יְהוָה}$. 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 𐤀 .

ἐκδικήσω] On this verb see above at 2.13.

τὰς ὁδοῦς] τ. ανομίας AchSa; τ. ἀδικίας Cyr.P. Both of these secondary alterations have been introduced in view of the fact that the acc. rei construed with this verb indicates crimes for which someone is to be punished, as in Am 3.2 $\text{ἐκδ. ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν}$, Ho 1.4 $\text{τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἰ. (bloodshed)}$, 2.13 (15) $\text{τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν Βααλῖμ}$, whereas the “ways” was felt to be neutral. The prefixation of κατά in 239 Aeth^p Arm, also *secundum* before διαβούλια in La^s, under the influence of the parallel 12.2 (3), is likewise an attempt to remove this ambiguity. Cf. Trg. $\text{כְּאַרְחֵתְהוֹן בִּישְׁתָּא}$.

$\text{τὰ διαβούλια αὐτοῦ}$ מַעְלָלָיו] This rare Gk word (only 10 times in LXX) is used four times in our book, and thrice it corresponds to מַעְלָלִים (plurale tantum) (4.9, 5.4, 7.2), whilst in the fourth case (11.6) it renders מוֹעֲצָה . On the other hand, rather strangely, the Heb. word concerned (מַעְלָלִים) appears eight more times in XII (Ho 9.15, 12.3, Mi 2.7, 9,²² 3.4, 7.13, Zc 1.4, 6), and their Gk equivalent is ἐπιτήδευμα in all of them. One should also note that מַעְלָלִים often stands parallel to דְּרָךְ 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 ($\text{לְפָקֹד עַל-יַעֲקֹב כְּדָרְכָיו כְּמַעְלָלָיו}$) (וְיָשִׁיב לוֹ). How can one then account for, firstly, this striking distribution of

²² $\text{διὰ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν}$ for 𐤀 מַעַל עֲלֵיָהּ . Our translator's *Vorlage* was identical with 𐤀 , as is shown by the secondary addition of the adjective unusually placed before its substantive.

the Gk equivalents within the corpus supposedly coming from a single translator, and secondly, the equally striking correspondence διαβούλιον ‘debate, counsel, deliberation’²³ and מַעֲלָלִים ‘(mostly bad) practices, deeds’? 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 $\text{מַעֲלָלֹת רֹחַם אֲנִי יֹדְעָתִיהָ}$. 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 α’* (chap. 1-27).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.

ἀνταποδώσω [אָשִׁיב] an equation found five more times in XII (Ho 12.2 [3], 14 [15], JI 3 [4].4, 7, Zc 9.12), while the same Gk verb also renders שלם Pi. in Ho 4.3, JI 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).

וְאָכְלוּ וְלֹא יִשְׂבְּעוּ הֵנוּ וְלֹא יִפְרְצוּ כִּי־אָת־יְהוָה עָזְבוּ לְשֹׁמֵר:

ἐμπλησθῶσιν] Also in conjunction with ἐσθθῆν in Mi 6.14, JI 2.26, but with πίνειν in Am 4.8.

ἐπόρνευσαν [הֵנוּ] The difference in stem, Hif. here, not Qal, is irrelevant to the Greek rendering, when הֵנוּ is not real causative. Thus πορνεύω = נָהַן in Ho 3.3, 4.14, 9.1, Am 7.17, but ἐκπορνεύω = הֵנוּ 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 [יִפְרְצוּ] an equivalence attested nowhere else in LXX. In one of the only two other occurrences of the Heb. verb in XII (Mi 2.13)²⁵ it is rendered with διακόπτειν, so Aquila here. Our version represents the line

²³ Cf. Syh. /mahšāvātā/.

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.

²⁵ The third example has been dealt with above at 4.2.

καίτοι μάλλον αὐτήν ἐκ μέσου διαρρίπτειν καὶ ἀφανίζειν ὀφείλοντες and Theophylactus (*PG* 126.644) ἐμμένειν αὐτῇ (scil. πορνεία) ἀμεταστάτως .. Δέον ἐκριζοῦν αὐτήν καὶ ἀφανίζειν· οἱ δὲ συνετήρουν ... The infinitive here is exegetical, *pace* Andersen - Freedman 1980.363: “any continuity between ‘*zbw* and *lšmr* is debatable.”

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

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

ונת ויין ותירוש יקה־לב:

μέθυσμα *שִׁירֹושׁ*] an equivalence attested only here in LXX, whilst the Gk noun is the regular equivalent of *שִׁכָּר*: Mi 2.11, Jd 13.4, 7, 14, 1K 1.15, Je 13.13. The root *שכר* 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 οἶνος, too, renders *שִׁירֹושׁ*: 2.8 (10), 9 (11), 22 (24). So eight more times in XII. Moreover, οἶνος quite frequently corresponds to ויין (16 times in XII). Hence we are justified in assuming that the rendering of *שִׁירֹושׁ* here with μέθυσμα is rather free, influenced by the familiar collocation, οἶνος 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: οἶνον καὶ οἶνον. In another case of combination of ויין and *שִׁירֹושׁ*, Mi 6.15, one is simply left untranslated: καὶ οἶνον καὶ οὐ μὴ πίητε.³⁰ Our passage, along with Mi 6.15, happens to be the only one in the entire OT, where ויין is combined with *שִׁירֹושׁ*,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 τρυξ could have been chosen. Did he, however, know precisely what *שִׁירֹושׁ* meant?³² It is generally thought to mean ‘new, not yet fermented sweet wine, must,’ hence not intoxicating.³³

καρδία *לב* *ח* is best interpreted as meaning ‘Wine and intoxicating drink take intelligence away, so Sym. οἶνος καὶ μέθυσμα ἀφαιρεῖται καρδίαν. Thus *ח* 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 adverbial 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 *חֶמֶץ* and *חֶמֶץ* 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. *שִׁירֹושׁ* ad finem.

³² See below ad Mi 6.15.

³³ So Ben Yehuda 8.7739a, n. 3, *HALOT* s.v. *שִׁירֹושׁ* C 1 c), and Clines *DCH* s.v. *שִׁירֹושׁ*. Radaq, however, says that it intoxicates fast (*משכר מהרה*).

- 4.12) ἐν συμβόλοις ἐπηρώτων, καὶ ἐν ῥάβδοις 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.

עֲמִי בַעֲצוֹ וּמִקְלָו יִגִּיד לוֹ כִּי רוּחַ יְנוּנִים הִתְעָה יְיָ וַיְנַחֵם מִתַּחַת אֲלֵהֶּיָּהּ:

ἐν συμβόλοις [בַּעֲצוֹ]. Ziegler opts for the variant, συμβούλοις ‘counselors,’ which is attested only by 130 (-λοις)-311* Thph.^{lem, 34} rejecting συμβόλοις, which is attested by the remainder of the witnesses. The variant preferred by Ziegler presupposes that our translator read in his *Vorlage* בְּעֵצָו, or at least wanted to so read even if his *Vorlage* read the same as in **ח**. At least one *yod* must be supplied for such reading, for there is no absolute, even stylistic, necessity in this case to write the pl. form, when the source language presents the sg. and the parallel term, מִקְלָו, is in the sg., thus precluding the otherwise possible explanation that the parallel member influenced, as often happens in LXX.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 **ח** (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.³⁶ Note further that some witnesses such as Ach Sa Aeth^p presuppose ξύλον, apparently without direct recourse taken to **ח**.³⁷

ἐπηρώτων] Also in the context of divination we find, e.g. Jd 18.5 ἐπ. ἐν τῷ θεῷ, 1C 10.13 ἐν τῷ ἐγγαστριμύθῳ, esp. Ez 21.21 (26) τοῦ ἀναβράσαι ῥάβδον καὶ ἐπερωτῆσαι ἐν τοῖς γλυπτοῖς (in all בְּ לֵאשׁוֹ). The rection with ἐν seems to be a Hebraism; LJS register no such instance for extra-biblical

³⁴ In our view Theophylactus must have read συμβόλοις in view of his comment: ἐν συμβόλοις, τουτέστιν, ἐν τισι σημείοις (PG 126.1 694). It appears then that the lemma reading is a secondary alteration. Cf. also Pesh. /tar‘itēh/ = συμβούλοις. Vollers (1883.246) would agree with Ziegler: “Mit Schindler, Grabe, Breitinger, [bei Schleusner] ist als alte S-Lesung συμβουλαῖς od. ähnl. zu vermuten [בַּעֲצָו], was besonders durch den Einfluss des nachfolgenden ῥάβδοις schon früh in συμβόλοις (rituelle Wahrzeichen) verwandelt wurde.” See an extended argument for συμβόλοις by Schleusner, s.v. V 157f.

³⁵ Besides, the pl. of יִקְלָו would have a fem. ending, יִקְלָוּ.

³⁶ Cf. Bouché-Leclercq 1897.I 176f. Is the word ξυλομαντεία mentioned by Schleusner V 157 s.v. σύμβολον really in use in the Greek literature?

³⁷ On the position of the Coptic tradition, see Ziegler 33f.

Greek. Note the hesitation felt by the translator at Jd 1.1 *διά* (A: *ἐν*) τοῦ κυρίου (הויהב); 1K 23.2, 30.8 *διά* etc.; so with *διά* in Sym., Theodor, Theodor, and Cyril in our place. The classical simple acc. is also instanced: e.g. De 18.11 *ἐκ. τοὺς νεκρούς*.

The Heb. habitual Impf. *לִּשְׁׁ* 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).

αὐτοῦ] -*τῶν* V 407’. The sg. is too mechanical and is out of tune with the pl. verb form. So also *αὐτῶ*.

ἀπήγγελλον] Cf. Ge 43.7 *ἀπηγγείλαμεν αὐτῶ κατὰ τὴν ἐπερώτησιν ταύτην*.

αὐτῶ] -*τοῦ* B*, under the influence of the preceding *αὐτοῦ*.

πνεύματι] pr. (* V) *ὅτι* 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 *ח* ≠ *חורב*, i.e. *ב* pro *כ*, as Nyberg (1935.29) thinks.

ἐπλανήθησαν *הִפְתְּהוּ*] 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 *ב* before *חורב*.

The dative of *πνεύματι* indicates the cause of deviation as in Is 28.7 *οὔτοι οἶνω πεπλανημένοι εἰσὶν וְגַם בְּיַיְנוּ הִלְאָ*. But this should be distinguished from the dative of reference as in Ps 94(95).10 *πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ כְּבָרְעֵי*, Is 53.6 *ἄνθρωπος τῇ ὁδῶ αὐτοῦ ἐπλανήθη*, and note esp. ib. 29.24 *οἱ τῶ πνεύματι πλανώμενοι חִירְעֵי*. Note that in all these instances the noun in the dat. has the article. Cf. Isocrates 15.52 *πλανᾶσθαι διανοία*, Ep. 6.10 *ταῖς διανοίαις πλανᾶσθαι*.

ἀπὸ *הִתְתַּמ*] Cf. 1.2 *ἀπὸ* ὀπισθεν *רִחַמָּ*, 9.1 *ἀπὸ* *לַמָּ*, Ez 6.9 *ἀπ’* ἐμοῦ .. ὀπίσω τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτῶν *רִחַמָּ* .. *לַמָּ*, 20.30 ὀπίσω τῶν βδελυγμάτων *רִחַמָּ*, all with (ἐκ)πορνεύειν *הוּ*. The Greek language is not capable of fully expressing the Hebrew combination of particles. *ἀπὸ* ὀπισθεν is daring enough for Greek.³⁸ It is not altogether improbable that ὀπισθεν did not stand in the original Septuagint, but was inserted by a later hand out of excessive regard for *ח*. Then its omission in V would be original. Elsewhere *ἀπὸ* is followed by θεός or κύριος, and ὀπισθεν by objects of profane worship. Note esp. Ez 23.5 *ἐξεπόρνευσεν ἡ Οολα ἀπ’* ἐμοῦ *הִתְתַּמ*. Cf. also ib. 16.26 (sim. 16.28) *ἐπὶ* τοὺς υἱοὺς Αἰγύπτου. Let’s note how *רִחַמָּ* with verbs of deviation is rendered in XII and Ez a’: Zp 1.6 *ἐκκλίνοντας ἀπὸ* τοῦ κυρίου, Ez 14.11 *πλανᾶται* .. *ἀπ’* ἐμοῦ. The combination with *הִתְתַּמ* with such a connotation, that of deviation and apostasy, does not appear elsewhere

³⁸ Note, however, *ἀπ’* οὐρανόθεν II. 8.365 and *ἀπὸ* Τροίηθεν 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 ἄρμοσθείσης πράξεως (PG 126.645), Theodor πρὸς πλάνην εἶδον ἀποστάντες τοῦ θεοῦ παντελῶς (PG 66.152), and Cyril ὡς ἀποτάτω γεγόνασι τοῦ θεοῦ (PG 71.132).

- 4.13) ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὄρεων ἐθυσίαζον καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς βουνούς ἔθουον, ὑποκάτω δρυὸς καὶ λεύκης καὶ δένδρου συσκιάζοντος, ὅτι καλὸν σκέπη. διὰ τοῦτο ἐκπορνεύσουσιν αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ αἱ νύμφαι ὑμῶν μοιχεύσουσι·

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.

עַל־רֶאֱשֵׁי הַהָרִים יִזְבְּחוּ וְעַל־הַגְּבָעוֹת יִקְטְרוּ תַחַת אֵלֶיךָ וְלִבְנָהּ וְאֵלֶּה כִּי טוֹב צֶלֶף עַל־כֶּן תִּזְנֶינָה בְּנוֹתֶיכֶם וְכָל־נְשֵׁיכֶם תִּזְנֶינָה.

τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὄρεων [רֶאֱשֵׁי הַהָרִים] 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.’

ἐθυσίαζον .. ἔθουον [יִקְטְרוּ .. יִזְבְּחוּ] The table below shows the pattern of equivalences in XII between 𐤆 and 𐤅.³⁹

	θύειν	θυσιάζειν	θυμιᾶν/άζειν
זבח	Ho 4.14, 8.13, 11.2, 13.2; Jn 1.16, 2.10; Hb 1.16; Ma 1.14 (Ez 16.20, 20.28)	Ho 4.13, 12.12; Zc 14.21; Ma 1.8 (θυσία)	
קטר Pi.	Ho 2.13 (15) [Hif. ἐπι- θύειν], 4.13		Ho 11.2; Hb 1.16; Ma 1.11 [Hof. θυμίαμα]

³⁹ As regards זבח there is no knowing whether our translator distinguished between Qal and Piel forms, for all the forms vocalised as Piel in 𐤆 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 Pi. 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*:

		θύειν	θυσιάζειν	θυμιᾶν/άζειν
זבח	Qal	83	20	
	Pi.	13	7	1
קטר	Pi. / Pu.	2		38
	Hif.	1		25

Thus, roughly speaking, θυμιᾶν = קטר 'to burn incense,' θύειν / θυσιάζειν = זבח 'to offer sacrifice.' Two questions must be raised in our context:

- whether there can be found any distinction between θύειν and θυσιάζειν,
- how is one to account for the equivalence θύειν = קטר?

Historically speaking, θυσιάζειν is a late coinage derived from the substantive, θυσία; 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,⁴⁰ whilst θύειν may mean 'to slaughter (in general)' as in Is 22.13 θύοντες (טחש) πρόβατα (for a feast). In this connection we should note an example like Ho 13.2 θύσατε ἀνθρώπους and the fact that θυσιάζειν does not, in XII,⁴¹ take animals as its object. Among the examples of θυσιάζειν, note esp. those of the participle in Ho 12.11 (12) ἄρχοντες θυσιάζοντες and Zc 14.21 ἕξουσιν πάντες οἱ θυσιάζοντες. 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 זבח θύειν // קטר θυμιᾶν, 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 קטר in 2.13 (15) he wrote ἐπιθύειν as a more general term and in our present passage he did the same thing, adding the synonymous θυσιάζειν to render זבח.

βουνοῦς [גבעות] a correspondence unique to XII - Ez α', see Mi 6.2.

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

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

⁴¹ Outside of XII, note 3K 1.9 ἐθυσίασε πρόβατα, 19 μόσχους καὶ ἄρνους, and 25 μόσχους. According to Shenkel (1968.17), the two renditions represent in 1 - 4K two different text-types, Old Greek and Proto-Lucianic.

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 (< δρυῶς) ἰστού] an equivalence unique to XII (Am 2.9, Zc 11.2). In Ez 6.13 A δρυὸς ἰστού is related to ἰστού, while in 27.6 a different use made of the tree leads to the identification of a different tree, fir (תֵּרֶן אֱלֹנִים) ἰστούς ἑλατίνους, preserving a phonetic similarity).

Outside of our corpus ἰστού is rendered with βάλανος; so Ge 35.8, Is 2.13, 6.13. Leaving aside botanical precision, the choice of δρυῶς 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).

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

δένδρου συσκιάζοντος ἰστού] 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 ἰστού] 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 πορνεύουσιν found in V L’ and C’ is probably a correction due to πορνεύωσι in the following verse.

אִי נִמְפֵּי הַמֶּלֶךְ] There is no problem with this equivalence. However, both נִמְפֵּי and מֶלֶךְ can be semantically ambiguous. מֶלֶךְ 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. נִמְפֵּי, 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.

BDB s.v. brings our Ho passage and the next verse under the sense ‘bride.’⁴³ The sequence *daughter - wife*, however, sounds a little unnatural. Was Dinah dearer to Jacob than Leah?

4.14) καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐπισκέψωμαι ἐπὶ τὰς θυγατέρας ὑμῶν, ὅταν πορνεύωσι, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς νύμφας ὑμῶν, ὅταν μοιχεύωσι, διότι καὶ αὐτοὶ μετὰ τῶν πορνῶν συνεφύροντο καὶ μετὰ τῶν τετελεσμένων ἔθουον, καὶ ὁ λαὸς οὐ συνίων συνεπλέκετο μετὰ πόρνης.

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

לֹא־אֶפְקֹד עַל־בְּנוֹתֵיכֶם כִּי תִזְנֶינָה וְעַל־כְּלוֹתֵיכֶם כִּי תִנְאַפְנָה כִּי־הֵם עִם־הַזְנוּת
יִפְרְדּוּ וְעִם־הַקְדָּשׁוֹת יִזְבְּחוּ וְעַם לֹא־יָבִין יִלְבֹּט:

ἐπισκέψωμαι ἱρᾶ] The use of ἐπισκέπτομαι with hostile connotation, ‘punitive visit,’ is unknown outside of LXX, reflecting the double meaning of the underlying Heb. פקד. 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 unambiguous ἐκδικεῖν to render פקד *in sensu malo* (13 times in XII, but none in Ez a’). Not only the meaning, but also the syntax reflect the Hebrew construction: 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*;⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵

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

συνεφύροντο] a rare word in LXX, occurring elsewhere only⁴⁶ at προσπορευόμενον ἀνδρὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ 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, 1 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 συναφύρω 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 υἱὸς μετὰ μητρὸς καὶ πατὴρ μετὰ θυγατρὸς 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 פָּרַד, which must have stood in his *Vorlage*, should have presented any difficulty to our translator.⁴⁷ Apparently there arose a difficulty from the preposition עַם, instead of which מִן would naturally have been anticipated. At the same time, however, the translator noted that the parallel sentence also had עַם followed by a parallel וְשָׂרָה (// וְזוֹת). 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. ἠκολούθησαν is an improvement upon ἔ, though with no regard paid to ἔ. The verb selected by Aq. here, ἐνδιηλλαγμένων, is also attested in 3K 22.47A for שָׂרָה and πόρνη Gn 38.21f., Dt 23.18 for הַשָּׂרָה.

τῶν τετελεσμένων תְּשִׁיבָה] The Heb. technical term for “temple prostitute” is rendered in different books as follows: πόρνη Gn 38.21f., Dt 23.18 (הַשָּׂרָה); σύνδεσμος 3K 14.24 (שָׂרָה); τελετής 1K 15.12 (שָׂרָה); καδησιμ 4K 23.7 (שָׂרָה); τελεσφόρος .. τελισκόμενος⁴⁸ as a doublet of πόρνη .. πορνέων De 23.17 (18 שָׂרָה .. הַשָּׂרָה).

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 ἀσεβείας ὄργια μεμνημένους (PG 81.1573), but Syh. correctly /mšammīyātā’/. The word τετελεσμένων reminded Cyril (PG 71.133) and Theophylactus (PG 126.648) of its use in the LXX at Nu 25.35 and Ps 105(106).28 in connection with the ancient Israelites’ involvement with the cult of Baal of Peor.

οὐ συνίων וְלֹא-יָבִין] Ziegler is certainly right in adopting this reading supported by V-239 Q^{ms} 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.

συνεπέκετο וְיָבִין] 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, *Fragm.* 618 Θέτιδι συμπλακεῖς ‘entwined with Thetis [a goddess].’ The phrase μετὰ πορνῆς brings out this connotation clearly.

μετὰ πόρνης] ἔ read the first two words of the next verse, הָאֵם-וְנָה, as the end of this verse, i.e. הָאֵם וְנָה.

⁴⁷ In XII - Ez α’ only at Ez 1.11, where פָּרַדוֹת is rendered as ἐκτεταμέναι, 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 δέ, Ἰσραηλ, μὴ ἀγνόει, καὶ Ἰουδα, μὴ εἰσπορεύεσθε εἰς Γαλ-
γαλα καὶ μὴ ἀναβαίνετε εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ὠν καὶ μὴ ὀμνύετε 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.*

אִם-זִנְה אַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל-יְאֻשָׁם יְהוָה וְאַל-תִּבְאוּ הַגִּלְגָּל וְאַל-תַּעֲלוּ בֵּית אֹן
וְאַל-תִּשְׁבַּעוּ בַּיְהוָה:

ἀγνόει **אִשָּׁם**] The use of the 2nd person Imperative does not mean that
the *Vorlage* read **אִשָּׁם**; 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 **אִשָּׁם** is shared
by Ez *א'*,⁴⁹ in which the phrase τὰ ὑπὲρ ἀγνοίας renders **אִשָּׁם** ‘trespass offer-
ing’ (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 **הִנָּשָׂה** or **הִנָּשָׂה** ‘igno-
rance’ and **אִשָּׁם** are repeatedly associated, which may have led our translator
to think that **אִשָּׁם** 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 **אִשָּׁם**. See, e.g. Le 4.22 **אִשָּׁם הִנָּשָׂה**.

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 igno-
rant” 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
ἀγνοεῖν and its congeners in LXX to render **אִשָּׁם**, **הִנָּשָׂה**, **רִשְׁעָה** 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 μωρός, μηδὲ τῆς εἰς λῆξιεν ἠκούσης ἀσυνεσίας ἔμπλεως
(*PG* 71.136) nor Theophylactus with his Γνωῶσιν λάβε, ἀπόθου τὴν ἀνοησίαν
(*PG* 126.648).

πλημμελεῖν of the Three is the accepted rendering of **אִשָּׁם** 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, ἄγνοια.

⁵¹ Cf. Daniel 1966.320-25.

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] = וְאֵן, ≠ אֵן. 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 אֵן בְּחַיִּי > νεανίσκοι Ἡλίου πόλεως.⁵² The addition τῆς ἀδικίας in 49 is a doublet. The same reading shown by B^{mg} A''-Q^{xtl}-233-407' etc. is rightly rejected by Ziegler in favour of that of Q^{mg} 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 ἀίδιον καὶ ὄντως ὄντα Θεόν (*PG* 66.152), which is put right by Theodoret: τὸ Ων ὄνομά ἐστι τοῦ εἰδώλου ἐν Βαιθηλ· οὐ γάρ, ὡς τινες ὑπέλαβον, τὸν “ἀίδιον” ἐρμηνεύει, τουτέστι, τὸν ὄντα· ἀλλ’ Ἑβραϊκὸν ἐστι, οὐχ Ἑλληνικὸν ὄνομα (*PG* 81.1573).

ζῶντα κύριον] The fronting of the participle is slavishly faithful to אֵן, in which the phrase is a standing oath formula.⁵³

The acc. with ὀμνύναι is already Classical; see LSJ s.v. III, e.g. ὀμνυμι 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 θεόν), ἐν c. dat. (e.g. Je 5.7 ἐν τοῖς οὐκοῦσι θεοῖς). Cf. Johannesson 1910.77 and Helbing 1928.71f. In XII once c. acc., 6 times c. κατὰ τινος and twice c. dat.

4.16) ὅτι ὡς δάμαλις παροιστρῶσα παροίστησεν Ἰσραηλ· νῦν νεμήσει αὐτοὺς κύριος ὡς ἄμνὸν ἐν εὐρυχώρῳ.

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

כִּי כִפְרָה סִרְרָה סִרְרָה יִשְׂרָאֵל עָתָה יִרְעֶם יְהוָה כִּכְבֵּשׁ בְּמִרְחָב:

δάμαλις [פְּרָה]. In 10.11 δάμαλις = עֲגֹלָה, which is a more correct equivalent, whilst δάμαλις = פְּרָה also in Am 4.1, Jl 1.17.

παροιστρῶσα [סִרְרָה] 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

⁵² Cf. a note by Cyril ad 5.8: Ων δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ ἥλιος (*PG* 71.149).

⁵³ The syntax was correctly understood in, e.g. Je 4.2, 5.2, 12.16.

of XII, may be profitably studied. In Ez 2.6 we read *παροιστρήσουσι καῑ επισυστήσονται ἐπὶ σὲ κύκλω*, which is supposed to render *סָרְבִּים וְסִלְוִיִּים וְהִתְרִיאוּ*. The first Heb. word is a hapax in BH, while the latter appears only once more in ib. 28.24 (וְהִתְרִיאוּ, if same word, and // קִרְיָן), rendered with *ἄκανθα* (// σκόλογ). *Παροιστρᾶν* relates the Heb. word to a root common in Aramaic in the sense of ‘to refuse,’ though it occurs in Si 4.25 *אל תסרב עם האל* *μη̄ ἀντίλεγε τῆ̄ ἀληθείᾳ* ‘Don’t contradict the truth.’⁵⁴ By contrast, *ἐπισυνιστάναι* ‘to conspire’ is a free rendering based on the general context. That our translator had Ez 2.6 in mind, as he translated our Ho passage, is beyond any doubt, and we should note that, in the later occurrences of the Heb. word, more appropriate equivalents are used: *ἀπειθεῖν* in 9.15 and (νῶτος) *παρὰφρονοῦν* in Zc 7.11, for *παροιστρᾶν* does not exactly indicate stubbornness or rebelliousness.⁵⁵ Needless to say, the reference to the Ez passage was made possible through the similarity of the two Heb. words *סרב* and *סרר* as well as the contextual affinity in that both places speak of a rebellious Israel.⁵⁶ The third instance, 2K 17.8L, reads *ὡσπερ ἄρκοι παροιστρῶσαι* for *כְּדָב שְׂכוּל*, which the Kage version renders as *ὡς ἄρκος ἠτεκνωμένη*. It is about brave, fearless fighters.

Aq. and Thdt.’s *ἐκκλίνουσα* construed the form of the Heb. verb as Po’lel of *סור*. The same equivalence is attested for Aq. (and Thdt.) also in Je 6.28, La 3.11, in both in the form *סורר*. Sym. *ἐπιθυμοῦσα* is very probably a Greek interpretation of *ס*, for *παροιστρᾶν* may be used figuratively of frenzy passion, see LSJ s.v. *οἰστρᾶν*.

All in all, the choice of *παροιστρᾶν* in our passage is not very far off the mark: “go mad, get out of hand or control.” The notion of rebellion was picked up by Theodor: *πρὸς ἀταξίαν νευσάσης* (PG 66.154) and Cyr. *εἰς ἀπόστασιν* (PG 71.137).

Pace Schleusner (IV 224), there is definitely involved more than insanity.

4.17) μέτοχος εἰδώλων Εφραιμ ἔθηκεν ἑαυτῷ σκάνδαλα,

Associating with idols, Ephraim has laid stumbling-blocks for himself.

הַבּוֹר עֲצָבִים אֶפְרַיִם הִנְחִילוֹ:

μέτοχος *הַבּוֹר*] The Gk word appears only here in XII - Ez α’. Cf. Ma 2.14 *κοινωνός σου הַבְּרִיתָה*. Sym. Hebr. *ηνωθη* derives from *ἐνωῦν* ‘to unify.’ There is no need to suppose, as Nyberg (1935.31) does, that *ס* read *הַבְּרִיתָה*.

⁵⁴ On the textual question here, see Segal 1958.28f. A non-verbal lexeme also occurs in Si 41.2B *סרב* (= *סָרַב*) *ἀπειθοῦντι* ‘disobedient.’

⁵⁵ See also *παρὰφρόνησις* *שָׁגְעוּן* and *כְּתָה* (Zc 12.4), *סִרְרָת* *νῶτον ἀπειθοῦντα* (Ne 9.29 as in Zc 7.11), and *שְׁמִיר* *ἀπειθής* (Zc 7.12).

⁵⁶ Zimmerli 1969 ad loc. is mystified by *ס*, and offers an alternative solution which does not seem to us very satisfactory; in any case he sees no link between the Ez and Ho passages.

εἰδώλων [עַצְבִּים] 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.

ἔθηκεν [הִנָּה] ℄ = הִנָּה or הִנֵּה, whilst Aq. and Thdt.'s ἀνέπαυσεν = הִנָּה.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.'

σκάνδαλα [סָר] In view of 2.6 (8) סִיר 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 מִשְׁכָּל (8 times in LXX) or מִכְשׁוֹל (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 וְתִרְבִּי אֶת־תִּוְנוֹתֶיךָ אֶל־אֶרֶץ כְּנַעַן כְּשֶׁדִּימָה.⁵⁸ There is no indication that the translator took into consideration another occurrence of סָר: Na 1.10 σμῖλαξ 'bindweed.' At Ez 23.42 [סָרָאִים] מִבְּאִים סִבְאִים ἡκο-ντας 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) ἠρέτισε Χαναναίους· πορνεύοντες ἐξεπόρνευσαν, ἠγάπησαν ἀτιμίαν ἐκ φρυάγματος αὐτῆς.

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

סָר סָבָאִים הִנָּה הִנֵּה אָהָבוּ הָבוּ קָלוֹן מִגְּנֵיָהּ:

ἠρέτισε] Vollers' (1883.246) ἠρέθισε '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 סָבָאִים was read as meaning 'Sabaeans,' but this name is normally spelled with שׁ.

ἠγάπησαν [אָהָבוּ] הָבוּ in ℄ must be considered as due to dittography. As for Sym. ἠγάπησαν ἀγαπήν οὗ ἢ βοήθεια ἀτιμία, it should be remembered that a change in word order has been introduced.

ἐκ φρυάγματος αὐτῆς [מְגִנֵּיָהּ] ℄ undoubtedly read מְגִנֵּיָהּ or מְגִנָּאִים 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 ἔασον Sym. Quinta, which is = ℄, though not mentioned by Ziegler.

⁵⁸ ℄ is remarkably different from ℄: καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὰς διαθήκας σου πρὸς γῆν Χαλδαίων. If διαθήκας is to be accepted, its association with μέτοχος εἰδώλων in our Ho passage is apparent.

Vorlage read like \mathfrak{H} , for a few verses later (5.5) וְאֵן is rendered with ὑβρις.⁵⁹ In other words, the homophonous מָנָן “discovered” by Driver (1931.383f.) was not part of the translator’s Hebrew vocabulary.

Two objections raised by Nyberg (1935.32) against postulating that \mathfrak{G} read וְאֵן may be removed by observing 1) that there is no absolute necessity to suppose that only in certain combinations וְאֵן can be rendered with φρύαγμα, and 2) that just when our translator manipulates \mathfrak{H} , 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. נָצַה ‘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, וְאֵן is translated with ὑβρις, but see our remark above that, in other books of XII, וְאֵן is = φρύαγμα.

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

4.19) $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \pi\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\upsilon\varsigma\iota\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma,\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\nu\text{-}\theta\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\omega\nu\ \theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omega\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu.$

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

$\text{צָרַר\ רֵיחַ\ אֹתָהּ\ בְּכִנְפֶיהָ\ וַיִּבְשׂוּ\ מִזִּבְחֹתֶיהֶם:}$

$\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ וְצָרַר\ רֵיחַ] The interpretation presented in \mathfrak{G} differs in two points from that deducible from \mathfrak{H} .

It appears that \mathfrak{H} was read as וְצָרַר\ רֵיחַ , $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ meaning ‘a mass of wind, whirlwind.’ The same interpretation is represented in 13.12 צָרַר\ רֵיחַ $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\ \nu\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, cf. also Ez 13.20 $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\tau$ being read as וְצָרַר\ רֵיחַ , ib. 13.21 $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\ \nu\ \lambda\acute{\mu}\zeta\omega\delta\eta$ (read as וְצָרַר\ רֵיחַ). For the phrase $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, cf. Si 43.17 $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\gamma\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \beta\omicron\rho\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\text{וְסַעֲרָה\ וְסוֹפָה\ וְסַעֲרָה}$ read as $\text{וְסוֹפָה\ וְסַעֲרָה}$ ⁶⁰, and LSJ s.v. $\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\ \text{II}$ 4.

$\sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}] = \text{אֵתָהּ, \neq \mathfrak{H}\ \text{אֹתָהּ.}$ The v.l. $\sigma\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ (< $\sigma\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$ ‘to make a hissing noise’) is an inner-Greek improvement starting from $\sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}$, influenced by the association with $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ ‘wind.’

$\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma]$ To say that our translator blindly rendered the fem. suffix in \mathfrak{H} without realising that it refers to וְצָרַר\ רֵיחַ (neut. noun) would be unfair to him; he consciously referred $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ to Ephraim.⁶¹ The v.l. $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ in A’’ testified to this difficulty. Note an improvement shown by Sym. $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$.

⁵⁹ Cf. also Driver 1931.44, 1933.383f.

⁶⁰ Cf. Yadin 1965.32.

⁶¹ Cf. Pesh. /kenfayhōn/, reading וְצָרַר .

ἐκ] The preposition ׀ must have fallen out in the Hebrew text due to haplography, since an impersonal subject with ׀ Qal is unheard of.

The use of ἐκ with καταισχύνεσθαι or αἰσχύνεσθαι is a Hebraism. According to LSJ s.v. αἰσχύνεσθαι,⁶² it is joined either with a noun in the acc. or dat., or with one of the prepositions ἐπί (τινι), ἐν (τινι), ὑπέρ (τινος), περί (τινος).⁶³

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. καταισχύνω 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, μετακλαιομένη τὴν ἀβουλίαν (*ib.* 655). In contrast, Theodor displays a better judgement: ὥστε αὐτοὺς τότε αἴσθησιν λαβεῖν ὅτι ματαίαν καὶ ἐπιβλαβῆ τὴν περὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια τῶν εἰδῶλων εἶχον σπουδῆν (*PG* 66.153).

⁶² For the former no evidence is recorded.

⁶³ Cf. Helbing 1928.24, 262.

CHAPTER V¹

5.1) Ἀκούσατε ταῦτα, οἱ ἱερεῖς, καὶ προσέχετε, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ οἶκος τοῦ βασιλέως, ἐνωτίζεσθε, διότι πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐστὶ τὸ κρίμα, ὅτι παγὶς ἐγενήθητε τῆ σκοπιᾶ καὶ ὡς δίκτυον ἐκτεταμένον ἐπὶ τὸ Ἴταβύριον, *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*

שְׁמַעוּ־זֵאת הַכְּהֻנִּים וְהַקְּשִׁיבוּ בַּיִת יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבַיִת הַמֶּלֶךְ הֲאִזִּינוּ כִּי לָכֶם הַמִּשְׁפָּט
כִּי־פַח הָיִיתֶם לְמַצְפָּה וְרֶשֶׁת פְּרוּשָׁה עַל־תְּבוֹר:

Ἀκούσατε] On the avoidance of Ἀκούετε, pres. impv., see above at 4.1. The particle δὴ, a secondary addition in 26, is highly frequent in the formula ἄκουε / ἀκούσατε δὴ as in Mi 3.1, 9, 6.1, Zc 3.8; Ez 18.25 (all with אָ); Am 8.4 Ἀκούσατε δὴ ταῦτα.

οἶ] om. 147, a stylistic improvement; see BDF, § 147 (3).

προσέχετε וְהַקְּשִׁיבוּ] an equation unique on both sides (⊖ and ⊕) in XII; no example in Ez. The imperative of this verb appears usually in the present tense except Da LXX 9.18; ib. TH 9.19; 3M 2.2 and often in Ps, where 77.1 προσέχετε is the sole exception.

Ἰσραὴλ] pr. του Q^{ms} II-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 וְהִזְזִינוּ] also in JI 1.2 // ἀκούειν. The reading is partially etymologising. The pair appears in Ge 4.23 for the first time: ἀκούσατέ μου τῆς φωνῆς, γυναικες 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 ὑμᾶς ἐστὶν τὸ κρίμα שְׁפָשְׁפָה לָכֶם] the precise meaning of ⊕ 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^w *adversus vos*, and Eth *ba'enti'akkemu*.

ἐστὶ] without a copula in κρίσις τῶ κυρίῳ πρὸς τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν γῆν 4.1.

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.

σκοπιῶ] 𐤇 was read as 𐤇𐤌𐤍 . 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.; $\text{ᾠκοδόμησεν} \dots \text{ᾶν βουνὸν Βενιαμιν καὶ τὴν σκ.}$ 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 [= 𐤌𐤍]) 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 τάξιον), and Eth. *za vāstahāyes*.²

δίκτυον רְשֵׁת parallel to παγίς also in Jb 18.8, where רְשֵׁת is parallel to כְּבֶכֶשׁ , and see Pr 29.5f. with $\text{רְשֵׁת} // \text{מוֹקֵשׁ}$. Our Greek word is also used metaphorically in δίκτυον ἄτης 'net of calamity' Aesch. *Prom.* 1078, δίκτυόν τί γ' Ἄιδου 'some net of death' id. *Agam.* 1115.

ἐκτεταμένον פְּרוּשָׁה , cf. ἐκτείνεται δίκτυα Pr 1.17.

Ἰταβύριον תְּבוֹר] 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 אֲתַבַּר (note that Tau, and not Theta, is used in the transliteration), and indeed, in the Targum the verb תַּבַּר renders הָמָה (Jd 4.15) כֹּנַע Hif. (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 טור רם for תְּבוֹר , the phrase appearing in the above-mentioned expansion in Jd with reference to Tabor, which boasts $\text{אנא טור רם על כל טוריא ולי חזיא שכינתא}$ 'I am a mountain higher than all other mountains and the divine appeared to me.' For Theod. ἐπὶ τὸ δρυμόν, cf. 1K 10.3 $\text{ἕως τῆς δρυὸς Θαβωρ תְּבוֹר אֶלֶן עַד-אֶלֶן}$. The mountain in Palestine is called Ἰταβύριον in Polybius 5.70.6. This form of the name indicates a

² On the formative -ια, see Schwyzer, 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 ..' (ὕπὸ τε τῶν ἱερέων .. ἐπισκοπούμενην πλῆθύν).

³ Joosten (97) is not interested in this remarkable discrepancy between 𐤇 and 𐤇 .

⁴ Note also Trg $\text{תְּבוֹר תְּבוֹר גְּבִירֵי סְנַאִיהוֹן}$ Jd 5.2, $\text{תְּבוֹר תְּבוֹר גְּבִירֵי סְנַאִיהוֹן} \dots \text{דָּם עֲמִייה תְּבוֹר גְּבִירֵי עֲמִמְיָא} \dots \text{יְיִ תְּבוֹר}$ 5.13.

connection between the Hellenised form of Tabor and Mount Atabyris or Atabyrium in Rhodes.⁵ For *statum in se* of La^w, see a discussion by Ziegler 1971.117f. Or is it possible that תבור was understood as ‘conqueror,’ but the midrashic expansion mockingly altered it into ‘the defeated (by Mt Sinai the Small)’?

5.2) ὁ οἱ ἀγρεύοντες τὴν θήραν κατέπηξαν. ἐγὼ δὲ παιδευτῆς ὑμῶν·

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

וְשִׁחַטְהוּ שְׂטִיִּים הַעֲמִיקוּ וְאָנִי מוֹסֵר לְכֻלָּם:

ὁ οἱ ἀγρεύοντες τὴν θήραν κατέπηξαν] There are a number of indications that here we are dealing with a free rendering, a procedure followed owing to the difficulty of Ἰ ; no doubt the *Vorlage* was not much different from the MT. The only word from which the translator was able to start with confidence was הַעֲמִיקוּ, which he brought into relation with the preceding רָשַׁת, ‘to fix a net deep into the ground,’ which procedure compelled him to provide a connecting particle ὁ. Note the same correspondence in 9.8, which is found in a very similar context. Aided by the context (רָשַׁת), he further argued that שַׁחַט might be justifiably taken as a remote synonym of טָרַף or טָרַףָּ, which are the most common equivalents of θήρα (e.g. Na 2., 13f., 3.1). The added article τὴν and the changed word-order are further indications of free rendering. Finally, ἀγρεύειν was freely chosen, although the possibility is not entirely precluded that his *Vorlage* read שַׁחַטִּים or the π was supplied by the translator.

One can hardly see how שַׁחַטְהוּ שְׂטִיִּים or שַׁחַטְהוּ שְׂטִיִּים suggested by Vollers (1883.247) as *Vorlage* could produce Ἰ .

It is beyond every doubt that this passage was in the mind of our translator when he came to translate 9.9; see there.

Sym. and Quinta θυσίαν on one hand and Theod. σφαγὴν for θήραν on the other as well as Trg. דְּבַחֵיךְ and Vulg. *victimās* took שַׁחַט as meaning sacrificial animal.⁶

παιδευτῆς] = מְיֹסֵר, cf. Trg. אָנִי מִיְיֹסֵרִיךְ, Pesh. 'enā 'erde and Vulg. *ego eruditor*. For the general idea, cf. De 8.5 κύριος ὁ θεὸς παιδεύσει σε σε μִיִּסְרֶיךָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ מִיִּסְרֶיךָ, ib. 4.36 ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀκουστῆ ἐγένετο ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ παιδεύσαι σε מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם הַשְּׁמִיעֶךָ אֶת־קִלְוֹ לִיִּסְרֶךָ. Joosten (98) mentions

⁵ See Thackeray 1903.181, n. 1. Cf. Abel 1967.353: “Atabyris est le surnom de Zeus à qui sur le mont Arabyris, à Rhodes, le Crétois Althaimenes avait consacré un temple sur un sanctuaire phénicien. On a pensé à תבור *quo ducuntur pecudes* en s'appuyant sur Hézychiuss: Αταβυριον, ὄρος ἔνθα θήρια συνάγονται.”

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 παιδευτῆς ἡμῶν 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).

ὕμῶν ׀לְכָל׀ 𐤄 > ׀לְכָל׀.

5.3) ἐγὼ ἔγνων τὸν Εφραιμ, καὶ Ἰσραηλ οὐκ ἄπεστι ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ, διότι νῦν ἐξεπόρνευσε Εφραιμ, ἐμίανθη Ἰσραηλ.

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

אָנִי יָדַעְתִּי אֶפְרַיִם וַיִּשְׂרָאֵל לֹא-נִכְחַד מִמֶּנִּי כִּי עָתָה הִוְנִיתָ אֶפְרַיִם נִטְמָא יִשְׂרָאֵל׃

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

ἄπεστι] the word occurs only here in XII-Ez *a*, and also only here corresponds to כַּחַד 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 ἄπεστιν seems to be that Israel is not estranged from God. God is not indifferent to her.

The form נִכְחַד 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 ἐκλείον τῆνִכְחַד; 11.16 τὸ ἐκλιμπάνον τῆνִכְחַד. The variant ἀπέστη of B^c etc. is partially explicable as a corruption from ἄπεστι. Whether the Coptic (Ach) *latuit* (so also Pesh *ksē* and Trg. ׀לְטַמְרִין = MT), as Ziegler thinks, is open to question.

διότι ׀לְכָל׀] The causal conjunction of 𐤄 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 ׀לְכָל׀] 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 υἰοὺς σου ὀπίσω τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν Ex 34.16.⁸ That is, however, contextually inapplicable to Ho 5.3. The Hebrew ׀לְכָל׀ is also used intransitively and transitively alike, the latter confined to Hō. See above at 4.10.

In comparison with 𐤄’s 3ms form, one may recognise in 𐤄’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 ἐστί, 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.

לֹא יִתְנוּ מַעַלְלֵיהֶם לְשׁוּב אֶל־אֱלֹהֵיהֶם כִּי רוּחַ זְנוּנִים בְּקִרְבָּם וְאֶת־יְהוָה לֹא יִדְעוּ:

ἔδωκαν [יִתְנוּ] 𐤀 = נָתַנוּ.

διαβούλια] see above at 4.9.

ἐν αὐτοῖς [בְּקִרְבָּם] The pseudo-prepositional בְּקִרְבָּם is rendered with ἐν μέσῳ τινός in Am 7.8, 10, Mi 5.6, 7, Hb 3.2, but when suffixed like here, without μέσῳ (Ho 11.9, Mi 3.11, 6.14, Na 3.13, Hb 2.19, Zp 3.3, 5, 12, 17, Zc 12.1, 14.1), but occasionally with μέσῳ as in Zp 3.15 ἐν μέσῳ σου and Am 3.9 ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς. Note also Am 5.17 διελεύσομαι διὰ μέσου σου. For a treatment of בְּקִרְבָּם, see on Am 2.3.

πορν. / ἐν αὐτ.] tr. V, so noted in Ziegler's apparatus. We are doubtful that a LXX translator would write something like πνεῦμα ἐν αὐτοῖς πορνείας ἐστί, though in Classical Greek such a word order would be no surprise. Maybe Ziegler meant πνε. πορν. instead.

- 5.5) καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται ἡ ὕβρις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ εἰς πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἐφραϊμ ἀσθενήσουσιν ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀσθενήσῃ 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.

וְעָנָה גְאוּן־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּפָנָיו וְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֶפְרַיִם יִכְשְׁלוּ בְּעֲוֹנָם כְּשֵׁל גַּם־יְהוּדָה עִמָּם:

καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται [וְעָנָה] On the analysis of the conjunction *waw* here, see below at 7.10, the beginning of which is exactly the same as here. We are going to refer to an important difference between the two passages in terms of the broader syntactic structure. Here the clause is followed by יִכְשְׁלוּ, which is best analysed as future in value. Hence, וְעָנָה following יִדְעוּ (vs. 5) is most likely a *w-qatalti* form, hence justly translated with the Fut., cf. Pesh. /netmakkak/. True, one could have anticipated יכשל in lieu of יִכְשְׁלוּ. Did the *Vorlage* of 𐤀 read וכשל?

𐤀's ταπεινωθήσεται is passive as in 2.15(17), 7.10, Ma 2.17; Ps 115.1, 118.67; see above on 2.15(17). 𐤀's עָנָה must have been read as עָנָה. Some other cases of *ταπ.* with ὕβρις are Jb 22.12 τοὺς δὲ ὕβρει φερομένους ἐταπεινώσεν; Is 13.11 ἀπολωθὼ ὕβριν ἀνόμων καὶ ὕβριν ὑπερηφάνων ταπεινώσω, 25.11 ταπεινώσει τὴν ὕβριν αὐτοῦ. Cf. also Xenophon, *Mem.* 3.5.4 τεταπεινῶται ἡ τῶν Ἀθηναίων δόξα.

εἰς πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ [בְּפָנָיו] The Greek phrase, as its Hebrew counterpart, implies hostility or disadvantage.⁹ Thus 7.10, Na 2.2 ἀνέβη ἐμφυσῶν εἰς πρόσωπόν σου (עָל פְּנֵי), Nu 12.14 ἐνέπτυσε εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς (בְּפָנֶיהָ), Ez 3.20 δώσω τὴν βάσανον εἰς πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ (לְפָנָיו). Note the interesting periphrasis in Trg. here: וְזוֹן וְזוֹן 'in their sight,' cf. Theodor's αὐτοὶ θεαταὶ τῆς οἰκείας γινόμενοι ταπεινώσεως (PG 66.156, Theodoret's προφανῶς ὀρώντες (PG 81.1577), and Theophylactus' προφανῶς ὄψονται (PG 126.660).

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

ἐν] For the causal force of the preposition with ἀσθενέω, cf. also 14.2 ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου, Pr 24.16 ἐν κακοῖς.

καὶ ult.] + γε in A, a well-known feature of the pre-Aquilanic recension.

5.6) μετὰ προβάτων καὶ μόσχων πορεύσονται τοῦ ἐκζητῆσαι τὸν κύριον καὶ οὐ μὴ εὗρωσιν αὐτόν, ὅτι ἐξέκλινεν ἅπ' αὐτῶν,

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

בְּצֹאֲנִים וּבְבָקָרִים יֵלְכוּ לְבַקֵּשׁ אֶת־יְהוָה וְלֹא יִמְצְאוּ חֵלֶץ מֵהֶם:

μετὰ] far more suitable as a rendering of the Heb. *beth* of accompaniment than the literal ἐν as in Le 16.3 εἰσελεύσεται Ἀαρὼν εἰς τὸ ἄγιον· ἐν μόσχῳ ἐκ βοῶν בְּבָקָר בֶּן־בָּקָר בְּפֶרֶךְ אֶל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ בָּא אֱהָרֹן אֶל־יְהוָה and Ps 65.13 εἰσελεύσομαι εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου ἐν ὄλοκαυτώμασιν בְּעוֹלוֹת בֵּיתְךָ אָבוֹא.

προβάτων καὶ μόσχων [בְּצֹאֲנִים וּבְבָקָרִים] The omission of the suffix is a stylistic improvement. The rendering of בָּקָר with μόσχος is striking, only here in XII Ez *α*, but elsewhere fairly frequent. The usual equivalent in XII is פֶּר (except Ez 1.10 for שׁוֹר), while בָּקָר in XII is always rendered with βούς (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 בָּקָר בֶּן־בָּקָר recurs in the description of sacrifices. Indeed, except in the above-mentioned places in Ez 43, βούς renders בָּקָר only where it has no specific reference to sacrifice (so Jl 1.11, Hb 3.17, Jn 3.7, Ez 4.15).

ἐκζητῆσαι [לְבַקֵּשׁ] no difference in usage between this form and its simplex is manifest, cf. Zp 1.6 τοὺς μὴ ζητήσαντας τὸν κύριον.

⁹ Many, e.g. Joosten 98, take ב־עָנָה in the sense of 'to testify against,' but the preposition in this collocation is usually followed by a person, e.g. פִּיךָ עָנָה בְּךָ 2Sm 1.16. More references are mentioned in BDB s.v. I עָנָה 3 c.

αὐτόν] 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) ζητήσῃ αὐτούς καὶ οὐ μὴ εὕρῃ αὐτούς אָמַץ אֱלֹהֵי בְּשֵׁקֶת, where אָמַץ 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 εὕρωσιν הִהָרְרָהְרָתָא שְׂקָשׁ לְבִטּוּשׁ יִמְצָא אֱלֹהֵי; Ez 22.30 ἐζήτουν ἐξ αὐτῶν ἄνδρα .. καὶ οὐχ εὕρον מְקָשׁ שְׂקָשׁ יִתְאָמַץ אֱלֹהֵי .. שׁ אֵי; 1 Ps 36.10 ζητήσεῖς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ μὴ εὕρῃς (אֲיִנָּה, free rendering!). In view of these examples, it may be better to explain 2.7(9) in terms of parallelism and see here (5.6) an influence of that passage.

ἐξέκλινεν ᾗ] For the intransitive ᾗ, cf. Arb. *halaṣa* ‘to withdraw, retire.’ Hence no need to emend the text to ᾗ or ᾗ, which means ‘to be rescued.’

The Greek verb (+ ἀπό) with God as subject is very rare; elsewhere only Ps 26.9 μὴ ἐκκλίνῃς (אָל אָל) ἐν ὀργῇ ἀπὸ τοῦ δούλου σου.

The Pf. ἐκκέκλινεν in B V and others seems to be a grammatical improvement as being more logical.

- 5.7) ὅτι τὸν κύριον ἐγκατέλιπον, ὅτι τέκνα ἀλλότρια ἐγεννήθησαν αὐτοῖς· νῦν καταφάγεται αὐτούς ἡ ἐρυσίβη καὶ τοὺς κλήρους αὐτῶν.
because they have forsaken the Lord; alien children have been born to them. Now rust will consume them and their estates.

בִּיהוּהָ בָּגָדוּ כִּי־בָנִים יָרִים יְלָדוּ עִתָּהּ יֵאָכְלֶם חֲדָשׁ אֶת־הַלְקִיָּהֶם: ס

ἐγκατέλιπον בָּגָדוּ] 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 ἐγκαταλείπω renders עֹב in XII-Ez α,¹⁰ while the exclusive correspondence in XII-Ez α¹¹ between בָּגָדוּ and καταφρονέω suggests that the nuance of disdain and belittling was possibly, by our translator, read into the Hebrew verb and its derivatives.

ἀλλότρια יָרִים] The phrase τέκνον ἀλλότριον does not appear any more in the LXX, while υἱός (υἱοί) ἀλλ. 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 *bnē*] *nēhār* [or *nohri*]). 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 בָּגָדוּ does not occur in Ez.

¹¹ See above on 4.10.

Greek commentators are aware of the ambiguity of the expression τέκνα ἄλλότρια, 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 [וַיִּלְדוּ] probably reading a passive Qal or pseudo-Pual.

ἐρυσίβη [וַיִּרְחַב] borrowing from *Jl* 1.4 and 2.25 to render the difficult [וַיִּרְחַב] in this context. In both passages the verb used is κατέφαγεν. The Greek word meaning ‘rust in corn’ renders [וַיִּרְחַב] in the above-mentioned *Jl* passages, and 3K 8.37, Ps 77.46, and [וַיִּרְחַב] in De 28.42 (*hapax*), while [וַיִּרְחַב] is rendered as βροῦχος ‘locust’ in 2C 6.28. Vollers (1883.247) suggests that the LXX read [וַיִּרְחַב] or [וַיִּרְחַב], but this Hebrew word, in its only occurrence (De 28.28), is rendered as κνήφη.¹²

Greek fathers mention a possible figurative use of the word referring to ravages wrought by military hostilities: Cyril, κάκωσίν τε καὶ βλάβην ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πολέμου προσβολῆς (*PG* 71.145); Theodoret, τροπικῶς .. τοὺς πολέμιους (*PG* 81.1580); Theophylactus, τάχα δὲ καὶ τῶν πολέμιων πληθύν (*PG* 126.661).

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

κλήρους αὐτῶν [וַיִּרְחַב] a correspondence found nowhere else in the LXX. Both [וַיִּרְחַב] and κλήρος may refer to allotted *land*; on the Hebrew, see Radaq, and cf. Cyril, τὰ αὐτῶν ‘theirs,’ i.e. ‘their possessions’ (p. 123); Theophylactus, πάσας τὰς χώρας (*PG* 126.661).

5.8) Σαλπίζατε σάλπιγγι ἐπὶ τοὺς βουνούς, ἠχήσατε ἐπὶ τῶν ὑψηλῶν, κηρύξατε ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ων· ἐξέστη Βενιαμιν,

Blow a trumpet on the hills, make loud sounds on the high places, proclaim in the house of On. Benjamin has been alarmed,

תְּקַעוּ שׁוֹפָר בְּגִבְעָה הַצְּרָה בְּרֶמֶה הָרִיעוּ בֵּית אֶן אַחֲרָיִךְ בְּנִימִין:

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

σάλπιγγι] pr. εν 764, cf. Zc 9.14 ἐν σ. בְּשׁוֹפָר, Ez 7.14 σαλπίζατε ἐν σάλπιγγι בְּתִקְעוּ בְּתִקְעוּ.

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 βουνούς .. τῶν ὑψηλῶν **בְּרַמָּה .. בְּגִבְעָה**] ‘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 **ἤ**. 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).

ἠγήσατε ἡγῶν] The possibility is not precluded that the Heb. word was unfamiliar to the translator, hence freely rendered. ἠγειν appears only here in XII-Ez, whilst the noun ἠχος renders **חִמּוֹ** in Am 5.23, JI 3(4).14. Cf. Ps 150.3 **αἰνεῖτε αὐτὸν ἐν ἠχῶ σάλπιγγος שׁוֹפָר בְּתִקְעַת הַלְלוּהוּ**.

ἐπὶ τῶν ὑψηλῶν] 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 βουνούς ἔθουσιν**. One may only note that a different case is used when the rendering is freely done; cf. 4.13 **ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὀρέων .. ἐπὶ τοὺς βουνούς ..** Statistically, **ἐπὶ** c. gen., dat., and acc. is frequent in this ascending order in XII. See BD, § 2 33.

κηρύξατε ἡρῶν] 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** **אָרַךְ** Qal Mi 3.5, JI 2.15, 3(4).9, Jn 1.2, 3.2, 4, 5 and **אָרַךְ** Hif. Jn 3.7. On the other hand, **רוּעַ** Hif. has no other Gk equivalent¹³ in XII-Ez **α**, whilst the noun **רוּעָה** 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 **ἡρῶν** 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 ὄρει ἀγίῳ**, Jn 1.2, 3.2 **ἐν αὐτῇ** (= Nineveh), 3.7 **ἐν τῇ N**. Other prepositions: Es 6.9 **διὰ τῆς πλατείας τῆς πόλεως**, Pr 1.21 **ἐπ’ ἄκρων τειχέων**.

ἐξέστη ἡρῶν] 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 **הִיָּהוּהוּ tihye ἐγένετο** in the Aorist. Since the Gk verb **ἐξιστάναι** always signifies in XII - Ez **α** ‘to be terrified, appalled,’¹⁴ the most probable equivalent here is **הִרְיָהוּ**. Indeed **הִרְיָהוּ** is rendered with **ἐξίστ.** 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 **רַעַי רַעַי** > ἔγνωσ **κακά** = **רַעַי רַעַי**.

¹⁴ Thus Cyril, who takes it to mean ‘to lose,’ is compelled to supply **ἀγαθῆσ ἀπάσις** **ἐννοίας** and the like (p. 126). Cp. Theodor **ἐκπληττόμενοι** (*PG* 66.156).

- 5.9) Εφραιμ εἰς ἀφανισμόν ἐγένετο ἐν ἡμέραις ἐλέγχου· ἐν ταῖς φυλαῖς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ ἔδειξα πιστά.

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

אֶפְרַיִם לְשִׁמָּה תִּהְיֶה בְּיוֹם תוֹכַחַת בְּשִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הוֹדַעְתִּי נְאֻמָּנָה:

ἀφανισμόν [שִׁמָּה] See above at 2.12(14).

ἐγένετο [תִּהְיֶה] on the tense, see our note on the preceding verse. Is it that the translator is looking back upon the actual fulfilment of the prophecy brought about by Shalmaneser?

ἡμέραις [יָוֵם] The change in number is only stylistic; similarly in 10.14 ἐν ἡμέραις πολέμου, but Am 1.14 ἐν ἡμέρα συντελείας, Na 1.7 ἐν ἡμέρα θλίψεως etc.

ἐν] the preposition *bet* is used in its usual, local sense, not antagonistic. Similar contrast in fate of the two parts of the nation is shown by the Targumist who writes בְּרַם בְּשִׁבְטֵי אֶרְצֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הוֹדַעְתִּי אֶרְצֵי אוּרִיָּה ‘but in the midst of the tribes of Israel I made the law known.’

ἔδειξα [הוֹדַעְתִּי] Theophylactus (*PG* 126.664) remarks that the aorist here has the force of the future as in Ps 21.17 ὄρυξαν (= ὀρύξουσιν).

πιστά [נְאֻמָּנָה] See Cyril, βεβαίους καὶ ἀληθεῖς τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἀποφύνας λόγους (p. 126); Theodor, τὸ ἀληθὲς καὶ βέβαιον .. πάντα ἦν πιστὰ καὶ ἀψευδῆ τὰ λεγόμενα (*PG* 66.157). Thus the collocation is not of the same meaning as in Aeschylus, *Agam.* 651 τὰ πιστὰ ἐδειξάτην ‘they have shown good faith.’ On the use of substantivised neuter plural adjectives for abstract notions, see *SSG* § 23 **fb**.

- 5.10) ἐγένοντο οἱ ἄρχοντες Ἰουδα ὡς μετατιθέντες ὄρια, ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἐκχεῶ ὡς ὕδωρ τὸ ὄρημά μου.

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

הָיוּ שָׂרֵי יְהוּדָה כְּמַסִּינֵי גְבוּל עַל־יְהֵם אֶשְׁפּוֹךְ כְּמִים עַבְרָתִי:

μετατιθέντες ὄρια [מַסִּינֵי גְבוּל] so also De 27.17 ἐπικατάρατος ὁ μετατιθένεις ὄρια and Pr 23.10 μὴ μεταθῆς ὄρια αἰώνια.

ἐκχεῶ [אֶשְׁפּוֹךְ] the metaphor of pouring out anger upon someone seems to be peculiar to Biblical Hebrew, and unknown to extra-Biblical Greek with a possible exception quoted in *BDAG* (s.v. ἐκχεῖν 2) from Aelianus (2nd cent. CE), *Natura Animalium* 7.23 ἐκχ. θυμόν.

ὄρημα] this rare word is employed two more times in XII to render עַבְרָתָא Am 1.11, and Hb 3.8, and its metaphorical use with reference to emotional

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 ὄρ. ἀετοῦ ‘like a swoop of an eagle,’ Ps 45.4 τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὰ ὀρμήματα ‘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. /hēfā/, La^w *impetus*. But Cyril paraphrases: τὰ ἐκ θείας ὀργῆς (PG 71.152); Theodoret, χειμάρρου δίκην αὐτοῖς ἐποίησεν τὰς τιμωρίας (PG 81.1580) ; Theophylactus, ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἐκχυθεῖσα (PG 126.665). It is more than likely that these Fathers and Eth. *ma* ‘*atya* are dependent on ‘the Three’ (with *χόλος*, *rugzā* etc.).¹⁵ However that may be, in view of ὡς ὕδωρ and a classical example like θαλάσσης ὀρμήματα (of the tides), the choice of ὄρμημα 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; θυμός 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 עַזַּי .. ὀργή עַזַּי parallel to 22.31 θυμός עַזַּי .. ὀργή עַזַּי . If so, the use of unusual equivalents like θολερός (Hb 2.15), φρικτή (Am 1.11) and ὄρμημα 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. ὄρμημα, θολερός and φρικτή, 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 עַזַּי in Ez 20.28 has no correspondent in the LXX ad loc., while the verb עַזַּי is rendered with παραοργίζεiv 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 synonyms, e.g. עַזַּי , עַזַּי .

		ἔχθρα	θυμός	ὀργή	ὄρμημα	θυλερός	φρίκη	Total
אָף	XII		9	7				16
	Ez	1	4	5				10
זַעַם	XII			1				1
	Ez		1	2				3
זַעַף	XII			1				1
	Ez							0
הָרוֹן	XII			5				5
	Ez							0
הָמָה	XII		4			1		5
	Ez		21	5				26
עֲבָרָה	XII		1	2	3		1	7
	Ez			3				3
קִצְף	XII			3				3
	Ez							0
רָגַז	XII			1				1
	Ez							0
Total	XII	0	14	20	3	1	1	38
	Ez	1	26	15	0	0	0	42
Grand total	XII + Ez	1	40	35	3	1	1	80

We might note that Aquila's vocabulary was slightly richer, for he knows such words as *mḥinis*, ἀνυπερθεσία (both for הַרְבָּה), παραξυσμός (קִצְף), χολός (הָמָה).

5.11) κατεδυνάστευσεν Εφραιμ τὸν ἀντίδικον αὐτοῦ, κατεπάτησε κρίμα, ὅτι ἤρξατο πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω τῶν ματαίων.

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

κατεδυνάστευσε [עָשׂוּף] The translator must have seen here an inf. abs. עָשׂוּף as in 4.2 – or it was spelled defectively עֲשָׂף, which was read by him as עָשָׂף or עָשָׂף – 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 לבלתי היות עשׂוּף ורצוּץ.

Na 3.2, Ez 3.12, 13; = ὀδύνη, free (cf. = ἔνδεια in the next verse), while the verb **שָׁעַר** = σείεσθαι (pass.) Am 9.1, Jl 2.10, 3(4).16, Na 1.5, Ez 26.10, 15; = φοβείσθαι Ez 27.28; **שָׁעַר** = σείειν Hg 2.6, 21; = συσσειείν Hg 2.7. This enquiry then lessens to a considerable degree the plausibility of such identification.

- ii) In three places **שָׁעַר** is rendered with *ταράσσειν*: Ps 6.8 *ἐταράχθη (הִשָּׁעַר) ἀπὸ θυμοῦ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς μου*; 30.10 *ἐταράχθη (הִשָּׁעַר) ἐν θυμοῦ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς μου*; 30.11 *τὰ ὀστά μου ἐταράχθησαν (וַיִּשָּׁעַר)*.²⁰
- 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 *אָרְגוּ אֶת־הַתִּיבֵי־בַעֲצָמַי רָקִי בְּוֹאִי*, which is rendered *εἰσῆλθεν τρόμος εἰς τὰ ὀστά μου, καὶ ὑποκάτωθέν μου ἐταράχθη*. Here, too, we find the word *רָקִי*, 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 *רָקִי* 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 **שָׁעַר**, 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 *רָקִי*] the translator's ignorance of the Heb. word is proved by the above-noted Hb 3.16.²¹ The Gk word appears once again in Ho 13.14 *ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου, ἄδη*, quoted also by Paul in 1Cor 15.55 *ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον*. Here, too, it seems to be a free rendering of *קִטְוִי*.²² Supposing that the *Vorlage* did not differ substantially from the MT, as it seems, and that the usual technique of our translator in face of an unfamiliar word was at work, the only possible related place we can think of is Ez 20.28 *אֲשֶׁר־נִגְזַרְנָהּ אֲנִי בְּעַס־קִרְבָּנִי*, 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 IQH^a 13.36 *עֲשִׂשׁוּ מַכְעַס עֵינַי*. LSJ (s.v. *ταραχή* 2) quote τ. τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ from Theophrastus (iii/iv cent. BCE), *De sensu* 81.

²¹ Cf. Pr 12.4 *σκόληξ* 'worm,' 14.30 *σῆς* 'worm,' 10.7 *σβέννυται* 'be quenched' (*אָרַב*), Jb 13.28 *ἴσα ἀσκῶ* 'like a hide wineskin' (*בְּרָקִי*), 41.19 *ξύλον σαθρόν* 'unsound tree' (*אֲרָבִי*), Is 40.20 *ξύλον ἄσηπτον* 'a tree not liable to decay' (*אֲרָבִי־לֹא־יָעָר*).

²² A word unfamiliar to other translators, too: cf. De 32.24 *ἄπισθότονος* 'a disease in which the body is drawn back and stiffens,' Ps 90.6 *σύμπωμα*, Is 38.2, free rendition.

by its very difficulty,²³ which compelled the Greek translator to omit it completely. Rather the following sentence שְׁמוֹ שֵׁם רִיחַ נִיחוּחֵיהֶם must be a later explanatory gloss, which, however, already stood in the *Vorlage* of the translator. Our suggestion is that this once omitted phrase was revived in our Hosea passage; the translator read דְּרָבָן instead of קָרָבָן. Note βουκέντρον ‘ox-goad’ in Ec 12.11 דְּרַבְנוֹת, 1K 13.21 Aq. and βοζc₂e₂ דְּרָבָן. It is also not impossible that the *Vorlage* was written with ש (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 φωνή μαστίγων καὶ φωνὴ σεισμοῦ τροχῶν קוֹל שׁוֹט וְקוֹל רֵעַשׁ אֹפֶן. 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 ὥσπερ μάστιξ ἵππῳ καὶ κέντρον ὄνῳ מִתְגַּתְגַּת מִמּוֹר לְשׁוֹט לְסוֹס.

5.13) καὶ εἶδεν Εφραιμ τὴν νόσον αὐτοῦ καὶ Ἰουδας τὴν ὀδύνην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπορεύθη Εφραιμ πρὸς Ἀσσυρίους καὶ ἀπέστειλε πρέσβεις πρὸς βασιλέα Ἰαριμ· καὶ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη ἰάσασθαι ὑμᾶς, καὶ οὐ μὴ διαπαύσῃ ἐξ ὑμῶν ὀδύνη.

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.

וַיֵּרָא אֶפְרַיִם אֶת־חִלּוֹ וַיְהוּדָה אֶת־מִזְרוֹ וַיִּלְךְ אֶפְרַיִם אֶל־אַשּׁוּר וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶל־מֶלֶךְ יָרִיב וְהוּא לֹא יוּכַל לְרַפֵּא לְכֶם וְלֹא־יִגְהַה מִכֶּם מִזְרוֹ:

τὴν ὀδύνην αὐτοῦ] likewise at the end of the verse. Cf. Je 37(30).13 ἀλγηρός and see on Ob 7 ἔνεδρα ‘snares’ מִזְרוֹ. Aquila’s ἐπίδεσις or σύνδεσμος preserved by Jerome derives the Heb. word from אָזַר ‘to bind, girdle.’

πρὸς Ἀσσυρίους] Unlike at 7.11 we are here probably having to do with people of Assyria.

πρέσβεις] Possibly מְלָאָךְ was found in the *Vorlage*; מְלָאָךְ = πρέσβυς in Nu 21.21, 22.5, De 2.26. Or the translator may have supplied it by assuming a kind of haplography, namely מֶלֶךְ אֶל מֶלֶךְ > מֶלֶךְ אֶל מֶלֶךְ, although Heb. admits of such elliptical construction without an object; this construction is slavishly copied by the LXX as in Ge 38.25 ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τὸν πενθερὸν αὐτῆς, 2K 11.6 ἀπέστειλε Δαυὶδ πρὸς Ἰωαβ; for additional examples, see BDB, s.v. חִלָּה Qal, 1 c (p. 1018a).

ἠδυνάσθη] for different forms, cf. BDF § 66.3 and Moulton - Howard p. 234.

²³ Elsewhere √עס caused no difficulty: Qal Ez 16.42 μερμυῶν Hif. Ho 12.15, Ez 16.26 θυμοῦν παροργίζειν.

		λέων	πάνθηρ	σκύμνος
אַרְיָ / אַרְיָה	XII	12		
	Ez α	4		
גור / גור	XII			2
	Ez α			3
כְּפִיר	XII	3		3
	Ez α	5		0
לְבִיאָ / לְבִיאָ	XII	1		2
	Ez α	0		1
שְׁחָל	XII		2	
	Ez α		0	

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 כְּפִיר. Thus the introduction of πάνθηρ in XII for the new synonym שְׁחָל does not probably represent accurate zoological knowledge on the part of the translator, as far as the fauna of Palestine are concerned.²⁹
- iii) אַרְיָ / אַרְיָה is always rendered by λέων (so also outside our corpus), which, however, corresponds to two more Heb. synonyms. The strictly exact equivalent of גור ‘whelp’ is σκύμνος, which also renders two other Heb. synonyms; כְּפִיר ‘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 (אַרְיָה) .. σκύμνοις (כְּפִירִים) .. λέων (אַרְיָה) .. σκύμνοις λέοντος (גור אַרְיָה) .. λέων (אַרְיָה) .. σκύμνοις (גור אַרְיָה) .. λέουσι (לְבִיאָה). See also JI 1.6 and Ez 19.2ff. The difficulty lay in the fact that Heb. has two synonyms for ‘lion’ in general, אַרְיָה / אַרְיָ and לְבִיאָ,³⁰ and that it distinguishes three stages of growth - whelp, young lion, grown-up lion.

²⁸ Aquila’s vocabulary is richer, including λις (לִישׁ - note the phonetic similarity) and λέαινα (לְבִיאָ, שְׁחָל). On synonyms in XII, see Muraoka 2019.

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

³⁰ Radaq (ad Jd 14.5) lists some of these synonyms in the order of size: לְבִיאָ > לִישׁ > גור > אַרְיָה > כְּפִיר > גור.

ἐγὼ ἄνι ἄνι] Emotion is one of those things which are not easy to transfer from language to language; Pesh. is also content with a single /'enā/. Cf. Ge 37.30 ἐγὼ δὲ ποῦ πορεύομαι ἔτι; אָנִי אָנִי הֲאֵנִי אָנִי, De 32.39 ἐγὼ εἰμι ἄνι ἄνι הוֹאֵנִי, Is 48.15 ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, ἐγὼ ἐκάλεσα וְיִזְכְּרוּ אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר־אָנִי אָנִי.

ἀρπῶμαι] on the form, cf. Helbing 1907.86, 89. The notion of ‘tearing to pieces,’ commonly associated with the Heb. verb, אָרַץ, 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 λήψομαι] om. V*. 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 (אָנִי) 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 אָנִי.

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

ὁ] Even Aquila (together with Theodotion) adds the article. Its omission would not make sense. So Mi 5.8(7) ἀρπάσῃ καὶ μὴ ἦ ὁ ἐξαίρουμένους, Mi 4.4 οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἐκφοβῶν וְיִזְכְּרוּ אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר־אָנִי, cf. also Na 2.12, Zp 3.13 *et passim* outside our corpus.

5.15) πορεύσομαι καὶ ἐπιστρέψω εἰς τὸν τόπον μου, ἕως οὗ ἀφανισθῶσι καὶ ἐπιζητήσουσι τὸ πρόσωπόν μου.

I will go and return to my place until they are destroyed, and they will (then) seek my face.

אָלֶיךָ אֲשׁוּבָה אֶל־מְקוֹמִי עַד אֲשֶׁר־אֲשָׁמוּ וּבִקְשׁוּ פָנַי

καὶ¹] 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 וְיִזְכְּרוּ אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר־אָנִי, cf. also Wolff (1965.134), ⚭ does not necessarily presuppose אָשׁוּבָה.

εἰς τὸν τόπον μου] The general rule is πρὸς + acc. pers. and εἰς + acc. loci, whether the verb be transitive or intransitive. Examples will be found in: πρὸς 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*.

ἀφανισθῶσι] Undoubtedly the translator means אָשׁוּבָה < √שמם Nif., judging from the highly frequent correspondence שמם = ἀφανίζεω 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

וַיִּשְׁמֹו for וַיִּשְׁמוּ. Note that in all those places where the MT אָשַׁם is rendered with ἀφ. the MT shows a seghol with a personal prefix and shewa with the Alef: so Ho 10.2 וַיִּשְׁמֹו, 14.1 תִּשְׁאָשֶׁם, Jl 1.18 נִשְׁאָשֶׁמוּ.³¹ But cf. Ho 4.15 יִשְׁאָשֶׁם ἄγνοεῖ, see above ad loc.

Words and forms derived from √שָׁמַם 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, מִדְּבָר לֹא-אָדָם בּוֹ Jb 38.26, but one does not speak of מִדְּבָר שָׁמַם. On the contrary, מִדְּבָר שָׁמְמָה is a man-made condition: וַתִּנְנוּ אֶת-הַלְקֵת הַמִּדְּוָתַי לְמִדְּבָר שָׁמְמָה Je 12.10, note also the next verse וְשָׁמְמָה כָּל-הָאָרֶץ ἐτέθη εἰς ἀφανισμόν ἀπωλείας, δι’ ἐμὲ ἀφανισμῶ ἠφανίσθη 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 prefix נִ are translated with a passive form of ἀφανίζω in וַיִּבְנוּ עָרִים נְשִׁמוֹת וַיִּבְנוּ οἰκοδομήσουσιν πόλεις τὰς ἠφανισμένας Am 9.14, so also ib. 7.9, Jl 1.17, Zp 3.6, and Zc 7.14. Note also the above-adduced נִשְׁמֹוּ 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 lend support to our assumption of ἀφανισθῶσι = וַיִּשְׁמוּ.

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

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

CHAPTER VI¹

- 6.1) Ἐν θλίψει αὐτῶν ὀρθριοῦσι πρὸς με λέγοντες Πορευθῶμεν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωμεν πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἤρπακε καὶ ἰάσεται 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.

בְּצָר לָהֶם יִשְׁחַרְגְּנוּ: לָכוּ וְנָשׁוּבָה אֶל־יְהוָה כִּי הוּא טָרָף וְיִרְפָּאנוּ יְיָ וְיִחַבְּבֵנוּ:

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] The Ⓞ translation is etymologically informed, i.e. שָׁחַר. 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 לָחַץ is often and idiomatically joined through the conjunction Waw with another verb following immediately in the future. Such a syntagm marks incitement or encouragement.² 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: הָלַךְ אֶל־יְיָ אֱשׁוּבָה: 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 אֶל־אִשִּׁי הָרִאשׁוֹן אֶל־לִבִּי וְאֶשׁוּבָה אֶל־יְיָ אֱשׁוּבָה, 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.’³ The verb שָׁב 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 **וַיִּצְחַק וַיִּהְפֹּר** ‘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 **שׁב**. Cf. 2S 3.16 **וַיִּשׁב** לְךָ **וַיִּשׁב** Πορσεύου ἀνάστρεφε· καὶ ἀνέστρεψεν. Furthermore, the hendiadic structure in our Hoseanic passage also differs from what we see in cases such as Ex 5.8 Πορσευθῶμεν καὶ θύσσωμεν for MT **נִלְכָּה וְנִבְרָדָה**; De 13.14 Πορσευθῶμεν καὶ λατρεύσωμεν for MT **נִלְכָּה וְנִנְעַבְדָּה**. Here the second verb in both cases is not a verb of physical movement, and the first verb is not desemantised or grammaticalised. By contrast, elsewhere in XII, our translator⁴ did recognise such a desemantised use of the Hebrew verb: e.g., Jn 1.7 **וַיִּנְפִּילָהּ גּוֹרְלוֹת** לְכוּ δεῦτε βάλωμεν κλήρους; Mi 4.2 **וַיִּנְעַלָּהּ** לְכוּ Δεῦτε ἀναβῶμεν.

[ἀρπάζω] as a rendering of **טָרַף** 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 **לִשְׁחַל**) and a lion (λέων **בְּפִיר**), and declares **אֲנִי אֲטָרְפֶנּוּ** ἐγὼ ἀρπῶμαι. 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 (ἤρπασεν) 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*).⁵ 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 ἐγὼ at 5.14, which is even more emphatic in the MT with the repetition of **אֲנִי**, 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.

כִּי הוּא יִכְאַיֵּב וַיִּחְבֹּשׁ יְמָחֶץ יְדָיו תִּרְפֵּי נָה

αὐτὸς γὰρ ἀλγεῖν ποιεῖ καὶ πάλιν ἀποκαθίσθησιν· ἔπαισεν, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ ἴασαντο

‘for He of all people makes one to suffer pains and yet He restores, He smote, and yet His hands healed.’⁶

The last Greek verb of the verse (Ho 6.1), μοτόω, is a hapax in the Septuagint, and its meaning is defined as ‘to plug a wound with lint.’⁷ The underlying Hebrew verb is not that specific, but means ‘to bandage.’

There is some significant difference in tense between 𐤀 and 𐤅. The third Hebrew verb (ךָ), in the form as it now stands in the MT, is a short imperfect, and it can be either jussive in force or preterite.⁸ The second (יִרְפְּאוּ) and third (יִחְבֹּשׁוּ) verb forms can be analysed as either long or short imperfects, depending on their vocalisation. The forms as vocalised by the Massorettes are preterite, but the addition of a dagesh in the Nun would make them more likely long imperfects: יִרְפְּאוּנוּ, יִחְבֹּשׁוּנוּ. The poetic parallelism between the first and the third verbs indicates that the latter is more likely preterite. Then the other two are also best interpreted as preterite in function.⁹ In other words, this is a reminiscence of God’s past dealings with His people. The Septuagint, by contrast, indicates a promise or prediction of what the people could expect to experience when they return to their God.

6.2) ὑγιάσει ἡμᾶς μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας· ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστησόμεθα καὶ ζήσομεθα 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

יִחְיֶנוּ מִיָּמִים בְּיֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי יִקְמְנוּ וְנַחֲיָה לְפָנָיו

⁶ I owe this reference to Mrs Mayumi Muratsu of Rotterdam.

⁷ LSJ s.v.

⁸ Wolff 1965.134, following Wellhausen 1898.116, proposes to emend the text by adding a *waw* as required (“geboben”) by the parallelism. But the form required by the parallelism should be הַכָּה, not an impossible הַכָּה, 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 ἴασεται (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 ךָ instead of הַכָּה is a separate issue. What matters is what he wrote indicates a past event just as its parallel 𐤀𐤌.

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

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 ךָ as preterite.

The athnach at מִיָּמִי 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 ἀναστήσομεθα καὶ ζήσομεθα, where the translator could have said ἀναστήσει to match MT מִיָּמִי, 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 הִיחַ is attested only here in the LXX,¹¹ but possibly as Pual at Le 13.24 τοῦ ὑγιασθέν for MT הִיחַ, 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 τοῦ γνῶναι τὸν κύριον, ὡς ὄρθρον ἔτοιμον εὐρήσομεν αὐτόν, καὶ ἦξει ὡς ὑετὸς ἡμῶν πρόϊμος καὶ ὄψιμος 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.

וְנִדְעָה נְרַדְפָּה לְדַעַת אֶת־יְהוָה כְּשַׁחַר נִכּוֹן מוֹצֵאֵי יוֹבֵאוּ כְּבֹשֶׁם לָנוּ כְּמַלְקוֹשׁ יוֹרֵה אֶרֶץ:

The two cohortatives are rendered in the future tense instead of the hortative subjunctive: γνωσόμεθα, διώξομεν instead of γνῶμεν, διώξομεν. 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 מִיָּמִי, but followed by הִיחַ?

¹¹ The additional two examples mentioned by Joosten *ibid.* come under a related, but different lexeme, ὑγιαίνω, intransitive, 'to be or become healthy.' As a matter of fact, Greek ὑγι-lexemes are used rather infrequently to render Hebrew or Aramaic יח lexemes: ὑγιαίνω – only once at To 6.9 ⁶ⁱⁱ; ὑγίεια only twice; ὑγιής 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 νεκροί, 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),¹³ where the form is of the middle voice: διώκεσθαι τὸ πλεόν ἔχειν. The use of an infinitive clause as a direct object is very common, e.g. a case of ζητέω, a synonymous verb in ἐζήτει αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι ‘he sought to kill him’ Ex 4.24.¹⁴

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

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

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

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

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

¹³ LSJ s.v. I 2.

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

¹⁵ Syrohexapla supports our new analysis: וְיֵצֵא מִשָּׁמַיִם.

¹⁶ Joosten 103.

¹⁷ Joosten 105; Harl 1992.154f.

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

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

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

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

מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה-לָּךְ אֶפְרַיִם מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה-לָּךְ יְהוּדָה וְחִסְדְּכֶם כַּעֲנַן-בֹּקֵר וְכֹטֵל מַשְׁכִּים הַלֵּךְ:

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

¹⁸ See JM § 137 g (p. 477).

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

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

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

עַל־כֵּן הִצַּבְתִּי בְּנְבִיאִים הֲרָגְתִּים בְּאִמְרֵי־פִי וּמִשְׁפָּטַי אִוֵּר יֵצֵא:

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

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

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

¹⁹ Cf. JM § 102 *g*.

²⁰ Nyberg 1935.40.

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

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

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

²⁴ Jenni 1992.120 (§ 1712).

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

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

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

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

וְהִמָּה כְּאָדָם עֹבְרֵי בְרִית שֶׁם בְּגָדוּ בִּי

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

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

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

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

²⁷ Cf. also Joosten 78 ad 2.20.

²⁸ See *GELS* s.v. ἦ 2.

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

³⁰ See JM § 154 *fa*.

³¹ See *GELS* s.v. 3 a.

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

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

6.8) Γαλααδ πόλις ἐργαζομένη μάταια, ταρασσουσα ὕδωρ,

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

גִּלְעָד קְרִית פְּעֻלִי אֲוֹן עֲקָבָה מַדָּם:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

³⁶ Probably MT וַיֵּא has been read as וַיֵּא.

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

³⁸ See *GELS* s.v., 1 b.

³⁹ See *GELS* s.v. ἐργάζομαι, 1.

⁴⁰ See JM § 89 n, o.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

⁴³ So Joosten 110.

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

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

שָׁת קָצִיר לָךְ בְּשׁוּבֵי שְׁבוּת עָמִי:

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

τρυγᾶν] possibly reflects קצור rather than MT קָצִיר.

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

⁴⁴ Joosten 110.

CHAPTER VII

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

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

כַּרְפָּאֵי לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִגְלָה עֲוֹן אֶפְרַיִם וְרַעוּת שְׁמֵרוֹן כִּי פָעְלוּ שְׂקָר וְנִגְבּ יְבוֹא פָשַׁט גָּדוּד בְּחוּץ:
:גָּדוּד בְּחוּץ:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ἐν τῇ ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ בְּחַוְיוֹ] a free, contextually informed translation.⁵

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

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

$\text{וּבְלִיאָמְרוֹ לְלִבָּבְכֶם כָּל־רָעָתְכֶם וְכַרְתִּי עִתָּה סְבָבוֹם מֵעַלְלֵיהֶם נָגַד פְּנֵי הָיוֹ:$

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 συναχθῆ μηδεὶς $\text{אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִקְוֶה לְאִישׁ}$ Mi 5.7 (\mathfrak{H} 6).

ὅπως συνᾶδωσιν ὡς συνᾶδοντες τῇ καρδία αὐτῶν $\text{וּבְלִיאָמְרוֹ לְלִבָּבְכֶם}$ Θ represents quite a departure from \mathfrak{H} . Where does ὡς συνᾶδοντες come from?⁶ The translator may have been perplexed, not knowing what the crowd were not to say. כַּרְתִּי עִתָּה does not answer that question.⁷ He may have anticipated something like $\text{לֹא יִרְאֶה יָהּ וְלֹא יִבִּין אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$, cf. Ps 94.7.

πάσας τὰς κακίας αὐτῶν כָּל־רָעָתְכֶם] The use of the pl. in Θ is sensible in the context.

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

⁵ We fail to follow Joosten 110: "Le traducteur a sans doute pris la lettre *waw* du mot qui suit pour le suffixe possessif de la 3^e personne sg.", i.e. בְּחַוְיוֹ read as בְּחַוְיוֹ ? In BH וְחַוְיוֹ takes a suffix pronoun only when the former is in the plural as in וְחַוְיוֹתַי $\text{אֲסֹדֹדֹסְ אֲוֹתָוֹן}$ Zp 3.6. בְּחַוְיוֹ is unlikely, since the plural of the word always appears with וְחַוְיוֹ , which is also true in Qumran Hebrew.

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

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

ἐγένοντο ἡ] 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 εὐφραναν βασιλεῖς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ψεύδεσιν αὐτῶν ἄρχοντας·

With their evils they gladdened kings and with their lies rulers,

בְּרָעָתָם יִשְׂחַמְּוּ-מְלָךְ וּבְכַהֲשֵׁיהֶם שְׂרִים:

βασιλεῖς מְלָךְ] The sg. מְלָךְ parallel to שְׂרִים makes sense, a king with multiple ministers under him. ⚔ with βασιλεῖς is probably aiming at formal parallelism.

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

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

כְּלָם מְנַאֲפִים כְּמוֹ תַנּוּר בֹּעֵר מְאֹפָה יִשְׁבוֹת מְעִיר מְלוּשׁ בְּצֶק עַד-הַמְצָתוֹ:

εἰς πέψιν καταπαύματος ἀπὸ τῆς φλογός מעיר יִשְׁבוֹת מְעִיר] 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 ⚔ that corresponds to εἰς. The other two, both very common words, are not represented in ⚔ 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’ κατακαύματος. 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 Ἱερουσαλημ τόπον καταπαύματός σου ‘Jerusalem, a place for Your rest’ *Si* 36.18 (מְכוֹן שְׁבוֹתֶיךָ), with which cp. τόπος καταπαύσεώς μου *Is* 66.1 (מְקוֹם מְנוּחָתִי). We are tempted to suggest that our translator mentally rewrote his ⚔ to read תַּנּוּר בֹּעֵר הֵם לְמַאֲפָה שְׁבֹתָ ‘they are an oven burning to bake (bread) for Sabbath.’ מְאֹפָה is a hapax in BH and means ‘something baked,’ but cf. a verbal noun of similar formation pattern מְשֻׁתָּה as in בֵּית מְשֻׁתָּה הַיֵּינָן *Est* 7.8, יוֹם מְשֻׁתָּה וְשִׁמְחָה, *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 ἑξ ἡμέραις ἐποίησεν κύριος τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ ἑβδόμη ἐπαύσατο καὶ κατέπαυσεν *Ex* 31.17, see also *Ge* 2.2, 3, *Ex* 20.11.

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

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

יֹם מְלִכָּנוּ הִקְלִי שָׂרִים מָתַח מִיַּיִן מְשֵׁה יָדוֹ אֶת־לְצָיִם:

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

ἤρξαντο הִקְלִי] \mathfrak{E} is obviously a rendition of הִקְלִי. Other than that, both \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{E} of this verse are too vague for us to make sense of it.

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

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

כִּי־קָרְבוּ כְתָנִיֹר לָבָם בְּאֶרְבָּם כָּל־הַלַּיְלָה יֵשֶׁן אִפְהֶם בְּקָר הוּא בְעַר כָּאֵשׁ לְהִבָּה:

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

αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν לָבָם] The plural in \mathfrak{E} does not necessarily presuppose לְבָבָם. Though not the rule, Hebrew allows the use of the singular in a case like this, similarly in vs. 14 below.⁹ Note הַיְטִיבָה יְהוָה לְטוֹבִים וְלִישָׂרִים בְּלִבּוֹתָם Ps 125.4, which is interestingly rendered as ἀγαθὸν, κύριε, τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ τοῖς εὐθέσι τῆ καρδία and לֹא־כִבְדָה אָזְנוֹ מְשִׁמוּעַ Is 59.1 // כבדו אונגיו 1QIsa^a.

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

Ἐφραιμ] = אִפְהֶם for אֶפְרַיִם.

⁸ Joosten (114) mentions חָדָד as an alternative.

⁹ See SQH § 8 aa.

- 7.7) πάντες ἐθερμάνθησαν ὡς κλίβανος καὶ κατέφαγον τοὺς κριτὰς 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.

כָּלֶם יַחְמוּ כַתְּנוּר וְאָכְלוּ אֶת־שֹׁפְטֵיהֶם כָּל־מְלִכֵיהֶם נָפְלוּ אִין־קָרָא בְהֶם אֲלֵי:

ἐθερμάνθησαν .. καὶ κατέφαγον וְאָכְלוּ .. יַחְמוּ] Ⓞ apparently identified perfective aspect in יַחְמוּ and a conjunctive *waw* in וְאָכְלוּ, probably guided by the immediately following נָפְלוּ, translating all the three verbs with the Aorist. Such a use of *yiqtol* is well known in Biblical Hebrew; see JM § 113 *h*.¹⁰ Note in particular יָדָה לִיְתֵד תִּשְׁלַחְנָה וַיְמִינָה לְהַלְמוֹת עַמְּלִים וְהִלְמָה סִסְרָא מִקָּה רָקָה: יְדָה לִיְתֵד תִּשְׁלַחְנָה וַיְמִינָה רָקָה: רָקָה וְהִלְמָה וְהִלְמָה רָקָה: Jdg 5.26.

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

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

אֶפְרַיִם בְּעַמִּים הוּא יִתְבוּלֵל אֶפְרַיִם הִיא עָנָה בְּלֵי הַפּוּכָה:

αὐτὸς הוּא] No emphatic function appears to be attached to the pronoun in either language. It is rather the subject of what precedes analysable as a nominal clause. Then יִתְבוּלֵל can be viewed as a circumstantial verbal clause subordinate to the preceding nominal clause. The Hebrew Impf. form here is imperfective in aspect, which accounts for the selection of the Impf. in Ⓞ. The Tiberian accentuation, however, connects הוּא with יִתְבוּלֵל. Then the pronoun highlights Ephraim.¹¹ However, אֶפְרַיִם בְּעַמִּים can still be analysed as constituting a self-standing, nominal clause.

In *GELS* the sense of ἐγκρυφίας has been defined as *cake baked in ashes of coal fire*, borrowed from Schleusner's *Thesaurus* “panis genus, quod sub cineribus et prunis coquitur.”

- 7.9) κατέφαγον ἄλλότριοι τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐκ ἐπέγνω· καὶ πολιαὶ ἐξήνηθησαν αὐτῷ, καὶ αὐτὸς οὐκ ἔγνων.

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,

אָכְלוּ זָרִים כֹּחוֹ וְהוּא לֹא יָדַע גַּם־שִׁיבָה וְרָקָה בּוֹ וְהוּא לֹא יָדַע:

¹⁰ Both JM § 119 *q* and Driver 1892.128 interpret our וְאָכְלוּ as a *w-qatalí* form.

¹¹ Joosten (115) has “lui-même.” Does the pronoun imply that Ephraim was acting of his own accord?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

וַיְהִי אֶפְרַיִם כִּינֹנָה פֹתֵהָ אֵין לָב מִצְרִיִּים קָרְאוּ אֶשׂוּר הִלְכוּ:

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

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

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

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

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

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

יִלְכוּ אֶפְרוֹשׁ עֲלֵיהֶם רְשֵׁתִי כְעוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם אֲרִידֵם אִסְרֵם כְּשִׁמְעַ לְעִדְתָּם:

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

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

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

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

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

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

אוי לָהֶם כִּי־נָדְדוּ מִמֶּנִּי שֶׁד לָהֶם כִּי־פָשְׁעוּ בִּי וְאָנְכִי אֶפְדֶּם הִמָּה דָּבְרוּ עָלַי
כְּזָבִים:

ἐγὼ δὲ .. αὐτοὶ δὲ ἠמָה כִּי .. וְאָנְכִי] 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.

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

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

ἐλυτρώσαμην αὐτούς אֶפְדֶּם 𐤁 identified here a preterite *yaqtul*, probably in view of three straightforward *qatal*'s in the verse.

- 7.14) καὶ οὐκ ἐβόησαν πρὸς με αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἢ ὠλόλυζον ἐν ταῖς κοίταις αὐτῶν· ἐπὶ σίτῳ καὶ οἴνῳ κατετέμνοντο.

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

וְלֹא־זָעְקוּ אֵלַי בְּלִבָּם כִּי יִלְיִלוּ עַל־מִשְׁכְּבֹתָם עַל־דָּגָן וְתִירוֹשׁ יִתְגַּדְּרוּ

αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν [בְּלִבָּם] On the sg. בְּלָם, see above at vs. 6.

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

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

¹⁴ *DJD* 8.48f.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER VIII

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

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

אַל־חַקְךָ שָׁפַר כְּנֹשֶׁר עַל־בַּיִת יְהוָה יַעַן עָבְרוּ בְרִיתִי וְעַל־תּוֹרָתִי שָׁפוּ:

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

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

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

8.2) ἐμὲ κεκραῖζονται Ὁ θεός, ἐγνώκαμέν σε.

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

לִי יוֹקוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִדְעוּנִי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

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

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

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

³ Cf. also τοῖς τέσσαρσιν ἀγγέλοις Rev 7.2.

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

8.3) ὅτι Ἰσραὴλ ἀπεστρέψατο ἀγαθά, ἐχθρὸν κατεδίωξαν.

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

נָנַן יִשְׂרָאֵל טוֹב אוֹיֵב יִרְדְּפוּ:

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

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

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

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

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

הֵם הַמְלִיכוּ וְלֹא מִמְּנִי הִשְׁרִירוּ וְלֹא יִדְעָתִי כִּסְפָם וְזָהָבָם עָשׂוּ לָהֶם עֲצָבִים לְמַעַן יִכָּרֵת:

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

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

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

⁴ On this question, see Le Moigne 1999.

ἡρξαν [הַשִּׁירָו] Without reference to 𐤀, the subjects of 𐤆 here could be understood to be kings implicit in the preceding clause, ‘they ruled.’ But the parallelism makes our translation preferable; “rulers” = ἄρχοντες.

ὅπως [לְמַעַן] Both conjunctions primarily indicate a purpose of an action expressed in the main clause, but at times end up indicating an unintended result. On ὅπως, 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.

8.5) ἀπότριψαι τὸν μόσχον σου, Σαμάρεια· παρωξύνθη ὁ θυμός μου ἐπ’ αὐτούς· ἕως τίνος οὐ μὴ δύνωνται καθαρισθῆναι

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

וְנָחַ עֲגֻלָּתְךָ שְׂמֵרוֹן חָרָה אִפִּי בָּם עַד־מָתִי לֹא יוּכְלוּ נִקְוֹן:

ἀπότριψαι [וְנָחַ] He of 𐤀 immediately followed by *your* is harsh.⁵ 𐤀 represents the Impv. וְנָחַ. This verb occurred earlier in vs. 3, translated as ἀπεστρέψατο. It occurs once more in XII: לֹא־וְנָחֶתִים > οὐκ ἀπεστρεψάμην αὐτούς. The two Greek verbs, ἀποτρίβω and ἀποστρέφω share the notion of rejection.

παρωξύνθη ὁ θυμός μου [חָרָה אִפִּי] Exactly as in Zc 10.3, also said by God. Cf. παρωξύνθη κύριος ἐφ’ ὑμῖν ἐξολεθρευσαί ὑμᾶς קָצַף יְהוָה עַל־יְכֶם וְהָיָה לְהַשְׂמִיד אֶתְכֶם De 9.19.

ἕως τίνος [עַד־מָתִי] 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 [יוּכְלוּ נִקְוֹן] Here we have an extremely rare instance of יכל used in the sense of ‘to be capable of’ taking a substantive as a direct object. Another instance is כִּי־יכל תוּכַל Jb 42.2, which 𐤆 translates literally as ὅτι πάντα δύνασαι. Similarly in Wi 7.27.⁶

8.6) ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ; καὶ αὐτὸ τέκτων ἐποίησεν, καὶ οὐ θεὸς ἐστίν· διότι πλανῶν ἦν ὁ μόσχος σου, Σαμάρεια.

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

כִּי מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל וְהוּא חָרַשׁ עָשָׂהוּ וְלֹא אֱלֹהִים הוּא כִּי־שִׁבְבִים יְהִי עֲגֻל שְׂמֵרוֹן:

⁵ Ibn Ezra and Radaq make עֲגֻלָּתְךָ its subject and שְׂמֵרוֹן its object.

⁶ BDAG s.v. δύναμαι c mentions some instances in the New Testament and non-biblical texts.

ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ; כִּי מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל] \mathfrak{H} is obviously amiss, for, as it stands, it makes no sense.

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

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

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

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

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

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

כִּי רוּחַ יִרְעוּ וְסוּפְתָהּ יִקְצְרוּ קָמָה אֵין-לוֹ צֶמַח בְּלִי יַעֲשֶׂה-קָמַח אוּלַי יַעֲשֶׂה וְרִיב יִבְלָעֶהּ:

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

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

⁹ So Qimron 2020.261.

ἀνεμόφορα הַרִי] The imagery is quite different between the two. הַרִי must denote something that has no substance, as in הַרִי הַיָּי ‘my life is a vanity’ Jb 7.7, cf. Ⲛ πνεῦμά μου ἡ ζωή.¹⁰

ἡ καταστροφή αὐτῶν הַרִי הַיָּי] Both הַרִי and הַיָּי primarily denote atmospheric phenomena, the former generic and the latter more specific. Ⲛ ’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 הַיָּי ‘end’ in the noun here, as he also did in הַיָּי הַיָּי ἐν ἡμέρα συντελείας αὐτῆς Am 1.14 and הַיָּי הַיָּי ἐν συντελεία καὶ ἐν συσσεισμῷ Na 1.3.

8.8) κατεπόθη Ἰσραηλ, νῦν ἐγένετο ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὡς σκεῦος ἄχρηστον.

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

נִבְלַע יִשְׂרָאֵל עִתָּה הָיָה בְּגוֹיִם כְּכֵלִי אֵי־חֶפֶץ בּוֹ:

σκεῦος ἄχρηστον בּוֹ אֵי־חֶפֶץ] See the same Heb. phrase rendered as σκεῦος, οὐ οὐκ ἔστιν χρεία αὐτοῦ Je 22.28, ἀγγεῖον, οὐ οὐκ ἔστιν χρεία αὐτοῦ ib. 31(Ⲙ 48).38, and cf. σκεῦος ἀνθρώπου συντριβὲν ἀχρεῖον Ep Je 15.

8.9) ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἀνέβησαν εἰς Ἀσσυρίους· ἀνέθαλε καθ’ ἑαυτὸν Ἐφραιμ, δῶρα ἠγάπησαν·

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

כִּי־הִמָּה עָלוּ אֲשׁוּר פָּרָא בּוֹדֵד לוֹ אֶפְרַיִם הִתְנוּ אֶהְבִּים:

ἀνέθαλε [פָּרָא] There is no doubt that this is a translation of פָּרַח.¹¹ Note especially ἀναθάλλων ξύλον ξηρόν ‘making a dry tree sprout afresh’ הַפָּרַחְתִּי יָבֵץ עַץ Ez 17.24. In our passage the Gk verb is intransitive.¹²

δῶρα ἠγάπησαν [הִתְנוּ אֶהְבִּים] a free rendition of the difficult Hebrew text, so Joosten (123). The subjects of ἠγάπησαν are likely to be Assyrians.

¹⁰ 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 εἰσδέξομαι αὐτούς, καὶ κοπάσουσι μικρὸν τοῦ χρίειν βασιλέα καὶ ἄρχοντας.

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

גַּם כִּי־יִתְנוּ בַגּוֹיִם עֲהָהָ אֲקַבֵּץ וְיִחְלוּ מֵעַתָּה מִמְשָׁא מְלָךְ וְשָׂרִים:

[παραδοθήσονται] most likely = יִתְנוּ. \mathfrak{H} 's יִתְנוּ is rather difficult.

[κοπάσουσι] = וְיִחְלוּ from $\sqrt{\text{להל}}$ 'to be ill.' \mathfrak{H} 's וְיִחְלוּ 'they will begin' is unintelligible. All the same, there is no question of infirmity, whether bodily or mental. Hence \mathfrak{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 ἐκόπασε τοῦ λαλήσαι πρὸς αὐτήν ἔτι 'she stopped speaking to her any more' Ru 1.18. The genitive article is probably not a mere marker of the infinitive, but ablative in force; the notion of stopping doing something carries by definition an ablative value.¹³ Cf. κοπάσουσιν ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν Ez 43.10.

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

[τοῦ χρίειν] = וְיִחְלוּ, ≠ \mathfrak{H} וְיִחְלוּ. The Heb. preposition *min* carries the same ablative value of τοῦ. τοῦ here is no mere marker of the infinitive as is the case in μὴ προσθῆς τοῦ προφητεῦσαι Am 7.13.

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

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

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

כִּי־הִרְבָּה אֶפְרַיִם מִזְבְּחֹת הַיְי־לוֹ מִזְבְּחֹת אֱהָבָה:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

אֲכַתְּוּב־[אֲכַתְּוּב־] לֹו רְבוּ [רַבִּי] תּוֹרֹתַי כְּמוֹ-זֶר נְהֻשְׁבוּ:

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

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

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

8.13) διότι ἐὰν θύσωσι θυσίαν καὶ φάγωσι κρέα, κύριος οὐ προσδέξεται αὐτά· νῦν μνησθήσεται τὰς ἀδικίας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκδικήσει τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν· αὐτοὶ εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀπέστρεψαν καὶ ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις ἀκάθαρτα φάγονται.

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

זָבַחַי הַבְּהֵבִי יִזְבַּחוּ בְשָׂר וַיֹּאכְלוּ יְהוָה לֹא רָצָם עֲמָה יִזְכֵּר עֲוֹנָם וַיִּפְקֹד הַטְּאוֹתָם
הָמָּה מִצָּרִים יָשׁוּבוּ:

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

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

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

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

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

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

νῦν μνησθήσεται יִזְכֹּרְךָ הַעֲתָה] 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 **יִזְכֹּרְךָ** and its Greek equivalents. Note the indicative Pres. as in δίκαιοι μνημονεύουσιν διὰ παντός τοῦ κυρίου, ἐν ἐξομολογήσει καὶ δικαιώσει τὰ κρίματα κυρίου PSol 3.3; ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἀδιαλείπτως ἐν τε ταῖς ἑορταῖς καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς καθηκούσαις ἡμέραις μιμνησκόμεθα ὑμῶν 1M 12.11. See also our remarks on ἐπιλανθάνω above at 4.6.

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

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

וַיִּשְׁכַּח יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶת־עֹשֵׂהוּ וַיִּבְנֶן הַיְכָלוֹת וַיְהוּדָה הִרְבָּה עָרִים בְּצִרּוֹת וְשִׁלְתֵּי־תִיָּא אֶת־בְּצִרְיֹו וְאֶכְלָה אֶרְמֹנֵיהֶן׃

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

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

CHAPTER IX

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

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

אַל־תִּשְׂמַח יִשְׂרָאֵל אֶל־גֵּיל כְּעַמִּים כִּי זָנִיתָ מֵעַל אֱלֹהֶיךָ אָהַבְתָּ אֶתְנָן עַל כָּל־גִּרְנוֹת דָּגָן:

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

ἐπόρνευσας ἀπὸ מֵעַל זָנִיתָ] See above at 4.12.

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

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

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

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

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

גֵּרָן וְיֶקֶב לֹא יָרְעוּם וְתִירוֹשׁ יִכְהֶשׁ בָּהֶם:

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 עַל see *BDB* s.v. II 6.

ἐγνώ αὐτούς] = ידעם, ≠ ירעם. Whether our translator knew such an unusual collocation as in מנת ירעם Ps 49.15, he may have found לָרַן וְיִקָּב as the subjects of רעך unusual and emended his *Vorlage*.

ἐψεύσατο αὐτούς [כִּהְיֶה בָּךְ] Either the harvest was much less than expected or the quality was inferior than wished for. On the equivalence < ψεύδομαι - שכח >, see διότι συκῆ οὐ καρποφορήσει, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται γενήματα ἐν ταῖς ἀμπέλοις· ψεύσεται ἔργον ἐλαίας, καὶ τὰ πεδία οὐ ποιήσει βρωσιν כִּי־תֵאָנָה בְּיַד אֱלֹהִים לֹא־עָשָׂה לְאֵל־עֲשָׂה אֶבְלָל Hb 3.17, where it is also about disappointing crops.

It is not impossible that the *Vorlage* of Ⓞ read Pf. כחש, and ידעם could have been read either as Pf. ידעם or Impf. ירעם. However, in vs. 4 we see Impf. translated with Aor. twice: יסכו ἔσπεισαν and יערבו ἤδυναν. See also vs. 3: ישוב .. ישוב κατόκησαν .. κατόκησεν < ישב .. ישוב. The Greek Aor. in these cases appears to indicate recent events.

αὐτούς [בָּךְ] Sensible harmonisation with the preceding αὐτούς ירעם.

9.3) οὐ κατόκησαν ἐν τῇ γῆ τοῦ κυρίου· κατόκησεν Εφραιμ εἰς Αἴγυπτον, καὶ ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις ἀκάθαρτα φάγονται.

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

לֹא יֵשְׁבוּ בְּאֶרֶץ יְהוָה וְשָׁב אֶפְרַיִם מִצְרַיִם וּבְאֶשׁוּר טָמֵא יֹאכְלוּ:

בָּךְ] On the tense vacillation, see above at vs. 2.

εἰς Αἴγυπτον [מִצְרַיִם] Since the verb ישב ‘to dwell,’ presupposed by Ⓞ, does not govern a direct object of dwelling-place,³ -ב was mentally supplied by our translator. εἰς is sometimes loosely used as synonymous with ἐν, e.g. εἰς τὸν τόπον, ὃν ἐὰν ἐκλέξηται κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου ἐπικληθῆναι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ, θύσεις τὸ πασχα De 16.6 // φάγη ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, ὃ ἐὰν ἐκλέξηται κύριος vs. 7. Note also ἐκεῖ προφητεύσεις· ¹³εἰς δὲ Βαιθηλ οὐκέτι μὴ προσθῆς τοῦ προφητεῦσαι Am 7.12f. Given the antithetic parallelism with the preceding οὐ κατόκησαν ἐν τῇ γῆ τοῦ κυρίου we would analyse εἰς here, too, as synonymous with ἐν.⁴

9.4) οὐκ ἔσπεισαν τῷ κυρίῳ οἶνον καὶ οὐχ ἤδυναν αὐτῷ· αἱ θυσίαι αὐτῶν ὡς ἄρτος πένθους αὐτοῖς, πάντες οἱ ἔσθοντες αὐτὰ μιανθήσονται, διότι οἱ ἄρτοι αὐτῶν ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὸν οἶκον κυρίου.

They did not pour wine to the Lord and their sacrifices were not to His pleasure. They are to them like bread of grief. All who eat it will become

³ Participles are distinct here, e.g. יְשֻׁבֵי הָאָרֶץ Ex 23.21, = יְהִי־שָׁבִים בְּאֶרֶץ.

⁴ 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.

לֹא־יִסְכּוּ לַיהוָה יֵין וְלֹא יִצְרְבוּ־לוֹ זִבְחֵיהֶם כָּלֶהֶם אוֹנִים לָהֶם כָּל־אֲכָלֵיו יִטְמְאוּ
כִּי־לְחֶמֶם לְנַפְשָׁם לֹא יָבוֹא בֵּית יְהוָה:

οὐκ ἔσπεισαν .. καὶ οὐχ ἥδυναν יִצְרְבוּ] The Impf. of ⚔ 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 ἥδυναν αὐτῶν.] From the punctuation in the current LXX versions the subject of the verb can only be personal, Ephraim.⁵ Whilst the verb ἥδύνω is not very common in SG (9×), its subject is usually impersonal with the exception of τί ὠραιώθης καὶ τί ἡδύνθης Ct 7.7. Particularly noteworthy in our context is αἱ θυσίαι ὑμῶν οὐχ ἥδυνάν μοι לִי יִצְרְבוּ Je 6.20. The subject of the following nominal clause can be supplied from the immediate context, i.e. זִבְחֵיהֶם, or what follows it can be analysed as the subject complement of the verbal clause, i.e. ‘they being to them like ..’.⁶

ἔσθοντες αὐτὰ אֲכָלֵיו] The n.pl. pronoun does not concord with the object suffix of אֲכָלֵיו, where the reference is most likely לָהֶם. 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 מוֹצֵד לָהֶם] a subject complement, on which see above.⁷

9.5) τί ποιήσετε ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πανηγύρεως καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἑορτῆς τοῦ κυρίου;

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

מִה־תַּעֲשׂוּ לַיהוָה מוֹצֵד וְלַיהוָה תִּגְיָהוּ:

9.6) διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ πορεύσονται ἐκ ταλαιπωρίας Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐκδέξεται αὐτοὺς Μέμφις, καὶ θάψει αὐτοὺς Μαχμας· τὸ ἀργύριον αὐτῶν ὄλεθρος κληρονομήσει, ἄκανθαι 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.

כִּי־הִנֵּה הִלְכוּ מִשָּׂד מִצְרַיִם תִּקְבְּצֵם מִן־תִּקְבְּרֵם מִחֶמֶד לְכַפְּפֵם קְמוֹשׁ יִרְשֵׁם הוֹחַ
בָּא לָהֶם:

⁵ This accords with the Tiberian accentuation with a disjunctive accent in לֹא.

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.

πορεύσονται .. καὶ ἐκδέξεται .. [הִלְכוּ מִשׁוּד מִצְרַיִם תִּקְבְּצֵם] On account of the shift from the Pf. to the Impf. in \mathfrak{H} the chronological sequence of the future events is easy to follow, whereas \mathfrak{C} highlights the futurity of the events and has added καὶ, ‘even so.’

Μαχμας [מְהֵמָה] a surprising equivalence, since מְהֵמָה 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 קְמוֹשׁ. He took it as parallel to מֵהַ, though Jerome (*PL* 25.892f.) rightly points out the absurdity of locating in Egypt the well-known place, e.g. 1K 14.5 (מִמְכָּמ). In the two remaining attestations of קְמוֹשׁ, 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.

9.7) ἦκασιν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς ἐκδικήσεως, ἦκασιν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς ἀνταποδόσεώς σου, καὶ κακωθήσεται Ἰσραὴλ ὥσπερ ὁ προφήτης ὁ παρεξεστηκώς, ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματοφόρος· ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἀδικιῶν σου ἐπληθύνθη μανία σου.

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.

בָּאוּ יְמֵי הַפְּקָדָה בָּאוּ יְמֵי הַשְּׁלֵם יַדְעוּ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲוִיל הַנְּבִיא מִשְׁנַע אִישׁ הָרוּחַ עַל רַב עֲוֹנָה וְרַבָּה מִשְׁטָמָה:

κακωθήσεται] = יַדְעוּ, ≠ \mathfrak{H} יַדְעוּ.

ὥσπερ ὁ προφήτης ἁϋθῆ [אֲוִיל הַנְּבִיא] One does not know where ὥσπερ originates nor what has happened to אֲוִיל. 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 Ἰσραὴλ.

ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματοφόρος [אִישׁ הָרוּחַ] On the unusual addition of the definite article in \mathfrak{C} , possibly influenced by הָרוּחַ, see above at 8.12, and *SSG* § 37 **bbc**. As unusual is the article in ὁ παρεξεστηκώς, where the syntactic analysis on the part of \mathfrak{C} departs from what \mathfrak{H} means: in the latter we have two self-standing nominal clauses in אֲוִיל הַנְּבִיא || מִשְׁנַע אִישׁ הָרוּחַ.

This rare adjective is also applied to prophets in οἱ προφηταὶ αὐτῆς πνευματοφόροι Zp 3.4, rendering וְהִזְּ.⁸

⁸ Joosten (129), relying on Chantraine (1968.1189), prefers πνευματόφορος.

The end of the verse in **ח** is also syntactically complicated. **עַל רַב עֲוֹנָהּ** is probably to be construed as an adverbial adjunct with the two preceding nominal clauses. However, **רַבָּה מְשֻׁטְמָה**, not **רַבָּה מְשֻׁטְמָה** nor **הַמְשֻׁטְמָה הַרַבָּה**, 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 **רַבָּה** here a verb, **רַבָּה** with a penultimate accent, ‘it increased,’ and not an adjective, **רַבָּה**. In the same vein of analysis our translator deleted the conjunction of **וְרַבָּה** and freely added σου.

[**μανία** מְשֻׁטְמָה] The Hebrew noun is known to mean ‘animosity, hostility,’ and it occurs a few times in Qumran documents. **ח** is consistent in its interpretation, when it occurs in the next verse. The sense ‘madness’ is parallel to **מְשֻׁטְמָה** in our verse. The noun does not occur anywhere else in BH. Independently of Joosten (129) we (*Index* 76b) mentioned **שִׁטְלִי** as a possible explanation of **ח**’s **μανία** here, referring to **ματαιότητος καὶ μανίας ψευδεῖς ῥηβίμς** **וְשִׁטְלִי** Ps 39.4. We (*Index* 364c) also mentioned **ἕως ἄν ἀπομανῶσιν οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ πλησθῆ ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας** Da 12.4 LXX, where also, as in our Ho passage, **ἀδικία** is brought in.

9.8) σκοπὸς Ἐφραιμ μετὰ θεοῦ· προφήτης, παγὶς 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,

צָפָה אֶפְרַיִם עִם־אֱלֹהֵי נְבִיא פַח יְקוֹשׁ עַל־כָּל־דְּרָכָיו מְשֻׁטְמָה בְּבַיִת אֱלֹהִיו:

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

[**κατέπηξαν** הֶעֱמִיקוּ] Though the second half of the verse can be analysed as two asyndetic, verbless, locative clauses, **ח** 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 ὀρθρινὴ πορευομένη** ‘*evanescent dew descending at dawn*’ Ho 6.4, 13.3, on which see our discussion above ad 6.4. See also **ἑτοιμάζου ὄρθρισον, διέφθαρται πᾶσα ἢ ἐπιφυλλίς αὐτῶν** **כָּל עֲלִילוֹתָם** **אָכַן הַשְׁכִּימוּ הַשְּׁחִיתוּ כָּל עֲלִילוֹתָם** Zp 3.7.⁹

9.9) ἐφθάρησαν κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ βουνοῦ· **μνησθήσεται ἀδικίας αὐτῶν, ἐκδικήσκει ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.**

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

הֶעֱמִיקוּ־שַׁחֲתוּ כִימִי הַגְּבָעָה יִזְכּוֹר עֲוֹנָם יִפְקֹד חַטָּאוֹתָם: ס

⁹ On this feature in BH, see JM § 177 g.

τοῦ βουνοῦ הַבְּבִנָּה] 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 הַבְּבִנָּה is transliterated as a place-name, Γαβαα. Is our translator using ὁ βουνός as a virtual place-name, ‘the hill *par excellence*’? That *παγίς ἐγενήθητε τῆ σκοπιᾶ* 5.1 differs from our case here is evident in view of the revocalisation of הַבְּבִנָּה as הַבְּבִנָּה; σκοπιᾶ then is functioning as an ordinary substantive.

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

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

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

כַּעֲנָבִים בְּמַדְבָּר מִצְאָתִי יִשְׂרָאֵל כְּבַכּוֹרָה בְּתֵאֵנָה בְּרֵאשִׁיתָהּ רְאִיתִי אָבוֹתֵיכֶם
הָמָּה בָּאוּ בְעַל-פְּעוֹר וַיִּנְזְרוּ לְבִשְׂת וַיִּהְיוּ שְׂקוּצִים כָּאֵלֶּם:

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

σκοπὸν ἐν συκῆ πρόϊμον הַבְּבִנָּה בְּרֵאשִׁיתָהּ] הַבְּבִנָּה is a reference to early figs not yet fully ripe. By contrast, הַבְּבִנָּה 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 הַבְּבִנָּה arrived at σκοπός is a mystery. The same problem arises at *συκαῖ σκοποὺς ἔχουσαι עַם-בְּכוֹרִים* Na 3.12, where the authors of *BA* (23_{4,6}.227) argue that הַבְּבִנָּה represents $\sqrt{\text{בקר}}$, not $\sqrt{\text{בכר}}$. This Semitic root has little to do 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 πρόϊμος, Walters (1973.75f., 92f.) is firm in his preference of *πρώ-*.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 *καρπός*.

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

καὶ ἀπηλλοτριώθησαν [וַיִּנָּרְוּ] ̣ is a reference to Israelites on the way out of Egypt who not only embraced Moabite girls at Peor (Baalphegor in ̣), but also their alien (ἄλλότριος) religious practices. Given the high frequency (37 times)¹² of the equivalence of ̣ ἄλλότριος and ̣ נָרַ, ̣'s וַיִּנָּרְוּ must have been read as a form of וָנוּ, say Nif. וַיִּרְוֵי Definitely noteworthy is τὰς ἀπηλλοτριωμένας ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν αὐτῶν [מְעַלֵּי בְּגִלְוֵיָהֶם] Ez 14.5, also a reference to idolatry. Another slight possibility is וְנָכַר, but the only relevant case is καὶ ἠλλοτριούτο ἀπ' αὐτῶν [וַיִּתְנַכֵּר אֱלֹהֵיהֶם] Gn 42.7, where it has nothing to do with a foreign religion, but feigning.

οἱ ἠγαπημένοι] Is [אֶפְרַיִם] meant for ̣'s [בְּמִצְרַיִם]?

9.11) Εφραιμ ὡς ὄρνειον ἐξεπετάσθη, αἱ δόξαι αὐτῶν ἐκ τόκων καὶ ὠδίνων καὶ συλλήμψεων·

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

אֶפְרַיִם כְּעוֹף יִתְעוֹפֵף כְּבוֹדָם מִלֵּדָה וּמִמִּצְוֹן וּמִהָרְיוֹן:

ἐκ τόκων καὶ ὠδίνων καὶ συλλήμψεων [וּמִהָרְיוֹן וּמִמִּצְוֹן וּמִלֵּדָה] ̣ has all the three nouns in the plural, probably in harmony with the preceding αἱ δόξαι αὐτῶν [בְּבוֹדָם]. 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 ̣ and ̣. The Tiberian accentuation adds a disjunctive accent to the first word, אֶפְרַיִם, and a conjunctive to the next word, כְּעוֹף. 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 ̣, in which αἱ δόξαι (pl.) cannot be the subject of ἐξεπετάσθη (sg.). The thrice repeated preposition מִ is assigned ablative value as we can read in Rashi's commentary ad loc.: Ephraim's loss of glory will materialise in still births (מִלֵּדָה), pre-natal deaths (מִמִּצְוֹן), and sterility (מִהָרְיוֹן). ̣, so also Jerome, may have failed to see this ablative value of the Hebrew preposition here.

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

¹² Cf. *Index* s.v. ἄλλότριος; we have proposed to include נָרַ in ἄλλοτρίουσ ̣ וַיִּרְוֵי Ma 3.15.

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

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

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

כִּי אֶם-יִגְדְּלוּ אֶת-בְּנֵיהֶם וְשִׁכְּלָתֵיהֶם מֵאָדָם כִּי-גַם-אֹי לָהֶם בְּשׁוּרֵי מְהֵם:

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

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

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

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

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

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

אֶפְרַיִם כְּאֶשְׁרָר-רְאִיתִי לְצוֹר שְׁתוּלָה בְּנוּהַ וְאֶפְרַיִם לְהוֹצִיא אֶל-הַרְגַּ בְּנָיו:

εἰς θήραν παρέστησαν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν בְּנוּהַ] 𐤄 departs quite considerably from 𐤁. 1) εἰς θήραν = לְצוֹר or לְצִיד. 2) παρέστησαν = שָׁתוּ. 3) There is nothing in 𐤄 which would correspond to לָהֶם. Was לָהֶם read as אֶלֶה, i.e. אֶלֶה ‘for their own sakes’? 4) τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν = בְּנוּהַ, i.e. בְּנוּהַ, an Aramaising form that sometimes occurs in QH, replacing the standard בְּנָיו, e.g. יסודותוהי ‘its foundations’ 1QS 8.8.¹⁵ בְּנֵיהֶם, i.e. בְּנֵיהֶם, is unlikely in view of בְּנָיו at the end of the verse.

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

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

¹⁵ See *SQH* p. 233.

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

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

הֶרֶג may have been read as הֶרֶה.

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

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

תִּן־לָהֶם יְהוָה מֵהַתֵּת תִּן־לָהֶם רֶחֶם מְשֻׁכָּל וְשָׁדַיִם צְמָקִים:

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

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

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

כָּל־רְצֻתָם בְּגַלְגָּל כִּי־שָׂשָׁם שָׂנְאֵתִים עַל רֵעַ מַעַלְלֵיהֶם מִבֵּיתִי אֶאְרָשֶׁם לֹא אוֹסֶה אֶהְבֵּתָם כָּל־שְׂרִייהֶם סְרָרִים:

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

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

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

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

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

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

הַכָּה אֶפְרַיִם שָׁרְשָׁם יִבֶּשׁ פְּרִי בְלִי-[בל]-יַעֲשׂוּן גַּם כִּי יֵלְדוּן וְהַמְתִּי מִמְדְּי בְטֶן: ס

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

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

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

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

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

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

יִמְאַסֵּם אֱלֹהִים כִּי לֹא שָׁמְעוּ לוֹ וַיְהִיוּ נִדְדִים בְּגוֹיִם: ס

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

¹⁸ See SSG § 22 **xh**.

¹⁹ See SSG § 31 **fc**.

CHAPTER X

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

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

גָּפְן בּוֹקֵק יִשְׂרָאֵל פְּרִי יִשְׁוּה־לוֹ כָּרֵב לְפָרְיוֹ הַרְבֵּה לְמִצְבוֹת כָּטוֹב לְאַרְצוֹ הִיטִיבוֹ
מִצְבוֹת:

εὐκληματοῦσα בּוֹקֵק] The Heb. word is usually considered to be a hapax meaning ‘luxuriant.’ Arabic is the only cognate,¹ in which /baqqa/ is said to mean ‘to abound.’ \mathfrak{G} 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 פָּרַקְקָה יְהוָה בְּיַד יִשְׂרָאֵל Is 24.1, where \mathfrak{G} reads κύριος καταφθείρει τὴν οἰκουμένην and Vulg. *dissipabit terram*. There has, however, been an approach which would not recognise two homonyms in BH, but to account for our hapax as an instance of $\sqrt{\text{בקק}}$ as exemplified in the just cited Is 24.1. Trg. is the earliest representative of this approach: אָפְקָה בְּיַד יִשְׂרָאֵל ‘a plundered vine.’²

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

Our translator most probably knew that the stative verb הִשְׁוֶה ‘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: קָרַקְרַק ‘empty.’ In our times, see “a ravaged vine” (JPS) and Kaddari (2006) s.v. “to split the earth and grow,” cf. his etymological notes.

translated text.³ Joosten (33) writes “le traducteur semble avoir lu le verbe *shlw*,” and he mentions Zc 7.7 along with two other places (not in XII) as showing the same equivalence. In Zc 7.7 \mathfrak{C} reads שְׁלִי , the referent being Jerusalem. Though the Heb. equivalent is different, our translator may have been thinking of Ps 127.3 $\text{הַיְשׁוּבָה שׁוֹן וְאֵינָהּ בְּיָדֶיךָ אֲנִי הַיְשׁוּבָה}$, with אַμπελος metaphorically used. Besides, this is not the only departure that our translator makes from \mathfrak{H} in this single verse.

Some take the referent of לו as Israel and the subject of יְשׁוּבָה also as Israel, hence making the suffix pronoun reflexive.⁴ For him $\text{לו} = \text{לְגַפְּנָן}$, as shown by the fem. gender of the pronoun, $\text{אַ\text{ו}τ\text{η}}$, referring back to אַμπελος , a fem. noun, though it does symbolise Israel.

$\text{אַ\text{ו}τ\text{η}}$] Ziegler scripsit. Joosten (133) prefers to read with Rahlfs δ καρπὸς $\text{אַ\text{ו}τ\text{η}}$ s, but what would that represent in Hebrew? פְּרִי ? What would one then do with לו at the end of the clause? Simply delete it and reconstitute \mathfrak{H} as $\text{פְּרִי הַיְשׁוּבָה}$? The fact that Rahlfs’ reading is attested by only part of the sources, for many others including B read δ καρπὸς ἐθθηνῶν $\text{אַ\text{ו}τ\text{η}}$ s, a secondary *lectio facillior*, which confirms the originality of $\text{אַ\text{ו}τ\text{η}}$, for the gen. $\text{אַ\text{ו}τ\text{η}}$ s separated from δ καρπὸς would be no problem in CG, but not in translation Greek of LXX nor לו .. פְּרִי cannot substitute פְּרִי . We would thus go along with Ziegler⁵ here.

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

\mathfrak{C} ’s analysis of the Heb. preposition is in line with its use as in Ps 51.3 $\text{כָּרַב רְחֻמֶיךָ מִהָהָה פֶּשַׁעִי}$, which is rendered in \mathfrak{C} as in our Ho passage: $\text{κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν οἰκτιρισμῶν σου ἐξάλειψον τὸ ἀνόμημά μου}$. כָּרַב is similarly used in BH five more times. However, it is only in our Ho passage that כָּרַב is followed by the preposition *lamed* prefixed to a noun. \mathfrak{C} applied the same

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

⁴ So BDB s.v. ל 5 I (a), p. 515b.

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

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

The collocation such as *רַב רְהֻמָּי* and the likes presumably led our translator to leave out of account this unusual preposition *lamed* away from an alternative analysis of the prepositional phrases, for *כָּרַב* and *כָּטוּב* can be analysed as representing <כֹּף> (of time) + inf. cst.>, so in Trg. *כֵּד אֶסְבִּיחֵי .. כֵּד* ‘when I multiplied .. when I brought,’ an analysis followed by Radaq with *כֵּד אֶסְבִּיחֵי*.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. *הָיָה לְכֶם שָׂבַת בְּהַר הַזֶּה* Dt 1.6, with a negative connotation, “you have had enough of it,” which certainly is inapplicable to our Ho example.⁸

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

τὰ θυσιαστήρια [לְמִזְבְּחוֹת] The preposition *lamed* in *ἔ* 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 *תָּא*.

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

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

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

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

חָזַק לְבָם עֲתָה יֵאָשְׁמוּ הוּא יַעֲרֶף מִזְבְּחוֹתָם יִשְׁדֵּד מִצְבּוֹתָם:

⁶ See JM § 130 and SQH § 21 fa.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A glance at *Index* (p. 115a) under *ταλαιπωρέω*, *ταλαιπωρία*, and *ταλαίπωρος* shows that these lexemes account for the overwhelming equivalents of $\sqrt{\text{דד}}$ lexemes. This equivalence is rather remarkable because of a discrepancy in meaning between lexemes represented by $\sqrt{\text{ταλαιπωρ-}}$ on one hand and those represented by $\sqrt{\text{דד}}$ 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 $\sqrt{\text{דד}}$ 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 דד as a substantive. Our translator thus stands in the line of this tradition of exegesis. One is naturally curious to know how all this started.

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

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

כִּי עַתָּה יֹאמְרוּ אֵין מֶלֶךְ לָנוּ כִּי לֹא יִרְאֵנוּ אֶת־יְהוָה וְהִמְלִיךְ מִה־יַּעֲשֶׂה־לָּנוּ:

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

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

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.

דָּבְרוּ דְבָרִים אֲלוֹת שׁוֹא כָּרַת בְּרִית וּפָרַח כָּרַאשׁ מִשָּׁפֵט עַל תְּלִמֵי שָׂדֵי:

λαλῶν [דְּבָרוֹ] Though \mathfrak{H} may be a description of recent events, יִאֲמְרוּ in the preceding verse, unlikely a reference to the past, makes such an analysis implausible. Then \mathfrak{G} 's Vorlage may have read יִדְבְּרוּ, a pseudo haplography following לֵנוּ at the end of the preceding verse.

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

διαθήσεται [כָּרַת] If \mathfrak{G} 's Vorlage accorded more or less with \mathfrak{H} , our translator is harmonising a fair bit: כרת as יכרת Impf. 3ms // דבר.

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

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

ἄγρωστις [רֵאשׁ] The Gk word is defined in 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 ἄρνες ἐπ' ἄγρωστιν 'like lambs on grass' Mi 5.7 for כְּרִבִּיבִים עַל־יַעֲשֹׁב (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 \mathfrak{G} represents דְּשֵׁא. All the same the selection

⁹ Cf. Pesh. /'ellātā/.

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

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

Cf. JM § 123 w.

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

of this rare word is noteworthy. Why not one of those standard equivalents such as βοτάνη and χόρτος? Cf. ὡσεὶ ὄμβρος ἐπ' ἄγρωστιν (אֲשֶׁר) καὶ ὡσεὶ νιφετὸς ἐπὶ χόρτον (בְּעֵשֶׂב) 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 Ων παροικήσουσιν οἱ κατοικοῦντες Σαμάρειαν, ὅτι ἐπένθησε ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ αὐτόν· καὶ καθὼς παρεπίκραναν αὐτόν, ἐπιχαροῦνται ἐπὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι μετωκίσθη ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ.

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

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

τῷ μόσχῳ] A calf as an object of idolatrous worship in Samaria was mentioned earlier at 8.5, 6. The generally accepted emendation of עִנְלוֹת to עָנָל is quite reasonable. Andersen - Freedman (1980.555) sees in עִנְלוֹת a *plurale maiestatis*. However, in view of שְׂמֵרוֹן בְּהַר אֲשֶׁר הִבְשֵׁן אֲשֶׁר בְּהַר שְׂמֵרוֹן Am 4.1 (> δαμάλεις [= ‘heifers’] τῆς Βασανίτιδος αἱ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῆς Σαμαρείας) ⑤ did not have to change the gender.

παροικήσουσιν [יִגְוּרוּ] ⑤ identified here a homonym of גֹּר ‘to dread,’ though the rection with the preposition *lamed* is unknown and unlikely, though ⑤’s mechanical rendition with the dat. is just as problematic with παροικεῖν.¹³

κατοικοῦντες [שְׂכָן] Unless ⑤’s Vorlage had שכני [= שְׂכַנְי or שְׂכַנְי], the pl. is an adjustment to παροικήσουσιν יִגְוּרוּ. Given its meaning, the collective use of the sg. שְׂכָן or שְׂכָן is unlikely.

καθὼς παρεπίκραναν αὐτόν [וּכְמָרְיוֹ עָלָיו] Our translator probably did not know this rare Heb. noun. Another instance of it occurring in הַכְרַתִּי מִן־הַמְּקוֹם הַהוּא זָרְקוּ אֶת־שִׁמְשֵׁם הַכְּמָרִים עַם־הַכְּהֲנָנִים Zp 1.4 is missing in ⑤ καὶ ἐξαρῶ ἐκ τοῦ τόπου τούτου τὰ ὀνόματα τῆς Βααλ καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἱερέων, where τῶν ἱερέων is most likely a rendering of הַכְּהֲנָנִים.¹⁴ The only other attestation of this Heb. noun in BH is at אֶת־הַכְּמָרִים וְהַשְׂבִּית אֶת־הַכְּמָרִים 2Kg 23.5, where we have another translator ignorant of the word, who resorts to transliteration, τοὺς χωμαριμ, though the proto-Lucianic version is more knowledgeable with τοὺς ἱερεῖς and the historic Lucian has *sacerdotes*.

⑤ is probably an attempt to render כְּמָרְיוֹ, a Hif. m.pl. ptc. of מָרַר. Instead of rendering it mechanically as ὡς παραπικραίνοντες αὐτοῦ or

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

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

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

ἐπιχαροῦνται וְגִלּוֹ 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: הַדָּבָר בְּרֵעָדָהּ וְגִלּוֹ בְּרֵעָדָהּ Ps 2.11 > δουλεύσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόμῳ. Cf. what Ibn Janach already wrote ad loc.: “it is concerned with a movement which accompanies joy and mourning .. and this movement happens to someone happy, but also to someone in sorrow” (*The Book of Roots* ad גּוּלָהּ).

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

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

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

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

גַּם־אוֹתוֹ לְאִשּׁוּר יוֹכֵל מִנְחָה לְמֶלֶךְ יָרִיב בְּשָׂנֵה אֶפְרַיִם יִקַּח וַיְבוֹשׂ יִשְׂרָאֵל מִצָּצָתָיו:

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

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

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

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

¹⁶ Cf. *JM* § 128.

ἐν δόματι הַבַּיִת] This Heb. hapax was probably unknown to our translator, who was compelled to resort to free rendering, for הַבַּיִת or הַבַּיִת cannot be made to mean ‘gift (δῶμα).’ As a consequence the grammatical subject of הַבַּיִת is now the Assyrian king, not Israel.

ἐν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ תַּבְּוֹלָה] One wonders why Ⲭ did not select a standard equivalent for the Heb. preposition; see, e.g. αἰσχύνηθε ἀπὸ καυχῆσεως ὑμῶν Je 12.13 (< וּבְשׁוֹ מִתְּבוּלָה וְאֵתִיכֶם). 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 (< קִדְּשׁ יְהוָה בְּהֵאֱשָׁרָה).¹⁷

10.7) ἀπέρριψε Σαμάρεια βασιλέα αὐτῆς ὡς φρύγανον ἐπὶ προσώπου ὕδατος.

Samaria cast her king as a dry stick (floating) on the surface of the water.

נִדְמָה שְׂמֵרוֹן מְלֶכָהּ כְּקֶצֶף עַל-פְּנֵי-מַיִם:

ἀπέρριψε הַמֶּלֶךְ] See above at 4.7.

φρύγανον הַקֶּצֶף] 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 Ⲭ it refers to something easy to manipulate, worthless or helpless.¹⁸

10.8) καὶ ἐξαρθήσονται βωμοὶ ὄν, ἁμαρτήματα τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ· ἄκανθαι καὶ τρίβωλοι ἀναβήσονται ἐπὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐροῦσι τοῖς ὄρεσιν 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.”

וְנִשְׁמְדוּ בְּמוֹת אֲנִי חֲטָאתֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל קוֹץ וְדַרְדַּר יַעֲלֶה עַל-מִזְבְּחֹתָם וְאֶמְרוּ לְהָרִים כְּסוּנוּ וּלְהַבְּעוֹת נִפְלוּ עֲלֵינוּ:

10.9) Ἄφ’ οὗ οἱ βουνοί, ἡμαρτεν Ἰσραὴλ, ἐκεῖ ἔστησαν· οὐ μὴ καταλάβῃ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ βουνοῦ πόλεμος; Ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἀδικίας

¹⁷ In *BA* ad loc. we are unjustly said to have suggested a Hebraism here. הַבַּיִת never governs בַּיִת. Its synonyms, קֶצֶף and הַקֶּצֶף do, cf. e.g. εὐδοκίῃσθε ἐν αὐτῷ בו ἄρְצָה-בו Hg 1.8. In *GELS* s.v. εὐδοκίῃ **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 קֶצֶף ‘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 καλύψατε ‘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 הַקֶּצֶף.

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

מִימֵי הַגְּבֻעָה הַטּוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁם עָמְדוּ לֹא־תִשְׁיָגַם בְּגְבֻעָה מְלֻחָמָה עַל־בְּנֵי
עֲלֹהָ:

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

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

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

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

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

בְּאֲוִתֵי וְאֶרֶם וְאִסְפוּ עֲלֵיהֶם עַמִּים בְּאֶסְרָם לְשֵׁתִי עֵינֹתָם [עוֹנֹתָם:]

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

ἤλθεν] We postulate that this represents באה [= בְּאָה], Pf. Qal 3fs. with מְלֻחָמָה as the subject. In the critical apparatus Ziegler states that his ἤλθον 'I came' is nothing but a conjecture, "*scripsi*," not supported by any Greek manuscript or version. He is presumably reconstructing תְּ as באתי [= בְּאֲתִי]. אֲוִתֵי means 'my desire,' which makes little sense here.

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

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

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

συναχθήσονται [אָפּוּ] In XII there is found another instance of אָפּוּ Pu., also in a military context, but it is rendered as Pi.: אָפּוּ συνάξει Zc 14.14. ταῖς δυσὶν ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν [עֲוֹנוֹתָם עֲוֹנוֹתָם] ע represents the Qre, though vocalised in an anomalous fashion in lieu of עֲוֹנוֹתָם.

10.11) Εφραιμ δάμαλις δεδιδαγμένη ἀγαπᾶν νεῖκος, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπελεύσομαι ἐπὶ τὸ κάλλιστον τοῦ τραχήλου αὐτῆς· ἐπιβιβῶ Εφραιμ, παρασι-
ωπήσομαι Ἰουδαν, ἐνισχύσει αὐτῷ Ἰακωβ.

*Ephraim is a heifer that has been taught to love to quarrel. How-
ever, 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.*

וְאֶפְרַיִם עֲגָלָה מְלֻמְדָה אֶהְבֵּתִי לְדֹשׁ וְאֲנִי עֲבַרְתִּי עַל־טוֹב צְוֹאֲרָה אֲרַכִּיב
אֶפְרַיִם יַחְרוֹשׁ יְהוּדָה יִשְׁדָּד־לוֹ יַעֲקֹב:

[ἀγαπᾶν אֶהְבֵּתִי] Whether or not our translator was puzzled by the para-
gogic /-i/,²¹ he would most likely have found the juxtaposition of two parti-
ciples 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 ..’.²²

νεῖκος [לְדֹשׁ] 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 αὐτούς, 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 indi-
cation that the vocabulary for agriculture was a weak spot for our translator?
See above at vs. 4.

ἐπελεύσομαι [עֲבַרְתִּי] The prophetic Pf. of עָבַר is correctly represented with
the Fut.

ἐπιβιβῶ [אֲרַכִּיב] Though βιβάζω and some of its compounds such as ἀνα-,
καταβιβάζω are causative equivalents of their corresponding βαίνω forms,
they are sometimes used as plain transitive verbs, e.g. βιβασθῆναι αὐτήν ὑπ’
αὐτοῦ [= κτήνος ‘animal’] Le 20.16. This is indisputable in another instance
of our Gk verb in XII: ἐπεβίβασας εἰς θάλασσαν τοὺς ἵππους σου Hb 3.15²³ //

²¹ Given another two examples in XII of this feature in שָׁכְנִי לְבָדֶד יַעַר Mi 7.14, where he
read שָׁכְנִי (pl. cst.), translating it as κατασκηνούντας καθ’ ἑαυτοὺς ὄρμυμόν and רָעִי הָאֱלִיל עֲזָבִי
וְהַצֹּאֵן Zc 11.17, likewise עֲזָבִי .. רָעִי (> οἱ ποιμαίνοντες τὰ μάτια καὶ οἱ καταλελοιπότες 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.

- 10.12) σπείρατε ἑαυτοῖς εἰς δικαιοσύνην, τρυγήσατε εἰς καρπὸν ζωῆς, φωτίσατε ἑαυτοῖς φῶς γνώσεως, ἐκζητήσατε τὸν κύριον ἕως τοῦ ἔλθεῖν γενήματα δικαιοσύνης ὑμῶν.

Sow for yourselves for 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.

וְרָעוּ לָכֶם לְצַדִּיקָה קָצְרוּ לְפִי־חֶסֶד נִירוּ לָכֶם נִיר וְעַתָּה לְדָרוֹשׁ אֶת־יְהוָה עַד־יָבוֹא
וְיָרָה צֶדֶק לָכֶם:

εἰς καρπὸν ζωῆς [לְפִי־חֶסֶד] 𐤇 represents לְפָרִי, but where ζωῆς comes from is a mystery.

φωτίσατε ἑαυτοῖς φῶς נִיר לָכֶם נִיר] Yet another example of our translator having a difficulty with the agricultural terminology. Precisely the same Heb. clause recurs in נִיר לָכֶם נִיר 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 נִיר ‘lamp’ and מְנוּרָה ‘lampstand,’ though נִיר ‘light’ is known. All the same, Hebrew does not possess a verb derived from this root.²⁷

γνώσεως] = נָעַת 𐤇 in lieu of 𐤇 נָעַת.

ἐκζητήσατε [לְדָרוֹשׁ] Already in BH the inf. cst. is beginning to be used to express an absolute command (JM § 124 l), whilst this feature is quite solidly established in Qumran Hebrew, e.g. לְדָרוֹשׁ אִישׁ אֶת שְׁלוֹם אַחֵיהּ וְלֹא יִשְׁקַץ ‘one is to seek the welfare of his brother and not to be unfaithful .. to refrain .. to remonstrate one another .. and not to remain resentful .. to part with .. and one shall not defile’ CD 6.21, cf. Muraoka 2020 § 18 c.

ἕως τοῦ ἔλθεῖν γενήματα δικαιοσύνης [עַד־יָבוֹא וְיָרָה צֶדֶק] 𐤇 most likely recognised in יָרָה a substantive meaning ‘early rain,’ and not a Hif. Impf. verb, and though he also recognised contextual affinity between this verse and 6.3, where he rendered the word with προῖμος, he did not see what early rain had to do with this passage, so that he opted for free rendering.²⁸ See above at 6.3.

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 ἔδωκεν ὑμῖν τὰ βρώματα εἰς δικαιοσύνην [אֶת־הַמִּוֶּרֶת לְכֶם] JI 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 JI 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 יָרָה as meaning ‘he will teach,’ its subject is God, not a leader of a faith community to be dispatched by Him. On JI 2.23, cf. also BA ad loc.

This Gk verb rarely has something inanimate, ἀπόλεια here, as its subject. Another instance is found in Ez α: ἡ ὕβρις ἐξανέστηκε Ez 7.10.³⁰

ἀπόλεια וְאִשׁ] The Heb. word, which signifies ‘very loud voice, roar, din’, occurs only twice in XII. In its second occurrence, we find וּמַתְּ בְּאִשׁוֹ מוֹאָב בְּתַרְוִיָּה Am 2.2 > καὶ ἀποθανεῖται ἐν ἀδυναμία 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 αⁱ we come across ὄλεθρος, a synonym of ἀπόλεια for וְאִשׁ at Je 51(⊕ 28).55 and on (⊕ 26).17.

οἰχήσεται וַיִּשָּׁח] On the interpretation of √דדש, see above at vs. 2. Joosten (139) finds odd the use of οἰχεσθαι with inanimate things as the grammatical subject, but note ὄχετο σοφία αὐτῶν // ἀπόλετο βουλή Je 30.1.

ἄρχων] = שַׂר, ≠ מֶלֶךְ דָּוִד. It is not absolutely certain that our translator read וְשַׂר or וְשָׂר; for BH the latter is the rule – וְדָוִד מֶלֶךְ, not like Engl. ‘King David,’ when *King* is a title, see JM § 131 k.

ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου] = מִן בֵּית, a haplography of the preceding שְׁלֵמָה.

ἐπὶ [עַל] Both particles are often used to indicate addition; see *GELS* s.v. II 5 and *BDB* s.v. II 4 c. Especially interesting is לֹא-תִקַּח הָאֵם עַל-הַבְּנִים Dt 22.6 > οὐ λήμψῃ τὴν μητέρα μετὰ τῶν τέκνων.

ἠδάρισαν וְשָׁח] The use of the Heb. verb in Pu. or pseudo Qal passive may not have been known to the translator; see also וְשָׁח עַל-לֵי יְרֵשׁוּ Na 3.10 > καὶ τὰ νήπια αὐτῆς ἐδαφιοῦσιν. He was then compelled to convert וְשָׁח to וְשָׁח = וְשָׁח. However, later וְשָׁח 14.1 is translated with a passive form, ἐδαφισθήσονται.

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), ὑποτίθια ‘sucklings’ (Ho 14.1) as its object, which is in addition to our Ho passage here, and all translating וְשָׁח.³¹ Luke appears to be familiar with this usage in ἐδαφιοῦσίν σε [= Jerusalem] καὶ τὰ τέκνα σου Lk 19.44.³²

10.15) οὕτως ποιήσω ὑμῖν, οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραηλ, ἀπὸ προσώπου κακιῶν ὑμῶν·

So I shall do to you, o House of Israel, on account of your evil (deeds).

כָּכָה עָשָׂה לְכֶם בֵּית-יִשְׂרָאֵל מִפְּנֵי רַעַת רַעַתְכֶם

³⁰ It is not certain whether this is a rendering of פָּרַח הַדָּוִד (end of vs. 10) or of הַמָּסָה קָם (beginning of vs. 11). The word order favours the latter.

³¹ *Index* (34b and 345c) suggests that at ἠδάρισαν Ez 31.12 ⊕ postulates וַיִּרְשָׁח in lieu of מִן יִשְׂרָאֵל.

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 כָּשָׁד as כְּשָׁר. Another consequence is the need to read הַשָּׁר as הַשָּׁרָא.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

³ The references are those of \mathfrak{G} ; the corresponding references in \mathfrak{H} are 7.25, 25.4, 26.5, 32.33, 35.14, 44.4.

Though \mathfrak{G} has not preserved any trace of רָחַשׁ in וְדַבַּרְתֶּם הַשָּׂמַיִם לְאָדָמָה 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 \mathfrak{H} וְיָחַשׁ אֵלֶיךָ need be emended to וְיָחַשׁ לְךָ.

⁵ Cf. Tov 1990a and Muraoka 2008.

⁶ Cf. *HALOT* 1465b s.v.

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

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

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

ἀπερρίφησαν, ἀπερρίφη **נְדָמָה נְדָמָה**] Whether or not **Ⓞ**'s *Vorlage* actually read the pl. **נרמו**, the translator wanted to read here **ר** instead of **ד** twice.

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

νήπιος Ἰσραὴλ **נָעַר יִשְׂרָאֵל**] The absence of a copula in **Ⓞ** is not necessarily a slavish reproduction of **Ⓢ**. Such a nominal clause is a commonplace in Greek, whether Classical or SG, see *SSG* § 94 **d-da**.

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

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

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

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

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

קָרְאוּ לָהֶם כִּן הִלְכוּ מִפְּנֵיהֶם לְבַעֲלִים יִזְבְּחוּ וְלִפְסִלִּים יִקְטְרוּ:

καθὼς μετεκάλεσα **קָרְאוּ**] καθὼς appears to be a free addition meant to pair with οὕτως (**כִּן**). To restore **כָּקְרָאֵי** [= **כָּקְרָאֵי**] would not do, since that would require changing **מִפְּנֵיהֶם** to **מִפְּנֵי**.

⁹ Preferred by Ziegler to πρὸς.

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

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

ἀπόχοντο .. ἔθυσον .. ἔθυσμίων] 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.

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

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

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

וְאָנֹכִי תַרְגְּמִיתִי לְאַפְרָיִם קָהָם עַל־זְרוּעֹתָיו וְלֹא יָדְעוּ כִּי רָפְאֵתִים:

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 הם is more painful: וְדַקְרָהוּ 'and they will pierce him through' Zc 13.3.

ἀνέλαβον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονά μου] $\text{על־זְרוּעֹתָיו קָהָם}$ הם need be emended to something like $\text{על־זְרוּעֹתָי לְקָהָתִים}$.¹²

οὐκ ἔγνωσαν] Many stative verbs in Hebrew and Aramaic can be used with ingressive value, especially with reference to the past. Thus יָדַע can mean 'he became aware' as well as 'he was aware.' Greek uses two different verbs for the purpose: γινώσκω and οἶδα. When Abram said to Sarai Γινώσκω (יָדַעְתִּי) ἐγὼ ὅτι 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 ἤδει ἐν τῷ κοιμηθῆναι αὐτὴν καὶ ἀναστῆναι 'he was not aware ..' Ge 19.35,¹³ a blissful ignorance on the part of Lot. At ἤδει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐν ἧ ἂν ἡμέρα

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

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

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

“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 רְבִיבֵי אֶמְשָׁכָה 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 ἀμְשָׁכָה] \mathfrak{C} is rather obscure of meaning. Who or what are ‘them’ and what does ‘extended them, stretched them’ mean? By contrast, רְבִיבֵי אֶמְשָׁכָה וְיָמְשָׁכוּ אֶת־יְרֵמְיָהוּ בְּהַקְבִּלִים וַיַּעֲלוּ אֹתוֹ מִן־הַבּוֹר Je 38.13 and its \mathfrak{C} καὶ εἴλκυσαν αὐτὸν 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 αὐτοῖς. The obj. suf. /-ēm/ can be analysed as equivalent to הֶהָ and the prep. *bet* is capable of introducing a direct object as in נִטְּוֹן בְּכִידוֹן נִטְּוֹן ‘Stretch out the javelin’ Josh 8.18.²⁰

ἐν δεσμοῖς ἀγαπήσεώς μου אֶהְבֵּה בְּעֵבְתוֹת אֶהְבֵּה] On the surface the combination of the two nouns in both \mathfrak{C} and \mathfrak{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 חוֹשֶׁף שְׁבִטוֹ שׁוֹנֵא בְּנֹו וְאֶהְבֵּוּ שְׁהָרוּ מוֹסָר Pr 13.24 comes to one’s mind. Cyr. (*PG* 71.268) quotes ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ κύριος παιδεύει, μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται Pr 3.12 in his exegesis of the next clause here.

μου looks like a free addition for אֶהְבֵּה, in which the suf. pronoun can be construed with אֶהְבֵּה alone or with the cst. chain as a whole.

καὶ ἔσομαι וְאֶהְיֶה] In \mathfrak{H} , as is also shown by the following וְאֶט, though not vocalised as וְאֶט, the Heb. form must have been meant as preterite,²¹ continuing אֶמְשָׁכָה, an Impf. with an archaic preterite value. \mathfrak{C} , however, is inconsistent: preterite - non-preterite - non-preterite.

רָאִיזֹן ἄνθρωπος ἐπὶ τὰς σιαγόνας αὐτοῦ עַל לְהִיָּהוּ עַל עַל מְרִימִי] What slapping one’s own cheeks symbolises here is not clear at all.²² Nor is it clear how \mathfrak{C} arrived at רָאִיזֹן.²³ Is this possibly a figure of vicarious sacrifice?

¹⁸ For an example illustrating the latter, see מַעֲשֵׂי אֵל ‘action(s) taken for God’s sake’ IQS 4.4.

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. (εξείλκυσσα, 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, וְאֶהְיֶה, 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 \mathfrak{H} can be rectified by vocalising מְרִימִי 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 וְיָהִי כְּמַשִּׁיב יָדָי 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 ραπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα), turn to him the other one, too” (Mt 5.39).

That Ⓞ is a somewhat free rendition is also evident in the unusual word order with an attributively used Ptc. preceding in lieu of ἄνθρωπος ραπίζων.

ἐπιβλέσονται πρὸς αὐτόν] = אֲבִיט אֲלֵי, and not אֲבִט אֲ. The equivalence ἐπιβλέπω אֲבִיט is quite common in LXX, and in XII alone 6 times, of which esp. noteworthy is καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς με אֲלֵי אֲבִיטוּ Zc 12.10. <+ πρὸς acc.> occurs also at Jn 2.15, and Hb 1.13, see also Nu 12.10 [compassionately on Miriam struck with leprosy], and in none of these cases there is a negative connotation attached.²⁴ But, who does αὐτόν refer to? The same question arises regarding αὐτῶ in the next clause.

δυνήσομαι αὐτῶ] = ‘I shall prevail upon him’ לוֹ אוֹכֵל ≠ אֲוֹכֵל.²⁵ Besides, Ⓞ represents a verse division different from MT, i.e. the first word of vs. 5, אֲל was read as לוֹ as the last word of vs. 4.

11.5) κατώκησεν Εφραιμ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ Ασσουρ αὐτὸς βασιλεὺς αὐτοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ἐπιστρέψαι.

Ephraim dwelt in Egypt, and Assur, he is his king, because they refused to return.

לֹא יָשׁוּב אֶל-אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וְאֲשׁוּר הוּא מְלִכּוֹ כִּי מָאֲנוּ לָשׁוּב:

κατώκησεν Εφραιμ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ] By having read לא as לו 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: יָשׁוּב בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם, i.e. ‘formerly Ephraim dwelt in Egypt as slaves, but now he was to toil and labour under a new overlord called Assur.’

οὐκ ἠθέλησαν [מָאֲנוּ] Exactly as in Je 8.5. This Heb. verb, when complemented with an inf. cst., is often rendered with a negated verb, e.g. אֲמָאֲנוּ אֲנִי וְיִשְׂרָאֵל τὸς μὴ βουλομένους ὑπακούειν Je 13.10.

ἐπιστρέψαι] πρὸς με is understood, cf. Ἐπιστράφητε πρὸς με ἐξ ὄλης τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν Jl 2.12.

are syntactically distinct: in the Ge instance the quoted text serves as a temporal adjunct, continued by אֲנִי וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֲמָאֲנוּ, whereas in our Ho case is no adverbial adjunct, but a self-standing verbal clause as shown by אֲמָאֲנוּ. On the difficulty of the Ge example, cf. Driver 1892 § 135, Ob. 6 and König 1897 § 412 z. On the paragogic /-i/ added to a sg. cst. ptc., see above on אֲהַבְתִּי 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) καὶ ἡσθένησε ῥομφαία ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ κατέπαυσεν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ φάγονται ἐκ τῶν διαβουλίῶν αὐτῶν.

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

הַחֶרֶב הָרַבָּה בְּעָרָיו וְכִלְתָּהּ בְּדָיו וְאָכְלָה מִמַּעֲצוֹתֵיהֶם:

καὶ ἡσθένησε ῥομφαία ῥַבָּה הַחֶרֶב] \mathfrak{S} must have derived the verb from חֶרֶב ‘to be sick,’ mentally emending the form to חֶלְתָּהּ. The sword then becomes Ephraim’s weapon of defence, not that of enemies, which would apply when the verb is derived from $\sqrt{\text{חול}}$ ‘to whirl, fly about.’

καὶ κατέπαυσεν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ] = וַיָּפְטוּ בְּדָוִד, which accords with \mathfrak{S} ’s interpretation of the preceding חֶלְתָּהּ.

καὶ φάγονται הַחֶרֶב] The sudden shift on the part of \mathfrak{S} to *w-qatalí* is difficult to account for. The subject is now perceived as bearers of the sword, hence pl.

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

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

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

וְעַמִּי תְלוּאִים לְמִשְׁבְּתֵי יְקָרָאָהוּ יַחַד לֹא יְרוּמָם:

ἐκ τῆς κατοικίας αὐτοῦ] = מִשְׁבְּתָם, as in κατοικίαν αὐτοῦ < ἰשְׁבְתָם Ob 3 or = מוֹשְׁבוֹ.

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

ὁ θεὸς] = לָא.

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

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

ὑπόσθη αὐτόν] In \mathfrak{C} 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 יְרִימָם, Hif. rather than Pol.²⁷

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

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

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

אֵיךְ אֶתְנֶה אֶפְרַיִם אֲמַנְנֶךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל אֵיךְ אֶתְנֶה כְּאַדְמָה אֲשִׁימָךְ כְּצִבְאִים נִהַפֶּךָ עָלַי
לְבִי יַחַד נִכְמְרוּ נַחוּמַי:

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

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

σε διαθῶ \mathfrak{A}] 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 \mathfrak{N} here appears to carry the sense of ‘to give up, not to care about, abandon,’ \mathfrak{C} most probably saw the following \mathfrak{M} as being used as its synonymous parallel. In BH \mathfrak{N} is often so used, as can be seen from quite an extensive listing in BDB s.v. **Qal 2** “Put, set, nearly = שִׁים, and sts. || with it”; see also ib. under **3** “Make, constitute.”

²⁷ Thus *pace* Nyberg 1935.89.

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

ὑπερασιῶ σου אָמַנְנָךְ ㊦ accords with what it sees as God's positive, supportive stance, and it is in line with its exegesis of נָתַן as indicated above. This Heb. verb that occurs only twice more in BH is said to mean 'to deliver, hand over' as at מָגַן צָרָךְ בְּיַד־יְיָ Gn 14.20 > παρέδωκεν τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποχειρίους σοι. The third instance is interesting: עָטַרְתָּ תְּמַנְנָתָּ Pr 4.9 > στεφάνω δὲ τρυφῆς ὑπερασπίση σου. Are these two translators etymologising, starting from מָגַן 'spear' [> ἄσπς five times]?

ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ] = עָלַי.²⁹ The unusual selection of ἐν is probably due to the translator's failure to see the value of the Heb. preposition for a painful effect being felt, a kind of *dativus incommodi*, e.g. עָלַי לְבִי רָוַי 'my heart is sick' Je 8.18, בְּהִתְעַטַּף עָלַי רוּחִי 'as my spirit faints' Ps 142.4, מָתָה עָלַי רָחֵל 'Rachel died on me' Gn 48.7; see JM § 133 f.³⁰ Though the same phrase translates יַדְדָּךְ 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 [בְּלַיְלָה הַהוּא]" Ge 26.24. This might apply to our Ho example. The gender of the pronoun is equivocal; it could be 'the same person [= the same persons, i.e. Ephraim].'

συνεταράχθη ἢ μεταμέλειά μου נִכְמְרוּ נְחוּמֵי Cf. ἐταράχθη ἢ μήτρα αὐτῆς רָחֵל נִכְמְרוּ רְחֵמֶיהָ 3K 3.26.

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

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

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

לֹא אַעֲשֶׂה חַרוֹן אַפִּי לֹא אָשׁוּב לְשַׁחַת אֶפְרַיִם כִּי אֵל אֲנִי וְלֹא-אִישׁ בְּקִרְבִּי
קְדוֹשׁ וְלֹא אָבוֹא בְעִיר:

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

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

κατὰ τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ θυμοῦ μου] The translator may have been uncomfortable with ὀργή as a direct object of ποιέω. This Heb. collocation is as uncommon. Another rare instance of it is קָלַף בְּצַמְלָהּ אֶפְרוֹחַי 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 ἔπλησας .. ‘you did not vent ...’ cf. ἐποίησας εἰς ἡμᾶς, κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, κατὰ πᾶσαν ἐπιείκειάν σου καὶ κατὰ πάντα οἰκτιρισμὸν σου τὸν μέγαν Ba 2.27.

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

The anarthrous, indeterminate πόλις is remarkable.

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

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

אֶחָדָי יְהוָה יִלְכוּ כְּאַרְיֵה יִשְׁאַג כִּי־הוּא יִשְׁאַג בְּנֵי־מַיִם :

πορεύσομαι [יִלְכוּ] ⑥'s personal focus.

αὐτὸς [הוּא] in contrast to τέκνα ὑδάτων.

τέκνα ὑδάτων] = בְּנֵי מַיִם or בְּנֵי מַיִם with homoioarcton. What the phrase, whether in ⑥ or ⑦, is supposed to mean is enigmatic.

ἐκστήσονται [יִקְרְדוּ] This is a rare instance of ἐξέστημι tinged with a sense of awe. Note καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα Ex 19.18, where the subject of the verb in ⑧ is Mount Sinai – וַיִּקְרַד כָּל־הָהָר מֵאֵד, and the occasion was a theophany accompanied by unusual natural phenomena.³²

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**סְבָבֵנִי בְכַחַשׁ אֶפְרַיִם וּבְמַרְמָה בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיְהוּדָה עַד רַד עַם-אֵל וְעַם-קְדוֹשִׁים
נֶאֱמָר:**

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

כַּחַשׁ	ψεῦδος	Ho 7.3, 11.21 [12.1]
	ψευδής	Ho 10.13, Na 3.1
מַרְמָה	δόλος	Mi 6.11, Zp 1.9
	ἀδικία	Ho 12.8
	ἄδικος	Am 8.5
	ἀσέβεια	Ho 11.21 [12.1]

In Ho 12.8, Am 8.5, and Mi 6.11 it is about false weights. Zp 1.9 is illuminating with two vices mentioned next to each other: ἀσεβείας καὶ δόλου, though the first term is **מַמְנָה**, 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 **מַרְמָה**.³³

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER XII

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

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

אֶפְרַיִם רֶעַח רֹחַ וְרוּחַ קָדִים כְּלֵה־יוֹם כָּזָב וְשׂוֹד יִרְבֶּה וּבְרִית עִם־אֲשׁוּר יִכְרֹתוּ
וְשָׂמֹן לְמִצְרַיִם יוּבֵל:

[πονηρὸν πνεῦμα] The parallelism of רֹחַ and קָדִים must have been apparent to our translator, but he may have found the wind as the object of grazing strange and reconstructed the text as רֶעַח רֹחַ. If we want to retain רֹחַ as parallel to קָדִים, then we would need to understand רֶעַח 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, רֶעַח cannot be an attributively used adjective: for πονηρὸν πνεῦμα we would anticipate רֶעַח רֹחַ, if not רֹחַ רֶעַח. Then רֶעַח 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 מַעֲלָלִים וְרַע מְעַלְלֵם 1Sm 25.3 > ὁ ἄνθρωπος σκληρὸς καὶ πονηρὸς ἐν ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ‘the man is hard and evil in deeds.’¹ Thus 12’s πονηρὸν πνεῦμα is a compromise in lieu of πονηρὸς ἐν πνεύματι or πονηρὸς πνεύματι. Cf. οἱ ἄωμοι ἐν ὁδοῖς Ps 118.1 (< תְּמִימֵי־דָרֶךְ) and καλὸς τῷ εἶδει καὶ ὠραῖος τῇ ὄψει Ge 39.6 (< יִפְה־תֶּאֱרָר < וַיִּפֶּה מִרְאָה).

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

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

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

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

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

ἐνεπορεύετο [יובל] The Gk verb ἐμπορεύομαι is never used in a genuine passive form, whereas יובל is passive with שָׁ as its subject. In הִרְדֵּה, 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 הִרְדֵּה 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 [הִרְדֵּה 12.3] καὶ κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ πρὸς Ἰουδαν τοῦ ἐκδικῆσαι τὸν Ἰακωβ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατὰ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτοῦ ἀνταποδώσει αὐτῷ.

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

וְרִיב לַיהוָה עִם־יְהוּדָה וְלִפְקֹד עַל־יַעֲקֹב כְּדַרְכָּיו כְּמַעֲלָלָיו יִשְׁיב לוֹ:

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

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

בְּבֶטֶן עָקַב אֶת־אָחִיו וּבְאוֹנוֹ שָׁרָה אֶת־אֱלֹהִים:

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

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

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

ἐπτέρνισεν קצץ] 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 קצץ is used there, for we are only told that Jacob came out of his mother's womb, gripping the heel of Esau – ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἐπειλημμένη τῆς πτέρνης Ησαυ· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰακωβ < בַּקָּצֵץ יָמוּ שְׂמוֹ אֶרְרָא עָשָׂו בְּעָקֵב עֵשָׂו וַיִּקְרָא יְהוָה יְדִי.⁶ Later when the Heb. verb is heard in a *cri de cœur* of Esau, it is not a reference to what happened at their birth – Δικαίως ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰακωβ· ἐπτέρνικεν (יִקְצֹץ) γάρ με ἤδη δεύτερον τοῦτο· τὰ τε πρωτοτόκιά μου εἴληφεν καὶ νῦν εἴληφεν τὴν εὐλογίαν μου Ge 27.36. Then we seem to have here a new folk-etymology of the name קצץ.

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

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

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

ἐνίσχυσε πρὸς θεὸν אֶת-אֱלֹהִים וְשָׁרָה] Cf. ἐνίσχυσας μετὰ θεοῦ καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατός < וְתוֹכַח וְעַם-אֱלֹהִים וְעַם-אֲנָשִׁים וְתוֹכַח Ge 32.29. We see that three different prepositions are used with וְשָׁרָה – עַם, אֶת, אֶל (this last in the next verse). אֶת is obviously not a nota obiecti. Greek uses two: πρὸς + acc. and μετὰ + gen. The selection of πρὸς here does not mean that the *Vorlage* of ℣ read here אֶל as in the next verse showing the equivalence [אֶל / μετὰ].

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

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

וַיִּשָׁר אֶת-מְלָאָךְ וַיִּכַּח בְּכַה וַיִּתְחַנְּנוּ-לוֹ בֵּית-אֵל יִמְצְאוּנֵנוּ וְשָׂם יְדָבָר עִמָּנוּ:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

וַיִּהְיֶה אֱלֹהֵי הַצְּבָאוֹת יְהוָה וְזָכָרוּ:

μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ ὀζְרִי] This naturally reminds us of τοῦτό μου ἔστιν ὄνομα αἰώνιον καὶ μνημόσυνον γενεῶν γενεαῖς דַּר וְזָכָרִי לְדַר וְזָה לְעַלְמִי לְעַלְמִי Ex 3.15, as stated explicitly in Trg here – וַיִּקְרָא דְאָמִיר עַל יְדֵי מִשָּׁה יוֹי דְּוִכְרָנְיָהּ – לְכָל דָּר וְדָר.

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

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

וְאַתָּה בְּאֱלֹהֶיךָ תָּשׁוּב תְּסֻדּוּ וּמִשְׁפָּט שְׁמֵר וְקִנְיָהּ אֶל-אֱלֹהֶיךָ תִּמְדָּד:

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

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

[= τὰ ἔθνη], καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται 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 **בְּאֵלֵהוּ**] and you shall return to Him [adding **וְאֵלָיו**]." 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."⁹ The Gk preposition here is then basically locative.¹⁰ See also below at ὁ ἐν σοὶ 14.4.

ἐπιστρέψεις **בּוֹשָׁף**] As Rashi does, we should understand πρὸς αὐτόν. Note Ἐν τίνι ἐπιστρέφωμεν; Ma 3.7, preceded by ἐπιστρέψατε πρὸς με, καὶ ἐπιστραφήσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

ἔλεον καὶ κρίμα] The two virtues are often found juxtaposed; in XII alone three more times – Ho 2.19, Mi 6.8, Zc 7.9.

ἔλπιδε πρὸς τὸν θεόν σου **יְהוָה לְאֵלֶיךָ הִקְוֶה**] The verb ἐλπίζω most commonly combines with ἐπί, whether + dat. or + acc., even against **ח** in **מִי** ἐλπίζετε ἐπὶ ἡγουμένοις **יְהוָה בְּחַטָּתֶיךָ לְאֵל** Mi 7.5. The only other instances in LXX of <+ πρὸς τινά> is **πᾶν αἴτημα ψυχῆς ἐλπίζούσης πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐπιτελεῖ ὁ κύριος** PSol 6.6¹¹ and **ἤλπισαν πρὸς [AL ἐπὶ] τὸ ἔνεδρον** Jd 20.36B. By contrast **הִקְוֶה** governs mostly **לְ**, only rarely **לְאֵל**, but never **לְעַ** unlike **הִמְצִי**, a synonym. **ἔλπιδε** is a reading proposed by Ziegler against the entire body of manuscripts and versions with the sole exception of *confide* Ach. Joosten (150) argues that our translator systematically derives all Hebrew words of **√הק** from a homonym meaning 'to assemble,' and prefers to read **ἔγγιζε**, translating it "approche-toi." However, 'to approach, draw near' and 'to assemble, come together' are two distinct notions. Besides, how is one to parse or vocalise **הִקְוֶה**? 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

⁸ BDB ib. mentions also a case such as **צִיּוֹן הִקְוֶה יְהוָה בְּשׂוֹב יְרֵאוּ בְּעֵין עֵין** Is 52.8, but this is quite distinct, for **עֵין** is part of an idiomatic phrase and it is not exactly about a physical movement. Radaq, ad loc., citing **תְּנַחֲמֵנוּ בְּשׂוֹב יְהוָה בְּנַחֲמֵנוּ** Is 30.15, says that **שׂוֹב** means **תְּנַחֵם**.

⁹ One non-Pauline example is **ἵνα φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ὅτι ἐν θεῷ ἔστιν εἰργαζόμενα** 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 **שׂוֹב** ein weiteres, mit **ב** konstruiertes Verb wie **יְהוָה אֱמַן** oder **בַּטַּח** zusammengedacht ist."

¹¹ This document widely believed to date from the first cent. BCE and to have been originally written in Hebrew shows diverse rections of this verb: **ἐπὶ σε** [= God] 9.10, **ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν** 17.3, **ἐπὶ ἵππον** 17.33, **εἰς βοήθειαν** 15.1.

¹² We shall accordingly revise *GELS* s.v. **ἔγγιζω** **I** ad initium and **ἔλπιδε** **I** ad finem and *Index* s.v. **ἔγγιζω** delete 12) **הִקְוֶה** pi.

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

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

כְּנַעַן בְּיָדוֹ מֵאֲזֵנֵי מְרֻמָּה לְעֵשֶׂק אָהֵב:

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

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

καταδυναστεύειν [לְעֵשֶׂק] 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 עֵשֶׂק 5 out of 37. Besides, עֵשֶׂק is the second commonest word in SG translated with this Gk verb (7 times including Mi 2.2), following Hif. הוֹנֵה (8 times).

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

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

וַיֹּאמֶר אֶפְרַיִם אֶף עֲשֵׂרְתִי מְצֹאתִי אוֹן לִי כֹל־יְגִיעִי לֹא יִמְצְאוּ־לִי עוֹן אֲשֶׁר־חָטָא:

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

ἀναψυχὴν [אוֹן] 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. Ⓞ, however, took no note of the parallelism with the preceding יִשְׁרָתָּ. 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 εὐρεθήσονται αὐτῷ] = כֹּל יִגְיִעֵיוֹ לֹא יִמְצָאוּ לוֹ
One would not know whether or not the translator is attempting to smooth out the difficult text of Ⓞ.

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

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

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

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

The combination ἀδικίας ἁμαρτάνω occurs in Je 40 (33).8, translating the same Heb. combination as here: ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀδικιῶν αὐτῶν, ὧν ἥμαρτοσάν μοι חָטָאוּ לִי מִכָּל-עֲוֹנֹתָי אֲשֶׁר חָטָאוּ לִי.

12.9 [Ⓞ 12.10] ἐγὼ δὲ κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἀνήγαγόν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἔτι κατοικιῶ 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,

וְאָנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם עַד אוֹשִׁיבְךָ בַּהֲלִים כִּימֵי מוֹעֵד:

¹⁵ See *GELS* s.v. **d**.

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

ἀνήγαγόν σε] One misses in \mathfrak{H} something like $\eta\lambda\epsilon\gamma\eta\eta$. It may have dropped out inadvertently. See below at 13.4, for which a 4Q fragment has preserved quite an expanded text which includes אנוכי העלותיכה . Maybe \mathfrak{H} 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 .

ἡμέρα ἑορτῆς] The use of the sg. form *pace* \mathfrak{H} is odd; this can hardly be a reference to the passover, the day of the Exodus.

12.10 [\mathfrak{H} 12.11]) καὶ λαλήσω πρὸς προφήτας, καὶ ἐγὼ ὀράσεις ἐπλήθυνα
καὶ ἐν χερσὶν προφητῶν ὁμοιώθην.

and I shall speak to prophets, and I multiplied visions and was compared through prophets.

$\text{וְדַבַּרְתִּי עַל־הַנְּבִיאִים וְאֲנֹכִי חִזֵּן הַרְבֵּיתִי וּבִיד הַנְּבִיאִים אֲדַמָּה}$

καὶ λαλήσω וְדַבַּרְתִּי] The Tiberian accentuation indicates a *w-qatálti* form, = ἐλάλησα.

πρὸς προφήτας עַל־הַנְּבִיאִים] A person spoken to is introduced with either לְ or אֶל , but not with עַל , which introduces a topic or subject-matter. The vacillation between \mathfrak{A} and \mathfrak{E} is not uncommon.¹⁷

ὁμοιώθην אֲדַמָּה] Both \mathfrak{E} and \mathfrak{H} are baffling. If ὁμοίω and דַּמָּה 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 \mathfrak{E} suggests that the translator may be reading \mathfrak{H} as a Hitpael form, הִדַּמָּה with /t/ assimilated to /d/, so Pesh. /’e(t)ddammit/. Even so the basic problem remains, cf. $\text{הָלַחְתִּי לְעֵלְיוֹן}$ ἔσομαι ὁμοιος τῷ ὑψίστῳ Is 14.14. See Cyril PG 71.293: “une imitation de Dieu” (Jan 152).

12.11 [\mathfrak{H} 12.12]) εἰ μὴ Γαλααδ ἐστίν· ἄρα ψευδεῖς ἦσαν ἐν Γαλαγαλ
ἄρχοντες θυσιαζόντες, καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτῶν ὡς χελῶναι ἐπὶ
χέρσον ἀγροῦ.

Unless Gilead is there, rulers in Gilgal then, offering sacrifices, would be false. Besides, their altars are like mounds on a parched field.

$\text{אִם־גִּלְגַּלְעַד אֲנִן אֶדְשָׁא הִיוּ בְּגִלְגַּל שׁוֹרִים וְבַחֹג גַּם מִזְבְּחֵיהֶם כְּגִלְעַד עַל תְּלִמֵי שָׂדֵי}$

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 דמה pi. 1 b), Clines דמה I Pi. b, and Kaddari דמה I 2. Cf. Dorival et al. 1988.307f.

12.13 [𐤁 12.14] καὶ ἐν προφήτῃ ἀνήγαγε κύριος τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐν προφήτῃ διεφυλάχθη.

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

וּבְנָבִיא הַעֲלָה יְהוָה אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמִּצְרַיִם וּבְנָבִיא נִשְׁמָר:

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

12.14 [𐤁 12.15] ἐθύμωσεν Ἐφραϊμ καὶ παρώργισε, καὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἐκχυθήσεται, καὶ τὸν ὄνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ ἀνταποδώσει αὐτῷ κύριος.

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

הַכְּעִים אֶפְרַיִם תְּמַרְוִרִים וְדַמְיוֹ עָלָיו יִטּוֹשׁ וְהִרְפֹּתוֹ יֵשִׁיב לוֹ אֲדָנָיו:

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

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

ἐκχυθήσεται] Far less ambiguous than 𐤁 יִטּוֹשׁ.

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

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

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

CHAPTER XIII

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

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

כְּדָבַר אֶפְרַיִם רָתַת נֶשָׂא הוּא בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאשֶׁם בְּבַעַל וַיָּמָת:

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

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

καὶ ἔθετο] = מִשָּׂא.

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

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

וַעֲתָה יוֹסְפוּ לְחַטֹּא וַיַּעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם מִסֻּכָּה מִכֶּסֶּפֶם כְּתַבּוּנָם צַצְצִיִּים מַעֲשֵׂה הַרְשִׁים כְּלֵה לָהֶם הֵם אֲמָרִים זָבַחֵי אָדָם צַנְגָּלִים יִשְׁקֹן:

συντελεσμένα αὐτοῖς ἔθετο] Translated by Joosten (155) as “achevés par eux,” and he assumes that the verb was read as Pi. כְּלֵה. 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: כְּלֵה with מַעֲשֵׂה הַרְשִׁים as its subject. כְּלֵה is sometimes used with an edifice as its subject, e.g. כְּלֵה הַבַּיִת ‘the temple was completed’ 3K 6.38.¹ Besides, who are *eux*? הַרְשִׁים? Then it becomes tautologous.² We probably have here an antecedentless relative clause in lieu of מַעֲשֵׂה הַרְשִׁים מִלְּהֵם. The pronoun of לָהֶם would be referring the subject of ἐποίησαν.

Θύσατε] = זָבַח.

¹ For more examples, see BDB s.v. I כְּלֵה 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 מַחְוֶה as its Hebrew equivalent here. A more common rendering of תְּמוּנָה is ὁμοίωμα, e.g. Ex 20.4, often with reference to an object of idol worship, and once μορφή Jb 4.16.

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

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

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

לְכֵן יִהְיוּ כַעֲנַן-בֹקֵר וְכַטֵּל מְשָׁכִים הַלֵּךְ כְּמַץ יִסְעַר מִגֶּרֶן וּכְעָשָׁן מֵאַרְבֶּה:

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

ἀκρίδων] = אַרְבֶּה, ≠ אַרְבֶּה 'lattice.'

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

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

וְאֲנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מֵאַרְץ מִצְרַיִם וְאֱלֹהִים זולָתִי לֹא תִדַע וּמוֹשִׁיעַ אֵין בְּלִתִּי:

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

וְכִי

אֲנֹכִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם בְּצַר שָׁמַיִם
[קוֹנֵה אֶרֶץ אֲשֶׁר יָדָיו בְּרָא כּוֹל צְבָא שָׁמַיִם וְלוֹא הָרְאִיתִים לְכַה לְלַכַּת אַחֲרֵיהֶם וְ] אֲנֹכִי הַעֲלוֹתִיכֶם
[מֵאַרְץ מִצְרַיִם וְאֱלֹהִים זולָתִי לֹא תִדַע וּמוֹשִׁיעַ אֵין בְּלִתִּי אֲנִי⁵ דִּדְעַתִּיכֶם בְּמַדְבַּר בְּאַרְץ תְּלַאבוֹת

³ In *DJD* 15.241.

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

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

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

οὗ αἱ θεῖαι 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 בראו is unlikely.

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

παρέδειξά σοι αὐτὰ לכה [הראיתים לכה] The Hif. verb הִרְאָה, when it indicates to whom something or someone was shown, attaches the personal referent directly to the verb. This is true in both BH and QH. E.g. וַיִּרְאֶהוּ יְהוָה אֶת-כָּל-הָאָרֶץ De 34.1, וּתְרַאֲנִי עִמָּךְ 4K 8.13, and You showed me toil’ 4Q443 2.5. There are many additional instances of <הִרְאָה + suf. pers. + dir. obj.>, e.g. בְּעֵבֹר הִרְאֵתָ אֶת-כַּחֲסֵי Ex 9.16, לֹא-הָיָה דְבַר אֲשֶׁר לֹא-הִרְאִיתִים Is 39.4 Alternatively <את + suf. pers.> may be used as in הִרְאָה אֶת-זֶרְעֶךָ אֵלֶיךָ Ge 48.11, וַיִּרְא אֶת-בְּנֵי-הַמֶּלֶךְ 4K 11.4. But the preposition *lamed* is not used. Thus the text as restored is a case of Anglicism. Did the new situation that would emerge in MH apply here? See, e.g. הִרְאָה הַדֶּרֶךְ לְאַחֵרִים אֶת הַדֶּרֶךְ ‘he showed others the way’ mPara 7.9.⁵ A more likely restoration would be הראיתך אתם.

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

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

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

Let's take a look at a related verb of sense perception, namely *הַשְׁמִיעַ*. Typical examples are *בְּטָרִם תִּצְמַחְנָה אֲשֶׁמִיעַ אֶתְכֶם*, De 4.36, *אֶת־קִלּוֹ הַשְׁמִיעָךְ* Is 42.9. We do not believe that *אֶלְיָךְ* in *עוֹד כְּלַמַּת הַגּוֹיִם* Ez 36.15 contradicts this general picture; we would analyse the preposition *אֶל* not as a marker of indirect object, but as a marker of movement, in other words, it could be rewritten as *לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ בְּקִרְבְּךָ עוֹד כְּלַמַּת הַגּוֹיִם* or something like that.

What the n.pl. *αὐτά* refers to is not immediately apparent, probably constituents of the heavenly host.

ἀνήγαγόν σε [העלותיכה] If the Heb. form is not a plain misprint in lieu of *העליתיכה*, 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 *הַקִּימוֹתִי* or *הַסְּבוֹתִי* producing *הַעֲלוֹתִי* is extremely unlikely.

The force of the emphatic *ἐγὼ* *אֲנוּכִי* is recognisable in Trg here, though its text is as abbreviated as MT: *אָנָּא יְיָ אֱלֹהֶיךָ דְאַסִּיקְתָּךְ* ‘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 γῆ ἀοικίτῳ*

I shepherded you in the wilderness in a non-habitable land

אֲנִי יִדְעָתִיךָ בַּמִּדְבָּר בְּאֶרֶץ תְּלָאבוֹת:

[*ἐποίμαινόν σε*] = *רַעֲתִיךָ*, i.e. *רַעֲתִיךָ*, so Pesh. /r'itāk/.

ἐν γῆ ἀοικίτῳ [בְּאֶרֶץ תְּלָאבוֹת] 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 *Ⲫ* here.⁶

to Abraham'? A theophany would scarcely be expressed in this way, cf. *וַיֵּרָא יְהוָה אֶל־אַבְרָם* וַיֹּאמֶר לְיִזְרְעֶל אֲתָן אֶת־הָאֶרֶץ הַזֹּאת וַיְבָרֵךְ שָׁם מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה הַנִּרְאָה אֵלָיו Ge 12.7. Qimron (loc. cit.) refers to Ben-Hayyim 2000 § 2.10.8, where, however, Ben-Hayyim is not dealing with a reflexive binyan at all; in § 8.10, however, he discusses the replacement of an archaic internal passive (Hofal in our case) with a reflexive binyan, thus reverse to our case here. Qimron's (2019.184) translation, “I have showed myself,” is rather debatable. Qimron further mentions *הַרְאָה* Ge 41.28 (with God as the subject) converted to the internal passive form in the Samaritan reading tradition, and goes on to cite *לֹא נִדְעָתִי לָהֶם* Ex 6.3 as exemplifying the use of the passive in reference to God. But the Samaritan recitation at Ge 41.28 is avoiding making God the subject of *הַרְאָה*, ‘God’s design was shown to Pharaoh’ instead of ‘the design which God showed Pharaoh.’

In BH the grammatical subject of Hof. *הַרְאָה* is either a person to whom something is shown or something that is shown to someone, e.g. *כְּמִשְׁפָּטוֹ אֲשֶׁר הָרְאִיתָ בְּהַר* Ex 26.30, *הַרְאָה* *אֶת־הַכֹּהֵן* ‘it [= some medical symptom] shall be shown to the priest’ Le 13.49, where *אֶת* is to be noted, not *לְכֹהֵן* or *לְכֹהֵן*.

⁶ According to Joosten (157) *Ⲫ*'s *ἀοικίτος* is etymological, i.e. *בֵּית* + *לֹא*, but what is one to do with the initial *taw*?

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

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

כְּמַרְעֵיתָם וַיִּשְׂבְּעוּ וַיִּשְׂבְּעוּ וַיִּרְגְּמוּ לָבָם עַל־כֵּן שָׁכַחוּנִי:

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

εἰς πλησμονήν] = שבוע, i.e. שָׂבַע⁷ Qal inf. abs., ≠ שָׂבַעוּ, which is odd, immediately following וַיִּשְׂבְּעוּ. Cf. Trg. מְבַעַע מְבַעַע.

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

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

וַאֲהִי לָהֶם כְּמוֹ־שִׁחַל כְּנֹמֵר עַל־דְּרָךְ אֲשׁוּר:

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

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

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

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

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

אֶפְגְּשֶׁם כְּדָב שְׂכוּל וְאֶקְרַע סְגוּר לָבָם וְאֶכְלֶם שָׁם כְּלָבִיא חַיִּת הַשָּׂדֶה תִּבְקַעֵם:

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

⁷ So Nyberg 1935.102.

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

specific reference to want or lack of children. We conclude that, for whatever reason, we have here a somewhat free rendition. Even so a famished bear would be savage and gravely threatening. Cf. ἀπορῶν ἄρτων Si 10.27, though with a human subject.⁹ By selecting the fem. form, not ἀπορούμενος with ἄρκος, a noun of common gender,¹⁰ as the subject our translator shows his awareness that √שכל is normally used with a female as its agens. Note a variation in gender in ὅταν φύγη ἄνθρωπος ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ λέοντος καὶ 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 αὐτοῦς] = יאכלם, i.e. יאכלם. The shift from 1sg to 3pl is deliberate, since no pl. noun that can serve as the subject of the verb has been mentioned before. The translator may not have been able to bear the sight of God devouring human victims, tearing up their pericardia may have been felt to be as much as he could emotionally take. This mental restructuring accords with his dropping of the preposition of comparison, i.e. σκύμνοι, and not ὡς σκύμνοι (פּלְבִיָּא מִסְכֻּמְנוֹי).

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

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

13.9) τῆ διαφθορᾶ σου, Ἰσραηλ, τίς βοηθήσει;

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

שְׁחַתְהָ יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי־בִי בְעֹזְרָךְ:

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

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

¹¹ So also Joosten 158.

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

13.10) ποῦ ὁ βασιλεύς σου οὗτος; καὶ διασωσάτω σε ἐν πάσαις ταῖς πόλεσίν σου· κρινάτω σε ὃν εἶπας Δός μοι βασιλέα καὶ ἄρχοντα.

Where is this king of yours? And let him rescue you in all your cities. Let him judge you concerning whom you said, “Give me a king and a ruler.”

אֱהִי מִלְכְּךָ אֲפוא וְיוֹשִׁיעֶךָ בְּכָל-עָרֶיךָ וְשֹׁפֵטֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר אָמַרְתָּ תַּנְה־לִי מֶלֶךְ וְשָׂרִים:

ποῦ [אֱהִי] מלך = אֲהִי.

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

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

13.11) καὶ ἔδωκά σοι βασιλέα ἐν ὀργῇ μου καὶ ἔσχον ἐν τῷ θυμῷ μου

And I gave you a king in my anger and got in my fury

אֲמַן-לִּי מֶלֶךְ בְּאִפִּי וְאָקַח בְּעִבְרָתִי: ס

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

¹² Dismissed by BDF § 196 as “suspect.”

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

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

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

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

In this quid pro quo, however, we miss a quo in \mathfrak{H} , which \mathfrak{G} identified in the following verse. The acc. συστροφήν cannot be analysed otherwise. Alternatively, $\eta\kappa\alpha$ can mean ‘to remove and take back $\eta\kappa$, an analysis which \mathfrak{G} did not opt for.

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

צָרוֹר עוֹן אֶפְרַיִם צְפוּנָה חֲטָאוֹתָיו:

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

\mathfrak{G} has not only transformed the first two words of this verse into a direct object of $\eta\kappa\alpha$ of vs. 11, but also broken up the cst. chain in \mathfrak{H} of עוֹן אֶפְרַיִם, so that עוֹן is now עוֹן and אֶפְרַיִם is an extraposed constituent of the following nominal clause.

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

- 13.13) ὠδῖνες ὡς τικτούσης ἤξουσιν αὐτῷ· οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς οὐ φρόνιμος, διότι οὐ μὴ ὑποστῆ ἔν συντριβῆ 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.

הַבְּלִי יוֹלְדָה יְבֹאוּ לוֹ הוּא־בֶן לֹא חָקָם כִּי־עַתְּ לֹא־יַעֲמֵד בְּמַשְׁבֵּר בָּנִים:

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

The noun בְּלִי 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 \mathfrak{G} uses the pl. πρὶν ἔλθεῖν τὸν πόνον

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

τῶν ὠδίνων < הָלַקְתָּ יְבוּא הַבֶּלֶל.¹⁷ We find, however, the sg. even where \mathfrak{H} has the pl.: ἐπὶ τῇ ὠδῖνι αὐτῆς ἐκέκραξεν < הָתַזַּעַק בְּהַבְלֵיָהּ Is 26.17.¹⁸

οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς οὐ φρόνιμος \mathfrak{H} **קָחַם לֹא הוּא-בֶן לֹא**] We have here two distinct syntactic patterns of nominal clause, for \mathfrak{H} means ‘he is an imprudent son.’

The use of οὗτος is another significant departure from \mathfrak{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. \mathfrak{G} had no Heb. *Vorlage*, which could have induced him to write ὁ υἱὸς οὗτος.¹⁹

We owe the negator οὐ to Ziegler’s authoritative *scripsi*.

צַת] This common noun, whose syntactic analysis here is difficult,²⁰ has left no trace in \mathfrak{G} .²¹

מְשַׁבֵּר] A st. cst. form of **מְשַׁבֵּר**, 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.²² Our translator may not have been comfortable with gynaecological technical terms, seeing children being broken into pieces instead of their breaking out.

οὐ μὴ ὑποστήῃ] In *GELS* s.v. ὑφίστημι **1 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,²³ who gives up instead of striving to protect his children in grave danger.

13.14) ἐκ χειρὸς ᾗδου ῥύσομαι αὐτούς καὶ ἐκ θανάτου λυτρώσομαι αὐτούς· ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου, θάνατε; ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου, ᾗδι; παράκλησις κέκρυπται ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν μου.

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.

מִיַּד שְׂאוֹל אֶפְדֶּם מִמָּוֶת אֲנֵלֵם אֱהִי דְבַרְיָה מָוֶת אֱהִי קִטְבָּהּ שְׂאוֹל נָחַם יִסְתֵּר מַעֲיָי:

¹⁷ This case enables us to differentiate between this noun and **הַבֶּלֶל** ‘rope, cord.’ In the pl. the two nouns look identical: **הַבְּלֵלִים** ‘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. ὠδὶς **1**, e.g. γυνὴ φεύγει πικρὰν ὠδῖνα παίδων ‘a woman escapes bitter pain of child-birth’ Soph. *Fr.* 9.32. In NTG we find one instance of the sg. at 1Th 5.3.

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 papyrus (*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 **הַתָּה**.

²² Kaddari 2006 s.v.: “a condition close to delivery.”

²³ We fail to follow “daher” of *SD* 1176 here.

ποῦ ἄῃ] As in vs. 10 above.

ἡ δίκη σου] A rather free rendering of דְּרָרִיךְ ‘your plagues.’ Probably = דְּרָרִיךְ ‘your pronouncement of verdict.’ As free is Pesh. /zākūtāk/²⁴ ‘your victory,’ which is how Paul quotes this verse: ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νίκος; 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 𐤀.

τὸ κέντρον σου 𐤀] Another pair which is difficult to harmonise the two words with each other. The Heb. noun, together with its homonym, קָטַב, 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 דרבן = דְּרָבָן or דרב, but such is graphically quite different from קטב.²⁵

παράκλησις 𐤁] Cf. λόγους παρακλητικούς 𐤁 דְּרָרִיךְ Zc 1.13, and see also συναράχθη ἢ μεταμέλεια μου 𐤁 נְכַמְרוּ נְחֹמִי 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 οὗτος ἀνὰ μέσον ἀδελφῶν διαστελεῖ. ἐπάξει καύσωνα ἄνεμον κύριος ἐκ τῆς ἐρήμου ἐπ’ αὐτόν, καὶ ἀναξηρανεῖ τὰς φλέβας αὐτοῦ, ἐξερημώσει τὰς πηγὰς αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς καταξηρανεῖ τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τὰ ἐπιθυμητὰ 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.

כִּי הוּא בֵּן אַחִים יַפְרִיא יְבוֹא קְדִים רוּחַ יְהוָה מִמִּדְבָּר עָלָה וַיְבֹשׂ מְקוֹרוֹ וַיִּחְרַב מְעֻנָּו הוּא יִשְׁסֵה אוֹצָר כָּל-כְּלֵי חַמְדָּה:

𐤀 as it stands does make sense. Most of the discrepancies between 𐤀 and 𐤅 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 𐤅 actually looked like. Thus ἀνὰ μέσον = בֵּין, so Pesh. /bēy/; ἐπάξει = יַבִּיא; ἐπ’ αὐτόν = עָלָיו; ἀναξηρανεῖ = יַבִּישׁ, so Pesh. /taḥrev/; ἐξερημώσει = יַחְרִיב, so Pesh. /tawbeš/; τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ = אַרְצוֹ. Besides διαστελεῖ = יַפְרִיד, so Pesh. /nefroš/²⁷

²⁴ Cf. Weitzman 1989.165.

²⁵ דרב is unattested in BH. Nyberg rightly mentions Ec 12.11, where דְּרָבָן 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. נָחַם, must have been unthinkable.

²⁷ /nefroq/ in Nyberg (1935.106) must be a typo.

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

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

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

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

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

³⁰ Cf. SSG § 33 c.

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

CHAPTER XIV

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

תִּשָׁמַד שְׂמֵרוֹן כִּי מָרְתָה בְּאַלְהֵיהָ בְּחָרֵב יַפְלוּ עַל־לֵיהֶם יִרְשָׁו וְהָרִיוּתִיו
בְּבִקְעוֹ: פ

ἀφανισθήσεται שְׁמָדָה] On this equivalence, see at 5.15 above.

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

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

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

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

ἐδαφισθήσονται יִרְשָׁו] On this equivalence, see above at 10.14.

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

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

שׁוּבָה יִשְׂרָאֵל עַד יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ כִּי כְשַׁלַּתָּ בְּעוֹנֶיךָ:

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

- 14.3) λάβετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν λόγους καὶ ἐπιστρέφητε πρὸς κύριον τὸν θεὸν ὑμῶν· εἶπατε αὐτῷ ὅπως μὴ λάβητε ἀδικίαν 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.'

קח עִמָּךְ דְּבָרִים וְשׁוּבוּ אֶל־יְהוָה אֱמַרוּ אֵלָיו כֹּל־תְּשֵׂא עוֹן וְקִח־טוֹב וְנִשְׁלַמְהָ פְּרִים שְׂפֵתֵינוּ:

λόγους] Probably meaning ‘verbalised thought.’

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

ὅπως μὴ κַל] In \mathfrak{H} there is nothing that would correspond to ὅπως, and μὴ is most likely = בַּל.¹ But אֵשָׂא בַל cannot be said to God. Already Rashi, Ibn Ezra, and Radaq join כַּל with וְנִשְׂא, but they must know of the syntactic irregularity of such an analysis.² The *Vorlage* of \mathfrak{G} probably read also כַּל, which he emended to בַּל. This, however, necessitated quite a transformation of the text. They could not say to God בַּל תְּשֵׂאוּ .. וְנִקַּח .. בַּל נִשְׂא, which would fit the following וְנִשְׁלַמְהָ. 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 \mathfrak{H} reminds one of what Abram said to his wife when they were about to enter Egypt: תֵּאָרְרִי אֲנִי־אֶרְרִי Ge 12.13, which \mathfrak{G} has rewritten in a style which appeared to the translator more logical – εἰπὸν οὖν ὅτι Ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ εἰμι.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

אֲשׁוּר לֹא יוֹשִׁיעֵנו עַל-סוּס לֹא נִרְכָּב וְלֹא-נִאֲמַר עוֹד אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְמַעַשֵׁי יְדֵינוּ
אֲשַׁר-בָּךְ יִרְחַם יְתוֹם:

οὐ μὴ σῶση] 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 ἡלֵהינוּ] 𐤒 did not see here a plural of majesty, which accords with his analysis of מַעַשֵׁי as pl. (ἔργοις).

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

ἐλεήσει] = 𐤒 active, ≠ 𐤒 𐤒 passive.

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

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

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

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

אֲרַפָּא מְשׁוּבָתָם אֶהְבֵּם נְדָבָה כִּי שָׁב אַפִּי מִמֶּנּוּ:

⁶ Cf. Cyr. I 317.

τὰς κατοικίας αὐτῶν] = מוֹשְׁבֵיהֶם.⁷ The reference is not only to their houses and dwellings, but also by implication to inhabitants in them. The verb *ἴαομαι* can mean ‘to repair’ with τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ κατεσκευασμένον ‘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 מוֹשֵׁב mostly means ‘dwelling,’ and only once in BH ‘dweller’: בֵּית-מוֹשֵׁב אֶצְבְּדִים לְמַפְיַבְשֵׁת 2Sm 9.12 (⊕ κατοίκησις, v.l. κατοικία as here).

ὁμολόγως הִדְבָּק The primary semantic component of הִדְבָּק 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 קָטַר מְהֵמָה וְתוֹבֵת וְקָרְאוּ וְקָרְאוּ תוֹדָה וְקָרְאוּ תוֹדָה וְקָרְאוּ תוֹדָה וְקָרְאוּ תוֹדָה וְקָרְאוּ תוֹדָה [= וְקָרְאוּ תוֹדָה וְקָרְאוּ תוֹדָה וְקָרְאוּ תוֹדָה וְקָרְאוּ תוֹדָה וְקָרְאוּ תוֹדָה] Am 4.5.⁸

ἀπέστρεψεν [שָׁב] The Gk verb need be analysed as intransitive, though it can be used transitively as in φόβος κυρίου .. ἀποστρέψει πᾶσαν ὀργήν Si 1.21, though ὀργή here means ‘anger (as a sinful act).’ Ziegler is certainly right in following Rahlfs 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? שָׁב cannot be transitive, either.

14.6) ἔσομαι ὡς δρόσος τῷ Ἰσραηλ, ἀνθήσει ὡς κρίνον καὶ βαλεῖ τὰς ῥίζας αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ Λίβανος·

I shall be as dew to Israel, it will blossom as a lily and it will put down its roots as Lebanon.

אֶהְיֶה כְּטֵל לְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִפְרַח כְּשׁוֹשַׁנָּה וְיִדְּ שָׁרְשָׁיו כְּלִבְנוֹן:

βαλεῖ [יָדָה] All the three Greek verbs in parallelism are in the fut., whereas in אֶהְיֶה, יִפְרַח alone is explicitly marked as volitive as against יִדְּ. If ⊕’s *Vorlage* read the same as אֶהְיֶה, it could have been translated with βάλοι (opt.) or βαλέτω (impv.).¹⁰

ὡς ὁ Λίβανος [כְּלִבְנוֹן] Without reference to אֶהְיֶה, ὁ λίβανος spelled and printed with a non-capital Lambda could mean either ‘frankincense’ or ‘frankincense tree,’ for which Hebrew would say לְבוֹנָה. However, the prophet

⁷ Pace Nyberg (1935.110) with his “indem ich mich ihnen wieder zuwende” the suffix in מוֹשְׁבֵיהֶם can be syntactically analysed as in יָתַתְנִי ‘you gave to me’ Josh 15.19. On this issue, see JM § 125 *ba*.

⁸ Cf. LSJ s.v. ὁμολόγως 2: “confessedly, openly.”

⁹ Some manuscripts do agree with Swete.

¹⁰ Driver (1892.54) assigns a modal value to יָדָה: “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 **𐤇**, there would be no option but to read "Lebanon."

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

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

יִלְכוּ יִנְקוּתָיו וְיִהְיֶה כְנִית הוֹדוֹ וְרִיחַ לוֹ כְּלִבְנוֹן:

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

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

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

κατάκαρπος [וְהוּד] Nowhere else in LXX this equivalence occurs. Besides, וְהוּד is a fairly common word, and κατάκαρπος as well as its two related lexemes, κατακάρπως and κατακάρπως¹¹ 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 רַעְעָן. In XII, the adverb, a hapax, meets us in Κατακάρπως κατοικηθήσεται Ἱερουσαλημ 'Jer. will be densely populated' Zc 2.4 for יְרוּשָׁלַם תִּשָּׁב תְּשֹׁבֵת פְּרוּזוֹת 2.8, where the translator may be thinking of פָּרִי.

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

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

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

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

יִשְׁבוּ יִשְׁבִי בְצֵלוֹ יְחִיֵי דָגָן וַיִּפְרְחוּ כַכֶּפֶן זָכְרוּ כִיִּין לְבָנוֹן: ס

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

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

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

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

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

¹³ Where ἐπιστρέψωμεν is redundant in the light of ἀνοικοδομήσωμεν.

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

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

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

אֶפְרַיִם מֵה־לִּי עוֹד לְעֵצֵיבַיִם אֲנִי עֲנִיתִי וְאֶשְׁרְנוּ אֲנִי כְבָרוֹשׁ רַעַן מִמִּנִּי פְרִיָךְ נִמְצָא:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

מִי חָכֵם וַיִּבֶן אֵלָּה נְבוֹן וַיִּדְעֵם כִּי־יִשְׁרִים דְּרָכָי יְהוָה וְצַדִּיקִים יִלְכוּ בָּם וּפְשָׁעִים
יִכְשְׁלוּ בָּם:

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

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

MICAH

CHAPTER I

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

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

דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה אֶל־מִיכָה הַמִּרְשָׁתִּי בְיָמֵי יוֹתָם אַחָז וְעִזְקִיָּה בְּמַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה
אֲשֶׁר־חָזָה עַל־שַׁמְרוֹן וְיִירוּשָׁלַם:

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

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

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

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

שְׁמַעְנוּ עַמִּים כְּלָם הַקְּשִׁיבִי אֶרֶץ וּמְלֶאכָה וַיְהִי אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה בְּכֶם לְעַד אֲדֹנָי מִהֵיכַל
קְדָשׁוֹ:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

² See BDB s.v. כל 1 d.

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

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

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

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

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

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

וְנִמְסוּ הַרְרִים תַּחְתֵּי וְהַעֲמָקִים יִתְבַּקְּעוּ כְּדֹנַג מִפְּנֵי הָאֵשׁ כְּמִים מְרַרִים בְּמִוֶּרֶךְ:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

בְּפֶשַׁע יַעֲקֹב כָּל־זֹאת וּבְחַטָּאוֹת בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל מִי־פֶשַׁע יַעֲקֹב הֲלוֹא שְׂמֵרוֹן וּמִי
בְּמוֹת יְהוּדָה הֲלוֹא יְרוֹשָׁלַם׃

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

ἀσέβειαν .. ἁμαρτίαν [פֶּשַׁע .. חַטָּאָה] In \mathfrak{H} 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 \mathfrak{H} . In the question it is about impiety and sin in general. One who hears the question would like to have reference to their specific manifestations.

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

ἢ ἁμαρτία οἴκου Ιουδα [בְּמוֹת יְהוּדָה] \mathfrak{H} appears to be amiss, to be emended to חַטָּאָה בֵּית יְהוּדָה. The mention of בְּמוֹת at this point is too abrupt and out of place.

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

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 ὄπωροφυλάκιον ἀγροῦ καὶ εἰς φυτεῖαν ἀμπελῶνος καὶ κατασπάσω εἰς χάος τοὺς λίθους αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς ἀποκαλύψω·

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

וּשְׂמֵתִי שְׂמֵרוֹן לְעֵי הַשָּׂדֶה לְמַטְעֵי כְרֶם וְהַגְרָתִי לְגַי אֲבֹנֶיהָ וְיִסְדֶּיהָ אֲנִלְהָ:

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 ἁμ]αρτίαν.

¹¹ Cf. GELS s.v. 1.

גָּזַל and גָּזַלָּהּ. 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: גָּזַל גָּזַלָּהּ. 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 גָּזַלָּהּ in the eyes of their divine Husband.

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

θήσομαι εἰς ἀφανισμόν הָמַשׁ ׀־שָׂא] The Gk preposition could have been left out as in θήσομαι τὴν Ἱερουσαλημ λίθον καταπατούμενον ׀־שָׂא הַסִּמְעָן מִצְבֵּן ׀־שָׂא לְמַשְׁרֵי־תָאֵל Zc 12.3. The translator is possibly thinking of θήσομαι Σαμάρειαν εἰς ὄπωροφυλάκιον יֵצֵי שְׂמֵרֹן שְׂמֵרֵי in vs. 6.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

κατεκράτησεν [אֲנוּשָׁה] The Heb. word here is generally thought to mean “incurable.” The Gk rendering is not very far from it, and a similar interpretation of it is found in מִכָּתִי אֲנוּשָׁה הִי פִלְגֵי מוֹ סְטֵרֵאָ Je 15.18.

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

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

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

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

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

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

בְּגַת אֶל־תִּגְדוּ בְּכֹ אֶל־תִּכְכּוּ בְּבֵית לְעַפְפָּה עַפְּרָתְהוֹשִׁי:]

μεγαλύνεσθε] = תִּגְדִּילוּ,¹⁷ cf. אֶל־גְּבוּלֵם and ἐμεγαλύνοντο ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρια μου Zp 2.8 and אֶל־עַמֵּי יְהוָה צָבָאוֹת and ἐμεγαλύνθησαν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον τὸν παντοκράτορα ib. 2.10.¹⁸ In view of אֶל־כָּל־אֲלֹהִים מֵגָלִיל מֵגָלִיל we could postulate אֶל־כָּל־אֲלֹהִים, which, however, would farther deviate from 𐤄; see also ib. 11.37.

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

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

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

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

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

עֲבָרִי לָכֶם יוֹשְׁבֵי שְׁפִיר עֲרִי־בִשֵׁת לֹא יִצְאָהּ יוֹשְׁבֵי צֹאֲנָן מִסְּפַד בֵּית הָאֶצֶל יִקַּח מִכֶּם עֲמָדָתוֹ:]

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

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

τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς] = עֲרִי־בִשֵׁת is not represented in 𐤄.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

כִּי־חָלָה לְטוֹב יוֹשֶׁבֶת מְרִית כִּי־יָרַד רַע מֵאֵת יְהוָה לְשַׁעַר יְרוּשָׁלַם:

τίς] = מי.

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

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

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

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

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

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

רַתֵּם הַמְרַכְבֶּה לְרַכֵּשׁ יוֹשֶׁבֶת לְכִישׁ רֵאשִׁית חֲטָאתַיָּהּ הִיא לְבַת־צִיּוֹן כִּי־בָרַךְ נִמְצְאוּ פְשָׁעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

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

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

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

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

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

Therefore you shall give away as far as the inheritance of Geth, worthless houses, as parting gifts. It became rubbish to the kings of Israel.

לְכֵן תַּתִּינֵי שְׁלוּחִים עַל מִוֶּרְשֵׁת גֵּת מִוֶּרְשֵׁת לְאֶכְזָב לְאֶכְזָב לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

ἐξαποστελλομένους [שְׁלוּחִים] On the first appearance Ⓞ looks like = מְשֻׁלָּחִים, so “ones being dispatched” (*NETS*). The meaning of שְׁלוּחִים is agreed to be ‘parting gift(s).’ For this interpretation of ἐξαποστελλομένους we refer to ἔδωκεν αὐτάς Φαραῶ ἀποστολάς (שְׁלוּחִים) θυγατρὶ αὐτοῦ 3K 5.14^b [= 1Kg 9.16].²¹ The mpl ending -ους is no reference to males, but due to οἴκους. Alternatively ἐξαποστελλομένους here could mean ‘parted, farewelled,’ hence ‘you shall give away as far as the ..., parting with worthless houses,’ on which see *GELS* s.v. ἐξαποστέλλω 6 as exemplified at Ge 26.31, 31.27, Ex 18.27.

ἕως] = עַד.

οἴκους ματαίους [בְּתֵי אֶכְזִיב] אֶכְזִיב is usually taken as a place name, but Pesh. and Vulg. also took it as a common substantive with /bāttē da-srīqūā/ and *domus mendacii* respectively.²²

- 1.15) ἕως τοὺς κληρονόμους ἀγάγω σοι, κατοικοῦσα [Λαχίς] κληρονομία, ἕως Οδολλαμ ἤξει ἡ δόξα τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἰσραηλ.

Until I lead the heirs to you, o inheritance dwelling [in Lachish]; the glory of the daughter of Israel will reach Odollam.

עַד הִירֵשׁ אָבִי לָּהּ יוֹשְׁבַת מְרֻשָּׁה עַד-עֲדָלָם יְבוֹא כְּבוֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל:

ἕως] = עַד. As a conjunction of temporal value ἕως can have its verb in the subjunctive, also with ἄν added as in ἕως ἄν παύσωνται πίνουσαι ‘until they finish drinking’ Ge 24.14. See further in *GELS* s.v. B and *SSG* § 29 c (v).

²¹ Analogously in the Antiochaeian version: 3K 5.2. Cf. also ἀποστείλατε ἀποστολάς (מְנֻחֵי) τοῖς μὴ ἔχουσιν 1E 9.51 [= Ne 8.10].

²² Cf. Wolff (1982.10): “Die Bauten von Trugstadt.”

Λαχίς] Ziegler proposes to delete this place name against all the manuscript evidences, probably because it is not represented in \mathfrak{H} , which may be, however, a result of a scribal error, i.e. $\text{לך ישבת לכיש} > \text{לך ישבת}$. Otherwise one can hardly make sense of $\text{κατοικοῦσα κληρονομία}$.

$\text{κληρονομία}] = \text{הַשָּׁמַר}$, 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.’

ξως²³] This is a preposition, not a conjunction, *pace GELS* s.v. **B a**.

τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἰσραηλ] Whilst ‘the daughter of Zion’ (בַּת צִיּוֹן) is a standing formula, בת ישראל is unknown to BH.

1.16) ξύρησαι καὶ κεῖραι ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα τὰ τρυφερά σου, ἐμπλάτυνον τὴν χηρείαν σου ὡς ἀετός, ὅτι ἤχμαλωτεύθησαν ἀπὸ σοῦ.

Shave and cut your hair on account of your pleasurable children, extend your widowhood like an eagle, because they have gone as captives off you.

קָרְחִי וְגַזִּי עַל-בְּנֵי תַעֲנוּגֶיךָ הַרְחַבִּי קְרָחְךָ כְּנֶשֶׁר כִּי גָלוּ מִמֶּךָ : ס

κεῖραι] The v.l. κεῖρε is inferior, if it is meant to be Pres. act. 2s impv. The middle voice is what is expected when it is about caring of one’s own body.²³ Nor is there a good reason for varying the voice in relation to the parallel 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/.²⁴

ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα τὰ τρυφερά σου $\text{עַל-בְּנֵי תַעֲנוּגֶיךָ}$] The Gk preposition ἐπί + acc. can indicate someone who or something which is in the actor’s purview. When her children were with her, they would be delighted at viewing her rich hair and attractive eyelids. In their absence now she cuts them away.

GELS defines one sense of τρυφερός as “having been used to comfortable life and not prepared for harsh or rough life-style,” and in one case such a sense is applied to children: $\text{οἱ τρυφεροὶ μου ἐπορεύθησαν ὁδοῦς τραχείας}$ ‘my delicate ones have gone rough ways’ Ba 4.26. Here, however, ‘affording much pleasure’ looks more suitable. Note $\text{καλέσεις τὰ σάββατα τρυφερά}$ ‘you shall call the Sabbaths pleasurable’ Is 58.13, for then people are free from daily toils and we would note that τρυφερά translates עָנַג , a word of the same root as that of תַּעֲנוּג in our Mi case.

τὴν χηρείαν σου הַקְרָחְךָ] When our translator has correctly rendered קָרְחִי 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 **שְׂכֹלֵי אֵלֶּמֶן** Is 47.9. Though in BG words of the stem *χηρ-* always have to do with widow, we see from LSJ examples in CG where it is about absence in general. One is *χηρεύει ἀνδρῶν* ‘it [= an island] lacks humans’ Hom. *Od.* 9.124, and another is *διὰ χηρείαν ἐπιστήμης* ‘due to the lack of knowledge’ Ph. 1.358. With some hesitation we could then take *χηρεία* in the sense of “lack of hair.” Namely, “Cut off all the hair of your head.” Theodore, who, along with some sources, reads *ξύρησιν* ‘cutting of hair,’ writes: “because this bird is said to lose all its own feathers at a certain time” (*PG* 66 1.354).²⁵

²⁵ Similarly Theodoret (*PG* 81 1.1749).

CHAPTER II

2.1) Ἐγένοντο λογιζόμενοι κόπους καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι κακὰ ἐν ταῖς κοίταις αὐτῶν καὶ ἄμα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ συνετέλουν αὐτά, διότι οὐκ ἦσαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν·

They set out devising troubles and doing evil things in their beds, and with the start of the day they were there, implementing them, because they did not raise their hands to God.

הוּי הַשְּׁבִי־אֶן וּפְעָלִי רַע עַל-מְשֻׁכְּבוֹתֵם בְּאֹר הַבֶּקֶר יַעֲשׂוּהָ כִי יִשְׁלְאֵל יְדָם:

Ἐγένοντο] = הָיוּ.

Here we have an example of the syntagm <γίνομαι + ptc.>. When the start of a process rather than a state is to be indicated, εἰμί of the frequent, periphrastic syntagm, <εἰμί + ptc.>, is replaced with γίνομαι, and the ptc. is usually Present.¹

καὶ ἄμα] Whether or not the *Vorlage* of ̄ did have the conjunction or not, its presence makes sense and accords with the athnach with the preceding word, מְשֻׁכְּבוֹתֵם.

οὐκ ἦσαν] = לֹא יִשְׂאוּ, i.e. לֹא יִשְׂאוּ. The thought expressed in ̄ radically differs from that of ̄, ‘they are capable (of it).’ Pesh. reads the same verb, though without a negator: /w-šāqlin ’idayhon lwāt ’alāhā/, and yet another thought, that of daring hypocrisy, which is better expressed with the conjunction w- rather than /mettūl d-/ ‘because.’ ̄ indicates a gesture of prayer, so in ἐν τῷ με αἰρεῖν χεῖράς μου πρὸς ναὸν ἁγίον σου Ps 27.2 <בְּנִשְׂאֵי יָדַי אֶל-דְּבִיר קִדְשֶׁךָ.

The idiomatic combination יִשְׁלְאֵל יְדָם could have presented a challenge.² Here is how other translators handled it:

Ge 31.29	יִשְׁלְאֵל יְדַי לְעִשׂוֹת	ἰσχύει ἡ χεῖρ μου
De 28.32	אֵין לְאֵל יְדָךְ	οὐκ ἰσχύσει ἡ χεῖρ σου
Pr 3.27	בְּהִיּוֹת לְאֵל יְדִיךָ [יְדָךְ] לְעִשׂוֹת	ἡνίκα ἂν ἔχη ἡ χεῖρ σου βοηθεῖν
Ne 5.5 (2E 15.5)	אֵין לְאֵל יְדָנוּ	οὐκ ἔστιν δύναμις χειρῶν ἡμῶν

¹ For more references, see *GELS* s.v. γίνομαι 5 a, and for a discussion of the syntagm, see *SSG* § 31 **fk**.

² For a discussion of where the idiom comes from, see McKane 1998.60.

Our Mi translator's colleagues have all³ recognised the idiomatic nature of the expression, not mechanically translating אָל. We see that also among Hebrew scribes there was a measure of uncertainty over the grammatical number of יד, as shown by the Ktiv in Pr 3.27, ידיך.

2.2) καὶ ἐπεθύμουν ἀγροὺς καὶ διήρπαζον ὀρφανοὺς καὶ οἴκους καταδυναστεύουν καὶ διήρπαζον ἄνδρα καὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, ἄνδρα καὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ.

And they coveted fields and plundered orphans and oppressed families and plundered a person along with his family, a person along with his inheritance.

וְחָמְדוּ שְׂדוֹת וְגִזְלוּ וּבְתִים וְנָשְׂאוּ וְעָשְׂקוּ גֵבֶר וּבֵיתוֹ וְאִישׁ וְנִחְלָתוֹ: פ

καὶ ἐπεθύμουν [וְחָמְדוּ] The Gk Impf., along with three other following verbs, carries on the imperfective aspect of συνετέλουν (vs. 1). This is in keeping with וְעָשְׂוּ carrying on four *w-qatalí* forms in this verse.

ὀρφανοὺς] Probably added by the translator, possibly puzzled by the conjunction *waw* of וּבְתִים with no verb to go with it in sight.⁴ The prophet probably meant it as parenthetical, i.e. not only fields, but also houses.

Our translator was now faced with the verb נָשְׂאוּ with no object. His solution was to ignore it⁵ and rewrite אָל as וּבְתִים יַעֲשֶׂקוּ⁶ and reuse וְגִזְלוּ as the verb with two parallel objects following. The vs. 2 he has mentally reconstructed may have read:

וְחָמְדוּ שְׂדוֹת וְגִזְלוּ יְתוּמִים וּבְתִים יַעֲשֶׂקוּ וְגִזְלוּ גֵבֶר וּבֵיתוֹ וְאִישׁ וְנִחְלָתוֹ.

Let us note that our translator has left οἴκους up front unlike the other three verbs.

οἴκους] Parallel to שְׂדוֹת, בְּתִים would naturally denote ‘houses, dwellings,’ whereas καταδυναστεύω takes an acc. of person. Hence our “families,” sim. *NETS* “households.”

³ Including Theodotion's somewhat clumsy rendering: διότι ἔχουσιν ἰσχὺν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῶν, cf. Aquila's ὅτι (ἔστιν ἐπι) ἰσχυρὸν χεῖρ αὐτῶν.

⁴ McKane (61) finds it difficult to see “Why the coveting of the fields should be coupled with the seizing of orphans.” The Gk verb here can be used not only with someone or something to be taken but also in the sense of ‘to rob someone of something’ as in διήρπασαν τὴν πόλιν Ge 34.27, i.e. valuables in the city. Thus orphans, in a vulnerable state, had their possessions robbed.

The Syriac translator appears also to have been troubled by this, solving the problem in a different way: /rāgēn ḥaqlātā w-vāttē/.

⁵ So Pesh.

⁶ נָשְׂאוּ is a poor fit for καταδυναστεύω, the two most frequent Heb. equivalents are יָנָה hi. (8x) and עָשָׂה qal (8x including Mi 2.2).

- 2.3) διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει κύριος Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ λογιζομαι ἐπὶ τὴν φυλὴν ταύτην κακά, ἐξ ὧν οὐ μὴ ἄρητε τοὺς τραχήλους ὑμῶν καὶ οὐ μὴ πορευθῆτε ὀρθοὶ ἐξαίφνης, ὅτι καιρὸς πονηρὸς ἐστίν.

Therefore thus says the Lord: "Behold, I devise disasters against this community. You will never be able to lift your necks out of them, and all of a sudden you will not be able to walk upright, for it is an evil time.

לְכֵן כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה הִנְנִי הַשֵּׁב עַל־הַמְּשַׁפְּהָהּ הַזֹּאת רַעַר רַעַר אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִמְיָשׁוּ מִשָּׁם
צָוָאֲרָתֵיכֶם וְלֹא תֵלְכוּ רוּמָה כִּי עַתָּה רַעַר הִיא:

τὴν φυλὴν [הַמְּשַׁפְּהָהּ] Both words can vary in the extent of their application. By referring to Am 3.1 Pusey (ad Mi 2.3) takes this as applicable to the entire nation of Israel.

ἄρητε [תִּמְיָשׁוּ] The Gk verb here, αἶρω, is about an upward movement, whereas תִּמְיָשׁוּ denotes moving away.⁷ Ⓔ is probably a figure of victims being constantly tramped down or writing in a deep pit. By contrast, in Ⓕ we have an image of a yoke, a symbol of enforced subjugation and loss of freedom and self-respect.

ὀρθοὶ [רָוָה] The Heb. word is a hapax in BH, and thought to mean either ‘haughtily’ or ‘erect.’ As regards ὀρθός, it appears later in our chapter, also with the same verb as here: ὀρθοὶ πεπόρευνται ‘they have conducted themselves honestly’ vs. 7. Our verse, however, is a description not so much of Israel’s moral stance as of a consequence arising from God’s punishment of their immorality. In sorrow, miserable, and depressed they cannot walk with their heads raised.

ἐξαίφνης] Where this comes from is not clear at all.

καιρὸς πονηρὸς [עַתָּה רַעַר] It is not so much ‘a bad time,’ ‘Unheilszeit’ (SD) as ‘a time characterised by wickedness.’ The Heb. phrase here can be analysed as a cst. chain as done in Pesh. /zavnāw d-vištā/ and Trg. בְּעַתָּה רַעַר, cf. Pesh. /b-šā’tā bištā/ < עַתָּה רַעַר Ps 37.19 > ἐν καιρῷ πονηρῷ ‘in hard times’ // λιμός ‘famine.’ Similarly in ὅτι καιρὸς πονηρὸς ἐστίν [עַתָּה רַעַר] Am 5.13.

- 2.4) ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ λημφθήσεται ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς παραβολή, καὶ θρηνηθήσεται θρῆνος ἐν μέλει λέγων Ταλαιπωρία ἐταλαιπωρήσαμεν· μερίς λαοῦ μου κατεμετρήθη ἐν σχοινίῳ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ κωλύσων αὐτὸν τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι· οἱ ἀγροὶ ἡμῶν διμερίσθησαν.

On that day a mocking speech will be made about you, and a mournful tune will be sung, ‘We have been relegated to utter misery. Part of my people has been portioned away with a measuring-chord, and there

⁷ SD’s “ziehen” (1186) is the sense of this Heb. word.

was none who would stop him from coming back. Our fields have been dealt out.’

בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִשָּׂא עֲלֵיכֶם מְשָׁל וְנָהָה נָהָה וְנָהָה אָמַר שְׂדֵדוֹד נִשְׁדָּדוּ חֶלְקֵי עַמִּי יָמִיר
אֵיךְ יָמִישׁ לִי לְשׂוֹבֵב שְׂדֵדֵינוּ חֶלְקֵי:

λημφθήσεται אִשָּׁ] 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’ אָמַר Am 6.10, the translator could have said λήμψεται .. παραβολήν. Note also ἐξελεύσεται ‘(someone) will come out’ יָצָא Mi 5.2. The reason for the selection of the passive voice may be because the suffering borne by the people could be better highlighted in that way.⁸ See also the immediately following θρηνηθήσεται.

παραβολή λְמָ] In the context something more than an innocuous discourse form, “parable” (*NETS*) or “Spruch” (*SD*) must be meant. See οὐχὶ ταῦτα πάντα παραβολὴν κατ’ αὐτοῦ λήμψονται (אִשָּׁ לְמָ) Hb 2.6, where κατ’ αὐτοῦ is to be noted, and ἔσσονται εἰς ὄνειδισμὸν καὶ εἰς παραβολὴν καὶ εἰς μῖσος καὶ εἰς κατάραν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, οὗ ἔξῳσα αὐτοῦς ἐκεῖ Je 24.9. It evidently denotes something that is said in public and hurts those about whom it is said.

ἐν μέλει] The difficult text of 𐤀 seems to have three words from the same root, two of which are rendered in 𐤄 with two words of the same stem.⁹ Whether or not our translator’s vocabulary contained θρήνευμα, he may have thought that enough had been said, and did not do as Ezekiel did in καὶ λήμψονται οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ σὲ θρήνον καὶ θρήνημα Σορ Ez 27.32, where also the translator recognised two, but not three words from one and the same root – וְנָשְׂאוּ אֶלֶיךָ בְּגִיָּה קִנְיָה וְקִנְיָנוּ.

On the selection of the passive voice here and the cognate object appearing in the nominative, see *SSG* § 57 **dd** (p. 530).

Ταλαιπωρία ἐταλαιπωρήσαμεν] The use of a noun in the dative added to a verb from the same stem is one of a few ways that correspond to an affiliated morphosyntactic structure in Hebrew, known under the name of *figura etymologica*. When such a dative noun stands on its own, not modified further, with an adjective, for instance, the verbal notion is emphasised.¹⁰

κατεμετρήθη ..] Whatever the *Vorlage* of 𐤄 looked like, it must have been as difficult as 𐤀. Hence the concluding part of the verse presents a fairly free rendition. Even if this particular verb could represent יָמַד, i.e. יָמַד, Nif. of √מַדַּד ‘to measure,’ where does ἐν σχοινίῳ come from? From Am 7.17,

⁸ On the impersonal 3ms with a personal subject in SG, see *SSG* § 87 **bc**.

⁹ McKane (68) approvingly mentions Carmignac (1955.351), who claims to have identified הִתְהַיָּה in the Qumran War Scroll (17.5), where, however, it is just a Nifal ptc., ‘what is to emerge’ as against Qal הִתְהַיָּה ‘what (already) exists,’ see Muraoka *SQH* § 12 **e 7**.

¹⁰ For a discussion with examples, see *SSG* § 56 **b** under the label of “cognate object.”

where, however, \mathfrak{H} reads $\text{קָלִיָּהּ לְבָרֶהּ הִתְמַדְדָּא}$. Moreover, the notion of ‘to measure people’ is odd; it is surely not measuring their height and weight. Their landed property must be being referred to. Our translator appears to be desperate.

In comparison with $\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, the word used here carries a feature of hostility and advantage, probably marked by the prefix $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ -. Likewise in $\kappa\alpha\iota \eta \gamma\eta \sigma\upsilon\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\chi\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\omega \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\eta\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ Am 7.17, as part of a long list of painful sufferings about to be inflicted; see for more references *GELS* s.v.

$\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\psi\alpha\iota$] The gen. article could be viewed as a remnant of the archaic gen. with ablative force, thus equivalent to $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{o}$, and such an analysis does fit the sense of the verb $\kappa\omega\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega$, with which this inf. is to be construed. Cp. $\omicron\upsilon\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omega\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu \tau\eta\varsigma \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\eta\varsigma$ ‘they were not forced to stop the construction work’ 1E 6.6 with $\kappa\omega\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\iota \lambda\alpha\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ ‘to prevent the people to sin’ Si 46.7. However, the parallelism as in $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omega\lambda\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\epsilon \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \mu\grave{\eta} \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ 1K 25.26 and $\eta \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\omega\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\sigma\acute{\alpha} \mu\epsilon \dots \mu\grave{\eta} \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ ib. 33 suggests that the $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ can be regarded as a mere marker of the inf., even when it is functioning as the subject of a nominal clause; it is like *to* in *To see is to believe*.¹¹

$\delta\iota\epsilon\mu\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$] = קָלִיָּהּ , though \mathfrak{H} can be understood as impersonally used 3s (Piel), though the passive form highlights the suffering borne by the victims. There is a v.l. $\delta\iota\epsilon\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, which must be a secondary change due to the preceding $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\mu\epsilon\tau\rho\eta\theta\eta$.

2.5) $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron \omicron\upsilon\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota \sigma\omicron\iota \beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu \sigma\chi\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\nu \kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omega \acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon.$

Therefore you shall have nobody casting a land-measure by lot among the Lord's congregation.

$\text{לְכֹן לֹא־יִהְיֶה לְךָ מְשַׁלְיָהּ תְּבַל בְּגוֹרֵל בְּקֶהֱל בְּיָהּ:$

$\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu \sigma\chi\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$] For every individual or family of the religious community there is supposed to be an appointed officer casting a land-measure and dividing the land.

2.6) $\mu\grave{\eta} \kappa\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\epsilon \delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu, \mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon} \delta\alpha\kappa\rho\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota} \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\cdot \omicron\upsilon \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \acute{\alpha}\pi\omega\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \acute{\omicron}\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\eta.$

Stop weeping with tears nor let them shed tears over these matters, for He will not remove humiliations.

$\text{אַל־תִּטְּפוּ יְטִיפוֹן לֹא־יִטְּפוּ לְאַלְהָהּ לֹא יִסַּג כְּלָמוֹת:$

¹¹ But cf. *SSG* § 30 c, § 69 f, p. 584, f.n. 3.

Somewhat similarly to vs. 4 with one and the same root repeated three times one after another, here we have one and the same verb, Hif. הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה (< $\sqrt{\text{השח}}$), repeated as often in three different forms.¹² The middle form, not negated unlike the other two, appears untranslated in Ⓞ . The prophet probably wanted to say: ‘they might do what they should not be doing.’

This Heb. verb occurs in BH in Qal and Hifil 9 times each. Leaving our three instances here it does not have anything to do with weeping, tears dropping. In QH it occurs in Hif. in the sense of ‘to teach, preach,’ a meaning which is generally thought to apply in our Mi 2.6 as well. In Qal it has a liquid such as rain water or honey dropping or dripping as the subject, but never tears ($\delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ here, dat. pl. of $\delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\upsilon\omicron\nu$). In Ⓞ here, then, we have a creative application of the primary sense of the verb on the part of its translator.

$\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$] = לֹא ? The translator apparently found it stylistically unacceptable to repeat the combination $\kappa\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\omega\ \delta\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$, hence a shift to $\delta\alpha\kappa\rho\acute{\upsilon}\omega$, which leads to the selection of $\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, not $\mu\acute{\eta}$.

$\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$] = לְעַל , part of the free translation going on here.

$\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$] = גַּחַן , Hif. $\sqrt{\text{גח}}$. The subject of the verb in Ⓞ and Ⓢ alike is vague. God or weeping? It might come down to the same: emotional response alone would not adequately deal with the situation. On the other hand, Ziegler puts a full stop at $\delta\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\eta$. But $\delta\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$ that is made to open vs. 7 is followed by a long address by God as communicated to the prophet, and there is no predicate to go with $\delta\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$. Without saying it in so many words, *SD* removes the full stop and makes $\delta\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$ the subject of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$.¹³ This might be a better resolution of the ambiguity.

2.7) $\delta\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$ וֵיכֹס יַעֲקֹב פָּאַרְוָרְגִיסַע פְּנֵעֻדְמַא כֻּרְיֹוּ \cdot $\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ $\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ - $\tau\eta\delta\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$; $\omicron\upsilon\chi$ $\omicron\iota$ $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\iota$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\iota$ $\mu\epsilon\tau'$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\omicron\rho\theta\omicron\iota$ $\text{π}\epsilon\pi\acute{\omicron}\rho\epsilon\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\iota$;

He who says, ‘The house of Jacob has angered the spirit of the Lord.’ Are these his deeds? Are not His words agreeable to him for him to walk upright?

$\text{הַאֲמֹר בֵּית יַעֲקֹב הִקְצַר רוּחַ יְהוָה אִם־אֵלֶּה מְעַלְלֵיו הֲלֹא דְבָרֵי יִטְיִבוּ עִם הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלִי הַזֶּה$
:הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלִי

$\delta\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$] = הַאֲמֹר .¹⁴ On analysing this phrase as to be construed with vs. 6, see above towards the end.

$\text{παρῶργισε}] = \text{הִקְצַר}$, cf. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ παροργίσαι $\mu\epsilon$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ πατέρας $\upsilon\mu\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\text{הִקְצַרְתָּ אֶת־אֲבֹתֶיכֶם}$ *Zc* 8.14.

¹² The verb also occurs at *Mi* 2.11, *Am* 7.16, 9.13.

¹³ But then, *pace SD* (II 2369), the speaker can hardly be the prophet.

¹⁴ *NETS*’s “One says,” is odd.

Ⓢ is difficult. We fail to see how *König* (III § 236b) could view it as meaning *dicendumne*.

κυρίου] When our translator read **הָאִמְרָה**, he may not have been sufficiently aware of a discourse complication that could ensue, for we might think **μου** more logical, but that would of course imply reading **רוּחִי** instead of **רוּחַ יְהוָה**, which is a far-reaching rewriting. The same complication is inherent in **οὐχ οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ εἰσι καλοὶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ**, where **αὐτοῦ** cannot be referring to same person, but the first is virtually equivalent to **μου**. A similar obscurity in direct discourse occurs in Abram’s instruction to his wife: **אָמַרְתִּי אֵלֶיךָ אַחְתִּי** Ge 12.13, where **אֵלֶיךָ** could be said to be more “logical,” what we find in **Θ** **Ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ εἰμι** and Pesh. **/hātēh nā/**.¹⁵

εἰ **אֵל**] We concur with Ziegler, who has added **<;>** after **ἐστὶν**. The use of **אֵל** 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 **אֵל** as well as **הֲ**. For the book of Mi, see 6.6, *7bis*, 11, and note esp. **ἐὰν φέρετε τὴν θυσίαν, εἰ προσδέξομαι αὐτὰ**¹⁶ **ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν**; ‘should you bring the sacrifice, shall I accept them from your hands?’ Ma 1.10, where **εἰ** introduces an apodosis of a conditional sentence introduced with **ἐὰν**.

οὐχ] This must be construed with **πεπόρευνται** as well.

οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ] = **דְּבָרָיו**, i.e. **דְּבָרָיָהוּ**.

εἰσι καλοὶ] The NH text has been correctly restored by Tov as **ἡγ]άθωναν**.

μετ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὀρθοὶ] = **עִמּוֹ וְיָשָׁר**? In any case the separation of the definite article in **Θ** from the participle is unusual for **יָשָׁר** **הַיָּשָׁר**. Wolff (40), relying on Hebraists such as Brockelmann and Gesenius - Kautzsch, suggests that the article is equivalent to **יָשָׁר** introducing an antecedentless relative clause. Such a relative clause, however, does not use a participle as its predicate verb.¹⁷

The NH text presents a revision in conformity with **Θ**: **μ[ετὰ τοῦ ὀρθῶ 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 **Θ** there reads differently than here.

πεπόρευνται ἡγ]άθωναν] Whilst the pl. form is intelligible in the context, the number shift comes over as unfounded.

¹⁵ On the question of *discours indirect*, see *SQH* § 42 d. Virtually identical is another Aramaic version: “Tell them about me that he is my brother (הוּא הוּא)” 1Q20 19.20.

¹⁶ The n.pl. acc. pronoun refers to several offerings mentioned earlier.

¹⁷ See examples in Brockelmann § 150a, GK § 138 i-k, and JM § 145 d-e.

In Qumran Hebrew we do find substantivised participles with or without the article. With the article, e.g. **הַשׁוֹגֵג** ‘one who errs inadvertently’ 1QS 9.1 and **הַיּוֹצֵא מִפִּיךָ** ‘that which issues forth out of your mouth’ 4Q51 II fr a-d.5, which is a variant reading of **דְּבָרָיָהוּ** 1Sm 1.23. For a discussion, see *SQH* § 17 j.

¹⁸ Tov, the editor, restores **ὀρθῶ**. However, the word is used adverbially (manner), to which the rule of grammatical concord does not apply. In an editorial note (p. 86) we read **ὀρθῶς**, perhaps a typo for **ὀρθῶς**. An example of adverbially used **ὀρθῶ** is **ὀρθῶ κρῖναι** ‘to judge correctly’ Pr 31.5, sim. **ὀρθῶ βλέπετωσαν** ‘Let them look straight’ ib. 4.25.

- 2.8) καὶ ἔμπροσθεν ὁ λαός μου εἰς ἔχθραν ἀντέστη· κατέναντι τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ τὴν δορὰν αὐτοῦ ἐξέδειραν τοῦ ἀφελέσθαι ἐλπίδα συντριμμὸν πολέμου.

Some time ago my people stood up as a hostile force. In spite of his peaceful stance they took his skin off to take away the hope of a ruining war.

וְאַתְמוֹל עָמִי לְאוֹיֵב יִקְוֶמָם מִמּוֹל שְׁלֵמָה אָדָּר תִּפְשׁוּן מִעֲבָרִים כְּחֹטֵי שׁוֹבֵי מְלָחָה:

Both 𐤄 and 𐤅 are full of challenges.

ἐμπροσθεν 𐤅] This is the sole instance of this equivalence. The usual rendering of 𐤅𐤍𐤅 or 𐤅𐤍𐤅 is ἐχθές. The translator must have had some reason for selecting ἔμπροσθεν, which would refer to a more distant past than yesterday.¹⁹

εἰς ἔχθραν] “In order to meet enemy attacks” must be meant.

ἀντέστη] = 𐤅𐤍, i.e. 𐤅𐤍, for 𐤅𐤍 is transitive.²⁰ This may have caused the translator to read a Qal form here. The pl. ἀντέστησαν of the NH text is a constructio ad sensum due to the sense of λαός.

τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ] = 𐤍𐤌𐤍.

τὴν δορὰν αὐτοῦ] περιβόλαιον ‘garment’ in the NH text (6.5).

ἐξέδειραν 𐤅𐤍𐤅] The abrupt shift in 𐤅 to 2mp is odd. The NH text reads ἐξεδύσ[ατε (6.5), or possibly ἐξεδύσ[αν, ‘you (or: they) took (someone’s) clothes off.’

ἐλπίδα συντριμμὸν πολέμου] ἐλπίδα is probably in a loose relation of apposition to συντριμμὸν πολέμου, i.e. people are hoping to bring about a ruin of their enemies through a war.

συντριμμὸν πολέμου] The NH text has been restored as ἐπι[στραφήσον]ται πόλεμο[ν as a rendering of the putative 𐤅𐤍𐤅 for 𐤅𐤍 in 𐤅. We would like to know what the reconstructed Gk text is supposed to mean.

- 2.9) διὰ τοῦτο ἡγούμενοι λαοῦ μου ἀπορριφήσονται ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν τρυφῆς αὐτῶν, διὰ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν ἐξώσθησαν· ἐγγίσατε ὄρεσιν 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.

נָשִׂי עָמִי תִגָּרְשׁוּן מִבֵּית תַּעֲנֻגָּיהָ מֵעַל עֲלֵיָהּ תִּקְחוּ הָרִי לְעוֹלָם:

¹⁹ The fact that ἐχθές has been preserved only by Symmachus does not give a licence, *pace* Wolff (40), to emend the beginning of the verse, for instance, to עָמִי עַל אֶתְּמָ, for 𐤄’s ἔμπροσθεν, Pesh.’s /’etmāl(y)/, and *ante unam dicem* (Jerome in his commentary) accord with 𐤅.

²⁰ Keil (444) holds that this Polel is “an intensified *kal*,” for which we would like to have certain examples. We fail to see how Wolff (38) could justify his translation, “aufgetreten.” Radaq also says just: “an intransitive verb.”

διὰ τοῦτο] > **ח**.

ἡγούμενοι] = נשיאי, i.e. נשיאי.

ἀπορριφήσονται] = יתגרשון.

τρυφῆς αὐτῶν, διὰ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν] = תענוגיהם על מעלליהם. This is certainly a fair bit of restitution. πονηρὰ is a free, sensible addition; it is unnecessary to restate על רע מעלליהם or something like that. SG proffers a good number of instances of the type <ὁ μέγας ἀνήρ> instead of <ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ μέγας> (SSG § 37 **bba**) the position of πονηρὰ does not necessarily support such a restitution.

ἐξώσθησα] In *Index* 45a we see that √נדה is the most frequent equivalent of this Gk verb: qal 1x, ni. 5x, hi. 13x, and we include our Mi instance there, thus = ידחו, i.e. ידחו. Note esp. τὴν ἐξωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι אקבצתה נדהתה Mi 4.6 and καὶ ἐξώσω αὐτὸν εἰς γῆν ἄνυδρον ציה אקבצתה אל-ארץ ידחתה JI 2.20. ἐγγίσατε] = תקרבו.

ὄρεσιν αἰωνίους] = הררי לעולם. In BH a noun in st. cst. may be subordinate to a prepositional phrase, e.g. למה למו Ps 58.5, משהפת לבני-קהת, 1C 6.55.²¹

2.10) ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι σοι αὕτη ἢ ἀνάπαυσις ἔνεκεν ἀκαθαρσίας. διεφθάρητε φθορᾷ,

Arise and go, for this rest is not for you because of uncleanness. You have been utterly ruined.

קומו וּלכו כי לא-זאת המנוחה בעבור טמאה תחבל וְחבל נמרץ:

ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου] On the use of the aorist and present imperative next to each other, see SSG § 28 **ha** (iii), p. 294, where “Get going!” is suggested for the latter in contrast to ἀνάστηθι, which is a one-off action.

αὕτη ἢ ἀνάπαυσις] This could mean, as in **ח**, ‘this is not ..’.²² The selection of the fem. pronoun would be due to the gender of ἀνάπαυσις; cf. SSG § 77 I.²³ Though not often, a bare demonstrative pronoun can be attributively used and precede, e.g. זֶה הַיָּם גָּדוֹל ‘this sea is vast’ Ps 104.25; cf. JM § 143 *i*. The position of οὐκ, not before αὕτη, is as in Οὐχὶ αὕτη ἢ ὁδὸς καὶ οὐχ αὕτη ἢ πόλις 4K 6.19L <זֶה הָעִיר וְלֹא זֶה הַדָּרָךְ וְלֹא זֶה הָעִיר>.

διεφθάρητε] = תתחבלו.

φθορᾷ] נמרץ ‘grievous’ is left untranslated; the translator may have thought that the notion of intensity is sufficiently expressed through the cognate dative.

²¹ For a discussion with more examples, see JM § 129 *m-n*.

²² So Trg.: לֹא דָא אַרְעָא בֵּית נִיחָא.

²³ Cf. *SD*: “nicht ist für dich dies die Ruhe.”

- 2.11) κατεδιώχθητε οὐδενὸς διώκοντος· πνεῦμα ἔστησε ψεῦδος, ἐστάλαξέ σοι εἰς οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα. καὶ ἔσται ἐκ τῆς σταγόνας τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου

You were persecuted, though none was chasing (you). A spirit brought about falsehood. It dripped to you as wine and drink, and it shall be out of the tiny number of this people

לִדְאִישׁ הַלֵּה רִוַח שְׂקָר כְּזַב אֶטֶם לְךָ לִיַּן לְשֹׁכֵר וְהִהָה מִטִּי הַעֵץ עַם הַזֶּה׃

κατεδιώχθητε] Nothing in 𐤇 corresponds to this.²⁴

οὐδενὸς] = לוֹא אִישׁ. So also in the Murabbaat text, XII 29. On οὐδενὸς, for which μηδενὸς could have been said, see SSG § 83 **bd**.

ἔστησε] Nothing in 𐤇 corresponds to this. For the meaning of the verb ἵστημι here, see *GELS* s.v. **II 5**.

ψεῦδος] One is not certain whether this is a rendering of שְׂקָר as in Zc 5.4, Ma 3.5 or כְּזָפ as in Ho 7.13.

ἐστάλαξέ] = הִטָּף or הִטָּה.

ἔσται] According to *SD* Iακωβ in vs. 12 is the subject of this verb, though it has a finite verb to go with it, συναχθήσεται. Even if we added a comma at the end of vs. 11, we would expect Iακωβ in this verse.

ἐκ τῆς σταγόνας] = הִטָּפ. For הִטָּפ / σταγών, see Jb 36.27. What is meant by 𐤇 is perhaps that the national restoration is going to be a very modest beginning.

- 2.12) συναγόμενος συναχθήσεται Iακωβ σὺν πᾶσιν· ἐκδεχόμενος ἐκδέξομαι τοὺς καταλοιπούς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ θήσομαι τὴν ἀποστροφὴν αὐτῶν· ὡς πρόβατα ἐν θλίψει, ὡς ποιμνιον ἐν μέσῳ κοίτης αὐτῶν ἐξαλοῦνται ἐξ ἀνθρώπων.

Jacob will be certainly gathered altogether. I shall certainly welcome the remainder of Israel, I shall effect their return together. Like sheep in distress, like a herd inside their pen they will jump out away from people.

הַסֵּף הָאֶסֶף יַעֲקֹב כְּקָב קַבֵּי אֶקְבֵּי שְׂאֲרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יַחַד שְׂמִינֵן כְּצֹאן בְּצָרָה
כְּעֶדְרָ בְּתוֹךְ הַדְּבָרוֹת הַיְמִינִה מְאָד׃

συναχθήσεται] = הִסָּף׃

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 𐤇 possibly read שְׂקָר in lieu of שְׂקָר. Cf. אֶרְיָנֵן Je 49.19 > ἐκδιώξω αὐτούς ib. 29.20 (𐤇).

הַרְבֵּה אֲרַבָּה עֲצָבוֹנָה.²⁵ The immediately following ἐκδεχόμενος represents the same feature.

τὴν ἀποστροφὴν] A free, contextually motivated addition? Since θήσομαι is a rendering of אֲשִׁימְנוּ, אֲשִׁיבְנוּ would not come into the picture.

ἐν θλίψει] = הַרְבֵּה, ≠ אֲרַבָּה ‘sheepfold.’ The translator probably saw here a parallelism of ב // תוך.

κοίτης αὐτῶν רִבְרָה] An unusual equivalence occurring nowhere else. רִבְרָה is thought to mean ‘pasture.’

ἐξαλοῦνται [תְּהִימְנָה] Another unusual equivalence. The Heb. verb is usually understood to have to do with vocal reaction, ‘to murmur, roar,’ not physical, bodily ‘to jump out.’

2.13) διὰ τῆς διακοπῆς πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν διέκοψαν καὶ διήλθον πύλην καὶ ἐξῆλθον δι’ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν, ὁ δὲ κύριος ἡγήσεται αὐτῶν.

Through the breach in front of them they broke through, and they went through a gate, and went outside through it, and their king went outside ahead of them, but the Lord will lead them.

עָלָה הַפָּרֶץ לְפָנֵיהֶם פָּרְצוּ וַיַּעֲבְרוּ שַׁעַר וַיֵּצְאוּ בּוֹ וַיַּעֲבֵר מֶלֶכָם לְפָנֵיהֶם וַיְהִי בְרִאשׁוֹם: פ

διὰ τῆς διακοπῆς] = עָלָה הַפָּרֶץ? But עָלָה can scarcely indicate a space through which one moves.

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν [וַיַּעֲבֵר] By selecting the verb which is nearer (ἐξῆλθον וַיַּעֲבֵר) Ⓞ stresses that, though the people were acting under the king’s leadership, their true leader was God.

²⁵ For a discussion of this feature in SG, see SSG § 31 **db**. That the feature is no Hebraism is evident in Ge 3.16, for הַרְבֵּה, irrespective of its vocalisation, cannot be a participle.

CHAPTER III

3.1) Καὶ ἐρεῖ Ἀκούσατε δὴ ταῦτα, αἱ ἀρχαὶ οἴκου Ἰακωβ καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι οἴκου Ἰσραηλ. οὐχ ὑμῖν ἔστι τοῦ γνῶναι τὸ κρίμα;

And He will say: "Do hear these things, o the rulers of the house of Jacob and the remnant of the house of Israel. Is it not up to you to know the judgement?"

ואמר שמעו-נא ראשי יעקב וקציני בית ישראל הלווא לכם לדעת את-המשפט:

Καὶ ἐρεῖ] = ויאמר.¹

κατάλοιποι קציני] A rather anomalous equivalence. Likewise in vs. 9. Cf. τοῖς καταλοίποις οἴκου Ἰουδα יהודי בית ישראל זר 2.7.

ὕμῖν ἔστι τοῦ γνῶναι [לכם לדעת] Ⓞ is a verbatim reproduction of Ⓢ, and both constructions indicate an obligation.² The gen. article τοῦ cannot be anything other than a mere infinitive marker, since the inf. here is the subject of what is basically an existential nominal clause. See above at 2.4.

γνῶναι] ‘To find out and act on’ rather than εἰδέναι ‘to be knowledgeable about, acquainted with.’

3.2) οἱ μισοῦντες τὰ καλὰ καὶ ζητοῦντες τὰ πονηρά, ἀρπάζοντες τὰ δέρματα αὐτῶν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτῶν.

o those who hate good things and seek evil things, tearing their skins off them and their flesh from their bones.

שנאי טוב ואהבי רעה [רע] גזלי עורם מעליהם ושארם מעל עצמותם:

οἱ μισοῦντες] This refers back to ὑμῖν in vs. 1, the virtual subject of τοῦ γνῶναι. The selection of the nom. form suggests that the combination of οἱ and three participles is not in apposition to ὑμῖν, but vocative.

ζητοῦντες [אהבי] In view of Μεμισήκαμεν τὰ πονηρὰ καὶ ἠγαπήκαμεν τὰ καλὰ אלהי-יצבאות יהוה יחנן אולי יחנן יהוה אלהי-יצבאות Am 5.15 the selection of ζητέω, and not ἀγαπάω, is puzzling.

αὐτῶν] Not ‘their own,’ but ‘of the ruled’ of vs. 1.

¹ For a summary of scholarly discussion on this variation, see McKane 95. Cf. Pesh. /w(‘)emar/ ‘and he said,’ most likely = ויאמר, i.e. ראמר or ויאמר.

² Cf. JM § 124 l and SSG § 30 bec. In Pesh. this obligative value of the syntagm is lexicalised by means of /wālē/ ‘appropriate.’

- 3.3) ὄν τρόπον κατέφαγον τὰς σάρκας τοῦ λαοῦ μου καὶ τὰ δέρματα αὐτῶν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐξέδειραν καὶ τὰ ὀστέα αὐτῶν συνέθλασαν καὶ ἐμέλισαν ὡς σάρκας εἰς λέβητα καὶ ὡς κρέα εἰς χύτραν,

Just as they devoured the flesh of My people and removed their skin from them and crushed all their bones and cut (them) in pieces as meat to go into a cauldron and as pieces of meat into a pot,

וְאִשֶּׁר אָכְלוּ שְׂאֵר עַמִּי וְעוֹרָם מִצְלִיָּהֶם הִפְשִׁיטוּ וְאֶת־עַצְמוֹתֵיהֶם פָּצְחוּ וּפְרָשׁוּ
כְּאִשֶּׁר בְּסִיר וּכְכֶשֶׂר בְּתוֹךְ קִלְחָת:

ὄν τρόπον] = פָּאָשָׁר.

ἀπ' αὐτῶν [מִצְלִיָּהֶם] ἐπάνωθεν αὐτῶν could have been said to indicate not removal from somewhere, but that A was attached to B. Cf. Ἐξαγάγετε πάντα ἄνδρα ἐπάνωθέν μου (מִצְעָלִי)· καὶ ἐξήγαγον πάντα ἄνδρα ἀπὸ ἐπάνωθεν αὐτοῦ (מִצְעָלִי) 2K 13.9.³

ὡς σάρκας] = כְּשֵׂאֵר.

- 3.4) οὕτως κεκράζονται πρὸς κύριον, καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούσεται αὐτῶν· καὶ ἀποστρέψει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκεῖνο, ἀνθ' ὧν ἐπονηρέυσαντο ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν ἐπ' αὐτοῦς.

so they will shout to the Lord, but He will not listen to them; He will turn His face away from them at that time, because they acted wickedly with their deeds upon them."

אִזּ יִזְעַקוּ אֱלֹהֵיהֶן וְלֹא יִשְׁמָע אוֹתָם וַיִּסְתֵּר פְּנָיו מֵהֶם בְּעֵת הַהִיא כְּאִשֶּׁר הִרְעוּ
מִצְעָלֵיהֶם: פ

οὕτως] Together with ὄν τρόπον at the beginning of vs. 4 there is formed a long clause of comparison.

ἀποστρέψει [וַיִּסְתֵּר] ⚭ most likely read here וַיִּסְתֵּר, as Driver (1892 § 174) proposed. However that might be, the three Impf. forms in this verse may be preterite. Such a use is attested in BH in conjunction with אַז as here,⁴ a particle not represented in ⚭. In the preceding, coordinate verse all the four verbs are *qatal*. The consistent use of the Fut. in ⚭ in this verse makes sense in its own way.

The equivalence ἀποστρέφω / וַיִּסְתֵּר is also attested elsewhere, e.g. ἀποστρέψω τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ' αὐτῶν פְּנֵי אֶסְתִּיר De 31.18 in a context similar to our passage; see also De 31.17, 32.20. There is hence no absolute need to postulate וַיִּסְר or וַיִּסְר, hi. from √סור.⁵

³ L, however, uses ἀπό both times.

⁴ See JM § 113 *i*. The only sure case in BH of <אַז + short *yiqtol*> with preterite value is יִקְהַל אַזּ ἐξεκκλησίασε 1Kg 8.1.

⁵ Correct *Index* 16a accordingly.

ἐπονηρεύσαντο [הִרְעוּ] The Heb. verb here is usually thought to be transitive, which, however, is not attested anywhere with this fairly frequent Hif. verb with a deed as object.⁶ Our translator's analysis of it as intransitive is underlined with the addition of ἐν, when he could have said τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα (nom.). Moreover, רָעָה never takes a deed as its grammatical subject.⁷

ἐπ' αὐτούς] A free addition with the pronoun referring to victims. Wolff (61) thinks of an infelicitous haplography, i.e. מַעֲלֵי־הֵם < מַעֲלֵי־הֵם & מַעֲלֵי־הֵם.

3.5) τάδε λέγει κύριος ἐπὶ τοὺς προφῆτας τοὺς πλανῶντας τὸν λαόν μου, τοὺς δάκνοντας ἐν τοῖς ὁδοῦσιν αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσοντας ἐπ' αὐτὸν εἰρήνην, καὶ οὐκ ἐδόθη εἰς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν, ἥγειραν ἐπ' αὐτὸν πόλεμον·

These things the Lord says: "Against the prophets who lead my people astray, bite with their teeth, and preach peace at them." Yet (nothing) has been laid into their mouth, they have set a war in motion against them.

כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה עַל-הַנְּבִיאִים הַמְתַּעִים אֶת-עַמִּי הַנִּשְׁכָּחִים בְּשִׁנְיָהֶם וְקָרְאוּ שְׁלוֹם וְאָשַׁר לֹא-יִתֵּן עַל-פִּיהֶם וְקָדְשׁוֹ עָלָיו מִלְחָמָה:

ἐπὶ [עַל] This Gk preposition, unlike עַל and irrespective of which case it governs, does not express a topic of verbal communication. Governing a nominal in acc. it "indicates one to whom or that to which action, attention, thought, emotion, utterance etc. are directed" (GELS s.v. ἐπί III 4).

τὸν λαόν μου [עַמִּי] In neither language the pronoun is unlikely a reference to Micah.⁸ Hence this simple expression hardly means 'my coreligionists.' But God as its referent also sounds odd. The discourse mechanism in use here does not appear to us logical.⁹ A similar problem meets us in vs. 6. Supposing that God is speaking, how would we account for the shift from ὑμῖν to τοὺς προφῆτας .. αὐτούς? Who is God speaking to? Is τάδε λέγει κύριος equivalent to τάδε λέγω? In the parable of talents the master, on his return home, says to two of his servants: εὖ, δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἦς πιστός,

⁶ Clines (VII 531a) mentions one QH example: הֵרַב הָהָרַע מַעֲשָׂיו 'he [= Esau] did many evil deeds' 4Q223-224 2ii5 [= Jub 35.13]. We would parse הָרַע as an inf. cst. complementing the preceding הִרְבָּה, not הִרְבָּה, an analysis exactly reflected in its Ethiopic translation, /'abzeḥa 'a'keyo megbārihu/. Qimron (2020.236) appears to find the absence of ל from the inf. anomalous, but in QH we find such a feature not infrequently, see, e.g., בְּרֵאשִׁית צֵאת וּבֹא לִשְׁבֹת וְקוּם, 'at the beginning when one leaves or enters, sit or stand' 1QS 10.13, where the two syntagms occur next to each other; see further in SQH § 18 i. In Aquila's ἐκάκωσαν ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν the verb is probably transitive. In SG it is always <+ acc. rei>, but in CG <+ acc. pers.> is securely attested. Then this use of הָרַע is not un-Hebraic.

⁷ Cf. Vulg. *nequiter egerunt in adinventionibus suis* = 6, but Pesh. /'av'eš(w) 'vādayhōn/ and Trg. אַבְאִישׁוֹ עוֹבְדֵיהוֹן = 7.

⁸ Thus *pace* Wolff 61.

⁹ Cf. McKane 103f.

ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω· εἴσελθε εἰς τὴν χαρὰν τοῦ κυρίου σου (Mt 25.21, 23), where he could have said μου instead of τοῦ κυρίου σου.¹⁰ Alternatively we can print Ἐπὶ and make a direct speech, God's oracle, start there, as shown in our translation above and regard the segment Ἐπὶ τοῦ .. εἰρήνην as the title of the oracle.

δάκνοντας דַּאֲכֻנְתַּא] Not a threatening figure as in δάκη αὐτὸν (דַּאֲכֻנְתַּא) ὁ ὄφις 'the snake bites him' Am 5.19, but "as long as they are provided enough to eat."

κηρύσσοντας קְרִיבְתַּא] König (III 517 *m-n*) analyses the Heb. verb as invariable, but 𐤄 is right in seeing it as parallel to the preceding two participles, though out of respect to 𐤄 (?), the translator refrains from adding the article, τοὺς. Analogously he saw a non-invariable form in the following קְרִיבְתַּא, though his analysis is partly conditioned by his ἐδόθη. He appears to have found the sequence of tense forms here confusing and attempted a fair bit of syntactic restructuring.

ἐδόθη יָתַן] There is no absolute need to assume that 𐤄 represents יָתַן. A passive, 3sg verb is sometimes used impersonally, e.g. προσετάγη τῷ κήτει 'a command was issued to the giant fish' Jn 2.11 (𐤄 יָתַן לְהַגְיָהּ).¹¹ However, יָתַן here is not impersonal. קְרִיבְתַּא ought to have been analysed as an antecedentless relative pronoun, 'one who ...',¹² and the relative clause is extraposed and joined with the main clause with an apodotic *waw* and the inherent antecedent is resumed in עָלָיו, whereas in 𐤄 αὐτὸν can be understood only as referring back to τὸν λαόν μου earlier in the verse, hence our *against them*, not *him*. Alternatively, 𐤄 represents נָתַן = נָתַן.

ἤγειραν ἠκηρύξαν] A rare equivalence attested nowhere else. The Heb. word must mean 'they declared the war holy (sanctioned by God).'¹³ The collocation ἐγείρω πόλεμον is also met with in 1E 1.23.

3.6) διὰ τοῦτο νύξ ὑμῖν ἔσται ἐξ ὀράσεως, καὶ σκοτία ὑμῖν ἔσται ἐκ μαντείας, καὶ δύσεται ὁ ἥλιος ἐπὶ τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ συσκοτάσει ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ἡμέρα·

Therefore it shall be night for you without vision, and it shall be darkness for you without divination, and the sun shall set against the prophets, and the day shall become totally dark against them.

לְכֹן לְיִלְהָ לְכֶם מְחִוּוֹן וְהַשְׁכָּה לְכֶם מְקֻסֵּם וּבְאֶה הַשְׁמַשׁ עַל־הַנְּבִיאִים וְקָדַר עַל־יָהּ הַיּוֹם:

¹⁰ In Japanese there is nothing unusual at all about a father saying to a son of his: /otōsan wa iku/ 'the father goes,' when what is actually meant is 'I go.'

¹¹ Cf. *SSG* § 87 a.

¹² So Pesh. /man d-lā ../.

¹³ On the declarative-estimative value of Piel, see *JM* § 52 d.

ἐξ] The preposition, just like its Heb. equivalent here, indicates absence, lack, or deprivation. Another example is ἡ γῆ ἀφανισθήσεται .. ἐκ διοδεύοντος καὶ ἐξ ἀναστρέφοντος (מַעְבֵּר וּמְשַׁבֵּר) ‘the land will be annihilated .. with none journeying through it and returning (thereafter)’ Zc 7.14.¹⁴

σκοτία הַשָּׁמַיִם] NH (6.41) is said to read σκοτασθ[ήσεται. It probably reflects הַשָּׁמַיִם read as a verb as in **Ⲑ**. But what is its subject, which must be fem. sg.? Σκοτάζω, just as συσκοτάζω later in the verse, is an intransitive verb, ‘to grow dark,’ unlike σκοτιζώ ‘to make dark.’ The latter, however, can be used in a pseudo-passive voice: ἕως οὗ μὴ σκοτισθῆ ὁ ἥλιος καὶ τὸ φῶς καὶ ἡ σελήνη .. ‘before the sun and the light and the moon .. become dark’¹⁵ Ec 12.2, which suggests a possible scribal error in NH for σκοτισθήσεται. On the other hand, **Ⲑ**, apparently reading הַשָּׁמַיִם, reproduces a perfect poetic parallelism in **Ⲑ**:¹⁶

A = noun		B	C (מ)		a = noun		B	c (מ)
νὺξ	ἔσται	ὕμῖν	ἐξ ὀράσεως	καὶ	σκοτία	ἔσται	ὕμῖν	ἐκ μαντείας
הַלַּיְלָה		לְכֶם	מִחִוּוֹן	וְ	הַשָּׁמַיִם		לְכֶם	מִמְקָם

Darkness is the central theme of this verse, looked at out of four perspectives and expressed in four short clauses, one nominal and three verbal. Each clause has a prepositional phrase, each joined to a personal referent, one and the same group of individuals, namely the doomed prophets. Given this impeccable parallelistic structure of the verse it makes sense to understand the two prepositions, ל- and על, as synonymous. We submit that they both carry a negative connotation. In ὑμῖν (twice < לְכֶם) we could recognise a dativus incommodi. In order to see visions and engage in divination prophets need light, without which they find themselves in a disadvantaged, unenviable situation, “a black-out” (McKane 106).

The combination of Qal בא with הַשָּׁמַיִם as its subject to express the notion of sunset occurs 19¹⁷ times in BH, mostly with no preposition following, e.g. שָׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם בָּא עַד-בָּא Ex 17.12. In one case ל- is used: וְתָבֹא לָהֶם הַשָּׁמַיִם אֶצְלֵ הַגְּבֻעָה Jd 19.14, where we have an equivalent of dativus commodi, for the travellers had reached one of the two locations of their choice for a night’s stay. In another instance we find על: שָׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם עָלָיו לֹא-תָבֹא עָלָיו De 24.15.¹⁸ Another value

¹⁴ Hardly “instead of” (Brenton) and “statt” (SD). Cf. GELS s.v. ἐκ **11** and BDB s.v. מן **7 ba-b**. Ibn-Ezra and Radaq take מן in the sense of ‘as a consequence of, originating in.’

¹⁵ Pace “are darkened” (NETS); the intransitive value of the form is supported by the parallel ἐπιστρέψουσιν τὰ νέφη ‘the clouds return.’

¹⁶ There is no absolute need to impose “our” grammatical concept of *substantive* and read מִמְקָם in lieu of the inf. cst. in **Ⲑ**.

¹⁷ In BDB s.v. בוא Qal **1 i** “18³⁴” should read “2Ch 18³⁴.”

¹⁸ This instance is, along with the two cases in our Mi passage, mentioned in BDB s.v. על **II 5**, as expressing “the idea of being suspended or extended, *over* anything, without however being in contact with it, *above, over*.” However, the notion of the sun setting over or above

Those who see visions will be put to shame, and the diviners will be laughed at, and they will all speak against them, because there will be none who will listen to them.

וּבְשׁוּ הַחֲזוֹנִים וְהַקְּסָמִים וְעָטוּ עַל־שִׁפְמָם כָּלֵם כִּי אֵין מַעֲנֶה אֱלֹהִים:

The third clause is rather puzzling. αὐτῶν most likely refers back to the visionaries and diviners, who, however, are unlikely to be identical with αὐτοί. The verb καταλάλησουσιν is most likely impersonal, but such a subject cannot be explicitly marked with αὐτοί. The use of πάντες with a 3pl verb impersonally used does not sound right. Nor can we identify in 𐤄 anything remotely equivalent to הטָּעַ, a fairly common verb meaning ‘to envelop or wrap oneself,’ and to שִׁפְמָ ‘moustache.’ 𐤄 is no less puzzling. What is the gesture supposed to mean?²³

The last clause in 𐤄 is straightforward: ‘there is no response from God.’ αὐτῶν] = אֱלֹהִים. Whilst the equivalence מַעֲנֶה / εἰσακούω does not occur elsewhere, מַעֲנֶה Qal is often rendered with εἰσακούω, e.g. εἰσάκουσόν μου, κύριε יְהוָה עֲנֵנִי יְהוָה Ps 68(69).17. Where εἰσακούω comes from is a mystery, whilst the intent of the clause as a whole is clear: ‘nobody is going to have ears for whatever they say.’ In one case they will be ignored by God, in the other by the general public.

The definite article prefixed to εἰσακούων does not have a determining value, but fulfils a useful function of averting syntactic ambiguity, for without it ἔσται εἰσακούων could be misunderstood as a periphrastic construction; see further in *SSG* § 1 c (pp. 7f.).

3.8) ἐὰν μὴ ἐγὼ ἐμπλήσω ἰσχὺν ἐν πνεύματι κυρίου καὶ κρίματος καὶ δυναστείας τοῦ ἀπαγγεῖλαι τῷ Ἰακωβ ἄσεβείας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ.

I shall certainly be fully empowered through the spirit of the Lord and judgement and strength to point out to Jacob his deeds of impiety and to Israel his sins.

וְאֹלָם אֲנֹכִי מְלֹאֲתִי כַח אֶת־רוּחַ יְהוָה וּמִשְׁפָּט וּגְבוּרָה לְהַגִּיד לְיַעֲקֹב פְּשָׁעוֹ
וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל חַטָּאתוֹ: ס

ἐὰν μὴ] = אִם לֹא, a typically Hebraic expression of confident assertion, which has been mechanically reproduced in 𐤄, cf. *GELS* s.v. ἐὰν III b, c.²⁴

²³ Pesh. /sefwāthōn/ suggests ‘they will cover their lips, not daring to speak any more,’ but מִשְׁפָּתִיהֶם is a shade too removed from שִׁפְמָ. Likewise Sym. ἐπὶ τῶν χειλέων αὐτῶν. According to Trg. with כְּאֲבִלִין, it is a gesture of mourners.

²⁴ In *GELS* s.v. εἰ 7 εἰ μὴ, a new subsection *b needs be added: “particle of asseveration, ‘assuredly’: εἰ μὴ (H 20.23 אִם-לֹא) κραταιώσομεν ‘we shall surely overpower’ 3K 21.23.”

Rejecting Brenton's "surely" and this analysis of ours, *SD* (II 2372) maintains that here the speaker is God, not the prophet, and translates "*Deshalb wird niemand auf sie hören, es sei denn, ich erfülle (sie) mit Stärke im Geiste des Herrn.*" One weakness of this analysis is its need to supply "sie." Verbs meaning "to fill A with B" only rarely use B in the accusative, and then only when both A and B are in the accusative, e.g. ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα θεῶν σοφίας 'I filled him with a divine spirit of wisdom' Ex 31.3. Otherwise B appears in the genitive or through its equivalent prepositional phrases, ἀπό τινος or ἐν τινι.²⁵ The same can be said of מָלֵא Qal when used in the sense of 'to fill' and מָלֵא Piel.²⁶

ἐν πνεύματι אָתֶרֶת רִיחַ] Here אָתֶרֶת could be taken as the object marker. Then רִיחַ אָתֶרֶת would be in apposition to כִּי.²⁷ By contrast, אָתֶרֶת represents אָתֶרֶת as a preposition. In spite of its rendition with ἐν it cannot, unlike Engl. *with*, indicate an instrument, for which Hebrew uses כִּי. It retains its basic sense of "together with," synonymous with עִם. BDB, s.v. II. אָתֶרֶת, 1 a mentions Mi 3.8 along with Ge 4.1 with a gloss "*with the help of.*"²⁸

Many delete אָתֶרֶת רִיחַ אָתֶרֶת as secondary, e.g. Wolff (61): "nachgetragener Kommentar." It does damage the tripartite parallelism here, but Pesh., Trg., Vulg., and Murabbaat text are also all in agreement with אָתֶרֶת.

κρίματος καὶ δυναστείας] To make מְשֻׁפָּט וְגִבּוֹרָה dependent on רִיחַ sounds rather odd.

ἰσχὺν .. δυναστείας וְגִבּוֹרָה .. כֹּחַ] It is not immediately apparent whether or not the two terms in both אָתֶרֶת and אָתֶרֶת are to be understood as complete synonyms. In two instances we find the two closely joined as וְגִבּוֹרָה .. כֹּחַ 1C 29.12 (ἰσχὺς καὶ δυναστεία) and 2C 20.6 (ἰσχὺς δυναστείας). In both of these cases the two nouns denote qualities possessed by God, but not moral or spiritual strength, as is manifest in the latter case in view of καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς σὲ ἀντιστῆναι (לְהִתְיַצֵּב). What Micah need be equipped with is not physical, let alone military force, but moral strength in order to confront and stand up to a group of influential but misguided fellow prophets.

²⁵ More examples and details are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. ἐμπίπλημι 2. See also under synonymous verbs such as πίμπλημι 1, and πληρώω 1. The sole possible exception in SG is ὁ πίμπλησθαι ὡς Φισῶν σοφίαν Si 24.25, where the subject of the ptc. can only be the Mosaic law (νόμος תורה vs. 23), not God, in view of the fem. המלאה, i.e. המלאה. Then πίμπλημι here may be pseudo-intransitive as ἐμπίπλημι in our Mi passage. <+ dat. rei> as in χαρᾷ πεπληρωμένος 'filled with joy' Je 13.13 is equivalent to ἐν χαρᾷ. More similar instances are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. πληρώω 1.

²⁶ See BDB s.v. מָלֵא Qal 2 and Piel.

²⁷ Pace Wolff (61) the absence of the conjunction *waw* would not then be anomalous.

²⁸ On אָתֶרֶת רִיחַ אָתֶרֶת אִישׁ קְנִייתִי אִישׁ Ge 4.1 Rashi has an enlightening observation: "עִם יי: when He created me and my husband, He created us alone, but here we are collaborating with Him." So "in close association with the Lord's spirit."

in *GELS* s.v. μετά **I 10**: Δωρεάν ἐπράθητε καὶ οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε ‘For no payment you were sold and you will be redeemed not in return for any silver’ < וְלֹא בְכֶסֶף תִּגְאָלוּ. This kind of “ב” is rendered in a number of ways, but not with μετά τινος except in the two cases just mentioned. E.g. μεμίσθωμαί γάρ σε ἀντί τῶν μανδραγορῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ μου ‘I have hired you in return for my son’s mandrakes’ Ge 30.16; ἐκτήσατο Δαυὶδ τὸν ἄλωνα .. ἐν ἀργυρίῳ σίκλων πενήτηκοντα ‘David bought the threshing floor .. for 50 shekels of silver’ 2K 24.24; δατίε – πρωτότοκον ὑποζυγίου λυτρώση προβάτω ‘you shall redeem the firstborn of a draft animal with a sheep’ Ex 34.20.

ἀπεκρίνοντο [יִוִּי] A striking equivalence not attested elsewhere, although the notions expressed by the two words are not so widely apart from each other.

ἐπανεπαύοντο [יִשְׁעֵי] The bracketed “unconcerned” is a negative nuance emerging from the context. In ἐπανεπαύσατο τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπ’ αὐτοῦς ‘the spirit rested on them’ Nu 11.25 no such nuance is evident.

3.12) διὰ τοῦτο δι’ ὑμᾶς Σιών ὡς ἀγρὸς ἀροτριάθησεται, καὶ Ἰερουσαλημ ὡς ὄπωροφυλάκιον ἔσται καὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦ οἴκου ὡς ἄλσος δρυμοῦ.

Therefore, because of you, Zion shall be ploughed like a field, and Jerusalem shall be like an orchard-guard’s shed and the mountain of the house like a grove of a thicket.

לְכֹן בְּגִלְלַכֶּם צִיּוֹן שְׂדֵה תִּהְיֶה וִירוּשָׁלַם עֵיין תִּהְיֶה הָהָר הַבְּיָת לְבָמֹת יִצְרָאֵל

A thought very similar to what we have here is expressed in Σιών ὡς ἀγρὸς ἀροτριάθησεται, καὶ Ἰερουσαλημ εἰς ἄβατον ἔσται καὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦ οἴκου εἰς ἄλσος δρυμοῦ Je 33.18 < צִיּוֹן שְׂדֵה תִּהְיֶה וִירוּשָׁלַם עֵיין תִּהְיֶה הָהָר הַבְּיָת לְבָמֹת יִצְרָאֵל 26.18. The LXX rendition is remarkably similar between the two passages. The mutual influence is likely. The phrase הָהָר הַבְּיָת ‘the temple mount’ occurs in these two passages only. The equivalence ἄλσος / ἄβατ does not occur elsewhere.

ὡς ἀγρὸς [שְׂדֵה] The addition of ὡς to the subject predicate is sensible. The particle is used twice more, making the whole statement metaphorical.

ὄπωροφυλάκιον] Earlier Samaria was threatened with *I shall turn Samaria into an orchard-guard’s shed in a field* Mi 1.6. For more details see there.

ὡς ἄλσος [לְבָמֹת] 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 𐤃’s “-”; the same preposition is also added to ἄβατον against 𐤃.

CHAPTER IV

4.1) Καὶ ἔσται ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου, ἔτοιμον ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὄρέων, καὶ μετεωρισθήσεται ὑπεράνω τῶν βουνῶν· καὶ σπεύσουσιν πρὸς αὐτὸ λαοί,

And at the end of the days the mountain of the Lord will be visible, ready on the summits of the mountains, and will be raised high above the hills, and peoples will hasten towards it,

וְהָיָה בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים יְהִי־הָרַב־בְּיַת־יְהוָה נֶכֶן בְּרֹאשׁ הַהָרִים וְנִשָּׂא הוּא מִגְּבֻעוֹת וְנָהָרוּ עָלָיו עַמִּים:

Almost an identical Hebrew text appears in Is 2.2:

וְהָיָה בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים נֶכֶן יְהִי־הָרַב־בְּיַת־יְהוָה בְּרֹאשׁ הַהָרִים וְנִשָּׂא מִגְּבֻעוֹת וְנָהָרוּ אֵלָיו כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם:

Its Gk version reads:

Ἵτι ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπ' ἄκρων τῶν ὄρέων καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ὑπεράνω τῶν βουνῶν· καὶ ἤξουσιν ἐπ' αὐτὸ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη

ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν] The same equivalence is found at Ho 3.5; cf. our remarks there. This rendition is closer to **Ⲙ** than that in Is 2.2.

ἐμφανὲς] This addition, so also in Is 2.2, makes sense, since the Temple Mount would be there anyway till its destruction. What is meant by the addition is that the house will be there ready to fulfil a particular function at the end of the days, a site destined to attract the whole of humanity.¹

The position of this adjective within the clause points its independence of **Ⲙ**. Its position in Is 2.2 scarcely suggests that it is a rendering of נֶכֶן; the meaning of the latter and that of ἐμφανής are irreconcilable with each other.²

¹ Our translator was surely familiar with this typically Hebrew syntagm <וְהָיָה> - temporal expression - *yiqtol*> which introduces an event that is to take place at a specified time in the future. E.g. וְהָיָה בַיּוֹם־הַהוּא נִאֲמַרְיָהוּהָ תִקְרָא׃ Ho 2.18 [καὶ ἔσται ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, λέγει κύριος, καλέσει με 2.16], see also 2.33(31). He, however, decided to assign the initial וְהָיָה (> καὶ ἔσται) its plain meaning. Wolff (83) suggests that the translator probably did not wish to repeat ἔσται and substituted ἐφανές for וְהָיָה, but the addition merely for such a purpose would represent too radical a departure from **Ⲙ**.

² Pace McKane (122) ἔτοιμος as a rendering of נֶכֶן is perfectly accurate, attested a total of 16 times in SG, including וְהָיָה נֶכֶן > ὄρθρον ἔτοιμον Ho 6.3. This would seriously affect his text-critical argument comparing Mi and Is.

וְהָלְכוּ עִמָּי רַבִּים וְאָמְרוּ לָכֹּוּ וְנִצְּלָה אֶל־הַר־יְהוָה אֶל־בַּיִת אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב וְיָרְנוּ מִדְּרָכָיו
וְנִלְכָה בְּאֶרְצוֹתָיו כִּי מִצִּיּוֹן תֵּצֵא תוֹרָה וּדְבַר־יְהוָה מִירוּשָׁלַם

Δεῦτε ἀναβῶμεν [לְכוּ וְנִצְּלָה] Δεῦτε followed asyndetically and immediately by a 1st pl. hortatory subj.(aor.) is a discourse marker used to propose a joint action.⁵ So also δεῦτε βάλωμεν κλήρους ‘now let us cast lots’ Jn 1.7.⁶ Occasionally, however, we come across the use of καί, e.g. δεῦτε καὶ διελεγχθῶμεν ἠνεγκῆ καὶ ἠνεγκῆ Is 1.18. That this syndetic construction is not necessarily influenced by \mathfrak{H} is evident in Δεῦτε λογισώμεθα .. δεῦτε καὶ πατάξωμεν αὐτὸν ἠνεγκῆ .. לָכֹּוּ וְנִכְהוּ .. לָכֹּוּ וְנִשְׁבַּחָהּ Je 18.18, see also δεῦτε καὶ καταβάντες συγχέωμεν ἐκεῖ ἡבָה גִּרְדָה וְנִבְּלָה שָׁם Gn 11.7.

ἐκ Σιῶν .. [מִצִּיּוֹן] From here to the end of vs. 3 there echoes in thought Is 2.3f. almost completely in both \mathfrak{E} and \mathfrak{H} , though the wording varies somewhat between the two texts, as we are going to see in vs. 3.

δείξουσιν ἡμῖν] = יוֹרְנוּ, cf. יוֹרְנוּ Is 2.3 1QIsa^a. Following on a volitive ἠνεγκῆ and followed by another, ἠנְלָכָה, it is more natural to take this also as such, though there is no formal, morphological distinction possible between the indicative and volitive.⁷ Hence the translator could have said δειξάτωσαν ἡμῖν, an aorist impv. Similarly, the following πορευσόμεθα could have been πορευσώμεθα.

τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ [מִדְּרָכָיו] The Heb. preposition here can indicate either a source, ‘from, out of,’ or partitive ‘one of His ways.’ Our translator’s selection of δείκνυμι to render הוֹרָה with appears to have led him to choose the sg. acc., cf. δηλώσεις αὐτοῖς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀγαθὴν πορεύεσθαι ἐν αὐτῇ 3K 8.36 (< תוֹרֵם אֶת־הַדְּרָךְ הַטּוֹבָה אֲשֶׁר יִלְכוּ־בָהּ >) and ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου διδάξῃς αὐτὸν תְּלַמְּדֵנוּ מִתּוֹרָתְךָ תְּלַמְּדֵנוּ Ps 93(94).12. The deletion of the preposition has facilitated to the shift to the sg., τὴν ὁδὸν, in lieu of the pl., τὰς ὁδοὺς. This contrasts with the complete equivalence between ἐν ταῖς τρίβοις αὐτοῦ and בְּאֶרְצוֹתָיו. The translator of Is, by contrast, apparently thought it more logical that the way shown to be right was that along which one was to walk, hence ἐν αὐτῇ.

4.3) καὶ κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον λαῶν πολλῶν καὶ ἐλέγξει ἔθνη ἰσχυρὰ ἕως εἰς μακρὰν, καὶ κατακόψουσι τὰς ῥομφαίας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα καὶ τὰ δόρατα αὐτῶν εἰς δρέπανα, καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ ἀντάρη ἔθνος ἐπ’ ἔθνος ῥομφαίαν, καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ μάθωσι πολεμεῖν.

⁵ Only twice in SG δεῦτε is used as a plain verb: γυναῖκες ..., δεῦτε ‘O women ..., come here’ and ἐξέλθε καὶ δεῦτε ‘Get out and come’ Da 3.93 TH, which latter is to be moved in GELS s.v. from the end of I. The sg. δεῦρο is more frequently used as a plain impv.; for details see GELS s.v. II.

⁶ More examples are mentioned in GELS s.v. I. a.

⁷ In the sg. it is possible: indicative יוֹרְנוּ vs. volitive יוֹרְנוּ. Cf. JM § 61 f.

And He will judge between many peoples and rebuke powerful nations even if (found) far away and smash their swords into ploughs and their spears into sickles, and nations will not lift a sword against one another any more, and they will not learn to wage a war any more.

ושפט בין עמים רבים והוכיח לגוים עצמים עד־רחוק וכתתו הרבתיהם לאתים
ולא־ישאו גוי אל־גוי הרב ולא־ילמדו עוד מלחמה:

The affinity with Is continues (Is 2.4):

καὶ κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἔθνῶν καὶ ἐλέγξει λαὸν πολύν, καὶ συγκόψουσι τὰς μαχαίρας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα καὶ τὰς ζιβύνας αὐτῶν εἰς δρέπανα, καὶ οὐ λήμψεται ἔτι ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος μάχαιραν, καὶ οὐ μὴ μάθωσιν ἔτι πολεμεῖν

ושפט בין הגוים והוכיח לעמים רבים וכתתו הרבותם לאתים והניתויהם למלחמה
ולא־ישאו גוי אל־גוי הרב ולא־ילמדו עוד מלחמה

[ἐλέγξει] So Ziegler and = Is 2.4; the majority reading is ἐξελέγξει.

ἔως εἰς μακράν] exactly as in Si 24.32.⁸ The compound preposition may represent $\text{לְ} \text{עַד}$ in the *Vorlage* of C , but such does not occur in H of XII. In NH 7.32 ἔως μα]κράν [= H] has been restored.

ἔθνη ἰσχυρά] In this Mi version the anti-armament message comes over more clearly than λαὸν πολύν in Is 2.4. Analogously Mi's κατακόψουσι for כתתו sounds more powerful and destructive than Is's συγκόψουσι.

τὰς ῥομφαίας αὐτῶν הַרְבֵּיתֵיהֶם] The translator of XII prefers ῥομφαία as a rendering of רַבֵּי , using μάχαιρα only once (Zc 1.17), which is a most preferred choice with the translator of Is, who uses ῥομφαία only once (Is 66.16). In Ez we find only μάχαιρα. Since the two Greek nouns show no difference in meaning,⁹ we have here an example of personal preference among different translators.

NH showing its affinity with Is at a number of places: μαχαίρας, συνκόψουσι, τὰς σιβύνας, μ[άχαιραν].¹⁰

Here again the orthography in NH is somewhat unorthodox, e.g. συνκόψουσι, ἀνθάρη, ἐφ' in lieu of ἐπ, σιβύ[νας in lieu of ζιβύνας.¹¹

⁸ Segal (146) translates the LXX reading into עַד לְמַרְחֹק , without mentioning Mi 4.3 C . Barthélemy (1992.744) prefers the rendering in *Traduction œcuménique de la Bible* (1976), "même au loin."

⁹ LEH s.v. μάχαιρα: "alternating with ῥομφαία as stereotypical rendition of רַבֵּי ." See also Muraoka 1970.499f.

Whilst Trench deals with neither noun as used in NTG, BDAG differentiates them: ῥομφαία 'a large and broad sword' used by non-Greek speaking peoples, esp. the Thracians vs. μάχαιρα 'a relatively short sword or other sharp instrument, sword, dagger,' a differentiation apparently taken over by Louw & Nida 6.32 and 6.33.

¹⁰ Barthélemy (1963.205-07) notes some agreements between NH and the text of Mi as cited by Justin the Martyr.

¹¹ For a fuller presentation of the data in this matter, see Tov in *DJD* 8.142-45 (§ 12).

Our translator must have been aware that, in another book of his corpus, a contradictory, rather belligerent message was being proclaimed, in which we read, in part, *וּמִזְמֵרְתֵיכֶם לְרַמְתֶּימָם*, JI 4.10, which he renders *συγκόψατε τὰ ἄροτρα ὑμῶν εἰς ῥομφαίας καὶ τὰ δρέπανα ὑμῶν εἰς σειρομάστας*.

4.4) καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ἕκαστος ὑποκάτω ἀμπέλου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος ὑποκάτω συκῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἐκφοβῶν, διότι τὸ στόμα κυρίου παντοκράτορος ἐλάλησε ταῦτα.

And each one will rest under his vine and each one under his fig-tree, and there will be nobody frightening, because the mouth of the omnipotent Lord has spoken these things.

וַיָּשְׁבוּ אִישׁ תַּחַת גַּפְנוֹ וְתַחַת תְּאֲנָתוֹ וְאִין מְחַרֵּיד כִּי־פִי יְהוָה צָבָאוֹת דְּבַר:

ἀναπαύσεται *וַיָּשְׁבוּ*] An equivalence attested nowhere in LXX. *Index s.v. ἀναπαύω* suggests *שָׁבַתוּ* as what the translator meant. This equivalence occurs another four times in LXX. For NH the editor restores *καθίσ[σ]ονται*, which is closer to *חָ* and attested by Justin.

ἕκαστος *אִישׁ*] This common noun here illustrates its so-called distributive use. Though sg. in form, its verb is pl., whereas *ח* adjusted the number of the verb. Similarly in *וַיִּזְרְדוּ אִישׁ אֶת־אֲמַתְתָּתוֹ אַרְצָה וַיִּפְתְּחוּ אִישׁ אֲמַתְתָּתוֹ* καὶ καθεῖλαν ἕκαστος τὸν μάρσιππον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ ἤνοιξαν ἕκαστος τὸν μάρσιππον αὐτοῦ Ge 44.11; *יָקְחוּ לָהֶם אִישׁ שֶׁה לְבֵית־אֲבָת* λαβέτωσαν ἕκαστος πρόβατον κατ' οἴκους πατριῶν Ex 12.3, where the number of the verb in *ח* is adjusted to that in *ח*; *אִישׁ לְפִי אָכְלוּ תְּכַסּוּ עַל־הַשָּׂה* ἕκαστος τὸ ἄρκοῦν αὐτῶ συναριθμησεται εἰς πρόβατον ib. 12.4, where the verb is 2mp; *וַיִּלְכוּ כָל־הָעָם אִישׁ לְבֵיתוֹ* Καὶ ἐπορεύθη ἅπας ὁ λαὸς ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ 1C 16.43, where the real subject of the verb is added.¹² In *ח* we see ἕκαστος repeated. Was our translator possibly thinking of some people having vines in their garden and others fig-trees? The notion of “distributive” is captured well with ἕκαστος, though we see the mechanical rendition through ἀνήρ, e.g. *καὶ παρεμβαλοῦσιν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἀνήρ ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ τάξει* < *אִישׁ עַל־מַחְנֵהוּ* Nu 1.52, or through ἄνθρωπος, e.g. *πάντες οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκοιμήθησαν ἐν τιμῇ, ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ* < *כָּל־מַלְכֵי גוֹיִם כָּלָם שָׁכְבוּ בְּכַבֹּד אִישׁ בְּבֵיתוֹ* Is 14.18. Likewise in NH in our Mi passage. This distributive use is also observable with *שָׁה* as in *שָׁה לְבֵית אֲמָה* > ἀποστράφητε ἑκάστη εἰς οἶκον μητρὸς αὐτῆς Ru 1.8.

οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἐκφοβῶν *אִין מְחַרֵּיד*] A substantivised ptc. can be anarthrous as in *σφύζων οὐκ ἔστιν ἀραξέξ ἔμοῦ* < *אִין בְּלֵתִי* Ho 13.4. The article

¹² On the question of the grammatical concord here, cf. *SSG* § 77 **bb** and *SQH* § 32 **ch**.

τὴν ὀδὸν αὐτοῦ אַלְהֵי וְיִי שׁ] A discrepancy difficult to see where it originates. NH follows 𐤀: πορε[ύσσονται ἐν ὀνόματι θε]οῦ αὐτῶν.

4.6) ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, λέγει κύριος, συνάξω τὴν συντετριμμένην καὶ τὴν ἐξωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι καὶ οὓς ἀπωσάμην·

*On that day, says the Lord, I will receive the bruised and the ejected
I will welcome and those whom I rejected,*

בְּיוֹם הַהוּא אֶנְאֵם-יְהוָה אֶפְסָה הַצְּלֵעָה הַנְּדָדָה וְאֶפְסָה הַרְעֵתִי:

συνάξω .. εἰσδέξομαι] A rendition of the synonymous parallelism of אֶפְסָה .. אֶפְסָה occurs also at 2.12 in a similar context.

This common Gk verb, συνάγω, carries here a sense unique to SG: “to invite, receive (guest).”¹⁶ We suspect a semantic development most likely influenced by MH סִכְנֵי, cf. LBH סִכְנֵי = רְסָא.¹⁷

τὴν συντετριμμένην καὶ τὴν ἐξωσμένην הַנְּדָדָה הַצְּלֵעָה] There is no fem. sg. noun in the immediate context nor can we think of such which could be in the background, which also applies to 𐤀. One possibility is, though, אֶנְאֵם, a fem. noun often applied to people, whether individual or group. The word occurs many times in XII, but always rendered πρόβατον, a neuter noun. Particularly illuminating here is Ποίμαινε λαόν σου ἐν ῥάβδῳ σου, πρόβατα κληρονομίας σου, κατασκηνοῦντας καθ’ ἑαυτοὺς δρυμὸν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Καρμύλου Mi 7.14, where πρόβατα, a metaphor of Israel, is further expanded with a *masc.* pl. ptc. and ἑαυτοὺς. This inflectional selection in 𐤀 then must be more likely due to the two fem. sg. participles in 𐤀. Unlike in Greek, the fem. sg. can be applied in Hebrew to a group of individuals as in אֶרְבָּאֵי תַלְתָּי > οἱ πτωχοὶ τῆς γῆς ‘the poor of the land’ 4K 24.14B (*L* τῶν πενομένων τοῦ λαοῦ τῆς γῆς). The last clause beginning with אֶפְסָה rendered οὓς (m.pl.) confirms this analysis of ours.¹⁸ See also below at 7.8.¹⁹

The equation συντριβῶ passive / אֶפְסָה Qal is unusual and occurs in LXX only here and the next verse.²⁰ Whilst the Heb. verb occurs a mere three times in BH, συντριβῶ occurs more than 200 times in LXX and its meaning is well known. Our translator, however, translates this Heb. verb form in a rather similar context with ἐκπιέζω ‘to push out’: הַנְּדָדָה הַצְּלֵעָה אֶת-הַצְּלֵעָה הַנְּדָדָה

¹⁶ GELS s.v. 2.

¹⁷ Cf. הַנְּסִיחָה אֶת-יְהוָה ‘he invited him to his home’ Leviticus Rabbah s. 9 and הַנְּסִיחָה אֶת-יְהוָה ‘reception of guests’ tShav 35. Note Wolff (55): “הַנְּסִיחָה hat hier einen tröstlichen Klang”; one of his references (p. 42), “Jos 20,4” should read “Jos 20,4,” and his translation reads “will ich das Lahme heimholen.”

¹⁸ NH reads הַנְּדָדָה, an obviously secondary adjustment to the preceding τὴν.

¹⁹ Cf. JM § 134 o and SSG § 20 f.

²⁰ Tov restores ἐκτεθλιμμένην for NH solely on the basis of a reading in Justin, whilst elsewhere in LXX this Gk verb never translates אֶפְסָה.

τὴν ἀπωσμένην הָאֲלֵהָ] The Heb. word is a hapax in BH and thought to derive from הָלָה '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 הַעֲלֵה־תָּאֶת־יְהוָה וְהַעֲלֵה־יְהוָה וְהַעֲלֵה־יְהוָה וְהַעֲלֵה־יְהוָה καὶ σώσω τὴν ἐκπεπλεγμένην καὶ τὴν ἀπωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι Zp 3.19 adduced under the previous verse, but unrelated to his choice of the same verb to render עָרָה there.²⁵

ἐπ' αὐτοὺς הָאֲלֵהָ] NH 8.6 reads ἐπ' αὐτῶν. There is no comparable case in XII, but in SG both <βασιλεύω τινα> and <βασιλεύω τινος pers.> are attested, e.g. Βασίλευσον ἐφ' ἡμῶν Jd 9.8 (L ἐφ' ἡμᾶς).

ὄρει Σιών יְהוָה הָאֲלֵהָ] NH 8.6 adds the article: ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σει[ων, but is not consistent, for in the next verse it reads θυγάτηρ [Σειων, and see also ἐν τῇ ἐπάρσει ὀνόματος יהוה θεοῦ [αὐτοῦ] 8.40 for ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν הָאֲלֵהָ יְהוָה הָאֲלֵהָ מִי מִי 5.4(3). On the frequent absence in SG of the article in the syntagm <substantive + genitive>, see SSG § 3 b.

ἕως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα עַד־עוֹלָם] Whilst NH 8.7 reads ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος (= *ἄ*), ἕως is often followed in SG by another preposition, e.g. ἕως εἰς μακράν 4.3 and ἕως ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν Ez 47.8, cf. *GELS* s.v. ἕως A j.

4.8) καὶ σύ, πύργος ποιμνίου ἀρχμώδης, θύγατερ Σιών, ἐπὶ σὲ ἤξει καὶ εἰσελεύσεται ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ πρώτη, βασιλεία ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος τῇ θυγατρὶ Ἱερουσαλημ.

And you, a dusty flock-tower, the daughter of Zion, the first dominion, a kingdom will come to you from Babylon and be launched for the daughter of Jerusalem.

אֶתְּךָ מִגְּדֵל־עֶדְרָא עַל־בֵּית־צִיּוֹן עֲדִיךָ תֵּאֲתָהּ וּבָאָהּ הַמְּשָׁלָהּ הָרֵאשִׁיטָה מִמְּלֶכֶת לְבַת־יְרוּשָׁלַם׃

πύργος ποιμνίου מִגְּדֵל־עֶדְרָא] For various attempts to explicate this phrase, cf. McKane (131-33).

ἀρχμώδης עַלְפָּא] 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 עֶפְרָא has been suggested in *Index* 20a as an underlying equivalent.

θύγατερ] NH (8.8) does not admit here a vocative, and then σύ אֶתְּךָ would be extraposed, a case of casus pendens, resumed with a pronoun in ἐπὶ σὲ יְדִיךָ, an analysis which is syntactically acceptable.

²⁵ Tov (*DJD* 8.41, 88) restores ἐκπεπλεγμένην at NH 8.5 on the basis of a reading found in Justin, but in the space available the form cannot be accommodated.

εἰσελεύσεται הַאָּבָה] Tov (*DJD* 8.41, 88) restores ἐλεύσεται as “the regular equivalent of the root באב.” Would the reviser have joined two complete synonyms with καί?

πρώτη] Though the word can mean ‘earlier, former’ as in μεγάλη ἔσται ἡ δόξα τοῦ οἴκου τούτου ἢ ἐσχάτη ὑπὲρ τὴν πρώτην ‘the future glory of this house will surpass its former one’ Hg 2.9,²⁶ here ‘first’ is to be preferred as persuasively argued in *SD* II 2373.

ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος] Out translator correctly identified מְמַלְכֶת as being in st. cst., and supplied a missing nomen regens, so מְמַלְכֶת בְּבָבֶל. As in שְׂמֵחַת בְּקִצְרֵי ‘joy at harvest time’ Is 9.2; מְשֻׁפְּחֶת לְבַנְיִן-קָהָת הַנּוֹתְרִים ‘the clam of the remaining members of Kohat’ 1Ch 6.55.²⁷ The translator went for a different analysis. The phrase is understandably missing in NH.

4.9) Καὶ νῦν ἵνα τί ἔγνωσ κακά; μὴ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἦν σοι; ἢ ἡ βουλή σου ἀπώλετο ὅτι κατεκράτησάν σου ὠδίνες ὡς τικτούσης;

And now why have you experienced misfortunes? Was there no king for you? Or has your intelligence become lost because pains like those of a woman in labour have overwhelmed you?

עַתָּה לָמָּה תְּרִיעֵי רַע הִמְלִיךְ אִין-בָּךְ אִם-יִוְעֲצֶךָ אָבָד כִּי-יִחַזְקֶךָ חַיִל כִּי־לְדָה:

ἐγnows κακά] = תְּרִיעֵי רַע. 𐤀 means ‘you cry bitterly.’ Our understanding of κακά is similar to that in *SD*: “warum *erfuhrst* du *Unheil*?” Cf. Aq. Syh. ἐκάκωσας, which is probably = תְּרִיעֵי, i.e. Hif. of רַעַע, as in ἐκάκωσαν ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν.²⁸

σοι] = לְךָ. 𐤀 means ‘in your midst.’

ἢ אִם] On ἢ introducing a disjunctive question, see *GELS* s.v. **1 b**. At NH 8.12 Tov (*DJD* 8.41, 88) restores ἐὰν in conformity with 𐤀.²⁹ The interrogative אִם is a commonplace, but ἐὰν is not so used, see *GELS* s.v.

יִוְעֲצֶךָ] = ‘your counsellor.’

ὠδίνες ὡς τικτούσης כִּי־לְדָה חַיִל] A well-known metaphor for excruciating pains. Here the sufferer is presented as female, but it can be also male as in ὠδίνες ὡς τικτούσης ἤξουσιν αὐτῶ Ho 13.13 and ὠδίνες αὐτοὺς ἔξουσιν ὡς γυναικὸς τικτούσης Is 13.8.

This Heb. phrase is rendered exactly in the same way in Je 6.24, 22.23, 27(50).43, Ps 47(48).7 as well. Though the sg. ὠδίν is used thrice in the context of childbirth – Is 26.17, where the Heb. pl. כִּי־לְדָה is to be noted, ib. 37.3 (a rather free rendering), and ἐπὶ τῇ ὠδίνι αὐτῆς ἐκέκραξεν Od 5.17 –

²⁶ The translation of this example in *GELS* s.v. πρῶτος c need be corrected.

²⁷ See JM § 129 n.

²⁸ Cf. Reider 1966.123, s.v. κακοῦν.

²⁹ Tov mentions Hb 2.3 in NH, but there ἐὰν rendering אִם is an ordinary conditional particle, ‘if.’

and 𐤌 uses sometimes a pl. noun as in the just mentioned Is 26.17 and 𐤌𐤁𐤏𐤓 Ho 13.13, for instance, the pl. ὠδῖνες is the standard irrespective of the corresponding Heb. word, not only in expressions of pains of childbirth, but also in general. Among a total of 35 attestations in LXX of this Gk noun we find only three instances of the sg. Thus the pl. form has become the norm for this noun irrespective of the form in 𐤌, and it can be indicative of intensity or high frequency.

- 4.10) ὠδινε καὶ ἀνδρίζου καὶ ἔγγιζε, θύγατερ Σιών, ὡς τίκτουσα· διότι νῦν ἐξελεύσῃ ἐκ πόλεως καὶ κατασκηνώσεις ἐν πεδίῳ καὶ ἤξεις ἕως Βαβυλῶνος· ἐκεῖθεν ῥύσεται σε καὶ ἐκεῖθεν λυτρώσεται σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν σου.

Stay in pain and keep your foot down and come near, o daughter of Zion, like a woman delivering a baby, for now you will go out of a city and dwell in a field and reach Babylon. From there the Lord your God will rescue you and from there He will redeem you from your enemies' hand.

חולִי וְגַחִי בַת־צִיּוֹן כִּי־יִלְדָה מִקְרִיָּה וְשָׁכְנָה בַשָּׂדֶה וּבָאת עַד־בָּבֶל
שָׁם תִּנְצְלִי שָׁם יִגְאָלְךָ יְהוָה מִכַּף אִיְבֹנֶיךָ:

ἀνδρίζου] All the three imperatives are in the imperfective aspect, but in 𐤌 we have only two verbs.³⁰ In *Index* 10b 𐤏𐤓𐤏 has been suggested. In theory 𐤏 could be translated “Be a man,” which is, however, inappropriate in an address to “daughter of Zion.”

ἔγγιζε ἡγῆ] If ἡγῆ is a form of a hollow root, ἡγ, we would expect ἡγῆ, and ἡγῆ if of ἡγ. In two passages the verb has to do with a baby coming out and being born: אָתָּה גַחִי מִבְּטֶן מִבְּטַחִי עַל־שְׂדֵי אִמִּי (σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐκσπάσας με ἐκ γαστρὸς .. ‘You are He who pulled me out of a belly’ Ps 22.10) and בְּגִיחָהּ יִצֵּא מִרְחֶם (ἐμαίμασεν ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτῆς ἐκπορευομένη ‘it was eager to come out of her mother’s womb,’ where the addition of μητρὸς is to be noted) Jb 38.8. But as an address to a mother figure we would expect a transitive verb. Either way it has little to do with ἔγγιζε ‘approach.’ In *Index* 34a we have suggested Qal גָּגַשׁ, thus גָּגַשׁ.³¹ But approach where or what? A new dwelling in the countryside? 𐤏 is as difficult as 𐤌.

- 4.11) καὶ νῦν ἐπισυνήχθη ἐπὶ σὲ ἔθνη πολλὰ οἱ λέγοντες Ἐπιχαρούμεθα, καὶ ἐπόσονται ἐπὶ Σιών οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν.

³⁰ Wolff (102) holds that ἀνδρίζου is a second translation derived from ἡγῆ ‘power,’ but the status of this verb in BH is rather insecure.

³¹ *BHS* suggests two alternative emendations: ἡγῆ and ἡג. The former, ‘Take it easy,’ is incompatible with חֲלִי. 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.”

וְעַתָּה נֶאֱסָפוּ עֲלֵיךָ גוֹיִם רַבִּים תִּתְּנֶנָּה וְתַחֲזוּ בְצִיּוֹן עֵינֵינוּ:

Ἐπιχαρούμεθα [תִּתְּנֶנָּה] The meaning of the Heb. verb should be evident, but has nothing to do with joy. This free translation is probably due to the translator’s failure to identify the subject of the verb as Zion whose status as עֵיר הַקֶּדֶשׁ is now being threatened. A wording such as תַּחֲזוּ בְצִיּוֹן וְתַחֲזוּ בָּהּ עֵינֵינוּ³² could have been less ambiguous.

ἐπόψονται [תַּחֲזוּ] On the collectively used Heb. verb in the sg., see JM § 150 d.

4.12) καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν λογισμὸν κυρίου καὶ οὐ συνήκαν τὴν βουλὴν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι συνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ὡς δράγματα ἄλωνος.

They, however, did not recognise the Lord’s thinking and did not understand His design, for He gathered them as sheaves of threshing-floor.

וְהִמָּה לֹא יָדְעוּ מַחְשְׁבוֹת יְהוָה וְלֹא הִבִּינוּ עֲצָתוֹ כִּי קִבְּצָם כְּעֲמִיר גִּרְנָה:

αὐτοὶ [הִמָּה] The disjunctive personal pronoun in Ⓞ and Ⓢ alike underscores the enemies’ failure to see who they were up against.

λογισμὸν [מַחְשְׁבוֹת] Wolff (102) holds that the sg. in Ⓞ is a harmonisation to the parallel βουλή וְעֲצָתוֹ.

4.13) ἀνάστηθι καὶ ἄλῳα αὐτοῦς, θύγατερ Σιων, ὅτι τὰ κέρατά σου θήσομαι σιδηρᾶ καὶ τὰς ὀπλάς σου θήσομαι χαλκᾶς, καὶ κατατήξεις ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔθνη καὶ λεπτυνεῖς λαοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ ἀναθήσεις τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς.

Arise and crush them, o daughter of Zion, for I shall make your horns iron and your hooves copper, and you shall liquidate nations with them and crush many peoples and dedicate to the Lord their accumulated possessions and their wealth to the Lord of the whole earth.

קוּמִי וְדוּשִׁי בְתַצִּיּוֹן כִּי־קִרְנֶיךָ אֲשִׁים בְּרִזְלֶיךָ וּפְרָסְתֶיךָ אֲשִׁים נְחוֹשֶׁה וְהִדְקוֹת עַמִּים רַבִּים וְהִתְרַמְתִּי לַיהוָה בְּצַעַם וְחִילָם לְאָדוֹן כָּל־הָאָרֶץ:

ἀνάστηθι [קוּמִי] Verbs of physical movement such as קָם, הִלֵּךְ, and בָּא, in the impv. in particular and often followed by another verb without the conjunction ׀ connecting them, are used to incite and encourage. Hence Jacob, when he said to his aged father, שָׁבָה נָא וְאָכְלָה Ge 27.19, was not suggesting that

³² Exactly so in Pesh.

CHAPTER V

5.1 (4.14) *nūn* ἐμφοραχθήσεται θυγάτηρ ἐμφοραγμῶ, συνοχήν ἔταξεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, ἐν ῥάβδῳ πατάξουσιν ἐπὶ σιαγόνα τὰς φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ.

Now a daughter will be totally denied passage. They have laid a siege against us. With a rod they will strike the tribes of Israel on the cheek.

עָתָה תִּתְגַּדְּדִי בַת־גְּדוּד מִצּוֹר שָׁם עָלֵינוּ בַּשֶּׁבֶט יִכּוּ עַל־הַחֵי אֶת שַׁפְּטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל: ס

ἐμφοραχθήσεται .. ἐμφοραγμῶ] = תִּתְגַּדְּדִי .. תִּתְגַּדְּדִי. As a verb $\sqrt{\text{גדד}}$ does not occur in BH in Hitpael, though it does in MH, but in the sense of ‘to stand aloof above others.’

θυγάτηρ [בַּת] Since \mathfrak{C} does not see בַּת as being in the st. cst., the indeterminate θυγάτηρ becomes rather obscure, though its obvious referent is בַּת־צִיּוֹן in 4.13, and the 2fs form, תִּתְגַּדְּדִי, remains odd.

ἔταξεν שָׁ] Not infrequently the 3ms is impersonally used in Hebrew and Greek alike. E.g. עָלַי (ἐκλήθη) בְּבָל שָׁמָּה קָרָא Ge 11.9; קָרָא (ἐκάλεσεν) ib. 16.14.¹

τὰς φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ] = שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל.

5.2 (5.1) Καὶ σύ, Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθα, ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰουδα· ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ, καὶ αἱ ἕξοδοι αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐξ ἡμερῶν αἰῶνος.

And you, o Bethlehem the house of Ephratha, are too few in number to be among the thousands of Judah. It is from you that someone will come out for me to become a ruler in Israel, and his origins are in the far remote past.

וְאַתָּה בֵּית־לְחֶם אֶפְרַתָּה צָעִיר לְהָיוֹת בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה מִמָּה לִי יֵצֵא לְהָיוֹת מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וּמוֹצָאֲתוֹ מִקֶּדֶם מִימֵי עוֹלָם:

σύ אַתָּה] The subject fronted, there is a focus on it, and the same applies to the equally fronted ἐκ σοῦ מִמָּה.

οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθα אֶפְרַתָּה] In the OT the combination בֵּית אֶפְרַתָּה does not occur. NH possibly read another variant: σύ, οἶκος[ς ... ε]φραθα 8.32, where the lacuna is said to have room for Βηθλεεμ.

ὀλιγοστὸς] Whilst the superlative can function with the value of relative,² it can also substitute the comparative as in πλείστην ἢ ἔμπροσθεν .. ἐξουσίαν

¹ For further details, see JM § 155 d-e, SSG § 87 c, cb, and SQH § 37 a.

² So NETS “very few” and SD “sehr klein.”

ἐπί על] The selection of ἐπί does not have to be viewed as a mere mechanical reproduction of על. See e.g. ἐὰν ἐπιστραφῆς ἐπὶ (לְא) κύριον τὸν θεόν σου De 30.10; ἀναβαίνουσιν ἐκ πάντων τῶν τόπων ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς (עֲלִינִי) Ne 4.6.⁹

5.4 (5.3) καὶ στήσεται καὶ ὄψεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἰσχύι κυρίου, καὶ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ὑπάρξουσι· διότι νῦν μεγαλυνθήσεται ἕως ἄκρων τῆς γῆς.

He will stand firm and watch out and tend his flock with the Lord's power, and they will be in the glory of the name of the Lord their God, for now he will be declared great as far as the ends of the earth.

עֲמַד וְרָעָה בְּעֹז יְהוָה בְּגִאֲוֹן שָׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיוּ וַיִּשְׁבּוּ כִּי־עֲתָה יִגְדַּל עַד־אֲפֹסֵי־אֲרָרָא׃

στήσεται עֲמַד] Both verbs do not normally mean ‘to stand up (from a seat or sitting position),’ but ‘to stay standing.’ In this case it is about a shepherd ready to act in case of any emergency.

καὶ ὄψεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ] = רָעָה וְרָאָה. NH = 𐤒.

δόξῃ גִּאֲוֹן] δόξα / גִּאֲוֹן, an equivalence occurring four times in LXX, but only here in XII.

τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ὑπάρξουσι] = אלהיהם י. The pl. αὐτῶν fits the pl. verb. For NH (8.40) the sg. αὐτοῦ has been restored, which makes sense, since there begins after it a pl. verb with καί: καὶ ἐπιστραφήσονται = וַיִּשְׁבּוּ.

The primary meaning of ὑπάρχω is ‘to exist.’ However, there are a few indisputable cases in which it is used as a copula in an equational clause, “A is B.” E.g. Ὡσπερ γὰρ σκευὸς ἀνθρώπου συντριβὲν ἀχρεῖον γίνεται, τοιοῦτοι ὑπάρχουσιν οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν ‘For just as a man’s tool, when broken, becomes useless, so are their gods’ Ep Je 16 and πολλαὶ σου αἰ κρίσεις ὑπάρχουσιν (𐤂¹ εἰσιν) ἀληθιναὶ ‘your many judgments are true’ To 3.5 𐤂¹¹.¹⁰ Another question that need be addressed here concerns יֵשׁ. Just like ὑπάρχω, this Heb. word primarily indicates existence. Though not very often, it does function as a copula. (1) הֲיֵשׁ אֶת־לִבְּךָ יֵשׁ כַּאֲשֶׁר לִבְּי עִם־לִבְּךָ ‘Is it right with your heart as my heart is with your heart?’ 2Kg 10.15; 2) אֲמִים־יִשְׁעֵי־נָא מִצְּלִיחַ ‘if you do prosper my way’ Ge 24.42.¹¹

μεγαλυνθήσεται יִגְדַּל] The identity of the subject is obscure. It can be the *glory* of the name of the Lord or the *name* of the Lord. NH reads μεγαλυνθήσονται = יִגְדְּלוּ.

⁹ Cf. GELS s.v. ἐπί III 2 and ἐπιστρέφω II 1 b.

¹⁰ Cf. GELS s.v. ὑπάρχω 2.

¹¹ There are another four examples of <יֵשׁ + suffix pronoun - participle>; see Muraoka 1985.78. In Biblical Aramaic we find an analogous construction, e.g. הֲאִיתָהּ כְּהַל לְהוֹדֵעַתְנִי אֵלַימָּא ‘Are you really capable of telling me the dream?’ Dn 2.26. In אֲלֵהִין דִּי מְדַרְהוֹן עִם־בְּשָׂרָא ‘gods whose residence is not with humans’ Dn 2.11, too, we find the particle used with the value of a plain copula. See Muraoka 2020a § 17 3).

5.5 (5.4) και ἔσται αὕτη εἰρήνη· Ἀσσοῦρ ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν
καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῆ ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐπεγεροθήσονται ἐπ’ αὐτὸν
ἑπτὰ ποιμένες καὶ ὀκτὼ δῆγματα ἀνθρώπων·

*And this will be peace. When Assyria comes against our land and when
it sets its foot on our region, then seven shepherds and eight bites of
people will rise up against it.*

וְהָיָה זֶה שְׁלוֹם אֲשׁוּר כִּי־יָבִיא בְּאַרְצֵנוּ וְכִי יִדְרֶה בְּאַרְמְנֵינוּ וְהִקְמִנוּ עָלָיו שִׁבְעָה
רְעִים וְשִׁמְנָה נְסִיכֵי אָדָם:

αὕτη η] Already Ibn-Ezra and Radaq understood the Heb. pronoun as a
reference to the Messiah on the way. The selection of the fem. demonstra-
tive pronoun in 5 is a case of assimilation to the predicate, εἰρήνη.¹²

Ἀσσοῦρ [אשור] A constituent of the following subordinate clause taken
out and fronted; for other examples, see *SSG* § 84 c.

ὅταν [כי] Rashi and Ibn-Ezra saw in כי an equivalent of אִם. NH provides
a more conventional rendering, ὅτι (9.1), which, in combination with ἔλθῃ,
a subjunctive form, creates a grammatical impossibility. The same holds for
next line: ὅτι ἐπιβῆ.

ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἡμῶν [בְּאַרְצֵנוּ] The Heb. preposition can be taken in a plain,
locative sense, ‘to enter our land,’ as understood by NH (ἔλθῃ [εἰς] [τὴν γῆν
ἡμῶν]), but with the selection of <ἐπί + acc.> 5 adds a nuance of hostility,
which is further highlighted with the same prefix of the verb ἐπέρχομαι, and
the same applies to the parallel prepositional phrase.

τὴν χώραν ἡμῶν] = אֶרְצֵנוּ or אֶרְמְנֵינוּ. NH reads βάρ[εις, pl. of βᾶρις
‘citadel.’

ἐπεγεροθήσονται [וְהִקְמִנוּ] Who Assyria is going to be up against is under-
lined. It is difficult to say whether ἐπεγεροθήσονται is meant as genuinely
passive¹³ or pseudo middle; on this intriguing question, see *SSG* § 27 db.
NH ἐπεγεροῦμεν = 𐤀.

δῆγματα] = נְסִיכֵי.¹⁴ ‘Bites’ parallel with ‘shepherds,’ and not ‘those who
bite,’ as the subjects of ἐπεγεροθήσονται sound rather odd. NH ἄρχοντας = 𐤀.

5.6 (5.5) και ποιμανοῦσι τὸν Ἀσσοῦρ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ τὴν γῆν τοῦ Νεβρωδ
ἐν τῇ τάφρῳ αὐτῆς· καὶ ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ Ἀσσοῦρ, ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὴν
γῆν ἡμῶν καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῆ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρια ἡμῶν.

*And they will tend Assyria with a sword and the land of Nebrod in its
irrigation ditch, and he will rescue out of Assyria, when it comes against
our land and when it sets its foot on our domains.*

¹² See *SSG* § 77 a c), e.g. ἐκείνη σου ἡ μερίς, οὗτός σου ὁ κληρὸς ‘that is your portion,
this is your lot’ Is 57.6 < הָיָה גִּוְרָלְךָ הָיָה הָיָה הָיָה >.

¹³ So *SD*: “werden .. erweckt werden.”

¹⁴ *Pace Wolff*’s נְסִיכֵי, which means ‘Beißer,’ not ‘Bisse.’

וְרָצוּ אֶת־אֶרֶץ אֲשׁוּר בַּחֶרֶב וְאֶת־אֶרֶץ נִמְרוֹד בַּפְּתָחֶיהָ וְהִצִּיל מֵאֲשׁוּר כִּי־יָבוֹא
בְּאֲרָצָנוּ וְכִי יִדְרֶה בְּגִבּוֹלֵנוּ:

tòn Ασσουρ [אֶת־אֶרֶץ אֲשׁוּר] The absence in Ⓞ of any equivalent of אֶרֶץ is difficult to account for. NH = 𐤀.

ἐν τῇ τάφρω αὐτῆς [בַּפְּתָחֶיהָ] As parallel to חֶרֶב one might expect another word denoting a piece of weapon, but one should note the two prepositional phrases are only partially parallel, for the first noun has no personal suffix attached. Then פְּתָחֶיהָ becomes a particular type of landscape inside the land of Nimrod. פְּתַח is often understood to mean a point of entry to a land at its border. Our translator took it to mean an opening in a field into which slaughtered victims are to be hurled. For NH (9.6) ἐν παραξ[ιφι.. has been restored with no space available for a pronoun.¹⁵ The text may be identifying a form of פְּתִיחָה ‘drawn sword,’ a hapax in BH [Ps 51(52).22], rendered with βολίς ‘drawn weapon’ or ‘weapon in general.’ This Gk noun, παραξιφίς, occurs merely twice in SG, and apparently rather rare outside of it as well, and is defined in LSJ s.v. as meaning ‘knife worn beside the sword, dirk.’ The first occurrence in SG is at 2K 5.8, where 𐤀 reads צָנוֹר, which does not denote any piece of weapon.¹⁶ The second attestation is at Jd 3.22 L¹⁷ for 𐤀 להב rendered φλόξ R ‘flame’ in perhaps the shining blade of a sword.

5.7 (5.6) καὶ ἔσται τὸ ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ἰακωβ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν πολλῶν ὡς δρόσος παρὰ κυρίου πίπτουσα καὶ ὡς ἄρνες ἐπ’ ἄγρωστιν, ὅπως μὴ συναχθῆ ἡμεῖς μηδὲ ὑποστῆ ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων.

And the remnant of Jacob will be in the nations in the midst of many peoples like dew from the Lord dropping and like lambs on dog’s-tooth grass, so that none among the sons of men will congregate and resist.

יְהִי שְׂאֲרֵית יַעֲקֹב בְּקֶרֶב עַמִּים רַבִּים כְּטַל מֵאֵת יְהוָה כְּרִבְבִים עַל־יַעֲשׂוּב אֲשׁוּר
לֹא־יִקְנֶה לְאִישׁ וְלֹא יִיחַל לְבָנֵי אָדָם:

ὑπόλειμμα] See above at 4.7. NH has κατά]λοιπον. In XII the noun שְׂאֲרֵית occurs 16 times, always in the st. cst. followed by the name of a tribe or עַמִּים and suchlike. Its Greek equivalents are κατάλοιπος (12×), περίλοιπος (1×), and ὑπόλειμμα (3×). The third is always used in the sg., and the other two always in the pl., whereas שְׂאֲרֵית is always sg. Hence the sg. κατά]λοιπον in NH is striking. In Zp 2.9 κατάλοι[πο[ι τοῦ] λαοῦ has been restored. In theory the sg. could be restored.¹⁸

¹⁵ This variant reading is preserved in later revisions. This rare word appears to have frustrated scribes as can be seen in diverse spelling variations; see Barthélemy 1992.752, n. 2619.

¹⁶ 𐤀 here, יַנַּע בְּצָנוֹר, still remains a major headache for every scholar; it is all the more frustrating, since there is hardly any uncertainty what the two constituent words mean on their own.

¹⁷ Inadvertently missing in GELS s.v.

¹⁸ In the remaining case, Mi 4.7, NH reads ὑπόλειμμα [= Ⓞ].

κτῆνεσιν **בְּהֵמָה**] Κτῆνος, used mostly in the pl., just as **בְּהֵמָה**, denotes landed animal, whether domesticated or not. In view of the parallelism here, <ὡς - animal name, sg. + locative ἐν - animal name, pl.> κτῆνεσιν, parallel with ποιμνίοις προβάτων, most likely refer to domesticated animals grazing in a thicket and threatened by a predator. By contrast, θηρίον indicates undomesticated, land animal.

σκύμνος **כַּפִּיר**] The Gk word can denote young of any predatory animal. Here the preceding λέων suggests ‘lion’s cub.’ In גּוֹר אַרְיֵה Na 2.12 we have a two-word definition of **כַּפִּיר**, rendered analogously σκύμνος λέοντος, sim. in Ge 49.9 and De 33.22.

ὄν τρόπον] = **כַּאֲשֶׁר**. The Heb. particle here is a standard relative pronoun with λέων and σκύμνος as its antecedents. Since the three subjunctive verbs in the ὅταν-clause must be coordinate,²³ this temporal clause has ended up incomplete, without a main clause, which applies to Am 5.19 as well. In this particular instance, ὅταν may be serving as a temporal conjunction, but among the six clauses in SG introduced with ὄν τρόπον ὅταν there are some in which ὅταν is almost redundant and the main value of the clause is that of comparison, e.g. ἡ ὄψις αὐτῶν ὁμοίωμα ἐν τοῖς τέσσαρσιν, ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἦ τροχὸς ἐν μέσῳ τροχοῦ ‘they four looked like one image as if one wheel were inside in the other wheel’ Ez 10.10 < מְרֵאֵיהֶם דְּמוּת אֶחָד לְאַרְבַּעַתָּם כַּאֲשֶׁר יְהִיָּה > **הָאִוֶּפֶן בְּתוֹךְ הָאִוֶּפֶן**.²⁴

Am 3.12	Ὅν τρόπον ὅταν ἐκσπάσῃ ὁ ποιμὴν ἐκ στόματος τοῦ λέοντος δύο σκέλη ἢ λοβὸν ὀπίου, οὕτως ἐκσπασθήσονται οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ	כַּאֲשֶׁר יִצִּיל הַרְעָה מִפִּי הָאָרִי שְׁתֵּי כַרְעִים אוֹ כַּדְלֵ-אֶזְן כִּן יִנְצְלוּ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
Am 5.19	ὄν τρόπον ὅταν φύγη ἄνθρωπος ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ λέοντος καὶ ἐμπέσῃ αὐτῷ ἢ ἄρκος	כַּאֲשֶׁר יָנוּס אִישׁ מִפְּנֵי הָאָרִי וּפָנָעוּ הַדָּב
Mi 5.8	ὄν τρόπον ὅταν διέλθῃ καὶ διαστείλας ἀρπάσῃ καὶ μὴ ἦ ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος	אֲשֶׁר אִם עָבַר וְרָמַס וְטָרַף וְאִין מִצִּיל
Zc 4.1	καὶ ἐξήγειρέν με ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἐξεγερθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑπνου αὐτοῦ	וַיַּעֲרֵנִי כַּאֲשֶׁר יַעֲוֹר מִשְׁנָתוֹ
Is 7.2	καὶ ἐξέστη ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἐν δρυμῷ ξύλον ὑπὸ πνεύματος σαλευθῇ	וַיֵּנַע לְקָבוֹ וּלְקַב עִמּוֹ כְּנוֹעַ עֲצָיֵי-יַעַר מִפְּנֵי-רוּחַ
Ez 10.10	ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἦ τροχὸς ἐν μέσῳ τροχοῦ	כַּאֲשֶׁר יְהִיָּה הָאִוֶּפֶן בְּתוֹךְ הָאִוֶּפֶן

²³ Thus *pace* “.. raubt es; dann wird keiner da sein, der es ihm (wieder) entreißt” (*SD*). In an apodosis of a conditional sentence, we would not expect a subjunctive.

²⁴ In *GELS* s.v. ὅταν the section 2 c should better read:

c. preceded by ὄν τρόπον and almost pleonastic: ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἦ τροχὸς ἐν μέσῳ τροχοῦ Ez 10.10(-); ὄν τρόπον ὅταν ἐκσπάσῃ Am 3.12(-), where ὄτ. is possibly a doublet or an equivalent of ἐάν or ἔν as in Am 5.19(-) v.l., cf. Mi 5.8(a), Zc 4.1(-), Is 7.2(-).

διαστείλας סמך] In Na 3.14 we find a correct translation of this Heb. verb, ‘to trample’: סמך בְּרַמֵּךְ > συμπατήθητι ἐν ἀχύροις. It is then a figure of a lion trampling a lamb under its feet, and carrying it off dead or half-dead. Διαστελλῶ means here ‘to separate between lambs’ and to pick up one that is after the predator’s liking. Why such a free rendering has been chosen is obscure.²⁵

5.9 (5.8) ὑψωθήσεται ἡ χεὶρ σου ἐπὶ τοὺς θλίβοντάς σε, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου ἐξολεθρευθήσονται.

Your hand will be raised above those who afflict you, and all your foes will be annihilated.

תָּרַם יָדְךָ עַל־צָרְיָךְ וְכָל־אֹיְבֵיךָ יִכָּרְתוּ: פ

ὑψωθήσεται תָּרַם] *ṯ* is optative²⁶ as against תָּרַם. If our translator recognised the form as such and wished to reproduce its full value, he could have used a desiderative optative, ὑψωθείη, and continued with ἐξολετρευθείησαν. Though the optative is still very much alive in SG, only a few instances out of XII were noted by Turner, e.g. ἔλθοι Jo 2.8.²⁷ Our translator may have been among those whose literary ambition was modest.

Here is a figure of a hand about to attack, cf. ὑψωσας τὴν δεξιὰν τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτοῦ Ps 88.43.

5.10 (5.9) Καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, λέγει κύριος, ἐξολεθρεύσω τοὺς ἵππους σου ἐκ μέσου σου καὶ ἀπολώ τὰ ἄρματα σου

And it will come to pass on that day, says the Lord: I shall annihilate all your horses out of your midst and destroy your chariots.

וְהָיָה בַיּוֹם־הַהוּא נֹאֵם־יְהוָה וְהִכֵּיתִי סוּסֵיךָ מִקֶּרְבְּךָ וְהִאֲבִדְתִּי מִרְכָּבֹתֶיךָ:

5.11 (5.10) καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω τὰς πόλεις τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐξαρθῶ πάντα τὰ ὀχυρώματά σου·

I shall annihilate the cities of your land and obliterate all your fortresses.

וְהִכֵּיתִי עָרֵי אֲרָצְךָ וְהָרַסְתִּי כָל־מְבָצְרֶיךָ:

Though the vocabulary of BH is relatively modest in size, it is strikingly rich in a number of lexical-semantic fields. One such field is that of destruction.

²⁵ In *Index* 29b s.v. διαστελλῶ “(20) סמך qal” had better be moved under “Del.”

²⁶ But not “Erhebe deine Hand” (Wolff 123), which should be תָּרַם.

²⁷ In SG Turner (1963.119) found a total of 539 optative forms whether in main clauses or subordinate.

In this short passage alone (vs. 10[11] - 14[15]) we meet הַכְרִית, הָאֲבִיד, הַסֵּרֶה, נָתַשׁ, and הַשְּׁמִיד. The list can be prolonged.²⁸ The translator's Greek vocabulary competes rather well: ἐξολεθρεύω, ἀπόλλυμι, ἐξαίρω, ἐκκόπτω, ἀφανίζω.²⁹ These are verbs denoting destruction.

5.12 (5.11) καὶ ἐξαρθῶ τὰ φάρμακά σου ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου, καὶ ἀποφθεγγόμενοι οὐκ ἔσονται ἐν σοί·

And I shall take your magic charms off your hands, and there shall be no diviners amongst you.

וְהַכְרַתִּי כְשָׁפִים מִיָּדְךָ וּמַעֲוֹנִים לֹא יִהְיוּ לְךָ:

ἐξαρθῶ [הַכְרַתִּי] Further to our remark on the preceding verse, we note that the verb הַכְרִית appears in three³⁰ consecutive verses, 10-12. Our translator, however, does not mechanically render it, but in this verse uses a different verb, ἐξαίρω instead of ἐξολεθρεύω, to which he goes back in the next verse. He must have had some good reason for this variation. In the cases where ἐξολεθρεύω is used, it involves physical destruction. In this verse, too, that may have been the case, but the locative adjunct, ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου, probably suggests that the enchanted instruments were taken out of sorcerers' hands, leading to their virtual annihilation. The instruments did not have to be smashed, but could just have been hurled into a nearby ditch or stream.

ἀποφθεγγόμενοι [מַעֲוֹנִים] The Gk verb means 'to make a clear, oral statement,' usually in public and authoritative.³¹ Of its seven attestations in SG it carries negative connotation with the sole exception of 1C 25.1, where it is applied to functionaries in the Jerusalem temple, as they sing, playing various instruments.³² Thus Ps 58.8 (with God's wicked enemies as the grammatical subject), speakers of tedious things (κόπους) Zc 10.2 (// μάντις), a variant reading in *L* of γνώστης 'diviner' 1K 28.9; its grammatical objects are μάταια 'vanities' Ez 13.9, μάταια ἀποφθέγματα 'worthless apophthegms' ib. 13.19. The instance in our Mi passage is to be understood against this background.

²⁸ See a very long list at the end of *GELS* s.v. ἀφανίζω.

²⁹ On how our translator coped with the multiplicity of synonyms in Hebrew and Greek alike, see Muraoka 2019.

³⁰ In vs. 9 the same Heb. root is used in Nifal and translated with the same Gk verb in the passive.

³¹ In CG there are instances in which such a statement was regarded as oracle (χρησμός), e.g. Diodorus Siculus 16.27 and Lucian, *Alexander* 25.

³² The Antiochene version (*L*) reads προφητεύοντας 'those who prophesy' for הַנְּבִיאִים.

- 5.13 (5.12) καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω τὰ γλυπτά σου καὶ τὰς στήλας σου ἐκ μέσου σου, καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ προσκυνήσῃς τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν σου·

And I shall annihilate your carved images and the steles out of your midst, and you shall not worship the works of your hands any more.

וְהִכְרַתִּי כְּסִילֵיךָ וּמַצְבֹּתֶיךָ מִקְרַבְךָ וְלֹא-תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה עוֹד לְמַעֲשֵׂה יָדֶיךָ:

τὰ γλυπτά σου כְּסִילֵיךָ] Between כְּסִילֵיךָ and כְּסִילֵים³³ they are the most frequent equivalent of γλυπτός, 40 times. Here is an intriguing morphological matter. In Hebrew כְּסִילֵיךָ is never used in the pl. and כְּסִילֵים never in the sg., hence no כְּסִילֵיךָ nor כְּסִילֵים (as reconstructed in dictionaries). Γλυπτός in the sg. is sometimes used attributively, e.g. γλυπτόν ὁμοίωμα ‘a carved image’ De 4.16, but also substantively, e.g. τοῦ ποιῆσαι γλυπτόν καὶ χωνευτόν ‘to make something carved and molten’ Jd 17.3, τὸ γλυπτόν Μειχα ‘Micha’s carved (image)’ ib. 18.30. But in the pl. it is consistently pl. as in our Mi case. Ὅμοιώματα or suchlike may have been considered to be latent here.³⁴

- 5.14 (5.13) καὶ ἐκκόψω τὰ ἄλση σου ἐκ μέσου σου καὶ ἀφανίσω τὰς πόλεις σου·

And I will cut down your sacred groves out of your midst and obliterate your cities.

וַנִּשְׁתִּי אֲשִׁירֶיךָ מִקְרַבְךָ וְהִשְׁמַדְתִּי עָרֶיךָ:

ἐκκόψω וַנִּשְׁתִּי] This is the sole instance of the equation נִשְׁתִּי / ἐκκόπτω. This Heb. verb occurs 21 times in BH, mostly in Qal, 3 times in Ben Sira, and once in QH. The number of its Greek translation equivalents is disproportionately large, 14.³⁵ For a semantic analysis of the verb it is important to note that in a number of passages in the book of Jeremiah it is in an antonymic parallelism with נָטַע ‘to plant.’ One example occurs in XII: וְנִטְעַתִּים עַל-אֲדָמָתָם: וְנִטְעַתִּים וְלֹא אֲהָרִם וְנִטְעַתִּים וְלֹא אֲהָרִם וְנִטְעַתִּים וְלֹא אֲהָרִם Am 9.15. So also וְנִטְעַתִּים וְלֹא אֲהָרִם Je 24.6, see also ib. 31.28, 42.10, 45.4. There cannot be found even a single case in which נִשְׁתִּי is used in a description of agricultural activity except our Mi passage which can be analysed as describing an act of uprooting carefully planted, impressive trees in a pagan temple court. The verb may have been part of farmers’ vocabulary.

- 5.15 (5.14) καὶ ποιήσω ἐν ὄργῃ καὶ ἐν θυμῷ ἐκδίκησιν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ἀνθ’ ὧν οὐκ εἰσήκουσαν.

³³ This Heb. word has inadvertently dropped out in *Index* s.v. γλυπτός p. 25a.

³⁴ Substantivised neut. pl. adjectives, especially articular, may refer to tangible objects, cf. SSG § 20 ec.

³⁵ So Dos Santos 1973.138.

And I shall, with anger and with fury, execute vengeance against the nations, because they did not listen.

וְעָשִׂיתִי בְּאַף וּבְחֵמָה נִקְמָה אֶת־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר לֹא שָׁמְעוּ:

ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] אֶת־הַגּוֹיִם] BDB 668a s.v. **נִקְמָה 1** analyses אֶת as a direct object marker. עָשָׂה with הִסָּד, טוֹבָה, מְשַׁפֵּט, נִקְמָה and the like can be combined with a variety of prepositions to mark somebody affected by such a deed: בְּ-, מִן, עִם. Only with דִּבֶּר מְשַׁפֵּט we find three indisputable cases of combination with אֶת as nota obiecti, e.g. וְדִבַּרְתִּי מְשַׁפֵּטִי אוֹתָם Je 1.16, so ib. 4.12, 12.1, but in וַיְדַבֵּר אֹתוֹ מְשַׁפֵּטִים Je 39.5 we have a distinct syntagm with אֶת as a preposition, sim. ib. 52.9. With נִקְמָה or נִקְמָה in combination with עָשָׂה we find only בְּ- or מִן, e.g. לַעֲשׂוֹת נִקְמָה בְּגוֹיִם Ps 149.7, sim. Je 50.15, Ez 25.14, 17 and עָשָׂה לְךָ יְהוָה נִקְמוֹת מֵאֲיִכֶיךָ מִבְּנֵי עַמּוֹן Jd 11.36, sim. Je 11.20, 20.10, 46.10. In view of these data we are inclined to view אֶת in Mi 5.15(14) as a preposition.

ἀνθ' ὧν אֲשֶׁר] The causal value of אֲשֶׁר is well established. The first instance mentioned in BDB s.v. **8 c** is שָׂפָחְתִּי לְאִישִׁי יְתָן אֱלֹהִים שְׂכָרִי אֲשֶׁר־נָתַתִּי שְׂפָחְתִּי לְאִישִׁי Ge 30.18 > Ἔδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν μισθόν μου ἀνθ' οὗ ἔδωκα τὴν παιδίσακην μου τῷ ἀνδρὶ μου. The use of the compound conjunction is felicitous because of its first constituent, ἀντί, which “precedes a noun of deed(s) which is required, whether positively (reward) or, mostly, negatively (punishment)” (GELS s.v. ἀντί 3).

CHAPTER VI

6.1) Ἀκούσατε δὴ λόγον κυρίου· κύριος εἶπεν Ἀνάστηθι κρήθιτι πρὸς τὰ ὄρη, καὶ ἀκουσάτωσαν βουνοὶ φωνὴν σου.

Do hear the word of the Lord: the Lord has said, “Arise, challenge the mountains, and let hills hear your voice.”

שְׁמַעוּ־נָא אֶת אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה אָמַר קוֹם רִיב אֶת־הַהָרִים וְתִשְׁמַעְנָה הַגְּבָעוֹת קוֹלְךָ:

[λόγον κυρίου] = דְּבַר יְהוָה.

[εἶπεν] = אָמַר. It is not apparent why the translator decided to expand אָ, if his *Vorlage* read the same: he could have said something like ὁ τι κύριος εἶπεν.

[Ἀνάστηθι קוֹם] On this Heb. verb which has virtually become an interjectory word, see above at 4.13. Cf. Wolff (136): “Auf.”

[πρὸς τὰ ὄρη אֶת־הָרִים] Here again arises the question of how to analyse the particle אֶת; see above at 5.15 (p. 241). The verb רִיב, meaning ‘to contest a legal case (against someone),’ lies close to אֶת נִקְמָה אֶת. BDB 936b s.v. רִיב 2 we read: “c. acc. pers. with whom (unfriendly sense), Jb 10² Is 27⁸,” where, however, the person is indicated with a suffix attached to the verb – תְּרִיבֵנִי and תְּרִיבְנָה, and we know that such suffixes are not necessarily equivalent to אֶתִּי and אֶתָּה respectively.¹ Whilst no instance is attested of an example such as אֶתְּ אֶתְּ, we find מִי־רִיב אֶתִּי Is 50.8 and הוֹאִי־רִיב אֶת־רִיבְּךָ אֶתְּ Je 2.9 אֶת, parallel with אֶתְּ, must be a preposition. Cf. לְרִיב עִמּוֹ Jb 9.3. Note also the next verse: עִמּוֹ לִיהוָה עִם־עִמּוֹ רִיב κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, where רִיב is a substantive. These data lead us to the conclusion that the particle in our Mi case is a preposition, hence the phrase cannot be rewritten as אֶתְּ, but only as אֶתְּ. The translation with πρὸς is close to this analysis. Cf. Κρήθιτε πρὸς τὴν μητέρα ὑμῶν בְּאִמְכֶם Ho 2.2(4).

[βουνοὶ הַגְּבָעוֹת] It escapes us why Ziegler rejects οἱ βουνοὶ. It is grammatically difficult as well to account for this shift from articular to anarthrous in the parallelism.

6.2) ἀκούσατε, λαοί, τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ αἱ φάραγγες θεμέλια τῆς γῆς, ὅτι κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ διελεγχθήσεται.

¹ For details, see JM § 125 *ba*.

O peoples, hear the contention of the Lord, and the chasms the foundations of the earth, for the Lord has a contention with His people, and with Israel He will debate.

שְׁמַעוּ הָרִים אֶת־רִיב יְהוָה וְהָאֲתָנִים מִסְדֵי אָרֶץ כִּי רִיב לִיהוָה עַם־עַמּוֹ וְעַם־יִשְׂרָאֵל
יִתְוַכַּח:

λαοί] = עַמִּים. The reason for this discrepancy is obscure. In vs. 1 the mountains were challenged for a legal contest, apparently to be conducted verbally. Then mountains are supposed to be capable of comprehending any oral message. Ziegler has opted for this *lectio difficilior* as against variants such as ὄρη or βουνοί, easily understandable as corrections in favour of ~~ἄ~~.

φάραγγες אֲתָנִים] A most unusual equivalence. A look at the only other occurrence of אֲתָנִים seems to suggest that for some reason or other our translator struggled with this Hebrew word: וַיִּגַּל כַּמִּים מִשֶּׁטַט וַצִּדְקָה כְּנַחַל אֵיתָן: και κυλισθήσεται ὡς ὕδωρ κρίμα και δικαιοσύνη ὡς χειμάρρους ἄβατος Am 5.23. A steadily flowing wadi has little to do with an impassable wadi. Finding himself cornered into this conundrum, he might be indulging himself in an association of words, for he may have remembered אֵל נַחַל אֵיתָן De 21.4 translated as εἰς φάραγγα τραχεῖαν, though he must have known that φάραγξ here is a rendering of נַחַל. Here we are dealing with a feature of the geographical landscape of the Holy Land. Earlier, ad Ho 10.4 (p. 127), we mentioned possible urban background and upbringing of our translator, for whom details of the Palestinian landscape somewhat different that of Alexandria and its environs. That might account for this rather free rendition here. Clefs or chasms in the ground can scarcely be called the foundations of the earth.²

6.3) λαός μου, τί ἐποίησά σοι ἢ τί ἐλύπησά σε ἢ τί παρηνώχλησά σοι; ἀποκρίθητί μοι.

O my people, what did I do to you? Or how did I grieve you? Or how did I annoy you? Answer me.

עַמִּי מִה־עֲשִׂיתִי לְךָ וּמִה־הִלְאֵתִיךָ עֲנֵה בִי:

τί [2] .. τί [3] מִה] Neither λυπέω nor παρενοχλέω is a doubly transitive verb. Hence the interrogative τί is adverbial here, meaning “In what manner?, How.” On this unique Hebraistic usage, see above at Ho 11.8. Since it is attested elsewhere in SG, its use here is unlikely to be a mechanical reproduction of מִה. 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) אֲפִיק Ez 6.3 is to be restored, and under 2) נִי Mi 6.2 is to be deleted.

ἐλύπησά σε .. παρηνώχλησά **הִתְאַלְחָהּ**] From the meanings of the two Gk verbs concerned the second appears to be a rendering of **הִתְאַלְחָהּ**, but then where does the first come from?³

מִי **בִּי**] On the use of the preposition in a description of exchange in court, see above at vs. 1.

6.4) διότι ἀνήγαγόν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας ἐλυτρώσάμην σε καὶ ἐξαπέστειλα πρὸ προσώπου σου τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ Ααρων καὶ Μαριαμ.

For I led you up out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery I redeemed you and sent before you (, as leaders,) Moses, and Aron, and Miriam.

כִּי הִעֲלֵתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וּמִבַּיִת עֲבָדִים פְּדִיתִיךָ וְאֶשְׁלַח לְפָנֶיךָ אֶת־מֹשֶׁה אֶת־אַרֹּן וְאֶת־מִרְיָם:

πρὸ προσώπου σου **הִפְּנִיךָ**] In SG the preposition with the temporal value, ‘prior to,’ is not used with a personal referent.⁴ Moreover, when it has the locative value, ‘in front of,’ it is never used on its own, but as a Hebraising pseudo preposition as in our passage. We see thus that the exodus of these three figures did not take place prior to that of the rest of the congregation, but they all left together with the three as their leaders.

6.5) λαός μου, μνήσθητι δὴ τί ἐβουλεύσατο κατὰ σοῦ Βαλακ βασιλεὺς Μωαβ, καὶ τί ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Βαλααμ υἱὸς τοῦ Βεωρ ἀπὸ τῶν σχοίνων ἕως τοῦ Γαλγαλ, ὅπως γνωσθῆ ἡ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ κυρίου.

O my people, do remember what Balak the king of Moab decided against you and what Balaam, the son of Beor answered him, (remember your journey) from the reeds to Galgal, so that the righteousness of the Lord can be recognised.

עַמִּי וְזָכַרְנָא מַה־יַּעַץ בְּלֶק מְלֶךְ מוֹאָב וּמַה־עָנָה אֹתוֹ בְּלַעַם בֶּן־בְּעוֹר מִן־הַשְּׁטִיִּם עַד־הַגְּלָגָל לְמַעַן דַּעַת צְדָקוֹת יְהוָה:

ἀπὸ τῶν σχοίνων ἕως τοῦ Γαλγαλ **לְמִן־הַשְּׁטִיִּם עַד־הַגְּלָגָל**] This prepositional phrase can hardly be construed as it is with ἀπεκρίθη nor with ἐβουλεύσατο, but with μνήσθητι, but then we need to fill a bit in as in our translation above.

Wasn't our translator familiar enough with the geography of the Holy Land? From the first mention of the place in Nu 25.1 it appears as Σαττιν,

³ Pesh. /'krit/ is = ἐλύπησά. So probably also Trg **הִתְאַלְחָהּ** אֶשְׁמַר אֶת־קִרְיָתִי **הִתְאַלְחָהּ**.

In *Index* 75b s.v. λυπέω we would delete 7) **הִתְאַלְחָהּ** hi. and accordingly λυπέiv ib. 239a s.v. **הִתְאַלְחָהּ** hi.

⁴ Unlike in CG, where we find, e.g. οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν γενόμενοι ‘those who lived before our time’ Isocrates 13.19 and τοῖς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ‘my predecessors’ Thucydides 1.97.

but in the other attestation in XII we have the same equivalence as here: τὸν χειμάρρουν τῶν σχοίνων < יִשְׁפֹּךְ לִנְיָ JI 4.18.

ἡ δικαιοσύνη τοῦ κυρίου יהיה תִּקְרָצַ] The pl. of תִּקְרָצַ is attributed to God six times in BH, indicating manifestations of His character, acts of justice. LXX, however, consistently translate it in the sg., and in the sole exception, Ps 102(103).6 we read ἐλεημοσύνας. On the other hand, in SG the pl. δικαιοσύναι is always – 14 times⁵ – applied to humans, indicating manifestations of their character. E.g. οἱ ποιοῦντες ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ δικαιοσύνας πλησθήσονται ζωῆς To 12.9⁶.

6.6) ἐν τίνι καταλάβω τὸν κύριον, ἀντιλήψομαι θεοῦ μου ὑψίστου; εἰ καταλήψομαι αὐτὸν ἐν ὀλοκαυτώμασιν, ἐν μόσχοις ἐνιαυσίοις;

*With what shall I secure the favour of the Lord, reach my highest God?
Can I secure His favour with wholly burnt offerings, with one-year old calves?*

בְּמָה אֶקְדֹּם יְהוָה אֲכַף לְאֱלֹהֵי מְרוֹם הַאֲדָמָה בְּעוֹלֹת בְּעֵצִים בְּנִי שְׁנָה:

ἐν τίνι בְּמָה] The preposition ἐν in the sense of ‘in return for’ is unknown prior to SG and reflects the so-called *beth pretii*, ‘bet of price’ in Heb.⁶

καταλάβω] Deliberative subjunctive; the speaker is pondering.⁷ The same verb in the same sense is resumed later with the fut.; another example of juxtaposition of the subj. and the fut., both with deliberative value, is Τί ἀντεροῦμεν τῷ κυρίῳ ἢ τί λαλήσωμεν ἢ τί δικαιωθῶμεν; Ge 44.16.⁸ It is about an attempt to secure God’s favour.

ἀντιλήψομαι אָכַף] This rare Heb. verb (5×) occurs only here in XII. Its meaning thought to have to do with bowing or bending may have escaped our translator.⁹ From the concluding part of the verse it is apparent that the verse is about worshipping and cultic ritual. The three Gk verbs selected imply general assessment and evaluation of such observances.

θεοῦ μου ὑψίστου] Ὑψιστος is often used on its own, substantivised, e.g. ἄγιοι ὑψίστου ‘saints of the Most High’ Da 7.18.¹⁰ On the other hand, a personal pronoun in the gen. can intervene in the syntagm <noun - gen. pron. - adj.> as in τὸ ἔλεός σου τὸ ἔσχατον ‘your latest mercy’ Ru 3.10 and τὰ ἔλέη σου τὰ ἀρχαῖα ‘your former mercies’ Ps 88.50. As regards מְרוֹם the following three instances are instructive, all in Ez:

⁵ Including ὧν αἱ δικαιοσύναι οὐκ ἐπελήσθησαν ‘their [= of the merciful people] were not forgotten’ Si 44.10.

⁶ For further data, see *GELS* s.v. ἐν 4.

⁷ See *SSG* § 29 **ba** (iii), pp. 313f.

⁸ See *SSG* § 28 **gf**. The choice in *SD* of two totally distinct verbs is debatable: “einnehmen .. erreichen.”

⁹ See also Pesh. /ʿešpar/, i.e. ‘I may be considered good enough.’

¹⁰ More examples are mentioned in *GELS* s.v. 1.

- a) 17.23 ἐν ὄρει μετεώρω τοῦ Ἰσραηλ **בְּהָר מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל**
 b) 20.40 ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους τοῦ ἁγίου μου, ἐπ’ ὄρους ὑψηλοῦ **בְּהָר־קְדְשִׁי בְּהָר מְרוֹם יִשְׂרָאֵל**
 c) 34.14 ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ὑψηλῷ Ἰσραηλ **בְּהָרִי מְרוֹם־יִשְׂרָאֵל**

In c) ὑψηλός is an attributive adjective, which applies also to b), because here God Himself is speaking and He would not refer to Himself in this instance as “the Most High.” In a) μετέωρος cannot be anything other than an attributive adjective. Our document does not attest to the use of **עֲלִיּוֹן** as in **יָדַע דַּעַת עֲלִיּוֹן** ‘he who knows the knowledge of the Most High’ Nu 24.16.¹¹

- 6.7) εἰ προσδέξεται κύριος ἐν χιλιάσι κριῶν ἢ ἐν μυριάσι χειμάρρων πiónων; εἰ δὼ πρωτότοκά μου ἀσεβείας, καρπὸν κοιλίας μου ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας ψυχῆς μου;

Would He accept (me) for thousands of rams or myriads of fatted animals lined up? Shall I offer my first-born children (resulting from) impiety, fruit(s) of my belly (to atone) for the sin of my soul?

הֲיִרְצָה יְהוָה בְּאַלְפֵי אֵילִים בְּרִבְבוֹת נַחְלֵי־שֶׁמֶן הָאֶתָּן בְּכוּרֵי פִשְׁעֵי פָרִי בְטָנִי חֲטָאֵת נַפְשִׁי:

εἰ ἦ] On εἰ introducing a question, see above at 2.7.

προσδέξεται] As a transitive verb, προσδέχομαι requires an acc. object, which we have supplied in the above translation. A direct object of this verb cannot be introduced with ἐν,¹² which is equivalent to a *bet pretii* mentioned above at 3.11 (p. 216) and 6.6 (p. 245).

ἐν χιλιάσι κριῶν **בְּאַלְפֵי אֵילִים**] The Heb. prep. **בְּ־** here is conditioned by the verb, **רָצָה** ‘to be pleased, satisfied.’ The verb can take either a zero-object or a **בְּ־** object. E.g. **לֹא־אֶרְצָה מִיְדְּכֶם** θυσίαν οὐ προσδέξομαι ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν Ma 1.10; **εἰ προσδέξομαι αὐτὰ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν; ib. 13.**

Since **Ⓞ** did not take **בְּ־** as an object marker, he must have understood the preposition as instrumental, which is affiliated with *beth pretii*, and it is necessary to understand μέ or ἐμέ as direct object. Though no such Heb. manuscript is known, the translator might be mentally reconstructing **Ⓞ** as **הֲיִרְצָנִי יְהוָה בְּאַלְפֵי אֵילִים** or suchlike. These remarks equally apply to the second ἐν in the verse.

The syntagm <num. st. cst. - noun phrase> is well attested in both Gk and Heb. Cf. *SGG* § 22 v (cc) and *SQH* § 26 fa - ff.

¹¹ Thus *pace* “meinen Gott, (den) Höchsten” (SD).

¹² Thus “Tausende von Widdern annehmen” (SD) is questionable. *NETS*’s “receive favourably among thousands of rams” is as questionable, for the Gk prep. here is scarcely locative.

μυριάσι] The pl. of ‘tens of thousands,’ *pace* “ten thousands” (*NETS*).

In view of the parallel χιλιάσι this larger number is likely to refer to πίωνων. “Tens of thousands of lines of fatted animals” would not be accepted even for poetic licence, although the syntactic hierarchy is <a - [b - c]>.

πίωνων שֶׁמֶן] The equation πίων / שֶׁמֶן is unattested in LXX.¹³ Oil as an essential ingredient in the ancient Israelite cult is well known, but this noun is not used on its own in the sense of a fat or fattened sacrificial animal, where שֶׁמֶן as adj. meaning ‘fat’ occurs in הַשְּׁמֵנָה Ez 34.16, where הַצֹּאן is understood, and MH amply testifies to the word applied to animals, e.g. דגים שמנים ‘fat fishes.’¹⁴ Our translator probably mentally reconstructed here שֶׁמֵנִים.

πρωτότοκά μου ἀσεβείας בְּכֹרִי פְּשָׁעִי] Assuming what follows, פְּרִי בְטָנִי, is in explanatory apposition, πρωτότοκος and בְּכֹר here are best understood as denoting “first-born male child.” The neuter gender of the form used here is no hindrance to this analysis. See πᾶν πρωτότοκον ἀνθρώπου τῶν υἱῶν σου λυτρώση Ex 13.13, τὰ πρωτότοκα τῶν υἱῶν σου δώσεις ἐμοί 22.28 and others. Though the genuine masc. form is still found, e.g. Υἱὸς πρωτότοκός μου Ἰσραηλ ‘Israel is my first-born son’ Ex 4.22, the widespread use of the neut.¹⁵ is probably due to the neut. gender of τέκνον.

How are we then to account for the plural? Is polygamy being implied? This might be what is meant by ἀσεβείας.

What is the grammatical, logical relationship between the two consecutive nouns in ㊤ and ㊦ alike? *HALOT* 982b s.v. פְּשָׁע 3c writes: “to give my first-born because of my crime (causal acc., see GK § 118 l.”¹⁶ Such an analysis was attempted in the Vulg., “pro scelere meo,” Rashi (קרבן לפשעי), Ibn Ezra and Radaq (בעבור פשעי). When occasions for a causal accusative are plentiful, its possibility of application limited to a couple of instances suggests that this is not much more than an ad hoc solution.

As a lexical-semantic solution BDB s.v. פְּשָׁע 6 suggests “offering for transgression,” though the only reference is our Mi case. On the other hand, such an extension is securely attested for הַטָּאָה, e.g. עֹלָה וְהִטָּאָה Ps 40.7, and

¹³ In *Index* 96a s.v. 5c), the only passage concerned, ἐν τόπῳ πίονι ‘in a fertile spot’ Is 5.1, is to be deleted; ㊦’s שֶׁמֶן שֶׁמֶן was probably read as שֶׁמֶן בְּמִקְוֵם.

¹⁴ For more examples, see Jastrow 1903, s.v. שֶׁמֶן II.

¹⁵ Once applied to a daughter: ὄνομα τῆς πρωτότοκῆς Μεροβ, καὶ ὄνομα τῆς δευτέρας Μελχολ 1K 14.49, where the Lucianic version, taking offence at this, emended the adjective to τῆς πρεσβυτέρας.

¹⁶ The sole instance mentioned by GK loc. cit. is .. רָאֵת שְׁמִירָה Is 7.25, where οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ ἐκεῖ φόβος· ἔσται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς χέρσου καὶ ἀκάνθης εἰς βόσκημα προβάτων perhaps suggests that its *Vorlage* may have read, or the translator may have mentally reconstructed, .. מִרְאֵת שְׁמִירָה. In any event, for ㊤ the subject of רָאֵת is תְּבוּאָה, *pace* GK “thou shall not come thither for fear of briers.” See also Vulg. *non veniet illuc terror spinarum*, Trg. לֹא יֵאָדָר לְתִמְנָן דְּתִלְתַּת הַיּוֹבְבָא, and Pesh. /lā' te' 'öl l-tammān dehlā' d-ya'rā'.

Willis (1968.274) follows Lescow's (1966.46) “für meine Bosheit .. für mein verfehltes Leben”, seeing here an acc. of cause.

innumerable references listed in BDB s.v. **חֲטֹאתַי** 4. An analogous shift, most likely under Hebrew influence, is observable in ἀμάρτημα as in ἐπιθήσει τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ ἀμαρτήματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ σφάξουσιν τὴν χίμαιραν τὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας (**חֲטֹאתַי** 2x) ‘he shall place the hand on the head of his sin-offering, and one shall slaughter the young she-goat meant for sin-offering’ Le 4.29¹⁷ and τὸ μοσχάριον τῆς ἀμαρτίας (**חֲטֹאתַי**) ‘the young calf for the sin’ Ex 29.36.¹⁸

Whilst no indisputable case is to be found for such a shift in ἀσέβεια, the analogy of the above-quoted examples such as τὴν χίμαιραν τὴν τῆς ἀμαρτίας and τὸ μοσχάριον τῆς ἀμαρτίας might render support to such an assumption, thus “my first-born, (an offering to atone for my) impiety.” There is, however, one serious difficulty here. In the two parallel phrases in the second half of the verse, one of the parallel words, ἀμαρτία, is preceded by a preposition, ὑπέρ, probably added in **Θ** independently of **Α**, but ἀσέβεια not. On this use of ὑπέρ τινοσ, note τὰ ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίας ‘the sin-offerings’ Ez 40.39 and ἐρίφους δύο αἰγῶν ἀμόμους ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτίας ‘two impeccable young goats for sin-offering’ ib. 43.22.¹⁹

The parallelism here also suggests that ἀσεβείας is sg., not ‘manifestations of impiety,’ though that could stand in apposition to the pl. πρωτότοκά μου. What then is the function of the genitive here? We suggest that this is a genitive of cause as in τὸ αἷμα τῆς περιτομῆς ‘the blood due to the circumcision’ Ex 4.26.²⁰ Note the use of ἀσέβεια applied to illicit sexual acts in ἕκαστος τὴν νόμφην αὐτοῦ ἐμίαινε ἐν ἀσεβείᾳ Ez 22.11.

ἀμαρτίας ψυχῆς μου **וְשֵׁנִי חֲטֹאתַי**] According to Wolff (138) **וְשֵׁנִי** with a suf. pron. added has the value of an emphatic pronoun. Then he could have translated the phrase here as “mein eigenes verfehltes Leben” instead of his own “mein verfehltes Leben.” How would he translate **חֲטֹאתַי**? Could we not say that anything one does with one’s limb or limbs ultimately flows out of one’s inner thought? The same issue arises with regard to ψυχή used here.²¹

6.8) εἰ ἀνηγγέλη σοι, ἄνθρωπε, τί καλόν; ἢ τί κύριος ἐκζητεῖ παρὰ σοῦ ἄλλ’ ἢ τοῦ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ ἀγαπᾶν ἔλεος καὶ ἔτοιμον εἶναι τοῦ πορεύεσθαι μετὰ κυρίου θεοῦ σου;

Was it told you, o man, what is good or what the Lord requires of you except to practise justice and value mercy and be ready to walk with the Lord your God?

¹⁷ NETS “on the head of his mistake”; a mistake has no head. It is the head of a young nanny goat offered to atone for his sin.

¹⁸ More examples are mentioned in GELS s.v. ἀμαρτία 3.

¹⁹ Cf. Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν 1Cor 15.3, and for further examples, see BDAG s.v. ὑπέρ A 1 b.

²⁰ More examples are added in SSG § 22 v (xxi).

²¹ On this important, though complicated, question, see above at Ho 9.5.

הַגִּיד לְךָ אֲדָם מִה־טוֹב וּמִה־יְהוָה דּוֹרֵשׁ מִמֶּךָ כִּי אִם־עֲשׂוֹת מְשֻׁפֵּט וְאַהֲבַת הַסּוֹד
וְהַצְנֵעַ לְכַתֵּעַם־אֱלֹהֶיךָ:

e] A *heh* may have dropped out, i.e. haplography: הַהִיד > הַגִּיד.

[ἀνηγγέλῃ] By using the passive form the translator might be averting the question that might arise as to who said it.²² Hence there is no absolute need to assume that his *Vorlage* actually read הַגִּד = הַגִּד. Of course it is possible that he parsed the *defectiva* spelled הַגִּד as Hofal. In both Hebrew and Greek the third ms verb form is occasionally used impersonally.²³

[ἀγαπᾶν ἔλεος הַסּוֹד וְאַהֲבַת הַסּוֹד] The parallelism with עֲשׂוֹת shows that אַהֲבַת here is functioning as an inf. cst. just as אָהַב Ec 3.8. Its syntactic status differs in שְׂמַתְּפָה צַד שְׂמַתְּפָה אֶת־הָאֲהָבָה צַד שְׂמַתְּפָה Ct 2.7. As regards its meaning, it is not so much as ‘to love’ as ‘to attach great value and importance to.’ Just as the two greatest commandments אַהֲבַת הַסּוֹד is here presented virtually as a commandment. It is an act of mercy granted to you by your neighbour and also such an act performed by you for your neighbour. If one is surprised to be commanded to accept mercy, one might remind oneself of what St Paul says he had heard Jesus saying μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν ‘it is a greater blessing to give than to receive’ Acts 20.35. Neither virtue is our inborn tendency. Hence our Mi text continues with another requirement: humility.²⁴

[ἔτοιμον εἶναι] A rather unexpected rendering. The root צנע commonly thought to have to do with humility occurs only once more in BH, and correctly rendered in Ⓞ: אֶת־צְנוּעִים הַכְּמָה: στόμα δὲ ταπεινῶν μελετᾷ σοφίαν Pr 11.2. The root occurs four times in Ben Sira, but its Gk translations are problematic:

- a) 16.25 דַּעִי בְּהַצְנַע אַחוּהַ דַּעִי ‘I shall express my unexaggerated view’
ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἀπαγγεῶλῶ ἐπιστήμην ‘I shall tell a view with accuracy’
- b) 35.3 שְׂכַל הַצְנַע שְׂכַל ‘Keep (your talk on) science under control’
ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ ἐπιστήμη ‘with accurate knowledge’
- c) 34.22 צְנוּעַ הִיָּה מַעֲשֶׂיךָ כִּכֵּל ‘whatever you do, be humble’
ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις σου γίνου ἐντροχῆς ‘in all your works be skilful’
- d) 42.8 חֵי כָל־אִישׁ צְנוּעַ לְפָנַי כָּל־חֵי ‘a humble man in the presence of every living one’
δεδοκιμασμένος ἔναντι παντὶ ζῶντος ‘acceptable before every living one’

We see this translator also struggling. Our Mi translator might be doing his own best.²⁵

²² Both Vulg. and Pesh. got out of the problem by making the prophet speak: *Indicabo* and /hawwītāk/, quite a departure from Ⓞ. For Rashi, Ibn Ezra and Radaq God is answering the questions put earlier in vs. 7.

²³ On Hebrew, cf. JM § 155 b, d-f and SQH § 37 a, and on Greek, cf. SSG § 87 a, c.

²⁴ Cf. Muraoka 2020b.90f.

²⁵ On a morphological issue here, see Muraoka 2020.124.

- 6.9) Φωνὴ κυρίου τῆ πόλει ἐπικληθήσεται, καὶ σώσει φοβουμένους τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. ἄκουε, φυλὴ, καὶ τίς κοσμήσει πόλιν;

The voice of the Lord will be addressed to the city, and He will save those who fear His name. Hear, o tribe, and who will adorn a city?

קול יהוה לעיר יקרא ותושיה יראא שמה שמעו מטה ומי יעדה:

Φωνὴ κυρίου [הוה קול] For the Tiberian Massorettes the first Heb. word was not in st. cst., as shown by a disjunctive accent (*ytiw*), hence an exclamation, ‘Listen!’, an analysis not opted for by Ⓞ. But a voice, not a person, addressing the city may have sounded unusual, so that יקרא was parsed as Nif. יקרא. One wonders whether or not our translator shared the conventional interpretation of קול קורא במדבר פנו דרה יהוה ישרו בערבבה מסלה לאלהינו Is 40.3, where the use of the capital letter in the standard LXX editions with Ἐτοιμάσατε instead of Ἐν τῆ ἐρήμῳ is to be noted: φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῆ ἐρήμῳ Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

καὶ σώσει ..]. This middle part of the verse in Ⓞ is rather obscure. Since Qal יראא is not doubly transitive, שמה must be the subject of יראא, but what on earth could שמה יראא mean? Faced with this riddle, our translator radically rewrote the text: והושיע יראי שמו.²⁶

ἄκουε] = שמע, an adjustment of the sg. מטה. The pl. of Ⓞ is ad sensum.

κοσμήσει] יעדה was derived by the translator from עדה ‘to adorn,’ and not from יעד ‘to appoint, assign.’²⁷

πόλιν] = עיר, which comes from עוד at the start of the following verse.²⁸

- 6.10) μὴ πῦρ καὶ οἶκος ἀνόμου θησαυρίζων θησαυροὺς ἀνόμους καὶ μέτρον ὕβρεως ἀδικία;

Fire and the house of a lawbreaker hoarding ill-gotten treasures and a measure of arrogance, injustice?

עוד האש בית רשע אצרות רשע ואיפת רזון ועומה:

μὴ πῦρ καὶ οἶκος] = האש ובית. μὴ presumably introduces a rhetorical question that anticipates a negative answer. The clause consists of three noun phrases joined with καί. It can be seen as an answer to the question put at the end of the preceding verse.²⁹

²⁶ Barthélemy (1992.759) goes into some details of divergent readings among Hebrew manuscripts.

²⁷ SD’s commentators (II 2376) and we agree at this point. However, to translate Ⓞ 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.

עָצָה וְאֵין אֲשֶׁר] The antecedents of וְאֵין are most likely the immediately preceding στάθμια δόλου, which served as instruments for unlawful accumulation of wealth. The Heb syntax, however, makes us anticipate בָּהֶם or something like that inside the relative clause.³³

τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν ἀσεβείας ἔπλησαν] = מְשַׁעְרָם מְלֵאֵי הַמָּס. In Hebrew both Qal מְלֵא and Piel מְלֵא can take two zero-objects. E.g. מְלֵאוּ אַרְבָּעָה כְּדִים מִים 1Kg 18.34; וְיָחַד אֲלֵהֶם בְּחֶקְמָה Ex 31.3. By contrast, πίμπλημι, when it takes two objects, enters only one syntagm, <vb - acc. - gen.>, and never <vb - acc. - acc.>. Hence ἀσεβείας in our Mi passage is sg. gen., not pl. acc. Interestingly, a synonymous verb, ἐπίμπλημι attests to both syntagms: ἐνέπλησα αὐτὸν πνεῦμα θεῖο σοφίας Ex 31.3, where σοφίας is to be construed with πνεῦμα θεῖον, and not with the verb as against ἐνέπλησεν αὐτοὺς σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως ib. 35.35. Likewise Is 11.3, Ps 90.16, 104.40. Our translator probably meant to say that they took recourse to all dubious and illegal tactics and means as they accumulated their wealth.

We would not analyse ἀσεβείας as a gen. of quality, i.e. ‘their wealth obtained through acts of impiety,’ for Hebrew does not allow מְלֵאוּ 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] = הִמָּחַ from √רום. The verb is indicative of arrogance,³⁴ cf. ὕψωθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ רִיבֵם-לְבָבוֹ De 17.20.

The last three words of the verse is comparable to a nominal clause we find in ‘I embody insight, I am insight *par excellence*’ אֲנִי בִינָה Pr 8.14 in lieu of a more prosaic אֲנִי מְבִין. This may have been missed by the translator, hence Ø’s attempt to restructure ~~Ⓜ~~.³⁵

The 3fs pronouns must be referring to the city (πόλις) in vs. 9 above.

6.13) καὶ ἐγὼ ἄρξομαι τοῦ πατάξαι σε, ἀφανισῶ σε ἐπὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις σου.

I on my part shall begin to strike you, I shall exterminate you on account of your sins.

וְגַם-אֲנִי הֶחֱלֵיתִי הַכּוֹתָהּ הַשָּׂמֵם עַל-הַטְּאֵתָהּ:

καὶ ἐγὼ וְגַם-אֲנִי] The ubiquitous particle גַּם cannot mean here that two persons do the same thing. Hence not to be rendered ‘I, too.’ An analogous case is גַּם-יְהוָה הָעֵבִיר הַטְּאֵתָהּ לֹא תָמוּת 2Sm 12.13.³⁶

³³ An argument presented by Wolff (160) for viewing אֲשֶׁר as causal in value. So many modern translations.

³⁴ Cf. ὑπερηφάνω κεχρημένοι διανοία ‘having taken recourse to arrogant thinking’ Theodor of Mopsuestia in PG 66.1 388.

³⁵ Barthélemy’s proposed interpretation, “Eux dont la langue est tromperie en leur bouche,” is questionable, since there is no pl. noun preceding that can serve as the antecedent of the French relative pronoun.

³⁶ Radaq attempts to retain the usual sense of the particle: “Just as you have made the indigent people sick who are robbed by you through your deceptions,” though no such incident is

ἄρξομαι] = יִרְחֹק. The selection of the fut. in **Θ**, however, is anomalous. ἀφανιῶ σε **מַשְׁחֵה**] Ἀφανίζω is one of the most frequent equivalents of the verb root **מ.ש.ח**. It is not easy to say precisely how the translator parsed **מ.ש.ח**. Replacing the initial **ה** with **א** as the 1s prefix of Hif. Impf. would not do, since one would anticipate a single *mem*. Thus he probably identified an inf. abs. Hif., which he translated somewhat freely. The absence of *καί* before ἀφανιῶ suggests that he identified **מ.ש.ח** as a non-finite verb form.³⁷

6.14) σὺ φάγεσαι καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐμπλησθῆς· καὶ σκοτάσει ἐν σοὶ καὶ ἐκνεύσει, καὶ οὐ μὴ διασωθῆς· καὶ ὅσοι ἐὰν διασωθῶσιν εἰς ῥομφαίαν παραδοθήσονται.

You may eat but will never be be sated. It will become dark inside yourself and people will move away, and you will never be rescued. Whoever are saved will be handed to a sword.

אַתָּה תֹאכַל וְלֹא תִשְׂבַּע וְיִשְׁחָךְ בְּקֶרְבְּךָ וְתִסַּג וְלֹא תִפְלֵיט וְאֲשֶׁר תִּפְלֵט לַחֶרֶב אֶתָּה:

σὺ ἀτῆ] The morphologically redundant pronoun in Greek and Hebrew alike is comparable to an accusing finger pointed at a person.³⁸

σκοτάσει] = שְׁחָךְ. The Heb. word here is a crux interpretum.³⁹ **Θ** may be wanting to say: “you will agonise in depressive darkness.” The use of the 3ms form here is typical of natural phenomena. Another example is σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος ‘it will become dark, though the sun is rising’ Is 13.10, cf. *SSG* § 87 **cc**.

ἐκνεύσει **תִּסַּג**] Comparison with another occurrence of the same verb root in Mi could be illuminating. In οὐ γὰρ ἀπόσεται δνειδή ‘for He will not remove humiliations’ Mi 2.6 **Θ** must have read Hif. **יִסַּג** as against **יִסַּג לֹא תִלְמוֹת**. In both instances it is about distancing. However, transitive in the one and intransitive in the other. In our present instance the translator may have read **יִסַּג**, though he leaves the identity of the subject vague, maybe deliberately⁴⁰: “someone who should be coming to your rescue will look away.”

mentioned by the prophet. The same holds for Barthélemy’s (1992.768) remark: “de même que .. par la violence .. moi aussi .. avec violence.”

SD reads “Und ich, ich werde ..”; without reference to **י** we could see here “assertive” force of the independent personal pronoun, on which see *SSG* § 7 **be**. But in view of **אָנִי** that could not have been our translator’s intention.

³⁷ *Pace Harper* (2016.85) we have not here an inf. abs. following a weqatal form.

³⁸ For Greek see *SSG* § 7 **bc**, and for Hebrew Muraoka 1985.50f., 58 (3).

³⁹ *HALOT* 446b s.v. “dirt, filth” is proposed, apparently based on Ehrman (TM: not Ehrmann) 1959.156 (TM: not 56), who translates: “Thou shalt eat but not be satisfied, and thy wastes shall be locked up within you.” He mentions Arb. /wash/ ‘dirt.’ Cf. also Driver 1965.114.

⁴⁰ Note our remark below on *παραδοθήσονται*. *SD* II 2377 asks: “Kann die 3. Pers. Sg. – wie im Hebräischen – unpersönlich wiedergegeben werden.” Our answer is “Ja,” see *SSG* § 87 **cb**. Here is a special case, however, should our assumption be correct. The translator is too sensitive to state the subject explicitly.

διασωθῆς טַלְפָּלָה] ⚭ may be meant as Qal, טַלְפָּלָה, cf. ἀνασωθήσονται וַטְלַףְּ עַז 7.16. Would one then postulate וַטְלַףְּ in lieu of טַלְפָּלָה?

ὄσοι רָצָא] Some modern Bible translations translate רָצָא as “that which,” “what,” etc., but things you manage to rescue would not be handed over to a sword. The mpl. ὄσοι can only refer to animate beings, humans. The person being addressed here, according to ⚭, is in some leadership position, attempting to rescue coreligionists or compatriots of his.

παραδοθήσονται] = יִתְּנוּ. The translator may not have been able to bear the image of God delivering some of His own people to be beheaded just like that.⁴¹

6.15) σὺ σπερεῖς καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀμήσης, σὺ πιέσεις ἐλαίαν καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀλείψῃ
ἔλαιον, καὶ οἶνον καὶ οὐ μὴ πίητε,

You may sow, but will never harvest. You may squeeze olive(s), but you will never anoint (your body) with olive oil, and wine you will never drink,

אַתָּה תִּזְרַע וְלֹא תִקְצֹר אֶתָּה תִדְרֹךְ-וַיִּתְּן לְאֶתְּסוּף שְׂמֶן וְתִירוֹשׁ וְלֹא תִשְׁתַּהֲוֶינָּה:

σὺ אַתָּה] On the value of these pronouns which are morphologically redundant, see at vs. 14 above. In this verse it is even repeated.

πιέσεις דָּרַךְ] The Heb. verb makes it plain that it is about treading fresh olives on a floor, which may escape readers of ⚭, in which πιάζω / πιέζω can mean ‘to press, squeeze with a hand or hands.’

ἀλείψῃ ἔλαιον] This verb, when used in the middle voice, can be governed by a prepositional phrase of instrumental value as in ἀλειφόμεναι ἐν σμυρνίνῳ ἐλαίῳ Es 2.12 ο’, where it might not be a Hebraism (שֶׁבַשְׁמֶן הַמֵּר) in view of a case in CG such as ἀλειψαμένῳ λίπ’ ἐλαίῳ ‘when the two anointed themselves richly with oil’ Homer *Il.* 10.577.

וְתִירוֹשׁ] Once in XII this noun occurs in conjunction with יַיִן and both have been translated: יַיִן וְתִירוֹשׁ יִקְחֶלֶב οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα ἐδέξατο καρδία λαοῦ μου Ho 4.11. No manuscript or version supplies another substantive. Despite of its position it is not very likely that it has been translated with οἶνον, יַיִן left untranslated.

The equivalences in LXX of the words in question look as below:

תִּירוֹשׁ	38	יַיִן	142	שְׂכָר	26	שְׂכָרוֹן	3
μέθυσμα	1	οἶνος	132	μέθυσμα	4	μέθυσμα	1
οἶνος	36	γλεῦκος	1	οἶνος	3		
				μέθη	3	μέθη	2

⁴¹ Another LXX translator might be displaying a measure of sensitivity and sympathy towards a dramatis persona in the text he is translating, Hagar running away from her pestering mistress. See Muraoka 2020b.97f.

The sole instance in LXX of the equivalence תִּירוֹשׁ / μέθυσμα is יַיִן וְתִירוֹשׁ οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα Ho 4.11. This is striking since the above table shows that οἶνος is the standard rendering of both יַיִן and תִּירוֹשׁ. If we postulate that the latter means ‘not fermented, new wine, must,’ then we would have to conclude that, for LXX translators, יַיִן is a generic lexeme, “drink produced from grapes,” making תִּירוֹשׁ one variety of it.⁴² The selection of οἶνος in our Mi passage should be considered against this general background. However, another factor may be playing a role here. Did our translator know precisely what תִּירוֹשׁ meant? His knowledge of this detail of the agriculture in the Holy Land may not have been good enough as to suggest to him τρύξις as the best rendering. One could safely assume that this Greek word, not a particularly rare one, was in his Greek vocabulary. Once he settled on this equivalence, he may have found it unnecessary to repeat οἶνος.⁴³

οἶνον καὶ יַיִן תִּירוֹשׁ Irrespective of the question of equations between the two Heb. words and the one Gk word, the conjunction here in both languages calls for an explanation. Is the noun preceding it highlighted one way or another? It appears that alcoholic drink is considered distinct by the translator from the other two agricultural products. The verb is suddenly shifted from the sg. to the pl. Wine is viewed as indispensable for an enjoyable life: ‘What is life when wine (οἶνος) becomes scarce?’ Si 34.27 and ‘a musicians’ melody accompanied by pleasant wine (οἶνος)’ ib. 35.6. The pl. verb suggests a family dinner or a social occasion.

In 𐤁 the less expensive variety was mentioned first: “And new wine? No way. You do not deserve any kind of יַיִן in order to have fun.” By contrast in 𐤂 the generic term alone was mentioned: “Not food alone, but also οἶνος would not be available for you to enjoy with others.”

6.15 end) καὶ ἀφανισθήσεται νόμιμα λαοῦ μου 6.16) καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα οἴκου Αχασαβ, καὶ ἐπορεύθητε ἐν ταῖς βουλαῖς αὐτῶν, ὅπως παραδῶ σε εἰς ἀφανισμόν καὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν εἰς συρισμόν· καὶ ὄνειδη λαῶν λήμψεσθε.

and regulations of my people will be destroyed as well as all the works of the house of Ahab, and you went along with their decisions, so that I would (eventually) hand you over to destruction and all its residents to (target of) hissing, and you will be subjected to derisions by peoples.

וַיִּשְׁתַּמְּרוּ חֻקֹת עַמִּי וְכָל מַעֲשֵׂה בֵית־אֲחָאָב וַתֵּלְכוּ בְּמַעֲצוֹתָם לְמַעַן תִּתִּי אֶתְּיָא
לְשִׂמְיָה וְיִשְׁבִּיָה לְשִׂרְקָה וְחִרְפַת עַמִּי תִשְׂאוּ:

⁴² This is probably what is meant in “The Bible called it [= יַיִן] תִּירוֹשׁ” (jNed 40.2), not that the two words are always freely interchangeable. I am told by an Israeli resident in Jerusalem, Mr Richard Medina, that in a local supermarket you can buy for a twopence a bottle of תִּירוֹשׁ, grape juice, as distinct from intoxicating יַיִן.

⁴³ On potential implications of our translator’s probably urban upbringing, see above at p. 127.

ἀφανισθήσεται] In *Index* 20a s.v. ἀφανίζω דַּמְשָׁי has been suggested.⁴⁴ However, our identification at מְשָׁיִךְ (> ἀφανισθῶσι) Ho 5.15 as מְשָׁיִךְ renders מְשָׁיִךְ more likely. Note also הַמְשָׁיִךְ / ἀφανισμός here.

λαοῦ μου] = עַמִּי. Pace Rahlfs Ziegler justly adds a full stop after μου, making the clause continue vs. 15, for otherwise καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα οἴκου Αἰσαβ would end up hanging in the air, not linked backwards or forwards.

After μου Rahlfs adds καὶ ἐφύλαξας [= מְשָׁיִךְ] τὰ δικαιώματα Ζαμβρι, which is roughly equivalent to 𐤌, but a second translation of the preceding clause. Obviously we need to adopt only one translation. A doublet of an entire clause is unheard of.

τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν הַיְיִשְׁרָאֵלִים] Though the ptc. is substantivised in Greek and Hebrew alike, SG never allows the use of a gen. form here, hence not αὐτῆς. Either the acc. or a prepositional phrase is used, e.g. οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ הַיְיִשְׁרָאֵלִים 2C 20.20.⁴⁵

λαῶν] = עַמִּים, which gives a message totally different from 𐤌, which is saying that some leaders are doomed to be derided by heathen nations on behalf of the entire people of God.

⁴⁴ Barthélemy (1992.769) rejects a form of $\sqrt{\text{מדש}}$ as an equivalent here, but his alternative interpretation “l’on s’excitait à observer ..,” let alone a play on words, “l’on se samarisait selon les prescriptions ..,” are not very convincing.

⁴⁵ For a fuller discussion, see *SSG* 31 **bbb**.

CHAPTER VII

7.1) Οἴμμοι ὅτι ἐγενόμην ὡς συνάγων καλάμην ἐν ἀμῆτῳ καὶ ὡς ἐπιφυλλίδα ἐν τρυγήτῳ οὐχ ὑπάρχοντος βότρυος τοῦ φαγεῖν τὰ πρωτόγονα. οἴμμοι, 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,

אֶלְלִי לִי כִי הָיִיתִי כְּאֶסְפִּי-קִיץ כְּעֵלְת בְּצִיר אֵין-אֶשְׁכּוֹל לְאֶכּוֹל בְּבוֹרָה אֹתָהּ
נַפְשִׁי:

Οἴμμοι לִי אֶלְלִי] An equivalence that occurs only twice, the other occurrence in Jb 10.15.

συνάγων] = אָסַף.¹

καλάμην ἐν ἀμῆτῳ] Obviously too long for אֶ, and קִיץ ‘summer’ has nothing to do with אֶ here. In *Index* 8a s.v. ἄμητος, אָסְפִי בְּקִיץ has been proposed, though this must be rather tentative, given its considerable departure from אֶ.² The equivalence καλάμη / אָסַף occurs nine more times in LXX.

ἐν τρυγήτῳ] = אָסְפִי.³

τὰ πρωτόγονα] This must be meant to be in apposition to βότρυος, though the separation of the two terms in apposition is not common, and their grammatical case does not match. The first term is generic, the second specific.⁴ In אֶ בְּבוֹרָה is the object of the following verb, ‘(my soul) desired.’⁵ Once our translator analysed אֶ בְּבוֹרָה as we are suggesting here, there remained not much scope for him to do as he did, admitting here an equivalent of אֶלְלִי, maybe אָסַף, a word he appears to be fond of. In another passage in XII he repeats it three times, when אֶ uses it once only: אָסַף אֶה אֶה לִי־וּם: Οἴμμοι οἴμμοι οἴμμοι εἰς ἡμέραν JI 1.15.

¹ The difference between אֶ and אֶ is not, *pace SD* (II 2378), that of sg. // pl., but between two different lexemes, Qal ptc. sg // cst.pl. of אָסַף, a substantive, as shown by the dagesh of the *pe*.

² However, *SD* (II 2378) interestingly thinks of a possible intertextual allusion to Ex 5.12, where we read Israelites gathered stubble for straw (καλάμην εἰς ἄχυρα), and אֶ reads אָסַף for καλάμη.

³ In *Index* 119b s.v. τρύγητος, delete 2) a. אָסְפִי.

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 אֶ an asyndetic relative clause, an analysis that would be analogous to that in אֶ. We would, however, not equate אָסַף with אָסַף, see above (p. 115) ad Ho 9.4.

7.2) ὅτι ἀπόλωλεν εὐλαβῆς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ κατορθῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις οὐχ ὑπάρχει· πάντες εἰς αἵματα δικάζονται, ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ ἐκθλίβουσιν ἐκθλιβῆ.

for the pious have vanished from the land, and those who conduct themselves uprightly are not to be found among people. They all demand capital punishment, they harass one another severely.

אָבָד קָסִיד מִן־הָאָרֶץ וְיִשָּׁר בְּאָדָם אֵין כְּלָם לְדָמִים יֵאָבְבוּ אִישׁ אֶת־הַקָּהִיל וְיִצְרֶה
:הָרָם

ἀπόλωλεν] The 2Pf. of ἀπόλλυμι is intransitive, but the 1Pf. transitive, e.g. ἔθνος ἀπολωλεκὸς βουλήν ‘a nation that is at their wits’ ends’ De 32.28, οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀπολωλεκόσιν τὴν ὑπομονήν ‘Woe to you, who have lost patience’ Si 2.14. Cp. ὁ δίκαιος ἀπόλετο אָבָד קִי־הַצְדִּיק Is 57.1.

ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς קָרָה־מִן] *Pace* “von der Erde” (SD) the prophet’s audience is most likely local.

δικάζονται] = יִרְיְבוּ. Here emerges a message quite different from that of 𐤆, in which people are lying in wait to commit murders, whereas in 𐤇 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 אִישׁ אֶת־הַקָּהִיל] 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 𐤆 reads יִרְיְבוּ. On the other hand, our translator makes use of an alternative, also Hebraising, expression as in דָּסָה וְהִיאֶתְאָהִי אִישׁ אֶת־אָהִיו עָשׂוּ וְהָרָמִים יִרְיְבוּ ἔλεος καὶ οἰκτιρμὸν ποιεῖτε ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Zc 7.9; four more times in XII. One wonders whether or not 𐤇’s *Vorlage* read יִרְיְבוּ here.⁶

ἐκθλίβουσιν] In *Index* 36b s.v. ἐκθλίβω we suggested Qal צָרַר as a Heb. equivalent.⁷ But on second thoughts, its Hif. looks a better candidate in the light of an example such as καὶ ἐκθλίψω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους וְהִצְרִיתִי לָאָדָם Zp 1.17 and καὶ ἔθλιψαν αὐτούς לְהָמֵר וְיִצְרֶה Ne 9.27. So 𐤇 read יִצְרֶה, i.e. יִצְרֶה.

ἐκθλιβῆ] This can be analysed as an instance of the well-known cognate dative.⁸ However, in 𐤆 there is no matching figura etymologica, something like הִצְרֶה or צָרַר. Though one could dismiss it as freely translated, the translator might have in his mind הָרָם ‘fishing net’ as in Hb 1.15, 16, 17, for such a net would come over to caught fish as harassing. The translator uses there σαγήνη.

⁶ Pesh. /’ahu(h)y/, Trg. אָהִיו, and Vulg. *fratrem suum* = 𐤆.

⁷ Wolff (175) suggests יִצְרֶה, i.e. < √צור> ‘to besiege, shut in.’

⁸ For details, see *SSG* § 22 wr.

7.3) ἐπὶ τὸ κακὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐτοιμάζουσιν· ὁ ἄρχων αἰτεῖ, καὶ ὁ κριτὴς εἰρηνικούς λόγους ἐλάλησεν, καταθύμιον ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ ἐστί, καὶ ἐξελοῦμαι τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν

They prepare their hands for the evil. The ruler demands, and the judge spoke sweet-sounding words. That is what he desires. And I shall carry off their good things

על־הָרַע כְּפִים לְהִטִּיב הַשָּׂר שְׂאֵל הַשֹּׁפֵט בְּשִׁלּוֹם וְהַגְדִּיל דְּבַר הַתּוֹרָה נִפְשׁוּ הוּא
וַיַּעֲבֹתוּהָ:

ἐτοιμάζουσι] The translation is Aramaising. In Aramaic Pael טִיב means ‘to prepare.’

εἰρηνικούς λόγους] Unlike in λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ἕκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ καὶ κρίμα εἰρηνικὸν κρίνατε ἐν ταῖς πύλαις ὑμῶν Zc 8.16 the adjective here must be taken in sensu malo. שִׁלּוֹם of 𐤔 must have been read as שִׁלְוָה, and דְּבַר as דְּבָרָה, but even so the rendition is rather expansive. What has happened to וְהַגְדִּיל?

ἐξελοῦμαι וַיַּעֲבֹתוּהָ] Another free rendition of a hapax in BH.

τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν טוֹבִים] This is the first word of vs. 4. The neut. adjective here is substantivised.⁹ As implied in n. 9, ἀγαθὰ always implies value judgement. It is not used like its Engl. equivalent as in “goods train” as against “passenger train.” The use of the article is optional.¹⁰

7.4) ὡς σὴς ἐκτρώγων καὶ βαδίζων ἐπὶ κανόνος ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σκοπιᾶς σου. [οὐαὶ οὐαί.] αἱ ἐκδικήσεις σου ἦκασι, νῦν ἔσσονται κλαυθμοὶ αὐτῶν.

like a moth that devours and walks on a rod on the day when you are watched. [Woe, woe.] your punishments are come.

טוֹבִים כְּחַדָּק יִשָּׂר מִמְּסוּכָה יוֹם מְצַפִּיָּה פְּקָדֹתַי בְּאֵה עֲתָה תִּהְיֶה מְבוֹבָתָם:

σὴς ἐκτρώγων καὶ βαδίζων ἐπὶ κανόνος מִמְּסוּכָה יִשָּׂר חַדָּק] Here again our translator appears to be struggling with features of the landscape of the Holy Land.¹¹ Is he aware of: אֵי עֲצָל כְּמִשְׁכַּת חַדָּק וְאַרְחָה יִשְׂרָיִם סְלִלָה: Pr 15.19? There, however, no moth is around. מְסוּכָה ‘hedge’ is a hapax in BH.

אἱ ἐκδικήσεις σου פְּקָדֹתַי] It is difficult to decide whether or not the translator read the pl. פְּקָדֹתַי, but elsewhere in XII we note ἦκασιν αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς ἐκδικήσεως < יָמֵי הַפְּקָדָה >.

⁹ The entry in question in *GELS* 2a s.v. ἀγαθός 6 is in need of emendation: “articular and” > “subst.”; “goods, possessions” > “good, valuable possessions; treasures”; “their goods” > “their good things.”

¹⁰ So in NTG, e.g. πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν ‘He filled the hungry with good things’ Lk 1.53 and CG, e.g. ἦν οἱ ἄλλα τε ἀγαθὰ μυρία ‘he possessed countless other treasures’ Herodotus 2.172.3.

¹¹ We fail to see why *SD* II 2379 believes the assumption of an Aramaism here √רַק can help.

because a son dishonours (his) father, a daughter rebels against her mother, a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law, the people in one's family are all his enemies.

כִּי־בֶן מְנַבֵּל אָב בֵּת קָמָה בְּאֵמָה כְּלָהּ בְּחַמְתָּהּ אִבִּי אִישׁ אֲנָשִׁי בֵּיתוֹ:

ἀτιμάζει [מְנַבֵּל] This is the only instance of the equation ἀτιμάζω // נְבַל. πατέρα [אָב] The lack of grammatical parallelism with τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς is a mechanical reproduction of \mathfrak{H} .¹⁵

7.7) Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐπιβλέψομαι, ὑπομενῶ ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτηρί μου, εἰσακούσεταιί μου ὁ θεός μου.

I, however, would look to the Lord, continue to count on God my saviour, my God will listen to me.

וְאֲנִי בֵּיהוָה אֶצְפָּה אוֹחִילָה לְאֱלֹהֵי יִשְׁעֵי יִשְׁמְעֵנִי אֱלֹהֵי:

Ἐγὼ [וְאֲנִי] There is unmistakable underlining and implicit opposition: whatever others might do, I ..., see SSG § 7 **bd**.

אֶצְפָּה] Being of a Lamed-He verb, there is no morphological possibility to mark this form as volitive, but its parallelism with אוֹחִילָה indicates in that direction. Analogous analysis can be applied to יִשְׁמְעֵנִי as against יִשְׁמְעֵנִי, though we are not certain how our translator pronounced this unvocalised form.¹⁶ The last verb in \mathfrak{H} could be rendered “May my God listen to me!”.

7.8) μὴ ἐπίχαιρέ μοι, ἢ ἐχθρά μου, ὅτι πέπτωκα· καὶ ἀναστήσομαι, διότι ἐὰν καθίσω ἐν τῷ σκότει, κύριος φωτιεῖ μοι.

Do not rejoice over me, o my enemy! Yes, I have fallen, but shall get up. For, if I am sitting in darkness, the Lord will provide light for me.

אַל־תִּשְׂמְחֵי אֵיבְתֵי לִי כִּי נָפַלְתִּי קָמְתִּי כִּי־אֲשׁוּב בְּחֹשֶׁךְ יְהוָה אֹר לִי:

ἐπίχαιρέ] As is usually the case, the verb is used of malicious joy. For a rare exception, see at Ho 10.5. The target of such a joy is appropriately expressed through a *dativus incommodi*, μοι לִי.

ἢ ἐχθρά μου [אֵיבְתֵי לִי] As rightly pointed out the suffix /-i/ cannot mean ‘my’,¹⁷ since the form is accented, in the Tiberian accentuation, as penultimate. The final vowel is a so-called paragogic *i*, frequent with participles in particular, JM § 93 *n*. We see that \mathfrak{C} has analysed the form differently. The fem. gender may be compared to the standing expression בֵּת צִיּוֹן. Its identity, however, is disputed already by mediaeval Jewish commentators; the Roman

¹⁵ Improved in Pesh. /la(°)vū(h)y/, cf. Trg. /‘abbā’/.

¹⁶ On this detail, see JM § 61 *f*.

¹⁷ Thus *pace* Wolff 187 and McKane 218.

Empire, Babylonian, or Assyrian Empire have been mentioned. מְלוֹכָה, אֲרָץ or מְמַלְכָה 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. אֲרָץ הַדְּלֵת > 4K 24.14 οἱ πτωχοὶ τῆς γῆς, cf. JM § 134 o.

ὅτι כִּי] Though a most frequent equivalence, the conjunction in the two languages do not appear to mean the same thing. As correctly punctuated by Rahlfs and Ziegler, this ὅτι-clause is to be construed backwards, indicating a cause of the enemy's gloating, namely I'm fallen; cf. ἐπιχαρύντες τῆ σῆ πτώσει 'having gloated over your fall' Ba 4.31. By contrast, the כִּי-clause is to be construed forwards and is often taken to be concessive in value, 'though': "Though I did fall, look, I am already up and about."¹⁸ This analysis is rendered likely in view of the shift in tense in Ⓞ, Pf. > Fut., in contrast to the two *qatal*'s in Ⓜ. In order to express a usual causal idea our translator skillfully changes the conjunction in this very verse: διότι.

ἐάν] Most likely freely added, though possibly = כִּי אִם אֲשֶׁב.

φωτειῖ] Possibly = אִורִי or the translator saw a substantive, "the Lord is a light for me," but freely translated.

7.9) ὀργὴν κυρίου ὑποίσω, ὅτι ἥμαρτον αὐτῷ, ἕως τοῦ δικαιοῦσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου· καὶ ποιήσῃ τὸ κρίμα μου καὶ ἐξάξει με εἰς τὸ φῶς, ὄψομαι τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ.

I shall bear the wrath of the Lord, for I have sinned against Him, until He deals with my case and performs my verdict and takes me out into the light, I shall see His justice.

וְעַף יְהוָה אֲשָׂא כִּי חָטָאתִי לוֹ עַד אֲשֶׁר יִרְיֵב יְרִיבִי וְעָשָׂה מִשְׁפָּטִי יוֹצִיאֵנִי לְאוֹר
אֲרָאָה בְּצַדִּיקוֹתָי:

ὀργὴν וְעַף] A rare equivalence that occurs once more, also about divine anger, at 2C 28.9. The Heb. word appears in Jn 1.15 with reference to the rolling swell of rough sea, rendered with σάλος.

τοῦ δικαιοῦσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου יְרִיבִי יְרִיבִי] Cf. δίκασον τὴν δίκην μου יְרִיבָה יְרִיבָה Ps 42(43).1, an appeal to God.

וְעָשָׂה מִשְׁפָּטִי Cf. עָשִׂיתָ מִשְׁפָּטִי ἐποίησας τὴν κρίσιν μου Ps 9.5.

καὶ ποιήσῃ] The punctuation adopted by Swete, Rahlfs, and Ziegler as well as the shift from the infinitive (δικαιοῦσαι) to the future show the progression of thought reflected in Ⓞ as different from that in Ⓜ. In the latter, וְעָשָׂה is a *w-qatalti* form constituting an integrated complex with the preceding יְרִיבִי. By contrast, in Ⓞ, a totally new thought is introduced with וְעָשָׂה, an analysis which harmonises with the addition of καὶ, which is missing from

¹⁸ The concessive כִּי is not very frequent in BH. HALOT s.v. II כִּי 12 mentions 6 instances, but LXX has not so analysed it, even in an obvious case such as Pr 6.35. The notion of "though, although" is usually expressed with εἰ καὶ or ἐάν καὶ, but in SG they mean "even if."

יִצְיָאֲנִי. Whilst Keil (500) points out that יִצְיָאֲנִי is not governed by אָשׁוּרָךְ and, starting with יִצְיָאֲנִי, “the hope takes the form of the certain assurance,” the vocalisation instead of יִצְיָאֲנִי might be indicative of a wish. Cf. our remarks above ad 7.7 above. A volitive value can be applied to אָרְאָה.

ποιήσει τὸ κρίμα μου] Because the speaker has admitted his sinful past, the verdict cannot be “completely innocent.” Even so, he is wishing, God will take him out of the total darkness and grant him sparks of light.

אָרְאָה בְּצַדִּיקוֹתָ] The collocation אָרְאָה בְּ means ‘to look with interest’ whether in sensu bono or sensu malo.¹⁹ This Hebraism has become naturalised in SG to a certain extent, e.g. לְרֵאוֹת בְּטוֹבוֹת בְּהִיָּרֶךְ τοῦ ἰδεῖν 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.

7.10) καὶ ὄψεται ἡ ἐχθρά μου καὶ περιβαλεῖται αἰσχύνην ἢ λέγουσα πρὸς με Ποῦ κύριος ὁ θεός σου; οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου ἐπόψονται αὐτήν· νῦν ἔσται εἰς καταπάτημα ὡς πηλὸς ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς

Then my enemy will see (it) and the tongue which used to say to me “Where is the Lord your god?” will be covered with shame. My eyes will look at her. Now she will become something like clay to be trampled upon in the streets

תִּרְאֶה אֵיבְתִי וְתִכְסֶּה בּוֹשָׁה הָאֲמָרָה אֲלֵי אִי יְהוָה אֲלֶהֶךָ עֵינַי תִּרְאֶינָה בְּךָ עַתָּה תִּהְיֶה לְמַרְמָס כְּטִיט חִצּוֹת:

[אֵיבְתִי] See above at vs. 8.

περιβαλεῖται αἰσχύνην ἢ λέγουσα בּוֹשָׁה הָאֲמָרָה] On this metaphorical use of περιβάλλομαι, cf. περιβαλέσθωσαν αἰσχύνην καὶ ἐντροπήν οἱ ζητούντες τὰ κακά μοι Ps 70.13. The passive voice in the translation above, “be covered,” does not imply that περιβαλεῖται is genuinely passive, which should be περιβληθήσεται. The subtle nuance of the middle voice here is “she will have no choice but to put on shame, she will find herself wearing.” Note the active voice in 𐤁: ‘shame will cover her.’

αὐτήν] Instead of ἐν αὐτῇ. See at vs. 9 end.

ἢ λέγουσα הָאֲמָרָה] A substantivised ptc. with the article attached can refer to a past event or condition,²¹ as in ἐνετείλατο Ἰωσηφ τῷ ὄντι ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ ‘Joseph commanded the one who was in charge of his house’ Ge 44.1. In our case the present tense may carry imperfective value.²² Otherwise ἢ εἰπούσα ‘she who once said’ could have been used.

¹⁹ BDB s.v. אָרְאָה Qal 8 a.

²⁰ For more examples, see GELS s.v. εἶδον *2 b and ὄρω I 2 a. Under the former verb, the asterisk is missing.

²¹ See SSG § 31 ba-bba.

²² As captured by Pesh. /d-(‘)āmra (h)wāt/ and Trg. אָמְרָה תִּהְיֶה

ἐπόπονται αὐτήν בָּהֶרְאִיָּה] On the collocation בָּהֶרְאִיָּה, see on the preceding verse. In 6 and 7 alike the fem. pronoun can be referring to her shame.

καταπάτημα סַמְמָה] The Gk word refers to a result of καταπατέω ‘to trample,’ whereas סַמְמָה here indicates the action itself, for which SG has καταπάτησις as in ἔθεντο αὐτοὺς ὡς χοῦν εἰς καταπάτησιν (שָׁדָר) 4K 13.7. A somewhat loose use of this substantive is exemplified in οὐκ ἀπέστρεψεν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ καταπατήματος ‘He did not pull His hand back from ..’ La 2.8, for the noun is about what one does with one’s feet.²³ Note the use of καταπατέω as in καταπατοῦσαι (תִּצְצָר) πένητας Am 4.1 // καταπατοῦντες (צָרָר) δίκαιον ib. 5.12, where the second Heb. verb in particular has nothing to do with feet.

7.11) ἡμέρας ἀλοιφῆς πλίνθου. ἐξάλειψίς σου ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη, καὶ ἀποτρίπεται νόμιμα ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη·

on the day of daubing (and making of) brick. That day is your obliteration, and that day shall annul regulations.

יִום לְבִנוֹת גְּדִרְיָה יוֹם הַהוּא יִרְחֶק־קֶחַק:

ἡμέρας] Should one follow here Rahlfs’s and Ziegler’s reading, this is most likely a temporal genitive, ‘on the day of ...’ and the the first three words must be concluding the preceding verse. A variant, ἡμέραν, can be similarly analysed. Another variant ημερα should be accented ἡμέρα, a temporal dative.²⁴ In yet another variant, εν ημερα, i.e. ἐν ἡμέρα, the temporal value is explicitly marked with the preposition.²⁵

ἀποτρίπεται] = קֶחַק־יִרְחֶק.

The message of the main part of the verse in 6 is very difficult to fathom in relation to 7, in which latter we can identify nothing that would be equivalent to ἐξάλειψίς. Nor do we see what difficulty יִרְחֶק־קֶחַק could have caused.²⁶ In 6 we hear a doomsday prophecy instead of a gospel message

²³ Ziegler, basing himself solely on the fifth column of Origen’s *Hexapla*, reads καταποντίσματος. We would regard this as a secondary harmonisation with κατεπόντισε(v) in vss. 2 and 5. The meaning of καταποντίζω also testifies to deviation from its primary meaning of ‘to drown by throwing into the sea’ in the direction of ‘to obliterate, annihilate (in general),’ e.g. κατεπόντισεν πάσας τὰς βάρεις αὐτῆς La 2.5; God would have had the towers of Jerusalem transported hundreds of kilometres to the Mediterranean Sea, the Sea of Galilee or the Dead Sea.

Pace LSJ s.v. καταπάτημα the word is unlikely to mean “that which is trampled under foot.”

²⁴ See SSG § 22 h, xc, we. Brenton reads .. ταῖς ὁδοῖς. Ἡμέρα .. πλίνθου, ἐξάλειψις ..

²⁵ To read with Swete .. ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς. ¹¹ ἡμέρας ἀλοιφῆς πλίνθου, ἐξάλειψίς σου .. makes for rather loose syntax.

²⁶ SD II.2380 identifies πλίνθος as a rendering of לבנות, but one could fairly assume that our translator knew that the pl. of לבנה ‘brick,’ which occurs as often as 9 times in BH, is לבנות, never *לבנות.

is supposed to mean is as mysterious. Is a day of flooding and disarray in a battlefield meant?

- 7.13) καὶ ἔσται ἡ γῆ εἰς ἀφανισμόν σὺν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτὴν ἐκ καρπῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτῶν.

And the land will become a ruin along with its inhabitants because of the fruits of their (mal)practices.

וְהָיְתָה הָאָרֶץ לְשָׂמָמָה עַל־שִׁשְׁבֵי־הָמַפְרִי מַעַלְלֵיהֶם:

τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτὴν] Not .. αὐτῆς, on which see above at 6.16, p. 256.

ἐκ] Causal, *GELS* s.v. 6.

- 7.14) Ποίμαινε λαόν σου ἐν ράβδῳ σου, πρόβατα κληρονομίας σου, κατασκηνοῦντας καθ' ἑαυτοὺς δρυμὸν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Καρμηλῶ· νεμήσονται τὴν Βασανίτιν καὶ τὴν Γαλααδίτιν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος.

Tend My people with your staff, sheep of your inheritance, inhabiting by themselves in a thicket in Carmel. They shall live in Bashan and Gilead as in the olden days.

רָעָה עֲמָךְ בְּשִׁבְטְךָ צֹאן נִחְלָתְךָ שְׂכָנֵי לְבָדָד יַעַר בְּתוֹךְ כְּרַמְלָ יִרְעוּ בְּשֵׁן וְגִלְעָד
כִּימֵי עוֹלָם:

πρόβατα κληρονομίας σου ἡτῆρῶν] The genitive as well as the st. cst. can be either appositive or partitive: “sheep which are your inheritance” or “sheep as part of your inheritance.”³¹

κατασκηνοῦντας καθ' ἑαυτοὺς] 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 שְׂכָנֵי may have been read as שְׂכָנֵי instead of the archaic sg. form with a paragogic *yod* (JM § 93 n).³² In either case the first member is in the st. cst., and such can be governed by a non-substantival or adverbial adjunct, e.g. “שְׂבִי בְּאֶרֶץ צְלֻמֹת” ‘those who dwell in the land of utmost darkness’ Is 9.1; see further JM § 129 m - o.

καθ' ἑαυτοῦς] With acc., κατά “indicates, esp. with a refl. pron., separation, dissociation or seclusion” (*GELS* s.v. II 9). See also παρέθηκαν αὐτῷ μόνῳ καὶ αὐτοῖς καθ' ἑαυτοῦς καὶ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις τοῖς συνδειπνοῦσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ καθ' ἑαυτοῦς ‘they set (foods) to him alone and to them apart and to the Egyptians .. apart’ Ge 43.32.

³¹ See *SSG* § 22 v (iii) and (x), JM § 129 f 8), *SQH* § 21 b (iii) and (viii).

³² The punctuation in “Shepherd .. the shepherd of your possession, tenting alone in a forest” (*NETS*) can be misleading. Is the shepherd tenting alone? If not, are your sheep (pl.) kept in a tent?

δρυσὸν ַעַי] The acc., followed by ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Καρμήλου, is not necessarily a Hebraism. A synonymous verb, κατοικέω often governs an acc. of place, as in κατοικοῦσα καλῶς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς 1.11, cf. *GELS* s.v. κατοικέω **1 c**. See also the immediately following νεμήσονται τὴν Βασανίτιν.

νεμήσονται] The verb in the middle voice means “to live in the open which provides grass and water” (*GELS* s.v. **II 1**) with animals as its subjects. Note an instance in the active voice: νεμήσει αὐτοὺς κύριος ὡς ἀμνὸν ἐν εὐρυχώρῳ ‘the Lord will tend them like sheep in a wide open area’ Ho 4.16.

καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος ַעֲלֵי עֹלְמִי] Exactly as in Am 9.11. Strictly speaking, the use of the nominative here is ungrammatical, cf. κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ αἰῶνος Si 50.23.³³ See the beginning of vs. 15 and κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἔμπροσθεν vs. 20.

τοῦ Καρμήλου ַקְרְמֶל] ֿ takes the Heb. word as a place name, not a substantive in the sense of ‘garden-land.’ So Am 1.2, 9.3. Especially important is ַקְרְמֶל וְכַשְׂמֶל הָ בַּשְּׂנִי הָ Βασανίτις καὶ ὁ Κάρμηλος Na 1.4, where also the word is anarthrous in ֿ and coordinate with another place-name.

7.15) καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐξοδίας σου ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ὄψεσθε θαυμαστά.

And you will see wonders comparable to those in the days of your exit out of Egypt.

ַעֲלֵי צִאתְךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם אֲרָאֶנּוּ נִפְלְאוֹת:

ἐξοδίας] The same event is also called ἔξοδος, e.g. Ex 19.1, Nu 33.38 +. ὄψεσθε] = ַעֲרָא. Is our translator of the view that the speaker here is still, as earlier in vss. 7-9, Jerusalem? Then the shift from the sg. (σου) to the pl. (ὄψεσθε) is not quite right. But for the sake of fairness, ֿ is also problematic: why “I will show him (or: them = Israel),” and not ַעֲרָא? Then God would be the speaker.³⁴

7.16) ὄψονται ἔθνη καὶ καταισχυνθήσονται ἐκ πάσης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτῶν, ἐπιθήσουσι χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν, τὰ ὄτα αὐτῶν ἀποκωφωθήσονται.

³³ For more examples of <καθὼς + nom.>, see *GELS* s.v. **1**.

³⁴ Whilst Vulg. = ֿ, Pesh. ‘as in the day on which they went out of the land of Egypt, I shall show them wonders’ and Trg. ‘as in the day of your (pl.) exit from the land of Egypt I shall show them wonders’ are struggling. Some Greek manuscripts read δεῖξω αὐτοῖς.

Some modern scholars (Wellhausen 1898.150, Wolff 189) propose emending the last word to ַעֲרָא ‘show us’ (Impv.), but we fail to see how that helps. Wolff almost says that the MT gives an impression as if “צאתך den Auszug des Volkes meint und nicht den Jahres.” MT cannot mean anything other than that; otherwise we would expect אֲרָא אֶתְּךָ הוֹצֵאתְךָ. We cannot make a head or tail of a short remark by Ehrlich (1912.291): “Statt אֲרָא lies אֲרָא, vulgäre Aussprache für אֲרָא.”

Nations will see (it) and feel ashamed because of all their power, they will put their hands on their mouth, their ears will be deafened.

יִרְאוּ גוֹיִם וַיִּבְשׂוּ מִכָּל גְּבוּרָתָם וַיְשִׂמוּ יָד עַל־פִּה אֲזוּיָהֶם תִּחְרָרְשָׁנָה:

ἐκ πάσης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτῶν] In terms of the sheer military strength they had no rivals.

χεῖρας 7] Apparently in order to stress their complete astonishment and inability verbally to react 𐤄 uses the pl., whereas the use of the sg. is idiomatic in 𐤄.³⁵ This contrasts with אֲזוּיָהֶם. The selection of the dual in this case makes sense. Cf. χεῖρα θήσω ἐπὶ στόματί μου לְמוֹתִי לְמוֹתִי Jb 40.4.

ἀποκωφωθήσονται] A verb unknown prior to SG. What 𐤄 wants to say is probably that heathens put their fingers into their ears, not being able to stand triumphant shouts of Israelites.

7.17) λείξουσι χοῦν ὡς ὄφεις σύροντες γῆν, συγχυθήσονται ἐν συγκλεισμοῦ αὐτῶν· ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ θεῶ ἡμῶν ἐκστήσονται καὶ φοβηθήσονται ἀπὸ σοῦ.

They will lick dust like snake(s), crawling over the earth, they will be dazed in their confinement. They will be astounded by the Lord our God and will fear you.

יִלְחֲכוּ עֶפְרַר כְּנֶחֱשׁ כֹּזֶה־לִי אֶרֶץ יִרְגְּזוּ מִמַּסְגָּרְתֵיהֶם אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִפְתְּדוּ וַיִּרְאוּ מִמֶּךָ:

σύροντες לִי] As shown by the preposition *kaf*, the pl. participle must be referring to crawling animals, and the verb 𐤄 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 שִׁנְיָהֶם is not meant to be a reference to the serpent in Ge 3, but in metaphors introduced with the preposition 𐤄 the article is idiomatically used, see JM § 137 *i*.

συγχυθήσονται יִרְגְּזוּ] The respective primary meaning of συγχέω ‘to mix together’ and יִרְגְּזוּ ‘to tremble’ have little to do with each other. Here the inner, psychic disarray and loss of control that expresses itself in trembling body is in focus. Twice more in XII we note this same equivalence: συγχυθήτωσαν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν הַשָּׁבִי הָאָרֶץ JI 2.1, and in πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν συγχυθήσεται ἡ γῆ καὶ σεισθήσεται ὁ οὐρανός לְפָנָיו

³⁵ Peshitta ‘their hands’ is probably due to the plurality of the people involved. In Jb 40.4 it reads ‘my hand.’ The Trg. is Hebraic, as far as the number is concerned: “their hand .. their mouth.”

שָׁמַיִם רָעָשׁוּ אֶרֶץ רַגְנָהּ ib. 10 the verb is parallel with σείω expressing physical shaking.³⁶

ἐν συγκαλεισμῷ [מִמְסַבְּרֵי תִּיְהוֹמָה] 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 [וַיִּרְאוּ וַיִּפְתְּחוּ] The two Heb. verbs are synonymous, but not their Gk renderings. Note καὶ ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ הִתְהַיְוָה וַיִּפְתְּחוּ Ho 3.5, where the subjects are Israelites and the occasion for their consternation also differs – ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς αὐτοῦ.

ἀπὸ σοῦ [מִמְךָ] Since ⚔ retains ⚔'s אֱלֹהֵי הַיְהוָה the pronoun cannot refer to God, but only to Israel.

7.18) τίς θεὸς ὥσπερ σύ; ἐξαίρων ἀδικίας καὶ ὑπερβαίνων ἀσεβείας τοῖς καταλοίποις τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ συνέσχεν εἰς μαρτύριον ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι θελητῆς ἐλέους ἐστίν.

Who is god like You, removing injustices and passing over ungodly acts for the remnants of His inheritance, and has not retained His anger for evidence, because He is desirous of mercy?

מִי־אֵל כְּמוֹךָ נִשְׂא עוֹן וְעָבַר עַל־פְּשָׁע לֹא־הִתְיַיֵּק לְעַד אָפוּ כִי־תִפְתָּח צַדִּיק הוּא:

τίς θεὸς [מִי־אֵל] The interrogative pronoun in Gk and Heb. alike, when followed by a substantive, could be analysed as adjectival.³⁷

ἀδικίας .. ἀσεβείας [עוֹן .. פְּשָׁע] It looks more natural to parse the Gk nouns as pl. acc. rather than sg. gen.³⁸

ὑπερβαίνων] The sense required here, ‘to pass over, overlook intentionally,’ is unknown prior to SG.

εἰς μαρτύριον] = לְעַד.

The segmentation of the verse in ⚔ is complicated. The question mark added after σύ leaves the following two participial clauses syntactically hanging loose. By adding καὶ ⚔ 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 לֹא־.

θελητῆς] Almost adjectival, just as ⚔ תִּפְתָּח here.⁴⁰

³⁶ Cf. γενομένης δὲ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης συνῆλθεν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ συνεχύθη, ὅτι ἤκουον εἷς ἕκαστος τῆ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ λαλοῦντων αὐτῶν Acts 2.6.

³⁷ BDB admits the attributive use of מִי s.v. **I a a**. We wonder whether or not such an analysis can be extended to מִי. Cf. *GELS* s.v. τίς **V**. Cf. *SD* “Welcher Gott ist wie du.”

³⁸ Cf. *SD* “Vergehen .. und Gottlosigkeit.”

³⁹ *SD* begins with an interrogative “Welcher,” but without a question mark at the end.

⁴⁰ For an analysis of substantives in SG ending with τῆς or τῆς, see Muraoka 2005.66f.

- 7.19) ἐπιστρέψει καὶ οἰκτιρήσει ἡμᾶς, καταδύσει τὰς ἀδικίας ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπορρίψει εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θαλάσσης πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν.

He will change His mind and show mercy on us, take our injustices and casting all our sins into the depths of the sea.

יְשׁוּב יְרַחֵמֵנוּ יְכַבֵּשׁ עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ וְתִשְׁלֵךְ בְּמַצְלוֹת יָם כָּל־טַחְטְאוֹתֵם:

ἐπιστρέψει καὶ ἰשוב] The verb ἐπιστρέφω joined with καὶ to another verb underlines “a change of heart or course of action” (GELS s.v. 4 a). The same construction indicates repetition of an action at Ho 14.8, q.v.

καταδύσει יְכַבֵּשׁ] An equivalent attested nowhere in LXX. The Heb. verb has little to do with movement downwards, but ‘to subdue.’ καταδύω, however, harmonises well with ἀπορρίπτω.

ἀπορρίψει תִּשְׁלֵךְ] In 𐤀 with the verb in the second person⁴¹ the prophet’s oracular statement is shifting to a personal prayer, for which “our sins” is more fitting.

- 7.20) δώσεις ἀλήθειαν τῷ Ιακωβ, ἔλεος τῷ Αβρααμ, καθότι ὤμοσας τοῖς πατέραςιν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἔμπροσθεν.

You will grant truthfulness to Jacob, mercy to Abraham, as You swore to our forefathers as on the former days.

תַּתֵּן אֱמֶת לְיַעֲקֹב חֶסֶד לְאַבְרָהָם אֶשְׁר־נִשְׁבַּעְתָּ לְאַבְתֵּינוּ מִיְמֵי קֶדֶם:

δώσεις תַּתֵּן] 𐤀 continues the speaker’s personal prayer, which now 𐤅 joins in.

ἀλήθειαν אֱמֶת] Faithfulness as regards pledges and promises made rather than truth as against falsehood.

καθότι] = כְּאִשֶּׁר.

⁴¹ Cf. Trg. יְרַמֵּי, Vulg. *proiciet*, and Pesh. /nešdē/.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABEL, F.M. ³1967. *Géographie de la Palestine*. Paris.
- ANDERSEN, F.I. and D.N. FREEDMAN. 1980. *Hosea* [The Anchor Bible 24]. Garden City.
- BA = *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Traduction et annotation des livres de la Septante sous la direction de M. HARL, G. DORIVAL et O. MUNNICH assistés de C. DOGNIÉZ. Paris, 1986-.
- BABUT, J.-M. 1995. *Les expressions idiomatiques de l'hébreu biblique. Signification et traduction. Un essai d'analyse componentielle*. Paris.
- BARRÉ, M.L. 1995. "Hearts, beds, and repentance in Psalm 4, 5 and Hosea 7, 14," *Bibl.* 76.53-62.
- BARTHÉLEMY, D. 1963. *Les devanciers d'Aquila*. Leiden.
- . 1992. *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. Tome 3: *Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*. Fribourg / Göttingen.
- BDAG = BAUER, W., W. ARNDT, F.W. GINGRICH and F.W. DANKER. ²1979. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago • London.
- BDB = BROWN, F., S.R. DRIVER and CH.A. BRIGGS. 1907. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford.
- BDF. See below under BLASS, DEBRUNNER and FUNK.
- BEN-HAYYIM, Z. 2000. *A Grammar of Samaritan Hebrew Based on the Recitation of the Law in Comparison with the Tiberian and Other Jewish Traditions*. Jerusalem • Winona Lake, IN.
- BEN YEHUDAH, E. 1958-59. *מלון הלשון העברית הישנה והחדשה* (*A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew*), 8 vols. New York • London • Jerusalem.
- BH = Biblical Hebrew.
- BHQ = *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*. [The minor prophets as edited by A. GELSTON].
- BHS = *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. [The minor prophets as edited by K. ELLIGER].
- BLASS, F., A. DEBRUNNER and R.W. FUNK. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago • London.
- BONS, E. 2001. "La signification de ἄρκος ἀπορομένη en LXX Osée xiii 8," *VT* 51.1-8.
- BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ, A. 1879-82. *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, 4 vols. Paris.
- BRENTON, L.C.L. 1851. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. London.
- BROCKELMANN, C. 1956. *Hebräische Syntax*. Neukirchen.
- BROWN, F., S.R. DRIVER and CH.A. BRIGGS. 1907. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford.
- CAIRD, G.B. 1969. "Towards a lexicon of the Septuagint. II," *JThSt* 20.21-40.
- CALLAHAM, S.N. 2010. *Modality and the Biblical Hebrew Infinitive Absolute* [Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 71]. Wiesbaden.
- CARMIGNAC, J. 1955. "Précisions apportées au vocabulaire de l'hébreu biblique par la guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres," *VT* 5.345-65.
- CG = Classical Greek.
- CHANTRAINE, P. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris.

- . 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris.
CLINES = DCH.
- COHEN, A. 1948. *The Soncino Books of the Bible*. London.
- COHEN, D. 1970-. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques*. Paris • Leuven.
- COOTE, R.B. 1974. "Hos 14:8: 'They who are filled with grain shall live'," *JBL* 93.161-73.
- DANIEL, S. 1966. *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la septante*. Paris.
DCH = CLINES, D.J.A. (ed.), 1993-2016. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 9 vols. Sheffield.
- DEL OLMO LETE, G. and J. SANMARTÍN. 1996-2000. *Diccionario de la lengua ugarítica*, 2 vols. Barcelona.
DJD = *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, 40 vols. Oxford.
DJD 8 = TOV, E. et al. *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* [Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 8]. Oxford.
- DINGERMANN, F. 1948. "Massora-Septuaginta der kleinen Propheten," diss. Würzburg.
- DOGNEZ, C. 2002. "The Greek renderings of Hebrew idiomatic expressions and their treatment in the Septuagint lexica," *JNWSL* 28.1-17.
- DOLD, A. 1940. *Neue St. Galler vorhieronymianische Propheten-Fragmente der St. Galler Sammelhandschrift 1398b zugehörig* [Texte und Arbeiten, I. 31]. Beuron.
- DORIVAL, G., M. HARL and O. MUNNICH. 1988. *La Bible grecque des Septante: du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*. Paris.
- DOS SANTOS, E.C. 1973. *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint*. Jerusalem.
- DRIVER, G.R. 1931. "Studies in the vocabulary of the Old Testament. IV," *JThSt* 33.38-47.
- . 1933. "Studies in the vocabulary of the Old Testament. VI," *JThSt* 34.375-85.
- . 1954. "Problems and solutions," *VT* 4.225-45.
- . 1965. Rev. of M. DAHOOD, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (1963) in *JSS* 10.112-17.
- DRIVER, S.R. ³1892. *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and some other Syntactical Questions*. Oxford.
- . ²1913. *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford.
- EHRlich, A.B. 1912. *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*. Vol. 5. Leipzig.
- EHRlich, C.S. 1985. "The text of Hosea 1:9," *JBL* 104.13-19.
- EHRMAN, A. 1959. "A note on ׀ׁׂ in Mic. 6:14," *JNES* 59.156.
- ELLIGER, K. and W. RUDOLPH (eds). 1967-77. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart.
- FIELD, F. 1875. *Origenis Hexapla*, 2 vols. Oxford.
- FITZMYER, J.A. 1956. "י as a preposition and a particle in Micah 5,1 (5,2)," *CBQ* 18.10-13.
- FRANKEL, Z. 1831. *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*. Leipzig.
- FULLER, R.E. 1991. "A critical note on Hosea 12:10 and 13:4," *RB* 98.343-57.
⊕ = the text of the Septuagint as in Ziegler.
- GEHMAN, H.S. 1972. "Ἐπισκέπτομαι, ἐπισκέψις, ἐπίσκοπος, and ἐπισκοπή in the Septuagint in relation to קָפַץ and other Hebrew roots – a case of semantic development similar to that of Hebrew," *VT* 22.197-207.
- GELS [= *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*] 1993, 2002a, 2009. See below under MURAOKA.

- GELSTON, A. 2010. *תרי עשר The Twelve Minor Prophets* prepared for *BHQ* Stuttgart. GK = GESENIUS, W., E. KAUTZSCH and A.E. COWLEY. 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Oxford.
- 𐤇 = the text of the Hebrew Bible as in *BHQ*.
- HALOT = KOHLER, L. and W. BAUMGARTNER. 1994-2000. *The Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 5 vols., translated from the German ed. (1967-76) and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. RICHARDSON. Leiden • New York • Köln.
- HARL, M. 1992. *La langue de Japhet*. Paris.
- . 1993. "La «Bible d'Alexandrie» et les études sur la Septante. Réflexions sur une première expérience," *VC* 47.313-40.
- HARPER, W.R. 1905. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea*. Edinburgh.
- HATCH, E. and H.A. REDPATH. ²1998. *A Concordance to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids, MI.
- HELBING, R. 1907. *Grammatik der Septuaginta: Laut und Worthebre*. Göttingen.
- . 1928. *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta. Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der Κοινή*. Göttingen.
- HORSLEY, G.H.R. 1981. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity. A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1976*. Sydney.
- Index* = see below at MURAOKA 2010.
- JASTROW, M. 1903. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli etc.* New York.
- JENNI, E. 1968. *Das hebräische Pi'el: Syntaktisch-semasiologische Untersuchung einer Verbalform im Alten Testament*. Zürich.
- . 1992. *Die hebräischen Präpositionen*. Bd. I: *Die Präposition Beth*. Stuttgart • Berlin • Köln.
- JM = see below under JOÜON and MURAOKA 2009.
- JOHANNESOHN, M. 1910. "Der Gebrauch der Kasus und der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta," diss. Berlin.
- . 1926. *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta*. Berlin.
- JOOSTEN, J. 2002. *La Bible d'Alexandrie. Les douze prophètes: Osée*. Paris.
- JOÜON, P. and T. MURAOKA. ²2009. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* [Subsidia Biblica 27]. Rome.
- KADDARI, M.Z. 2006. *מילון העברית המקראית*. Ramat-Gan.
- KAMINKA, A. 1928. *Studien zur Septuaginta an der Hand der zwölf kleinen Prophetenbücher*. Frankfurt a. M.
- KAUPEL, H. 1935-36. "'Sirenen' in der Septuaginta," *BZ* 23.158-65.
- KBS = KÖHLER, L., W. BAUMGARTNER and J.J. STAMM. 1967-96. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*. Leiden.
- KEIL, C.F. 1866. *Biblischer Commentar über die zwölf kleinen Propheten*. Leipzig. Quoted from Martin's English translation, see below.
- . 1975. Tr. of the above by J. MARTIN as *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*. Vol. X. Grand Rapids, MI.
- . 1872. *Biblischer Commentar über den Propheten Jeremiah und die Klagelieder*. Leipzig.
- . 1988. Tr. of the above by D. PATRICK as *Commentary on the Old Testament in Ten Volumes*. Vol. VIII. Grand Rapids, MI.
- KÖNIG, F.E. 1881-97. *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache*. III 2. Leipzig.
- KOUWENBERG, N.J.C. 1997. "Gemination in the Akkadian Verb." Diss. Leiden Univ.

- KÜHNER, R. and B. GERTH. ³1898. *Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, 2 vols. Hannover • Leipzig.
- KUTSCHER, E.Y. 1974. *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (I Q Isa^a)*. Leiden.
- LAMPE, G.W.H. 1961-68. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. 5 fascicles. Oxford.
- LEE, J.A.L. 1985. "Some features of the speech of Jesus in Mark's Gospel," *NT* 27.1-26.
- LEMOIGNE, PH. 1999. "βασιλεύω transitif: du corpus au système, et réciproquement," *Cahiers de Biblia Patristica* 6.177-243.
- LESCOW, TH. 1966. *Micha 6, 6-8. Studien zu Sprache, Form und Auslegung* [Arbeiten zur Theologie I 25]. Stuttgart.
- LIPSCHITZ, A. 1988. *Ibn Ezra: Commentary on Hosea*. New York.
- LOUW, J.P. and E. NIDA. 1988. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, 2 vols. New York.
- LUST, J., E. EYNIKEL and K. HAUSPIE. 2003. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart.
- LXX = Septuagint.
- MACINTOSH, A.A. 1997. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea* [ICC]. Edinburgh.
- MAYSER, E. 1934. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit etc.* Band II 2. Berlin • Leipzig.
- MCKANE, W. 1986. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*. Vol. I. Edinburgh.
- . 1998. *Micah: Introduction and Commentary*. Edinburgh
- MM = MOULTON, J.H. and G. MILLIGAN. 1930. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. London.
- MOMMSEN, T. 1895. *Beiträge zur Lehre von der griechischen Präpositionen*. Berlin.
- MOULTON, J.H. and W.F. HOWARD. 1919-29. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. II. *Accidence and Word-Formation with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament*. Edinburgh.
- MURAOKA, T. 1964. "The use of ὡς in the Greek Bible," *NT* 8.51-72.
- . 1970. "Is the Septuagint Amos viii 12-ix 10 a separate unit?," *VT* 20.496-500.
- . 1973. "Literary device in the Septuagint," *Textus* 8.20-30.
- . 1979. "ערות על תרגום השבעים לספר הושע" [Remarks on the Septuagint Book of Hosea], in Ch. Rabin et al. (eds), *Studies in the Bible and the Hebrew Language* [Fshr. M. Wallenstein], pp. 180-87. Jerusalem.
- . 1982-83. "The Greek texts of Samuel - Kings: Incomplete translations or recensional activity?," *Abr-Nahrain* 21.28-49.
- . 1983. "Hosea IV in the Septuagint Version," *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 9.24-64.
- . 1985. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem • Leiden.
- . 1986. "Hosea V in the Septuagint Version," *Abr-Nahrain* 24.120-38.
- . 1991. "Hebrew hapax legomena and Septuagint lexicography," in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Leuven 1989* [Septuagint and Cognate Studies 31], pp. 205-22. Atlanta, GA.
- . 1993. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)*. Leuven.
- . 1995. "Hosea III in the Septuagint version," in J. DAVIES, G. HARVEY and W.G.E. WATSON (eds), *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed. Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer*, pp. 242-52. Sheffield.

- . 2002. "Introduction aux douze petits prophètes," in *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, 23.1, *Les douze prophètes: Osée*, pp. I-XXIII. Paris.
- . 2002a. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets*. Leuven.
- . 2005. "Apports de la LXX dans notre compréhension de l'hébreu et du grec, et de leur vocabulaire," in J. JOOSTEN and PH. LE MOIGNE (eds), *L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'Antiquité: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg 8-9 novembre 2002*, pp. 57-68. Paris.
- . 2008. "Septuagint lexicography and Hebrew etymology," in A. VOITILA and J. JOKIRANTA (eds), *Scripture in Transition* [Fshr. R. Sollamo], pp. 463-69. Leiden • Boston.
- . 2008a. "Hosea 6 in the Septuagint," in H. AUSLOOS, B. LEMMELIJN and M. VERVENNE (eds), *Florilegium lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, pp. 335-49. Leuven.
- . 2009. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven. [= GELS].
- . 2010. *A Greek ≈ Hebrew / Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint*. Leuven.
- . 2012. "Luke and the Septuagint," *NT* 54.13-15.
- . 2014. "Women labouring," in K. DE TROYER et al. (eds), *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes* [Fshr. A. Aejmelaes], pp. 65-78. Leuven.
- . 2015. "Nathan's ominous and tragic prophecy becoming a reality: 2Samuel 13:23-39," in T.D. FINLAY and W. YARCHIN (eds), *The Genre of Biblical Commentary: Essays in Honor of John E. Hartley on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday*, pp. 166-83. Eugene, OR.
- . 2016. *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven.
- . 2019. "How did our translator of the Greek Minor Prophets cope with multiple synonyms?," in C. DOGNEZ and Ph. LE MOIGNE (eds), *Les Douze Prophètes dans la LXX. Protocoles et procédures dans la traduction grecque: stylistique, poétique et histoire* [Vetus Testamentum Supplement 184], pp. 88-95. Leiden • Boston.
- . 2020. *A Syntax of Qumran Hebrew*. Leuven.
- . ²2020a. *A Biblical Aramaic Reader with an Outline Grammar*. Leuven.
- . 2020b. *Why Read the Bible in the Original Languages?* Leuven.
- NEEF, H.-D. 1986. "Der Septuaginta-Text und der Masoreten-Text des Hoseabuches im Vergleich," *Bib.* 67.195-220.
- NETS = *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York • Oxford, 2007.
- NH ⇒ DJD 8 above.
- NITZAN, B. 1986. *Peshar Habakkuk. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea (1QpHab)*. [Heb]. Jerusalem.
- NÖLDEKE, TH. 1910. *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Strassburg.
- NYBERG, H.S. 1935. *Studien zum Hoseabuche, zugleich ein Beitrag zur Klärung des Problems der alttestamentlichen Textkritik*. Uppsala.
- OLYAN, S.M. 1992. "«In the Sight of Her Lovers»: On the interpretation of *nablūt* in Hos 2.12," *BZ* 36.255-61.
- Pesh. = Peshitta, quoted from A. GELSTON (ed.), *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta Version* III 4. Leiden, 1980.
- PG = MIGNE, J.P. (ed.). 1857-66. *Patrologia graeca*. Paris.
- PL = MIGNE, J.P. (ed.). 1841-55. *Patrologia latina*. Paris.
- PUSEY, PH.E. 1868. *The Minor Prophets: A Commentary*, 2 vols. Oxford.
- QIMRON, E. 2019. *A Grammar of the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Jerusalem.
- . ²2020. מגילות מדבר יהודה: החיבורים העבריים, vol. 2. Jerusalem.
- Ra = RAHLFS, A. (ed.). 1935. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart.

- REIDER, J., completed and revised by TURNER, N. 1966. *An Index to Aquila*. Leiden.
- SCHENKEL, J.D. 1968. *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*. Cambridge, MA.
- SCHLEUSNER, J.F. 1820-21. *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos veteris testamenti*, 5 vols. Leipzig.
- SCHREINER, J. 1957. *Septuaginta - Massora des Buches der Richter. Eine textkritische Studie*. Roma.
- SCHWYZER, E. ³1950-53. *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*, 3 vols. München.
- SD = *Septuaginta Deutsch*, Stuttgart, 2009.
- SD II = *Erläuterungen und Kommentare II Psalmen bis Daniel*, Stuttgart, 2011.
- SG = Septuagint Greek.
- SEGAL, M.Z. ²1958. ספר בן סירה השלם. Jerusalem.
- SI = Italian Septuagint. *La Biblia dei LXX*. Roma, 1999.
- SIMON, U. 1989. *Abraham Ibn Ezra's Two Commentaries on the Minor Prophets. An Annotated Critical Edition*. Vol. 1. [Heb]. Ramat Gan.
- SOISALON-SOININEN, I. 1965. *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*. Helsinki.
- . 1973. "Der Gebrauch des *genetivus absolutus* in der Septuaginta," in *The Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies IV*, pp. 131-36. Now in SOISALON-SOININEN, I., *Studien zur Septuaginta-syntax* (Helsinki, 1987), pp. 175-80.
- SOKOLOFF, M. 2009. *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum*. Winona Lake, IN • Piscataway, NJ.
- . 2014. *A Dictionary of Christian Palestinian Aramaic*. Leuven.
- SOLLAMO, R. 1979. *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*. Helsinki.
- SPICQ, C. 1991. *Lexique théologique du Nouveau Testament*. Fribourg (Suisse) • Paris.
- SQH = see above at MURAOKA 2020, *A Syntax of Qumran Hebrew*.
- SS = Spanish Septuagint. *La Biblia Griega: Septuaginta*. Salamanca, 2008.
- SSG = see above at MURAOKA 2016, *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*.
- STREANE, A.W. 1896. *The Double Text of Jeremiah (Massoretic and Alexandrian Compared)*. Cambridge.
- SWETE, H.B. (ed.). ⁴1909-12. *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, 3 vols. Cambridge.
- SWINN, S.P. 1990. "ἀγαπᾶν in the Septuagint," in T. MURAOKA (ed.), *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*, pp. 49-82. Atlanta, GA.
- Syh. = Syrohexapla.
- TAL, A. 2000. *A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic*, 2 vols. Leiden.
- THACKERAY, H.ST.J. 1903. "The Greek translators of the prophetic books," *JThSt* 4.578-85.
- . 1909. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Vol. I: *Introduction, Orthography, and Accidence*. Cambridge.
- . ²1923. *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*. London.
- THUMB, A. 1901. *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus*. Strassburg.
- TOV, E. 1990. "Renderings of combinations of the infinitive absolute and finite verbs in the Septuagint - Their nature and distribution," in D. FRAENKEL, U. QUAST, and J.W. WEVERS (eds), *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren*, pp. 64-73. Göttingen.

- . 1990a. "Greek words and Hebrew meanings," in T. MURAOKA (ed.), *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography*, pp. 83-126. Atlanta, GA.
- TRENCH, R.C. *Synonyms of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, 1953 [= repr. of (London, 1880)]).
- Trg. = Targum, quoted from A. SPERBER, *The Bible in Aramaic III* [= Targum Jonathan]. Leiden, 1962.
- TUR-SINAI, N.H. 1972. ספר איוב. Jerusalem.
- TURNER, N. 1963. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 3: *Syntax*. Edinburgh.
- TURNER, P.D.M. 1977. "ANOIKOΔOMEIN and intra-septuagintal borrowing," *VT* 27.492-93.
- VOLLERS, K. 1883-84. "Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner. 1. Teil," *ZAW* 3.219-72; *ZAW* 4.1-20.
- Vulg. = Vulgate.
- WALTERS, Peter. 1973. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation* [as ed. by D.W. GOODING]. Cambridge.
- WEITZMAN, M.P. 1989. Rev. of A. GELSTON, *The Peshitta of the Twelve Prophets* (Oxford, 1987) in *JThSt* 40.162-65.
- WELLHAUSEN, J. 1898. *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt*. Berlin.
- WEVERS, J.W. 1990. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* [Septuagint and Cognate Studies 30]. Atlanta, GA.
- . 1993. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* [Septuagint and Cognate Studies 35]. Atlanta, GA.
- . 1998. *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* [Septuagint and Cognate Studies 46]. Atlanta, GA.
- WILLIS, J.T. 1968. Rev. of LESCOW 1966 in *VT* 18.273-78.
- WOLFF, H.W. ²1965. *Das Dodekapropheton 1: Hosea* [BKAT 14/1]. Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- . 1982. *Dodekapropheton 4: Micha* [BKAT 14/4]. Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- YADIN, Y. 1965. *The Ben Sira Scroll from Massadah*. Jerusalem.
- ZIEGLER, J. 1943. "Beiträge zum griechischen Dodekapropheton," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Jahrgang 1943, Nr. 10*. Göttingen.
- . ²1967. *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum etc. XIII, Duodecim Prophetae*. Göttingen.
- . 1971. *Sylloge: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta*. Göttingen.
- ZIMMERLI, W. 1969. *Ezechiel*. Neukirchen-Vluyn.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- Bickel S., Schroer S., Schurte R., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Bilder als Quellen. Images as Sources. Studies on Ancient Near Eastern Artefacts and the Bible Inspired by the Work of Othmar Keel*, 2007, XLVI-560 p. + XXXIV pl.
- 25.1a Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band Ia: Der syrische Text der Edition in Estrangela. Faksimile des griechischen Papyrus Bodmer XI*, 1980, 64 p.
- 25.3 Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band III: Forschungsgeschichtliche Bibliographie 1799-1984 mit kritischen Anmerkungen. Mit einem Beitrag von Majella Franzmann: A Study of the Odes of Solomon with Reference to French Scholarship 1909-1980*, 1986, XXXIV-478 p.
- 25.4 Lattke M., *Die Oden Salomos in ihrer Bedeutung für Neues Testament und Gnosis. Band IV*, 1998, XII-272 p.
- 46 Hornung E., *Der ägyptische Mythos von der Himmelskub. Eine Ätiologie des Unvollkommenen. Dritte Auflage*, 1982, XII-133 p.
- 50.3 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 3: Ézéchiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*, 1992, CCXLII-1150 p.
- 50.4 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 4: Psaumes*, 2005, XLVIII-931 p.
- 50.5 Barthélemy D., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Tome 5: Job, Proverbes, Qohélet et Cantique des Cantiques*, 2015, XXVIII-974 p.
- 55 Frei P., Koch K., *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich. Zweite, bearbeitete und stark erweiterte Auflage*, 1996, 337 p.
- 61 Engel H., *Die Susanna-Erzählung. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Septuaginta-Text und zur Theodotion-Bearbeitung*, 1985, 205 p.
- 75 Schulman A.R., *Ceremonial Execution and Public Rewards. Some Historical Scenes on New Kingdom Private Stelae*, 1988, XXX-223 p. + 35 fig. + 6 pl.
- 77 Utzschneider H., *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz. Studien zur Bedeutung der sinaitischen Heiligtumstexte (Ex 25-40; Lev 8-9)*, 1988, XIV-320 p.
- 78 Gosse B., *Isaïe 13,1-14,23 dans la tradition littéraire du livre d'Isaïe et dans la tradition des oracles contre les nations*, 1988, 300 p.
- 81 Beyerlin W., *Bleilot, Brecheisen oder was sonst? Revision einer Amos-Vision*, 1988, 61 p.
- 82 Hutter M., *Behexung, Entsühnung und Heilung. Das Ritual der Tunnawiya für ein Königspaar aus mittelbithitischer Zeit (KBo XXI 1 - KUB IX 34 - KBo XXI 6)*, 1988, 180 p.
- 85 Otto E., *Rechtsgeschichte der Redaktionen im Kodex Ešnunna und im «Bundesbuch». Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche und rechtsvergleichende Studie zu altbabylonischen und altisraelitischen Rechtsüberlieferungen*, 1989, IV-209 p.
- 89 Abitz F., *Baugeschichte und Dekoration des Grabes Ramses' VI.*, 1989, 196 p.
- 90 Henninger J., *Arabica Varia. Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Arabiens und seiner Randgebiete. Contributions à l'histoire culturelle de l'Arabie et de ses régions limitrophes*, 1989, 498 p.
- 92 O'Brien M.A., *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis. A Reassessment*, 1989, XIV-319 p.
- 94 Cortese E., *Josua 13-21. Ein priesterschriftlicher Abschnitt im deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk*, 1990, VI-122 p.

- 96 Wiese A.B., *Zum Bild des Königs auf ägyptischen Siegelamuletten*, 1990, XVI-207 p. + XXXII Taf.
- 98 Schart A., *Mose und Israel im Konflikt. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Wüsten-erzählungen*, 1990, VI-284 p.
- 100 Keel O., Shuval M., Uehlinger C., *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band III: Die Frühe Eisenzeit. Ein Workshop*, 1990, XIV-458 p. + XXII Taf.
- 103 Schenker A., *Text und Sinn im Alten Testament. Textgeschichtliche und bibeltheologische Studien*, 1991, VIII-302 p.
- 105 Osumi Y., *Die Kompositionsgeschichte des Bundesbuches Exodus 20,22b-23,33*, 1991, XII-273 p.
- 107 Staubli T., *Das Image der Nomaden im Alten Israel und in der Ikonographie seiner sesshaften Nachbarn*, 1991, XII-308 p. + 125 Abb.
- 109 Norton G.J., Pisano S. (eds), *Tradition of the Text. Studies Offered to Dominique Barthelemy in Celebration of his 70th Birthday*, 1991, XII-310 p. + VII pl.
- 114 Schneider T., *Asiatische Personennamen in ägyptischen Quellen des Neuen Reiches*, 1992, XIV-482 p.
- 115 von Nordheim E., *Die Selbstbehauptung Israels in der Welt des Alten Orients. Religions-geschichtlicher Vergleich anhand von Gen 15/22/28, dem Aufenthalt Israels in Ägypten, 2 Sam 7, 1 Kön 19 und Psalm 104*, 1992, VI-220 p.
- 117 Richards F.V., *Scarab Seals from a Middle to Late Bronze Age Tomb at Pella in Jordan*, 1992, XII-138 p. + XIII pl.
- 118 Goldman Y., *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil. Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie*, 1992, XIV-259 p.
- 119 Krapf T.M., *Die Priesterschrift und die vorexilische Zeit. Yehezkel Kaufmanns vernach-lässigt Beitrag zur Geschichte der biblischen Religion*, 1992, XX-351 p.
- 123 Zwickel W. (ed.), *Biblische Welten. Festschrift für Martin Metzger zu seinem 65. Geburts-tag*, 1993, XII-248 p. + VIII Taf.
- 125 Kass B., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Studies in the Iconography of Northwest Semitic Inscribed Seals. Proceedings of a Symposium held in Fribourg on April 17-20, 1991*, 1993, XXIV-336 p.
- 126 Bartelmus R., Krüger T., Utzschneider H. (eds), *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte. Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag*, 1993, X-401 p.
- 127 Ivantchik A.I., *Les Cimmériens au Proche-Orient*, 1993, 325 p.
- 128 Voss J., *Die Menora. Gestalt und Funktion des Leuchters im Tempel zu Jerusalem*, 1993, 112 p.
- 131 Burkert W., Stolz F. (eds), *Hymnen der Alten Welt im Kulturvergleich*, 1994, 123 p.
- 132 Mathys H.-P., *Dichter und Beter. Theologen aus spätalttestamentlicher Zeit*, 1994, X-374 p.
- 135 Keel O., *Studien zu den Stempelsiegeln aus Palästina/Israel. Band IV. Mit Registern zu den Bänden I-IV*, 1994, XII-325 p. + 23 Taf.
- 136 Stipp H.-J., *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches. Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte*, 1994, VIII-186 p.
- 137 Eschweiler P., *Bildzauber im alten Ägypten. Die Verwendung von Bildern und Gegen-ständen in magischen Handlungen nach den Texten des Mittleren und Neuen Reiches*, 1994, X-371 p. + XXXVI Taf.
- 143 Bieberstein K., *Josua - Jordan - Jericho. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Land-nahmeerzählungen Josua 1-6*, 1995, XII-483 p.
- 144 Maier C., *Die «fremde Frau» in Proverbien 1-9. Eine exegetische und sozialgeschichtliche Studie*, 1995, XII-296 p.

- 145 Steymans H.U., *Deuteronomium 28 und die «adè» zur Thronfolgeregelung Asarhaddons. Segen und Fluch im Alten Orient und in Israel*, 1995, XII-425 p.
- 146 Abitz F., *Pharao als Gott in den Unterweltbüchern des Neuen Reiches*, 1995, VIII-219 p.
- 148 Bachmann M., *Die strukturalistische Artefakt- und Kunstanalyse. Exposition der Grundlagen anhand der vorderorientalischen, ägyptischen und griechischen Kunst*, 1996, 80 p.
- 150 Staehelin E., Jaeger B. (eds), *Ägypten-Bilder. Akten des «Symposiums zur Ägypten-Rezeption», Augst bei Basel, vom 9.-11. September 1993*, 1997, 383 p. + 96 Taf.
- 152 Rossier F., *L'intercession entre les hommes dans la Bible hébraïque. L'intercession entre les hommes aux origines de l'intercession auprès de Dieu*, 1996, XIV-380 p.
- 153 Kratz R.G., Krüger T. (eds), *Rezeption und Auslegung im Alten Testament und in seinem Umfeld. Ein Symposium aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstags von Odil Hannes Steck*, 1997, 139 p.
- 154 Bosshard-Nepustil E., *Rezeptionen von Jesaja 1-39 im Zwölfprophetenbuch. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Verbindung von Prophetenbüchern in babylonischer und persischer Zeit*, 1997, XIV-521 p.
- 156 Wagner A., *Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik*, 1997, VIII-199 p.
- 157 Artus O., *Études sur le livre des Nombres. Récit, Histoire et Loi en Nb 13,1-20,13*, 1997, X-298 p.
- 158 Böhler D., *Die heilige Stadt in Esdras Alpha und Esra-Nehemia. Zwei Konzeptionen der Wiederherstellung Israels*, 1997, XIV-435 p.
- 159 Oswald W., *Israel am Gottesberg. Eine Untersuchung zur Literargeschichte der vorderen Sinaiperikope Ex 19-24 und deren historischem Hintergrund*, 1998, X-286 p.
- 160.5 Veenhof K.R., Eidem J., *Mesopotamia. The Old Assyrian Period. Annäherungen 5*, 2008, 382 p.
- 163 Bietenhard S.K., *Des Königs General. Die Heerführertraditionen in der vorstaatlichen und frühen staatlichen Zeit und die Joabgestalt in 2 Sam 2-20; 1 Kön 1-2*, 1998, XIV-363 p.
- 164 Braun J., *Die Musikkultur Altisraels/Palästinas. Studien zu archäologischen, schriftlichen und vergleichenden Quellen*, 1999, XII-388 p.
- 167 Bollweg J., *Vorderasiatische Wagentypen im Spiegel der Terracottaplastik bis zur Altbabylonischen Zeit*, 1999, X-206 p.
- 168 Rose M., *Rien de nouveau. Nouvelles approches du livre de Qohéleth. Avec une bibliographie (1988-1998) élaborée par Béatrice Perregaux Allison*, 1999, 629 p.
- 171 Macchi J.-D., *Israël et ses tribus selon Genèse 49*, 1999, XIV-380 p.
- 172 Schenker A., *Recht und Kult im Alten Testament. Achtzehn Studien*, 2000, X-208 p.
- 173 Theuer G., *Der Mondgott in den Religionen Syrien-Palästinas. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von KTU 1.24*, 2000, XVIII-657 p.
- 174 Spieser C., *Les noms du Pharaon comme êtres autonomes au Nouvel Empire*, 2000, XII-398 p.
- 176 de Pury A., Römer T. (eds), *Die sogenannte Thronfolgegeschichte Davids. Neue Einsichten und Anfragen*, 2000, VI-189 p.
- 177 Egger J., *Influences and Traditions Underlying the Vision of Daniel 7:2-14. The Research History from the End of the 19th Century to the Present*, 2000, VIII-143 p.
- 178 Keel O., Staub U., *Hellenismus und Judentum. Vier Studien zu Daniel 7 und zur Religionsnot unter Antiochus IV.*, 2000, XII-147 p.
- 179 Goldman Y., Uehlinger C. (eds), *La double transmission du texte biblique. Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, 2001, VI-114 p.
- 180 Zwingenberger U., *Dorfkultur der frühen Eisenzeit in Mittelpalästina*, 2001, XX-593 p.
- 181 Tita H., *Gelübde als Bekenntnis. Eine Studie zu den Gelübden im Alten Testament*, 2001, XVI-251 p.

- 182 Bosse-Griffiths K., *Amarna Studies and Other Selected Papers. Edited by J. Gwyn Griffiths*, 2001, IV-244 p.
- 183 Reinmuth T., *Der Bericht Nebemias. Zur literarischen Eigenart, traditionsgeschichtliche Prägung und innerbiblischen Rezeption des Ich-Berichts Nebemias*, 2002, XIV-383 p.
- 184 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel II*, 2002, XII-194 p.
- 185 Roth S., *Gebietlerin aller Länder. Die Rolle der königlichen Frauen in der fiktiven und realen Aussenpolitik des ägyptischen Neuen Reiches*, 2002, XII-168 p.
- 186 Hübner U., Knauf E.A. (eds), *Kein Land für sich allein. Studien zum Kulturkontakt in Kanaan, Israel/Palästina und Ebirñari für Manfred Weippert zum 65. Geburtstag*, 2002, VIII-331 p.
- 187 Riede P., *Im Spiegel der Tiere. Studien zum Verhältnis von Mensch und Tier im alten Israel*, 2002, XII-364 p.
- 188 Schellenberg A., *Erkenntnis als Problem. Qohelet und die alttestamentliche Diskussion um das menschliche Erkennen*, 2002, XII-333 p.
- 189 Meurer G., *Die Feinde des Königs in den Pyramiden-texten*, 2002, X-404 p.
- 190 Maussion M., *Le mal, le bien et le jugement de Dieu dans le livre de Qohélet*, 2003, VIII-199 p.
- 192 Koenen K., *Bethel. Geschichte, Kult und Theologie*, 2003, X-251 p.
- 193 Junge F., *Die Lehre Prahhoteps und die Tugenden der ägyptischen Welt*, 2003, 286 p.
- 194 Lefebvre J.-F., *Le jubilé biblique. Lv 25 - exégèse et théologie*, 2003, XII-443 p.
- 195 Wettengel W., *Die Erzählung von den beiden Brüdern. Der Papyrus d'Orbiney und die Königsideologie der Ramessiden*, 2003, VI-301 p.
- 196 Vonach A., Fischer G. (eds), *Horizonte biblischer Texte. Festschrift für Josef M. Oesch zum 60. Geburtstag*, 2003, XII-316 p.
- 199 Schenker A., *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher. Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher*, 2004, XXII-197 p.
- 200 Keel-Leu H., Teissier B., *Die vorderasiatischen Rollsigel der Sammlungen «Bibel+Orient» der Universität Freiburg Schweiz. The Ancient Near Eastern Cylinder Seals of the Collections «Bibel+Orient» of the University of Fribourg*, 2004, XXII-472 p.
- 201 Alkier S., Witte M. (eds), *Die Griechen und das antike Israel. Interdisziplinäre Studien zur Religions- und Kulturgeschichte des Heiligen Landes*, 2004, X-199 p.
- 202 Sayed Mohamed Z., *Festvorbereitungen. Die administrativen und ökonomischen Grundlagen altägyptischer Feste*, 2004, XVI-185 p.
- 204 Cornelius I., *The Many Faces of the Goddess. The Iconography of the Syro-Palestinian Goddesses Anat, Astarte, Qadesh, and Asherah c. 1500-1000 BCE*, 2008, XVI-216 p. + 77 pl.
- 205 Morenz L.D., *Bild-Buchstaben und symbolische Zeichen. Die Herausbildung der Schrift in der hohen Kultur Altägyptens*, 2004, XXII-373 p.
- 206 Dietrich W. (ed.), *David und Saul im Widerstreit - Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit. Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuches*, 2004, 312 p.
- 207 Himbaza I., *Le Décalogue et l'histoire du texte. Études des formes textuelles du Décalogue et leurs implications dans l'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*, 2004, XIV-354 p.
- 208 Isler-Kerényi C., *Civilizing Violence Satyrs on 6th-Century Greek Vases*, 2004, XII-123 p.
- 209 Schipper B.U., *Die Erzählung des Wenamun. Ein Literaturwerk im Spannungsfeld von Politik, Geschichte und Religion*, 2005, XII-383 p. + XII Taf.
- 210 Suter C.E., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Crafts and Images in Contact. Studies on Eastern Mediterranean Art of the First Millennium BCE*, 2005, XXXII-395 p. + LIV pl.
- 211 Léonas A., *Recherches sur le langage de la Septante*, 2005, X-340 p.

- 212 Strawn B.A., *What is Stronger than a Lion? Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*, 2005, XXX-587 p.
- 214 Böhler D., Himbaza I., Hugo P. (eds), *L'Écrit et l'Esprit. Études d'histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, 2005, XXXII-472 p.
- 215 O'Connell S., *From Most Ancient Sources. The Nature and Text-Critical Use of the Greek Old Testament Text of the Complutensian Polyglot Bible*, 2006, XII-178 p.
- 216 Meyer-Dietrich E., *Senebi und Selbst. Personenkonstituenten zur rituellen Wiedergeburt in einem Frauensarg des Mittleren Reiches*, 2006, XII-438 p.
- 217 Hugo P., *Les deux visages d'Élie. Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17-18*, 2006, XXII-389 p.
- 218 Zawadzki S., *Garments of the Gods. Studies on the Textile Industry and the Pantheon of Sippar according to the Texts from the Ebabbar Archive*, 2006, XXIV-254 p.
- 219 Knigge C., *Das Lob der Schöpfung. Die Entwicklung ägyptischer Sonnen- und Schöpfungshymnen nach dem Neuen Reich*, 2006, XII-365 p.
- 220 Schroer S. (ed.), *Images and Gender. Contributions to the Hermeneutics of Reading Ancient Art*, 2006, 383 p. + 29 pl.
- 221 Stark C., «Kultprostitution» im Alten Testament? Die Qedeschen der Hebräischen Bibel und das Motiv der Hurerei, 2006, X-249 p.
- 222 Pruin D., *Geschichten und Geschichte. Isebel als literarische und historische Gestalt*, 2006, XII-398 p.
- 223 Coulange P., *Dieu, ami des pauvres. Étude sur la connivence entre le Très-Haut et les petits*, 2007, XVI-282 p.
- 224 Wagner A. (ed.), *Parallelismus membrorum*, 2007, VIII-300 p.
- 225 Herrmann C., *Formen für ägyptische Fayencen aus Qantir. Band II: Katalog der Sammlung des Franciscan Biblical Museum, Jerusalem und zweier Privatsammlungen*, 2007, X-125 p. + XXIX Taf.
- 226 Heise J., *Erinnern und Gedenken. Aspekte der biographischen Inschriften der ägyptischen Spätzeit*, 2007, IV-385 p.
- 227 Frey-Anthes H., *Unheilsmächte und Schutzgenien, Antiwesen und Grenzgänger. Vorstellungen von «Dämonen» im alten Israel*, 2007, XIV-363 p.
- 228 Becking B., *From David to Gedaliah. The Book of Kings as Story and History*, 2007, XII-227 p.
- 229 Dubiel U., *Amulette, Siegel und Perlen. Studien zu Typologie und Tragsitte im Alten und Mittleren Reich*, 2008, XVI-270 p. + XVIII Taf.
- 230 Giovino M., *The Assyrian Sacred Tree. A History of Interpretations*, 2007, VIII-242 p. + 107 fig.
- 231 Kübel P., *Metamorphosen der Paradieserzählung*, 2007, X-238 p.
- 232 Paz S., *Drums, Women, and Goddesses. Drumming and Gender in Iron Age II Israel*, 2007, XII-143 p.
- 233 Himbaza I., Schenker A. (eds), *Un carrefour dans l'histoire de la Bible. Du texte à la théologie au IIe siècle avant J.-C.*, 2007, X-151 p.
- 234 Tavares R., *Eine königliche Weisheitslehre? Exegetische Analyse von Sprüche 28-29 und Vergleich mit den ägyptischen Lehren Merikaras und Amenemhats*, 2007, XIV-306 p.
- 235 Witte M., Diehl J.F. (eds), *Israeliten und Phönizier. Ihre Beziehungen im Spiegel der Archäologie und der Literatur des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt*, 2008, VIII-295 p.
- 236 Müller-Roth M., *Das Buch vom Tage*, 2008, XII-603 p. + XXIX Taf.
- 237 Sowada K.N., *Egypt in the Eastern Mediterranean during the Old Kingdom. An Archaeological Perspective*, 2009, XXIV-309 p. + 48 fig. + 19 pl.

- 238 Kraus W., Munnich O. (eds), *La Septante en Allemagne et en France. Septuaginta Deutsch und Bible d'Alexandrie. Textes de la Septante à traduction double ou à traduction très littérale. Texte der Septuaginta in Doppelüberlieferung oder in wörtlicher Übersetzung*, 2009, XII-307 p.
- 239 Mittermayer C., *Enmerkara und der Herr von Arata. Ein ungleicher Wettstreit*, 2009, VIII-386 p. + XIX Taf.
- 240 Waraksa E.A., *Female Figurines from the Mut Precinct. Context and Ritual Function*, 2009, XII-246 p.
- 241 Ben-Shlomo D., *Philistine Iconography. A Wealth of Style and Symbolism*, 2010, X-232 p.
- 242 LeMon J.M., *Yahweh's Winged Form in the Psalms. Exploring Congruent Iconography and Texts*, 2010, XIV-231 p.
- 243 El Hawary A., *Wortschöpfung. Die Memphitische Theologie und die Siegesstele des Pije – zwei Zeugen kultureller Repräsentation in der 25. Dynastie*, 2010, XII-499 p. + XXIV pl.
- 244 Wälchli S.H., *Gottes Zorn in den Psalmen. Eine Studie zur Rede vom Zorn Gottes in den Psalmen im Kontext des Alten Testaments und des Alten Orients*, 2012, VIII-191 p.
- 245 Steymans H.U. (ed.), *Gilgamesch: Ikonographie eines Helden. Gilgamesh: Epic and Iconography*, 2010, XII-452 p.
- 246 Petter D.L., *The Book of Ezekiel and Mesopotamian City Laments*, 2011, XVI-198 p.
- 247 Fischer E., *Tell el-Far'ah (Süd). Ägyptisch-levantinische Beziehungen im späten 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 2011, X-430 p.
- 248 Petit T., *Edipe et le Chérubin. Les sphinx levantins, cypriotes et grecs comme gardiens d'Immortalité*, 2011, X-291 p. + 191 fig.
- 249 Dietrich W. (ed.), *Seitenblicke. Literarische und historische Studien zu Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch*, 2011, 459 p.
- 250 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Langlois M. (eds), *Le jeune héros: Recherches sur la formation et la diffusion d'un thème littéraire au Proche-Orient ancien. Actes du colloque organisé par les chaires d'Assyriologie et des Milieux bibliques du Collège de France, Paris, les 6 et 7 avril 2009*, 2011, VI-360 p.
- 251 Jaques M. (ed.), *Klagetraditionen. Form und Funktion der Klage in den Kulturen der Antike*, 2011, VIII-110 p.
- 252 Langlois M., *Le texte de Josué 10. Approche philologique, épigraphique et diachronique*, 2011, 266 p.
- 253 Béré P., *Le second Serviteur de Yhwh. Un portrait exégétique de Josué dans le livre éponyme*, 2012, XVI-275 p.
- 254 Kilunga B., *Prééminence de YHWH ou autonomie du prophète. Étude comparative et critique des confessions de Jérémie dans le texte hébreu massorétique et la «Septante»*, 2011, XVI-216 p.
- 255 Gruber M., Ahituv S., Lehmann G., Talshir Z. (eds), *All the Wisdom of the East. Studies in Near Eastern Archaeology and History in Honor of Eliezer D. Oren*, 2012, XXVIII-475-85* p.
- 256 Mittermayer C., Ecklin S. (eds), *Altorientalische Studien zu Ehren von Pascal Attinger*, 2012, XVIII-452 p.
- 257 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Hutzli J. (eds), *Les vivants et leurs morts. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 14-15 avril 2010*, 2012, X-287 p.
- 258 Thompson R.J., *Terror of the Radiance. Aššur Covenant to YHWH Covenant*, 2013, X-260 p.
- 259 Asher-Greve J.M., Westenholz J.G., *Goddesses in Context. On Divine Powers, Roles, Relationships and Gender in Mesopotamian Textual and Visual Sources*, 2013, XII-454 p.

- 260 Zawadzki S., *Garments of the Gods. Vol. 2: Texts*, 2013, XIV-743 p.
- 261 Braun-Holzinger E.A., *Frühe Götterdarstellungen in Mesopotamien*, 2013, X-238 p. + 46 pl.
- 263 Sugimoto D.T. (ed.), *Transformation of a Goddess: Ishtar - Astarte - Aphrodite*, 2014, XIV-228 p.
- 264 Morenz L.D., *Anfänge der ägyptischen Kunst. Eine problemgeschichtliche Einführung in ägyptologische Bild-Anthropologie*, 2014, XVIII-257 p.
- 265 Durand J.-M., Römer T., Bürki M. (eds), *Comment devient-on prophète? Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 4-5 avril 2011*, 2014, XII-223 p.
- 266 Michel P.M., *La culte des pierres à Emar à l'époque hittite*, 2014, VIII-312 p.
- 267 Frevel C., Pyschny K., Cornelius I. (eds), *A "Religious Revolution" in Yehûd? The Material Culture of the Persian Period as a Test Case*, 2014, X-440 p.
- 268 Bleibtreu E., Steymans H.U. (eds), *Edith Porada zum 100. Geburtstag. A Centenary Volume*, 2014, XVI-642 p.
- 269 Lohwasser A. (ed.), *Skarabäen des 1. Jahrtausends. Ein Workshop in Münster am 27. Oktober 2012*, 2014, VI-200 p.
- 270 Wagner A. (ed.), *Göttliche Körper - Göttliche Gefühle. Was leisten anthropomorphe und anthropopathische Götterkonzepte im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament?*, 2014, X-273 p.
- 271 Heintz J.-G., *Prophétisme et Alliance. Des Archives royales de Mari à la Bible hébraïque*, 2015, XXXVI-373 p.
- 272 von der Osten-Sacken E., *Untersuchungen zur Geflügelwirtschaft im Alten Orient*, 2015, XVI-670 p.
- 273 Jaques M., *Mon dieu qu'ai-je fait? Les diğir-ša-dab_(S)-ba et la piété privée en Mésopotamie*, 2015, XIV-463 p.
- 274 Durand J.-M., Guichard M., Römer T. (eds), *Tabou et transgressions. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 11-12 avril 2012*, 2015, XII-314 p.
- 275 Himbaza I. (ed.), *Making the Biblical Text. Textual Studies in the Hebrew and the Greek Bible*, 2015, XIV-192 p.
- 276 Schmid K., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Laws of Heaven - Laws of Nature: Legal Interpretations of Cosmic Phenomena in the Ancient World. Himmelsgesetze - Naturgesetze: Rechtsförmige Interpretationen kosmischer Phänomene in der antiken Welt*, 2016, X-177 p.
- 277 Wasmuth M. (ed.), *Handel als Medium von Kulturkontakt. Akten des interdisziplinären altertumswissenschaftlichen Kolloquiums (Basel, 30.-31. Oktober 2009)*, 2015, VIII-175 p.
- 278 Durand J.-M., Marti L., Römer T. (eds), *Colères et repentirs divins. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 24 et 25 avril 2013*, 2015, X-393 p.
- 279 Schütte W., *Israels Exil in Juda. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung der Schriftprophetie*, 2016, X-270 p.
- 280 Bonfiglio R.P., *Reading Images, Seeing Texts. Towards a Visual Hermeneutics for Biblical Studies*, 2016, XIV-364 p.
- 281 Rückl J., *A Sure House. Studies on the Dynastic Promise to David in the Books of Samuel and Kings*, 2016, VIII-356 p.
- 282 Schroer S., Münger S. (eds), *Khirbet Qeiyafā in the Shephelah. Papers Presented at a Colloquium of the Swiss Society for Ancient Near Eastern Studies Held at the University of Bern, September 6, 2014, 2017*, IV-168 p.
- 283 Jindo J.Y., Sommer B.D., Staubli T. (eds), *Yehezkel Kaufmann and the Reinvention of Jewish Biblical Scholarship*, 2017, XVIII-376 p.
- 284 Nocquet D.R., *La Samarie, la Diaspora et l'achèvement de la Torah. Territorialités et internationalités dans l'Hexateuque*, 2017, X-354 p.

- 285 Kipfer S. (ed.), *Visualizing Emotions in the Ancient Near East*, 2017, VIII-294 p.
- 286 Römer T., Dufour B., Pfitzmann F., Uehlinger C. (eds), *Entre dieux et hommes: anges, démons et autres figures intermédiaires. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 19 et 20 mai 2014*, 2017, XII-367 p.
- 287 Römer T., Gonzalez H., Marti L. (eds), *Représenter dieux et hommes dans le Proche-Orient ancien et dans la Bible. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 5 et 6 mai 2015*, 2019, XII-386 p.
- 288 Wyssmann P., *Vielfältig geprägt. Das spätperserzeitliche Samaria und seine Münzbilder*, 2019, XII-368 p.
- 289 Anthonioz S., Mouton A., Petit D. (eds), *When Gods Speak to Men. Divine Speech according to Textual Sources in the Ancient Mediterranean Basin*, 2019, X-138 p.
- 290 Wasserman N., *The Flood: The Akkadian Sources. A New Edition, Commentary and a Literary Discussion*, 2020, X-187 p.
- 291 Römer T., Gonzalez H., Marti L., Rückl J. (eds), *Oral et écrit dans l'Antiquité orientale: les processus de rédaction et d'édition. Actes du colloque organisé par le Collège de France, Paris, les 26 et 27 mai 2016*, 2021
- 292 Himbaza I. (ed.), *The Text of Leviticus. Proceedings of the Third International Colloquium of the Dominique Barthélemy Institute, held in Fribourg (October 2015)*, 2020, XII-278 p.
- 293 Galoppin T., Bonnet C. (eds), *Divine Names on the Spot. Towards a Dynamic Approach of Divine Denominations in Greek and Semitic Contexts*, 2021, VIII-256 p.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS. SERIES ARCHAEOLOGICA

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- 1 Briend J., Humbert J.-B. (eds), *Tell Keisan (1971-1976), une cité phénicienne en Galilée*, 1980, XXXVIII-392 p. + 142 pl.
- 5 Müller-Winkler C., *Die ägyptischen Objekt-Amulette. Mit Publikation der Sammlung des Biblischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg Schweiz, ehemals Sammlung Fouad S. Matouk*, 1987, 590 p. + XL Taf.
- 12 Wiese A.B., *Die Anfänge der ägyptischen Stempelsiegel-Amulette. Eine typologische und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu den «Knopfsiegeln» und verwandten Objekten der 6. bis frühen 12. Dynastie*, 1996, XXII-194 p. + 93 Taf.
- 14 Amiet P., Briend J., Courtois L., Dumortier J.-B., *Tell el Far'ah. Histoire, glyptique et céramologie*, 1996, IV-91 p.
- 18 Nunn A., *Die figürliche Motivschatz Phöniziens, Syriens und Transjordaniens vom 6. bis zum 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, 2000, XII-269 p. + 78 Taf.
- 19 Bignasca A.M., *I kernoi circolari in Oriente e in Occidente. Strumenti di culto e immagini cosmiche*, 2000, XII-324 p.
- 20 Beyer D., *Emar IV: Les Sceaux. Mission archéologique de Meskéné-Emar. Recherches au pays d'Aštata*, 2001, XXII-490 p. + 50 pl.
- 21 Wäfler M., *Tall al-Hamidiya 3: Zur historischen Geographie von Idamaras zur Zeit der Archive von Mari₍₂₎ und Šubat-enlil/Šehnā*, 2001, 298 p. + 14 maps
- 22 Herrmann C., *Die ägyptischen Amulette der Sammlungen BIBEL+ORIENT der Universität Freiburg Schweiz. Anthropomorphe Gestalten und Tiere*, 2003, X-291 p.
- 23 Wäfler M., *Tall al-Hamidiya 4: Vorbericht 1988-2001*, 2003, 253 p. + 8 Pläne
- 24 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Band III*, 2006, XII-359 p.
- 25 Egger J., Keel O., *Corpus der Siegel-Amulette aus Jordanien. Vom Neolithikum bis zur Persezeit*, 2006, XVIII-510 p.
- 26 Kaelin O., «Modell Ägypten». *Adoption von Innovationen im Mesopotamien des 3. Jahrtausends v. Chr.*, 2006, 204 p.
- 27 Ben-Tor D., *Scarabs, Chronology, and Interconnections. Egypt and Palestine in the Second Intermediate Period*, 2007, XVI-211 p. + 109 pl.
- 28 Meyer J.-W., *Die eisenzeitlichen Stempelsiegel aus dem 'Amuq-Gebiet. Ein Beitrag zur Ikonographie altorientalischer Siegelbilder*, 2008, X-655 p.
- 29 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band II: Von Bahan bis Tel Eton*, 2010, XIV-642 p.
- 30 Kletter R., Ziffer I., Zwickel W., *Yavneh I: The Excavation of the 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit and the Cult Stands*, 2010, XII-297 p. + 176 pl.
- 31 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band III: Von Tell el-Far'a Nord bis Tell el-Fir*, 2010, VI-461 p.
- 32 Rohn K., *Beschriftete mesopotamische Siegel der Frühdynastischen und der Akkad-Zeit*, 2011, XIV-385 p. + 66 pl.
- 33 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band IV: Von Tel Gamma bis Chirbet Husche*, 2013, XVI-715 p.
- 34 Golani A., *Jewelry from the Iron Age II Levant*, 2013, XII-313 p.
- 35 Keel O., *Corpus der Stempelsiegel-Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Von den Anfängen bis zur Persezeit. Katalog Band V: Von Tel el-Idham bis Tel Kitan*, 2017, XVIII-672 p.

- 36 Kletter R., Ziffer I., Zwickel W., *Yavneh II: The 'Temple Hill' Repository Pit*, 2015, XIV-288 p. + 63 pl.
- 37 Choi G.D., *Decoding Canaanite Pottery Paintings from the Late Bronze Age and Iron Age I. Classification and Analysis of Decorative Motifs and Design Structures - Statistics, Distribution Patterns - Cultural and Socio-Political Implications*, 2016, XII-272 p. + CD.
- 38 Herrmann C., *Ägyptische Amulette aus Palästina/Israel. Band IV: Von der Spätbronzezeit IIB bis in römische Zeit*, 2016, XVI-510 p.
- 39 Keel O., *700 Skarabäen und Verwandtes aus Palästina/Israel. Die Sammlung Keel*, 2020, XX-319 p.
- 40 Attinger P., Cavigneaux A., Mittermayer C., Novák M. (eds), *Text and Image. Proceedings of the 61e Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Geneva and Bern, 22-26 June 2015*, 2018, XXIV-526 p.
- 41 Ahrens A., *Aegyptiaca in der nördlichen Levante. Eine Studie zur Kontextualisierung und Rezeption ägyptischer und ägyptisierender Objekte in der Bronzezeit*, 2020, XX-451 p.

ORBIS BIBLICUS ET ORIENTALIS. SUBSIDIA LINGUISTICA

(available volumes – volumes disponibles – lieferbare Bände)

- 1 Van Damme D., *Altarmenische Kurzgrammatik*, 2004, X-149 p.

