

# Some Pitfalls of Translation Greek \*

Natalio FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS \*\*  
Instituto de Filología - CSIC, Madrid

One of the primary functions of textual criticism is to detect the genesis of errors. The «true» reading can only be discovered when the «false» is unmasked <sup>1</sup>. Similarly, if the Septuagint is to be used critically, it is essential to start by unmasking the corruptions, misreadings or mistranslations that lie within.

The completion of a Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene Text in the Historical Books is an excellent opportunity to go through the whole translation process and detect the most common mistakes, the main difficulties met by the translators and the mechanisms employed to overcome them. It is like looking at the reverse side of the weave, giving an insight into the high degree of literal and formal correspondence between the Greek translation and the Hebrew parent text in most of the historical books. At the same time it offers

---

\* Ponencia leída en el XII Congreso de la International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS), Leiden, 30 de julio de 2004.

\*\* natalio@filol.csic.es

<sup>1</sup> «La critica testuale non scopre 'il vero' se non in quanto caccia il 'falso'»: cf. G. CONTINI, *Breviario di Ecdotica* (Torino 1990) p. 147. Or, in words of the famous text critic A. E. HOUSMAN: «Textual criticism is the science of discovering error in texts and the art of removing it»: cf. A. E. HOUSMAN, «The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism», *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 18 (1922) pp. 67-84: p. 68.

the opportunity to appreciate the limits of the formal equivalence and, in some cases, to get a glimpse into the presumed Vorlage of the translators.

For the Greek, our edition of the Antiochene text has been used as the basis of the analysis, and for the Hebrew the text of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) <sup>2</sup>. We are aware that the Masoretic Text (MT) is not identical to the Hebrew Vorlage of the translators. We use it in the comparison for practical reasons, since it is the only complete Hebrew text available for those books. Moreover, it should be emphasized that the MT agrees to a large degree with the Vorlage of the translators, as can be inferred from a look at the Index in which the formal, extant equivalent, is of first concern. One may wonder why priority is not given to Qumran texts of Samuel. The fact is, that apart from the fragmentary character (ca. 8% of the text of Samuel) and occasional agreements with the Antiochene text, there is little evidence to define the textual affiliation of the Qumran fragments <sup>3</sup>.

Much has been written recently on the use of formal or presumed equivalents in an index or concordance. E. Tov and T. Muraoka have diversely criticized the Hatch & Redpath's procedure, because these scholars adhered very closely to the formal, almost mechanical equivalence in their Concordance <sup>4</sup>. For the Index of the

<sup>2</sup> N. FERNÁNDEZ MARCOS and J. R. BUSTO SAIZ, with the collaboration of M.<sup>a</sup> V.<sup>a</sup> SPOTTORNO DÍAZ-CARO and S. P. COWE, *El texto antioqueno de la Biblia Griega I-III*, TECC 50, 53, 60 (Madrid 1989-1996), and K. ELLIGER and W. RUDOLPH (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (5th corrected ed., Stuttgart 1997).

<sup>3</sup> «However, insufficient evidence was found to affirm any link between L and 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, except for L's dependence upon LXX, which was in turn dependent upon 4QSam<sup>a</sup>»: cf. E. D. HERBERT, «4QSam<sup>a</sup> and its Relationship to the LXX: An Exploration in Stemmatological Analysis», in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Cambridge, 1995*, SCS 45, ed. B. A. TAYLOR (Atlanta, GA 1997) pp. 37-55: p. 49.

<sup>4</sup> E. TOV, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Jerusalem 1997) pp. 91-100; T. MURAOKA, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint Keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance* (Grand Rapids, MI 1998) p. 8.

Antiochene text we have adopted a middle road. We adhere to the formal equivalence when it looks plausible after a scrutiny of the sentence in both languages. We believe that by using this procedure we are ensuring that the reader can make the best use of the Index without going down the path of the subjectivity of the presumed equivalences. It is common knowledge that the abuse of presumed equivalents, while they may be tempting, can lead to suggestions that can be analysed in different ways by scholars, thus producing different reconstructions. Nevertheless, in some cases and as an aid to the reader, the presumed equivalent preceded by the abbreviation *leg* (= *legit*) is suggested between brackets <sup>5</sup>.

In our search for the correct correspondence, the meticulous study of both the Hebrew and the Greek texts leads us to some further considerations. In some cases it is extremely difficult to decide whether the extant Masoretic text reflects a new equivalent for the extant Greek or whether, in fact, the Greek is being translated from a different Vorlage. Indeed, our knowledge of the Hebrew and Aramaic as well as of the Alexandrian Greek is limited, and I subscribe to the sound statement of R. Smend that «Eine Konkordanz muss in der Gleichsetzung, soweit eine solche überhaupt durchführbar ist, so mechanisch wie möglich verfahren und das Urteil der Zukunft überlassen» <sup>6</sup>. This appreciation is also valid for an Index. Both extre-

<sup>5</sup> Just as Abraham Tromm did in his Concordance published in Amsterdam 1718 (*Abrahami Trommii Concordantiae Graecae Versionis Vulgo Dictae LXX Interpretum...*, I-II [Amstelodami et Trajecti ad Rhenum MDCCXVIII]).

We hope that a mine of useful information has been added through the new Greek words and new Hebrew equivalents preceded by an asterisk in the Index. Likewise we suggest the presumed reading in a number of obvious equivalences signaled with an obelus by Hatch and Redpath: αὐχμῶδες, 'dry' in 1 Sam 23:14.15 does not translate מדבר, but is a doublet of the unknown geographic name יי; βορρᾶς is a stereotype equivalent for צפון; hence, it can be presumed that in 2 Chr 14: 9 the translator read צפונה instead of צפתה; in 1 Sam 13:7 it can be presumed that the translator read ועברים as participle of עבר (οἱ ὀδοβαίνοντες) instead of the substantive 'the Hebrews' (יְהוּדָיִם).

<sup>6</sup> R. SMEND, *Griechisch-Syrisch-Hebräischer Index zur Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (Berlin 1907) p. x.

mes should be avoided: the inclusion of Hebrew words among the new equivalents whose meaning is well outside the semantic field of the Greek word <sup>7</sup>, and the systematic exclusion of a new Hebrew equivalent because it is not attested in other parts of the Septuagint. The good number of new equivalents marked with an asterisk in our Index attests to the richness and variety of the translation manifested through several new plausible correspondences. These equivalents are lacking in the Hatch & Redpath Concordance, be it because the Antiochene Greek terms are only attested in the deuterocanonical or apocryphal books (some of them without Hebrew Vorlage), or because they appear in the three Jewish translators whose Hebrew equivalents are not recorded in this Concordance. Moreover, Hatch & Redpath follow the Greek text of the codices *Vaticanus*, *Alexandrinus* and *Sinaiticus* plus the Sixtine edition (1587), but they ignore the Antiochene text which is very different from these manuscripts in the historical books.

A careful use of the Index allows the user to draw certain conclusions in relation to the different problems of textual criticism. The stereotype correspondence between two terms in Hebrew and Greek may lead to the restoring of a different reading from that of the MT for the passage in question. Thus, in 2 Chr 33:7 αἰών has been introduced in the Greek translation for the MT עילום. Taking into account that 99% of the occurrences of עילום have been regularly translated by αἰών, it can be deduced, in all confidence, that the Greek translator of this passage also read עילום, as was the case in the other ancient versions, and, consequently, it can be restored as a genuine reading instead of the dubious and uncertain עילום of MT. On the contrary, in 1 Chr 17:16 we come across a different text critical panorama. MT reads «and what is my house, that you have brought me thus far (עד-הלים)?». The entire Greek tradition inter-

---

<sup>7</sup> The translation may be idiomatic or metaphorical, or may correspond to a different Vorlage, or may conceal a complex text critical problem.

prets the last part of the sentence as ἕως αἰῶνος. But this reading results from a phonetic confusion between the guturals γ and η and, consequently, cannot be invoked as a sound witness to change the reading of the MT that makes sense. The frequent occurrence of the expression ἕως αἰῶνος in the Greek Bible has contributed to consolidate this reading in the Greek transmission.

This is just a sample of the kind of textual criticism that can be made with the aid of the Index, and which is valid for a high proportion of common, abstract and concrete names where an almost stereotype equivalence is recorded. Notwithstanding, the critical judgement is more difficult to exercise in other names (for which the translator liked the *variatio* or the metaphorical or stylistic equivalence), and more especially in the verbs, where the array of equivalents is highly diversified: for instance, εἶδωλον corresponds to no less than ten Hebrew words, and λαμβάνειν translates eighteen different Hebrew forms <sup>8</sup>.

I shall now move on and try to identify the incorrect readings of the Greek tradition, especially of the Antiochene text, in order to highlight the genuine reading. I will deal with the translation process and the text transmission in a reverse order, going back from a) the paleographic errors of transmission (inner-Greek corruptions), through b) the different vocalization performed by the translator and c) the interchange or confusion of similar letters in the Hebrew Vorlage, to d) some variant readings supported by a different Vorlage. For the last case, the Qumran fragments of Samuel open a window towards actual readings of the Greek confirmed by an extant Hebrew Vorlage different from MT.

---

<sup>8</sup> As Muraoka observes, «It is obviously ill-advised to attempt to establish mechanical patterns of correspondence between Greek tenses and those of Hebrew»: T. MURAOKA, «Translation Techniques and Beyond», in *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, eds. R. SOLLAMO and S. SIPILÄ (Helsinki - Göttingen 2001) pp. 13-22: p. 20.

## A. INNER-GREEK CORRUPTIONS

Using the parent text as a control, some Greek corruptions can be detected that have contaminated a part of or the entire manuscript tradition. A few examples taken from the Antiochene text, shared occasionally by the whole Greek tradition, will suffice to illustrate this phenomenon:

— Αἶξ,-γός is the regular equivalent for the Hebrew נֵז ‘goat’. However, in 2 Chr 31:6 we come across a formal equivalent of αἰγῶν for the Hebrew נִשְׁדָּק in the sequence «the tithe of cattle and sheep, and the tithe of the *dedicated things* that had been consecrated to the Lord their God»<sup>9</sup>. In all probability the whole Greek tradition has been corrupted from ἀγίων to αἰγῶν. However, following the manuscript tradition we have restored αἰγῶν as did A. Rahlfs in his manual edition. The reason why this new reading, so alien to the original meaning of the Hebrew, succeeded in the text reception, is that it makes sense also in the Greek chain of words joined to the cattle and sheeps: καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤνεγκαν ἐπιδέκατα μόσχων καὶ προβάτων καὶ ἐπιδέκατα αἰγῶν, καὶ ἡγίασαν τῷ Κυρίῳ θεῷ αὐτῶν.

— The Antiochene reading of 2 Chr 16:14 must be characterised as an inner-Greek corruption: καὶ ἔκλαυσαν αὐτῷ κλαῦσιν μεγάλην for the Hebrew וַיִּשְׁרֹפוּ לוֹ שָׂרֵף גָּדוֹל (‘and they made a very great fire in his honor’). Καίειν and καῦσις correspond better to the meaning of the Hebrew root שָׂרַף, while κλαίειν translates regularly the root בָּכָה. However, the paleographic confusion ἔκλαυσαν / ἔκαυσαν and κλαῦσιν / καῦσιν, easy to detect in the cursive Greek writing, provoked the new reading in the Antiochene branch of manuscripts<sup>10</sup>. The fact that the new reading makes sense in the context of the verse lead to its consolidation within the Greek tradition. In fact it is a doublet or alternative translation that Antio-

<sup>9</sup> The English translation of the Hebrew, when no otherwise said, is taken from B. M. METZGER and R. E. MURPHY (eds.), *The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha* (New York 1989).

<sup>10</sup> Interestingly, the correct alternative reading καὶ ἔκαυσαν αὐτὸν καῦσιν μεγάλην has been preserved exclusively in the Alcalá polyglot Bible.

chene added to the reading of the current Septuagint resulting in the following sentence: καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ἐκφορὰν μεγάλην καὶ ἔκλαυσαν αὐτῷ κλαῦσιν μεγάλην. In a text conceived for public reading it is essential that it has meaning. On several occasions the doublets of Antiochene fulfil this function by completing the sense or clarifying the context by means of an alternative reading attached to the reading of the majority. The same phenomenon of a doublet or alternative reading based on a paleographic, inner-Greek, corruption can be detected in the Antiochene text of 2 Chr 21:19: καὶ οὐκ ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἐκφορὰν καὶ κλαῦσιν κατὰ τὴν κλαῦσιν τῶν πατέρων αὐτοῦ. Again, this alternative reading has succeeded in the text transmission because it fits the context of mourning for Asa's death.

— In 2 Chr 34:22 the MT speaks of «the prophet Huldah, the wife of Shallum... son of Hasrah, keeper of the wardrobe (סִיגְדֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ)». In the target language Shallum is no longer the keeper of the wardrobe but 'a prophet Huldah... φυλάσσοῦσαν τὰς ἐντολάς' ('that observes the commands'!). Already Montfaucon<sup>11</sup> detected the corruption of the original reading στολάς, restored by A. Rahlfs, against the ἐντολάς of the manuscript tradition. The Antiochene text, following his tendency to incorporate as doublets alternative readings, retains the corrupted reading of the current Septuagint and introduces a correct translation of the Hebrew, restoring Shallum (Sellem) as keeper of the wardrobe (ἱματιοφύλαξ): καὶ ἐπορεύθη Χελκίας... πρὸς Ὀλδαν τὴν προφῆτιν γυναῖκα Σελλήμ υἱοῦ Θεκῶε υἱοῦ Ἀσὲρ τοῦ ἱματιοφύλακος<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> As Montfaucon realized, instead of φυλάσσοῦσαν τὰς ἐντολάς the original reading should be φυλάσσοντος τὰς στολάς, and these words should refer not to Huldah but to Shallum, her husband: cf. F. SCHLEUSNER, *Novus Thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (Lipsiae 1820) *sub voce* ἐντολή.

<sup>12</sup> This term is the right Greek translation in the parallel passage of 2 Kings 22:14. Did the author of the Antiochene text take τοῦ ἱματιοφύλακος from this parallel passage? There is no trace of Hexaplaric reading to 2 Chr 34:22; Field's reference points to *alia exemplaria*, in fact the reading of the Complutensian Polyglot which follows the Lucianic manuscript 108: cf. F. FIELD, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt* I (Oxford 1875 = Hildesheim 1964).

τὴν φυλάσσοσαν τὰς ἐντολάς. The reading of רמפ as feminine participle by the translator (joining to the participle the article of the following word) generated an embarrassing interpretation in the target language and probably contributed to the success of the corrupt reading ἐντολάς instead of στολάς.

— When the queen of Sheba visits king Solomon, she contemplated and admired all his wisdom and among other things in his palace she was amazed by the clothing of his servants, and by his cupbearers (יִרְשָׁמ, 1 Kings 10:5). The current Septuagint translates this part of the sentence τὸν ἱματισμὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς οἰνοχόους αὐτοῦ, in exact correspondence with the meaning of the root הַרַשׁ in *hiphil*, ‘give to drink’. However, in Antiochene we come across τὸν ἱματισμὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς εὐνούχους αὐτοῦ (‘his clothing and his eunuchs’). It is the reading of Antiochene without variants, with a meaning far different from the original. It is not plausible to imagine a paleographic confusion at the level of the Hebrew between הַרַשׁ, the regular equivalent for οἰνοχόος and הַרַשׁ, the stereotype equivalent for εὐνούχος. However, at the level of the Greek transmission the phonetic corruption by similar pronunciation of both terms due to the phenomenon of itacism provides a reasonable explanation. The reading also makes sense, and is consolidated in the text transmission of the Antiochene family of manuscripts<sup>13</sup>.

#### B. A DIFFERENT READING OF THE CONSONANTAL TEXT

The numerous passages characterised as *aliter* in the Index provide some information on misleading translations caused by a different reading of the Hebrew text and, occasionally, by homophonic translation. I emphasize that it is a typical phenomenon that occurs

<sup>13</sup> Ms *i* of Brooke-McLean has still another corruption, ἡνιοχούς, ‘chariot-drivers’. There are no Hexaplaric remains to this passage. Two late minuscules (243 and 244) solve the problem by creating the doublet: καὶ τοὺς οἰνοχόους καὶ τοὺς εὐνούχους; cf. F. FIELD, *Origenis Hexaplorum, ad loc.*

in the translation process at the first level of encounter of the two languages. Translation is a kind of reading and concretely the Septuagint is the *first interpretation* of an unvocalised Hebrew text. It is a kind of performance of the consonantal text, like a score, to use a musical metaphor. No doubt, in several cases it is clear that the translators were following a different reading tradition or an exegetical device, but in many other cases the end product can be analysed simply as a misreading.

— In 1 Sam 2:31 the Hebrew word עֲרֵץ, ‘arm’, is read twice as עֲרֵץ, ‘seed’. The Hebrew sentence «See... I will cut off your arm and the arm of your ancestor’s family» becomes in Greek καὶ ἰδοὺ... ἐξολοθρεύσω τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρός σου.

— In 1 Sam 15:9, the different vocalization plus the confusion of similar consonants leads to a new diverse sense in the target language quite different from the parent text. Saul and the people spared Agag, and «the best of the sheep... and the lambs (הַכְּרִימִים), and all that was valuable». The plural of כֶּרֶם, ‘lamb’ or ‘ram’ is read and interpreted by the whole Greek tradition as τῶν ἀμπελώνων = כְּרָמִים, the plural of כֶּרֶם.

— In 1 Sam 16:20 the Hebrew וַיִּקַּח יֵשׁוּעַ חֲמֹר לֶחֶם («And Jesse took a donkey with bread») is translated in Antiochene: καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἰεσσαὶ ὄνον, καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτῷ γόμορ ἄρτων. In all probability this sentence arose from the double translation of a single word חֲמֹר with different vocalization as donkey (חֲמֹר) and as a measure (חֲמֹר). Antiochene utilizes this recourse to double interpretation in order to solve the brachilogia of the Hebrew; the majority text of the Septuagint understood it as γόμορ. But only Antiochene makes a difficult sentence in Hebrew explicit. Interestingly, the Old Latin retains the Antiochene reading: *Et accepit Iesse asinum et imposuit super gomor panis*<sup>14</sup>.

<sup>14</sup> The Old Latin can be consulted in the *apparatus* of our edition of the Antiochene text quoted in note 2.

— In 2 Sam 14:17 the Hebrew word *הַנְּחִימָה*, ‘resting-place’ is translated by the entire Septuagint tradition by *θυσία*, reading *הַנְּחִימָה*, ‘offering’, and changing the sense of the Hebrew sentence «the word of my lord the king will set me at rest» into the new *Γενηθήτω δὴ ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου μου τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς θυσίαν*.

— The same source of confusion can be detected in 2 Chr 10:10: *וַיִּלְכְּדוּ אֶת הַיֹּדֵם*, where Antiochene reads the preposition *לְ* as *עַל* ‘yoke’ and translates accordingly: *καὶ σὺ νῦν κούφισον ἀπὸ τοῦ ζυγοῦ ἡμῶν* in contrast with the current Septuagint *καὶ σὺ ἄφες ἄφ’ ἡμῶν*.

An alternative reading of the consonantal text may produce a double interpretation that Antiochene incorporates willingly into the textual chain, as in 1 Kings 18:44, where the MT *מִיָּם*, ‘out of the sea’, has been translated twice by Antiochene: *ὕδωρ ἀπὸ θαλάσσης*<sup>15</sup>.

— The different vocalization of the MT may result in the interpretation of some proper names as common names or verbs, with a sense far from that of the original. In 1 Kings 6:3 (= MT 5:32a) it is stated that in the building of the temple «Solomon’s builders and Hiram’s builders and the Giblites did the stonecutting» (*וַיִּבְנוּ הַבְּנֵי שְׁלֹמֹה וְהַבְּנֵי חִירָם וְהַגִּבְלִיטִים*), translated by Antiochene: *καὶ ἤνεγκαν οἱ υἱοὶ Σολομώντος καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Χειράμ, καὶ ἐνέβαλον αὐτούς* («and Solomon’s sons and Hiram’s sons brought the stones and fashioned their borders»). The majority text of the LXX reads *ἐπελέκησαν* (‘did the stonecutting’) instead of *ἤνεγκαν*, and puts the simple verb *ἔβαλαν* instead of *ἐνέβαλον*. But, what is more important, the translator read with different vocalization ‘sons’ (*בְּנֵי*), not ‘builders’ (*בְּנֵי*), and interpreted the proper name in the plural ‘Giblites’<sup>16</sup> as a *hiphil* of *גבל*, ‘circumscribe’, probably read-

<sup>15</sup> MT: «A little cloud no bigger than a person’s hand is rising out of the sea» (*וַיֵּרָא מִן הַיָּם מַעֲלָה מִיָּם*). The Old Greek *ἀνάγουσα ὕδωρ* probably read *מַעֲלָה מִן הַיָּם*. Antiochene conflates both readings and obtains a meaningful sentence.

<sup>16</sup> People from Gebal called Byblos by the Greeks.

ing וַיִּגְבְּלוּם, ‘they fashioned their borders’, a different reading accepted as emendation to the MT by some modern dictionaries <sup>17</sup>.

The homophonic translation may also explain some unusual equivalences in the Index. In these examples there is no reason for postulating a paleographic confusion at the level of the Hebrew language. However the similar phonetics of the Hebrew and Greek word may have influenced the selection of terms in the translation process in passages such as 2 Chr 33:6 ἐν γῆ Βενευνόμ for the Hebrew בגי בן-הנום («in the valley of the son of Hinnom»), or 2 Chr 30:10 ἐν τῷ ὄρει Ἐφραΐμ καὶ Μανασσή for the Hebrew בארץ-אפרים ומנשה («in the country of Ephraim and Manasseh»). A phonetic connection exists between גי and γῆ, אר and ὄρος in Hebrew and Greek that might reasonably explain these uncommon translations. There may also be an underlying, diffuse conscience among Hellenistic Jews that Hebrew and Greek had something in common <sup>18</sup>.

In 2 Chr 12:11 the guard of Rehoboam, whenever he went into the house of the Lord, would come along bearing the shields of bronze, «and would then bring them back to the guardroom» (השׁבום אל-תא) (הרצים). The verse has been diversely interpreted by the Greek tradition. It is clear that the word תא, ‘guardroom’ was not transparent for the translators <sup>19</sup>. They resolve the difficulty with a puzzling translation; the majority text of the Septuagint reads καὶ οἱ ἐπιστρέφοντες εἰς ἀπάντησιν τῶν παρατρεχόντων. But the homophonic translation appears clear enough in the double sentence of Antiochene that includes εἰς τὴν τάξιν τῶν παρατρεχόντων, a

<sup>17</sup> Cf. D. J. A. CLINES (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. II (Sheffield 1995). Translation of proper names is very frequent in Antiochene. But, occasionally, they are interpreted as common names: cf. ἐν τοίχῳ τεκτονικῆς for ‘at Qir Hareset’ in 2 Kings 3:25.

<sup>18</sup> H. B. ROSÉN, *L’hébreu et ses rapports avec le monde classique. Essai d’évaluation culturelle* (Paris 1979) pp. 25-46 and F. VINEL, *La Bible d’Alexandrie. 18 L’Ecclésiaste* (Paris 2002) pp. 55-57.

<sup>19</sup> Of an unknown origin it means ‘guard-chamber’ for the outrunners: cf. L. KOEHLER and W. BAUMGARTNERT, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* [translated by M. E. J. RICHARDSON] (Leiden - Boston - Köln 1999).

guess translation induced by the phonetic similarity of τᾶξις with תא<sup>20</sup>. Hatch and Redpath insert an obelus instead of the Hebrew equivalent of the septuagintal ἀπάντησις, although the formal equivalence is beyond doubt.

### C. INTERCHANGE OF SIMILAR LETTERS

Another source of misleading translations lies in the confusion of similar letters or groups of letters. The Index provides a mine of information on unusual equivalences going back eventually to a misreading of some consonants in the early square script. It is an accident of reading or copying; in the first case it arises in the course of the translator's deciphering of the Vorlage; in the second, it reflects a Vorlage already at variance with the MT. It is not to be excluded that a genuine textual difference underlies some of these variants, but in general it can be stated that the paleographic confusion at the level of the Hebrew script is the most plausible explanation. The most frequent interchange of similar letters occurs between ר/ד.

— In 1 Sam 23: 15-16.18-19, the city where David remains hidden in the wilderness of Ziph, Horesh (חרשה), is translated systematically in Antiochene by Καινή, obviously read as חדשה.

— In 1 Sam 19:13.16 the uncertain Hebrew expression העזים כביר, translated commonly as 'net of goat's hair' (Vulgate *pellem pilosam caprarum*), is interpreted in the whole Greek tradition as ἡπαρ αἰγῶν, by reading the first term as קֶבֶד, 'liver'.

— In 1 Sam 24:3 Saul went to look for David and his men על פני עמורי היעלים, ususally translated as «in the direction of the Rocks of the Wild Goats». The majority text of the Septuagint reads ἐπὶ πρόσωπον Ἐδδαίεμ, that is, a transliteration (*cum variantibus*).

<sup>20</sup> In the parallel passage of I Kings 14:42 (= MT 14:28), the majority text of the Septuagint transliterates θεέ, and Antiochene θεκοῦε.

But Antiochene interprets κατὰ πρόσωπον τῆς θήρας τῶν ἐλάφων. This interpretation is confirmed by the reading of the Old Latin transmitted by Lucifer of Cagliari *ante faciem venationis cervorum*. No doubt, the translator read דגצ, ‘hunting’ instead of the דגז ‘rocks’ from MT. In this example the two most frequent interchanges of similar letters concur: ר/ד and י/ו.

— In 2 Sam 22:21b it is stated «according to the cleanness of my hands he [the Lord] recompensed me» (כבר ידי ישׁיב לי), translated literally by the current Septuagint as κατὰ τὴν καθαριότητα τῶν χειρῶν μου ἀνταπέδωκέν μοι. However, Antiochene gives a different interpretation of the sentence: δόξαν χειρῶν μου ἀνταποδώσει μοι, reading the first word as דובך. A similar graphic confusion underlies the Antiochene term δοξασμός in 2 Sam 22:25: δοξασμός μου ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῦ for the Hebrew כברי לנגד עיניו.

— In 1 Sam 14:40 Saul says to all Israel: «You shall be on one side, and I and my son Jonathan will be on the other side» (לעבר דחא ... לעבר דחא). The whole Greek tradition transmits in both cases εἰς δουλείαν, reading עבד instead of עבר. Interestingly, the Antiochene text adds, as a doublet, a new sentence with the correct sense according to the MT: καὶ εἶπε Σαοὺλ πρὸς τὸν λαόν Ὑμεῖς ἔσσεσθε εἰς ἓν μέρος, καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ Ἰωναθὰν ἐσόμεθα εἰς ἓν μέρος. The alternative reading, in agreement with MT, is not supported by any Hexaplaric witness, and we are probably dealing with an early correction, already known to Josephus <sup>21</sup>. The double reading δουλείαν/μέρος, based on the interchange of ד/ר generated a new sentence. As is well known, a trend of the Antiochene text consists of joining double readings with small redactional retouches to clarify the meaning so that all the information of the preserved variants can be explicit for public reading.

The misreading of other graphically similar letters like י/ו, ר/ז, ח/ה, כ/ב, פ/ב, ד/ד, ג/ג; letters with similar phonetics like the sibilants ז, ס, ש, ש; or the gutturals א, ה, ח, ע, is also reflected in the

<sup>21</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* VI,125: ἵσταται δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς σὺν τῷ παιδί κατ' ἄλλο μέρος.

Index. These phenomena have been recently dealt with by T. Muraoka, E. Tov and A. Gelston<sup>22</sup>. The examples abound, especially in the transmission of the proper names and other transliterated words. Herewith a handful of illustrations:

Reference	MT	Presumed Reading	Antiochene
1 Kings 12:16	ראה ( <i>qal</i> )	רעה	βόσκειν
2 Kings 10:11	גדליו	גאליו	τοὺς ἀγγιστεύοντας
2 Kings 16:18	מוסך	מוסד	θεμέλιον
2 Kings 21:9	תעה ( <i>hiph.</i> )	תעב	βδελύσσειν
1 Chr 4:10	רעה	דעה	γνώσις
1 Chr 12:33	עדר ( <i>qal</i> )	עור	βοηθεῖν

In 1 Kings 21:38 (MT 20:38), the prophet waited for the king of Israel along the road, «disguising himself with a bandage over his eyes» (ויִתְחַפֵּשׂ בְּאֶפְרַח עַל-עֵינָיו). The entire Greek tradition reads this part of the sentence καὶ κατεδέσατο ἐν τελαμῶνι τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ. Hatch and Redpath give as the Hebrew equivalent of καταδεῖν the *hithpael* of חָפַשׂ with a question mark. Muraoka<sup>23</sup> put this root between double brackets signifying that the equivalent given by Hatch and Redpath is implausible. He pointed with an arrow to the *qal* of עָמַס as the true equivalent that should replace that of Hatch and Redpath. However, I think it is more plausible that the translator read in this passage the *qal* of חָבַח, regularly translated in the Septuagint by δεῖν, καταδεῖν. The confusion of פ/ב in the Hebrew script is frequent and also between the sibilants ש/ש, while עָמַס in *qal* is regularly translated by αἴρειν, ἐπιγεμί-

<sup>22</sup> T. MURAOKA, «A New Index to Hatch and Redpath», *ETL* 74 (1998) pp. 257-276; E. TOV, «Interchanges of consonants between the Masoretic Text and the Vorlage of the Septuagint», in *Sha'arei Talmon*, eds. M. FISHBANE and E. TOV (Winona Lake 1992) pp. 255-267, and A. GELSTON, «Some Hebrew Misreadings in the Septuagint of Amos», *VT* 52 (2002) pp. 493-500.

<sup>23</sup> T. MURAOKA, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index*, p. 54.

ζειν and, in my opinion, its confusion with פח is less probable. In any case, it is just an example of how the presumed equivalents can be seen differently by diverse scholars.

The different reading based on paleographic confusion may affect not only isolated consonants but also a group of letters, the phenomenon of metathesis included:

— In 1 Sam 8:16 the Hebrew reads «He will take your male and female slaves and the best of your young men (ואת־בחוריכם), *iuvenes optimos* in the Vulgate) and donkeys», while the Greek tradition interprets: καὶ τοὺς δούλους ὑμῶν καὶ τὰς δούλας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ βουκόλια ὑμῶν τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ τοὺς ὄνους ὑμῶν. In view of the regular equivalence between בקר and βουκόλιον, it can reasonably be presumed that the translator read ואת־בקר־יכם.

— In 1 Chr 22:9 the king Jehu searched for Ahaziah, «who was captured while hiding in Samaria» (וילכדהו והוא מתחבא בשמרון). But the Greek tradition interprets unanimously: καὶ κατέλαβον αὐτὸν ἰατρευόμενον ἐν Σαμαρείᾳ. Hatch and Redpath insert an obelus of uncertainty by ἰατρευόμενον as equivalent of חבא. However, given the regular equivalences of κρύβειν, κρύπτειν for the *hithpael* of חבא, and, likewise, the regular equivalence of ἰατρεύειν for the *hithpael* of רפא, it can be presumed that the translator read מתרפא.

Moreover, the confusion of final ך and final ף leads to a quite different interpretation in the Greek of 1 Sam 28:14, when the woman medium evokes Samuel's spirit to Saul. To Saul's question concerning Samuel's appearance, the woman answers according to the MT: «An old man is coming up; he is wrapped in a robe» (שיא זקן עלה והוא עטה מעיל). However, Antiochene translates with the rest of the Greek witnesses <sup>24</sup>: ἄνδρα ὄρθιον ἀναβαίνοντα ἀπὸ τῆς

<sup>24</sup> Only the manuscripts AN followed by a few cursives transmit ὄρθριος, 'of the morning' or *matutinus*: cf. A. E. BROOKE, N. MCLEAN and H. St. J. THACKERAY, *The Old Testament in Greek. Part I, I and II Samuel* (Cambridge 1927).

γῆς, ἀναβεβλημένον διπλοῖδα. Ὁρθιος is a *hárax* of the Septuagint in this passage. The Hexaplaric witnesses represented by οἱ λοιποὶ read, according to the MT, πρεσβύτην. But ὄρθιος is used by Symmachus for the translation of Gen 1:27, the man's creation<sup>25</sup>. In this passage of Genesis Symmachus inserts an explanatory note relying probably on an exegetical tradition that emphasizes the most peculiar feature of the human being in contrast with animals, his upright stance, a tradition that can be traced back to Justin Martyr and other rabbinic sources<sup>26</sup>. In contrast, in 1 Samuel 28:14 it seems that the origin of the Greek reading is not exegetical but paleographic. The verb ἤρῃ is translated by ἀνορθοῦν in the two occurrences of the Bible (Psalm 144:14 and 145:8). Moreover, it is well attested with the meaning of 'stand upright, erect' in postbiblical Hebrew as well as in Aramaic and Akkadian<sup>27</sup>. In any case, an exegetical tradition may have influenced this version since, according to the Midrash, when the spirits of dead people are evoked from the netherworld, only the kings appear upright, face first; the other persons rise feet first. This is, no doubt, why the woman recognised Samuel<sup>28</sup>.

Metathesis can be detected in some unusual translations, but it is especially visible in the transliteration of proper names.

In 2 Chr 28:3: καὶ διήγαγε τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ ἐν πυρί, for the MT ויעבר... בנא reflects a different reading from the verb בנא in *hiphil*, a stereotype expression for «make pass through fire». In 2 Sam 22:13 it is said that «coals of fire flamed forth» (בנא-לגח). The current LXX translates literally: ἐξεκαύθησαν ἄνθρακες πυρός. However, Antiochene interprets the whole sentence as διήλθον χάλαζα

<sup>25</sup> καὶ ἔκτισεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν εἰκόνι διαφόρῳ, ὄρθιον ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν αὐτόν, cf. J. W. WEVERS, *Septuaginta. I Genesis* (Göttingen 1974) p. 6.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. A. SALVESEN, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (Manchester 1991) pp. 2-6.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. F. SCHLEUSNER, *Novus Thesaurus*, sub voce ὄρθιος and P. K. MCCARTER, *1 Samuel*, AB 8 (Garden City, NY 1984) p. 419. McCarter prefers the reading of the Old Greek as more genuine.

<sup>28</sup> W. A. VAN BEUKEN, «1 Samuel 28: The Prophet as a 'Hammer of Witches'», *JSOT* 6 (1978) pp. 3-17: p. 9.

καὶ ἄνθρωποις πυρός. As a matter of fact, a reading עברו underlies the Antiochene translation. It is also probable that γάλαζα, which commonly translates the Hebrew ברד in the Septuagint, originated as a double reading of this very word.

Some items of metathesis in the transliteration of proper names are the following: Ἀβουζά for עזובה (1 Chr 2:18,19); Ἀδαρί for חרדי (2 Sam 23:25); Ἀφαρεί for פּערי (2 Sam 23:25); Θοργαμά for תּוּגְרָמָה (1 Chr 1:6), and Πάφες for רַצַּף (2 Kings 19:12)<sup>29</sup>.

I believe that most of the commented phenomena can be explained as misreadings during the process of translation due to the incorrect desciphering of the Hebrew Vorlage. Consequently, they are of secondary character arising from an accident of the transmission, be it in the copying of the Hebrew text itself or produced by a misreading of the translator. It cannot be excluded, however, that some of these variants conceal a genuine reading.

#### D. TRACES OF A DIFFERENT VORLAGE

It is common knowledge that the Antiochene text is rooted in the Hebrew not only as part of the Septuagint tradition, but also due to the fact that it incorporates a set of Hexaplaric corrections according to the MT. Sometimes it is even closer to the MT than the rest of the Septuagint tradition. Moreover, S. Brock realized that not all the approximations to the Hebrew in Antiochene were of Hexaplaric

<sup>29</sup> Less plausible, in my opinion, is the conjecture in BHS of γαψ, as metathesis of γαψ in 2 Chr 20:9, based on the Antiochene or Lucianic text of the Septuagint. It occurs in a sequence of calamities announced, «if disaster comes upon us, sword, judgement, or pestilence or famine», and was translated by Antiochene: εἰ ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς κακά, ῥομφαία, ἀκρίς, θάνατος, λιμός. The majority text of the Septuagint reads κρίσις according to the MT, instead of ἀκρίς. The regular equivalent for ἀκρίς, 'locust', is ἄρ, while the regular translation for γαψ, 'flood', is κατακλυσμός. Given the stereotype correspondence of these two words, I rather consider ἀκρίς a secondary variant resulting from an inner-Greek corruption from κρίσις. Again, this variant reading succeeded and consolidated in the text transmission because it was inserted in a sequence of disasters that made sense.

provenance<sup>30</sup>. Thanks to the discovery of the Qumran documents for Samuel this statement has been confirmed. There are a few Antiochene deviations from the MT that are supported by 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.

The relationship between the textual witnesses of the book of Samuel is very complex and, therefore, it is dangerous to make any kind of generalization. On the other hand, only with the full publication of the fragments and a thorough comparative study of all the witnesses can the net of relationship be ascertained. Provisionally, it can be stated that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> was not the Vorlage of the Antiochene text; the lack of secondary agreements or conjunctive errors between both texts do not allow such a close relationship to be established<sup>31</sup>. For our purpose it will suffice to point out some agreements of Antiochene with 4QSam<sup>a</sup> leaving a full comparison of both witnesses for a further study.

— 1 Sam 5:9: «And it occurred that after they had brought it [the ark of God]» (וַיְהִי אַחֲרַי הִסְבוּ אֹתוֹ), in the majority text of the Septuagint the translation is καὶ ἐγενήθη μετὰ τὸ μετελθεῖν αὐτήν. However, in Antiochene we come across the following interpretation: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ μετελθεῖν τὴν κιβωτὸν πρὸς τοὺς γεθθαίους. This version makes explicit the noun of the ark, translated literally by the pronoun in the Septuagint, but, what is more important, it mentions Gath (τοὺς γεθθαίους) as read in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (וַיְהִי אַחֲרַי סְבוּ גַתָּה), but absent in MT<sup>32</sup>.

— 2 Sam 12:16: When the Lord struck the child that Uriah's wife bore to David, the king fasted «and went in and lay all night on the ground» (וּבָא וּלָךְ וּשְׁכַב אַרְצָה). The *Vaticanus* and his group of

<sup>30</sup> S. BROCK, *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel* (Torino 1996) pp. 167-169.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. E. D. HERBERT, «4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Its Relationship to the LXX: An Exploration in Stemmatological Analysis», p. 46.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. E. ULRICH, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, HSM 19 (Missoula, MO 1978) p. 95 and A. FINCKE, *The Samuel Scroll From Qumran. 4QSam<sup>a</sup> restored and compared to the Septuagint and 4QSam<sup>c</sup>*, STDJ 43 (Leiden - Boston - Köln 2001) p. 12.

manuscripts translate καὶ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἠύλισθη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. However, Antiochene renders: καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἐκάθευδεν ἐν σάκκῳ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, a version that corresponds exactly to the reading of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> to this passage, ויבוא ושכב בשק ארצה<sup>33</sup>. The *Alexandrinus* and the group of MN plus some minuscules read ἠύλισθη καὶ ἐκοιμήθη according to the MT. Only Antiochene uses καθεύδειν the frequent equivalent for שכב in the Septuagint<sup>34</sup>.

— 2 Sam 22:43: «I beat them fine like the dust of the earth» (כעפר־וארץ גרקהם), has been translated in the current Septuagint: καὶ ἐλέανα αὐτοὺς ὡς χνοῦν γῆς. But Antiochene translates the sentence differently: διασκορπιῶ αὐτοὺς ὡς χνοῦν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἀνέμου. The Antiochene version is closer to the Qumran reading (ואשחקם כעפר על פני ארץ) than to the MT<sup>35</sup>. Interestingly, the Vorlage of Antiochene was not identical to that of the Qumran fragments; it probably read רוח 'wind' instead of אֲרֶחָ 'wanderer', the reading of the parallel passage in Psalm 18 (17):43.

— In 2 Sam 23:1, the majority text of the LXX is close to the MT, while the Antiochene version follows the reading of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>: Oracle of David, son of Jesse, «and oracle of the man who was exalted on the anointed of the God of Jacob» (וּנְאֻם הַגִּבֹּר הַקֵּם עַל מְשִׁיחַ אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב), is rendered in the current Septuagint as καὶ πιστὸς ἀνὴρ ὃν ἀνέστησεν Κύριος ἐπὶ χριστὸν θεοῦ Ἰακώβ. However, the Antiochene family of manuscripts translates πιστὸς ἀνὴρ ὃν ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεὸς χριστὸν, Θεὸς Ἰακώβ, a literal rendering of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>:

נאום הגבור הקים אל משיח ואלוהי יעקב<sup>36</sup>. It is clear that Antiochene read a Hebrew text similar to the fragment of Qumran, that is, לַא (θεός), instead of על (= ἐπί) of the rest of the Septuagint tradition.

<sup>33</sup> A. FINCKE, *The Samuel Scroll*, p. 202. The Antiochene reading is supported by the Old Latin: *dormivit in cilicio*.

<sup>34</sup> E. ULRICH, *The Qumran Text*, pp. 100-101.

<sup>35</sup> E. ULRICH, *The Qumran Text*, p. 104 and A. FINCKE, *The Samuel Scroll*, p. 261.

<sup>36</sup> E. ULRICH, *The Qumran Text*, p. 113 and A. FINCKE, *The Samuel Scroll*, p. 263.

In two other cases, the reading underlying the whole Greek tradition is witnessed in Qumran, not in the MT: 1 Sam 2:8-9 the use of εὐλογεῖν in the Septuagint is transparent of the Qumran reading ויברך<sup>37</sup>, not of a different or corrupted MT. And in 1 Sam 2:20 the current text of the Septuagint with ἀποτίνειν as well as the Antiochene variant with ἀνταποδιδόναι are supported by the Qumran reading ושלם<sup>38</sup> instead of the ושי of the MT. Ἀποτίνειν and ἀνταποδιδόναι are regular equivalents for the *piel* of ושלם in the Septuagint, while these two verbs are never used for ושי.

These agreements between the Greek text, especially the Antiochene, and an extant, non-Masoretic, Hebrew, lead us to the conclusion that, in all probability, several other deviations of Antiochene are also rooted in the Hebrew. In this context I would like to point out a series of doublets in the Antiochene text whose origin can only be explained at the level of the Hebrew, a Hebrew text different from the MT. Such cases also confirm, from another perspective, that the Antiochene text is rooted in the Hebrew. A typical example will serve as an illustration:

— In 2 Kings 2:23 while Elisha was going up on the way to Bethel, «some small boys came out of the city and jeered at him, saying (ויתקלסו בו ויאמרו לו), «Go away, bald-head! Go away, bald-head!». The current Septuagint renders literally: καὶ παιδάρια μικρὰ ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ κατέπαιζον αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ. Notwithstanding, Antiochene emphasizes that the boys not only mocked him but also threw stones at him: ἐξῆλθε παιδάρια μικρὰ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐλίθαζον αὐτὸν καὶ κατέπαιζον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ Ἀνάβαινε, φαλακρέ, ἀνάβαινε, φαλακρέ. The use of ἐμπαίζειν, καταπαίζειν for the *hihtpael* of וקלס is consolidated in the Septuagint. The use of λιθάζειν, λιθοβολεῖν for all the forms of לקס is also well attested among the Greek-Hebrew equivalences. Consequently, it can be deduced that

<sup>37</sup> E. ULRICH, *The Qumran Text*, p. 119 and A. FINCKE, *The Samuel Scroll*, p. 9.

<sup>38</sup> E. ULRICH, *The Qumran Text*, p. 72 and A. FINCKE, *The Samuel Scroll*, p. 10.

this curious doublet ultimately relies on a different Vorlage with the reading לקס, or on the extant MT read with metathesis of consonants by the translator. Interestingly, the Old Latin retains only this second interpretation of the Antiochene text: *pueri pusilli exierunt de civitate et lapidabant illum dicentes: Ascende calve, Ascende calve.*

#### E. CONCLUSIONS

Through the lens of translation, particularly of the Antiochene text in the historical books, I have tried to point out some of the pitfalls that may have occurred in the process of translation and transmission. An awareness of these mistranslations is the only way of correctly evaluating the Greek variants for the restoration of the genuine text. Some mistakes have been produced, such as inner-Greek corruptions, through the frequent copying of the manuscripts. Several mistranslations arose as a result of a different vocalization on the side of the translators. Other variant readings were produced by the confusion of similar consonants or groups of letters; these variants or alternative readings can be explained only at the level of the Hebrew. And finally, in a few cases, an extant, non-Masoretic, Vorlage has been detected in the Hebrew fragments of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. These agreements open a window toward a textual stage when different Hebrew texts were in circulation. The Vorlage of the Septuagint (Old Greek) was one of them. MT is the only complete Hebrew text available, but we must be aware that the Greek tradition, when it deviates from the MT, may conceal another text, with a striking resemblance, but not identical to the MT. Some scholars maintain that the Vorlage of the Septuagint in the books of Kings is older and probably more genuine than the MT.

There are numerous passages in the Index preceded by the mention of the mark *aliter*. These draw our attention to the specific texts which should allow a continuous exercise of textual criticism

with all the evidence at our disposal, and this, in the knowledge that not every scholar will come to the same conclusions in a great many of these text-critical problems.

#### RESUMEN

En crítica textual es muy importante descubrir la génesis de los errores; a veces la lectura verdadera sólo se descubre desenmascarando la falsa. De igual manera, para usar críticamente la Septuaginta es imprescindible descubrir primero las corrupciones y los errores de traducción. La confección de un índice griego-hebreo del texto antioqueno en los libros históricos es una ocasión excelente para analizar el proceso de traducción y detectar los errores más comunes cometidos por los traductores. En el artículo se estudian algunos ejemplos con relación a los siguientes fenómenos: corrupciones internas al griego y traducciones equivocadas motivadas por la confusión gráfica de letras (paleografía) o sonidos (fonética) semejantes y por una vocalización diferente del texto consonántico. En varios casos este análisis permite vislumbrar un texto base hebreo distinto del masorético.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Crítica textual, técnicas de traducción, hebreo y griego.

#### SUMMARY

In textual criticism it is important to detect the genesis of mistakes; sometimes the true reading is only reached through the unmasking of the wrong one. Likewise, in order to use critically the Septuagint it is indispensable to find out first its corruptions and mistranslations. The making of a Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene Text in the Historical Books is an excellent occasion to observe the translation process and find out the most common errors made by the translators. A few examples will be commented concerning the following issues: inner-Greek corruptions and misleading translations caused by the graphic confusion of similar letters (paleography) or sounds (phonetics), and by a different reading or vocalization of the consonantal text. In several cases this analysis may open a window towards a non-Masoretic Hebrew Vorlage.

KEYWORDS: Textual criticism, translation technique, Hebrew and Greek.