

Copyright © 2020 Jonathan Mark Whittle

All rights reserved. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary has permission to reproduce and disseminate this document in any form by any means for purposes chosen by the Seminary, including, without, limitation, preservation or instruction.

DOUBLE RENDERINGS IN THE SEPTUAGINT OF  
PROVERBS 1-9

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculty of  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Theology

---

by  
Jonathan Mark Whittle  
December 2020

**APPROVAL SHEET**

DOUBLE RENDERINGS IN THE SEPTUAGINT OF

PROVERBS 1-9

Jonathan Mark Whittle

Read and Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Peter J. Gentry

Date \_\_\_\_\_

This thesis is the product of late nights, early mornings, and little sleep between them. For all my efforts, the efforts of my wife, Emily, were far greater. This work is dedicated to her, for her relentlessness with our cantankerous son, Judson, and her patience with me when I needed to work.

אני לדודי ודודי לי

שיר השירים 6:3

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	v
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
Scope of Research.....	3
Double Renderings: A Definition.....	4
Outline and Argument.....	8
2. DOUBLE RENDERINGS IN GREEK PROVERBS 1–9 .....	10
Proverbs 1:7 .....	10
Proverbs 1:14 .....	15
Proverbs 1:21 .....	18
Proverbs 2:2 .....	24
Proverbs 2:3 .....	28
Proverbs 2:19 .....	30
Proverbs 2:21 .....	34
Proverbs 3:15 .....	38
Proverbs 4:10 .....	44
Proverbs 6:25 .....	46
Proverbs 8:10 .....	49
3. CONCLUSION .....	52
Double Renderings as Additions.....	52

Chapter	Page
Character of the Double Renderings .....	54
Summary .....	54

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
OG	Old Greek

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

In *Rewriting the Sacred Text*, Kristen de Troyer notes that “scholars use the term ‘Rewritten Scripture’ to indicate literature that is based on Scripture but not identical with it.”<sup>1</sup> She explains,

This means that the 'Sacred Text' – and more precisely, the canonical Biblical Text – lies at the base of the rewritten text...Calling a text rewritten sets up a dichotomy between biblical and non-biblical texts, between texts which are being rewritten – source texts – and the rewritten texts themselves – the (new) final product. This is, in my opinion, a false dichotomy, for the biblical text is often nothing other than a rewritten text itself.<sup>2</sup>

She goes on to explain her view that the source texts themselves were subject to rewriting – the product of “a continuous process of redactional activity”.<sup>3</sup> She attempts to defend her thesis with exemplary material from the Greek texts of Esther (two chapters), Joshua, and 1 Esdras. She concludes her first survey of Esther by saying that the “Greek translator of the Hebrew biblical book of Esther not only translated the book, but also interpreted the book” and thereby “has rewritten the biblical Hebrew book of Esther”, producing a “new reading.”<sup>4</sup>

The Old Greek text of Proverbs, too, could be classified, under the criteria of De Troyer, as a rewritten text. With no clear, predictable method the translator of Proverbs produced a text of remarkable literary innovation and creativity: adding where he felt the need, decorating and adorning the text with good Greek style or exegetical

---

<sup>1</sup> Kristen De Troyer, *Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us About the Literary Growth of the Bible*, Text-Critical Studies 4, Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 1.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, 27-28.

insight, and rendering various grammatical units from his Hebrew *Vorlage* more than once, sometimes reusing the same expression in multiple locations. He has many notable patterns, such as new forms of parallelism (often antithetical), the addition and abundance of Greek particles, and rendering Hebrew *parataxis* with Greek *hypotaxis*. He also adds a moral quality to the text in many places where the Hebrew only implies it. The double renderings in Greek Proverbs present numerous challenges, though historically they have been programmatically reduced to corruptions in the text, the more literal line usually being considered secondary. Inner-Greek textual criticism has yet to reveal anything novel about the translation, though nothing comprehensive has been completed. The daughter versions are often enlightening, but they, too, have a complicated history and are subject to a web of influences.

*In lieu* of a critical edition of Proverbs, Rahlfs' *Septuaginta* will be assumed to be the best text of OG Proverbs.<sup>5</sup> Peter Gentry has expressed to me and others<sup>6</sup> that the resulting critical text may not be remarkably different from that of Rahlfs. Though this paper is not principally text-critical in orientation, this discipline is incredibly valuable and will be handled on a case-by-case basis, where I find the data valuable. As I will show below, the conclusions drawn about double renderings in Greek Proverbs are rarely as easy and straightforward as the scholarly literature has presented it. The very free nature of the translation makes anything possible – *in theory*. What constitutes a secondary addition/corruption in one verse is thoroughly consistent with the translator's tendency in other places. In what follows I will let the overall technique of the translator frame the discussion for what is possible and what is not. The data below is presented in commentary fashion in order to deal with a single verse at a time, observing both its

---

<sup>5</sup>Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, editio altera, ed. Robert Hanhart, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

<sup>6</sup>Fox quotes personal communication between himself and Dr. Gentry in Michael V. Fox, *Proverbs: An Eclectic Edition with Introduction and Commentary*, The Hebrew Bible A Critical Edition vol. 1, Atlanta: SBL, 2015, 36.

relationship to the Hebrew *Vorlage* as well as its character in relation to the rest of the book. And though I have limited this study to double renderings in chapters 1–9, every part of the translation will be touched at one point or another. What I hope to demonstrate is that complexity is expected and that there are viable, alternative explanations to what has been previously proposed. In some cases, I will side with the majority but will do so on the basis of better considerations of internal evidence. In other cases, the internal evidence could point in either direction and conclusions will be drawn with caution.

### Scope of Research

The scope of research in this paper is limited to *apparent* double renderings of entire cola in chapters 1-9 of Greek Proverbs. Though the additions to the text are one of the most immediately noticeable features of the translation, the doubled lines stand out almost as quickly. Many translational features can be observed in Greek Proverbs in almost every syntactical combination imaginable. But the doubly rendered lines are unique in the septuagintal corpus, at least the sheer volume of them. I have labeled and identified as a double rendering any verse that a) has at least one additional line in Greek where at least two of the lines b) correspond syntactically or semantically to the a single line in Hebrew. In other words, if a Greek verse has multiple lines that can be reasonably traced back to a single line in Hebrew, I have included it for study here. They have been selected to be studied side-by-side with the others in order to isolate any potential characteristics that they may share between them.

The most thorough treatments will be interacted with for each verse. Cook's *The Septuagint of Proverbs* is one of the more lengthy and focused studies to date, so it will receive a fair amount of treatment.<sup>7</sup> Cook's work is admittedly exegetically oriented but unfortunately characterized by lack of definition and clarity in many places.<sup>8</sup> Even

---

<sup>7</sup>Johann Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. 69, Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1997, 31.

<sup>8</sup>See Claude Cox, review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, by Johann Cook, *TC: A Journal of*

still, the monograph is considered a staple in the study of Greek Proverbs. Tauberschmidt's *Secondary Parallelism* is another book-length treatment of Greek Proverbs, with the aim of identifying the ways the translator reimagined parallelism throughout.<sup>9</sup> This monograph also suffers from various shortcomings, but I find that much of his research holds true and provides insight in specific cases.<sup>10</sup> David Marc D'Hamonville's translation in *La Bible D'Alexandrie* is a valuable resource for the study of Greek Proverbs, and will be given a fair amount of attention as well.<sup>11</sup> Lastly is Paul De Lagarde's classic work *Anmerkungen zur Griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien*.<sup>12</sup> This brief collection of "remarks" on Greek Proverbs has been the foundation for most of the research of the twentieth century, and his principles are still perceivable in many contemporary writers.

### **Double Renderings: A Definition**

The material under study, double renderings, are verses where a Hebrew line is "doubly translated", or, a line from the Hebrew is represented in Greek more than once within the same verse and the result is two Greek lines for one Hebrew line. In three cases, the translation appears to have rendered the entire bicolon twice, though other complexities are involved. The bulk of these double renderings in Greek Proverbs occur in the first nine chapters, though there are several examples later in the book. The later examples typically demonstrate the translator's preference for antithetical parallelism and

---

*Biblical Textual Criticism*, vol. 3, 1998, who does not mince words concerning the deficiencies of this book.

<sup>9</sup>Gerhard Tauberschmidt, *Secondary Parallelism: A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs*, Academia Biblica 15, Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004.

<sup>10</sup>See Michael V. Fox, review of *Secondary Parallelism* by Gerhard Tauberschmidt, *Review of Biblical Literature* 11, 2004, for a very critical review, although he concedes in Fox, *Proverbs: An Eclectic Edition*, 52, that Tauberschmidt does identify a common feature of OG Proverbs.

<sup>11</sup>David-Marc D'Hammonville, *Les Proverbs*, Paris: Cerf, 2000.

<sup>12</sup>Paul De Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur Griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien*, Leipzig, Germany: Brockhaus, 1863.

it is unclear whether some of these should rather be understood as pure additions that are loosely based on the content of the Hebrew.<sup>13</sup>

The examples covered in this paper are 11 in number and have been grouped into four types, all indicated after the verse reference in chapter two (i.e., *II*). For type *I* double renderings, the second Hebrew line is rendered twice in Greek and the first rendering is more free than the second. Type *II* are those where the second Hebrew line is translated twice but the second line is more free than the first. This is the most prominent type. The next type, *III*, are tetracola where it appears that the Hebrew bicolon has been rendered twice and where the innermost lines (b, c) are more free than the outermost (a, d). Finally type *IV* classifies tetracola where both Hebrew lines are apparently rendered twice, but only the first line is freely rendered. Only one example fits this category (2:21). As well, I have also identified two subtypes (*i* and *ii*). Subtype *i* classifies verses where material from the Hebrew line is split across the two Greek lines. Subtype *ii* labels verses where there is extraneous material that cannot be legitimately traced to the *Vorlage*. Many more categories could be extracted, but these two deal abstractly enough with the examples to be meaningful without getting stuck in the quagmire of minutiae.

Academic literature to date has contributed little to the definition and classification of this phenomenon in Proverbs. Cook believes that “it is by no means clear whether a double translation comes from the translator or from a later hand.”<sup>14</sup> Because of this he distinguishes between “doublets” and “double translations”, the former being the product of the transmission history, the latter being genuinely from the translator as a means to elucidate a complicated Hebrew or Aramaic phrase. As he proceeds through commentary, he tends to classify every example as a doublet. De Waard, in his contribution to *Biblia Hebraica Quinta*, makes no distinction between doublet and double

---

<sup>13</sup>A legitimate case could be made that *all* the double renderings in Greek Proverbs are actually just additions, no matter how literal or free they are. This depends on establishing that they are not truly hexaplaric corruptions.

<sup>14</sup>Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 15.

translations.<sup>15</sup> Neither does Fox in his contribution to the Oxford Hebrew Bible.<sup>16</sup>

D'Hammonville defines a doublet as “la présence de deux stiques quasiment identiques en deux endroits du livre”.<sup>17</sup> He notes that “le « doublet » lui-même est un trait caractéristique du livre hébreu des *Proverbes*...le traducteur grec est donc fondé à user à son tour d'un procédé stylistique qui lui apparaît sans aucun doute typique du livre qu'il traduit.”<sup>18</sup> Though his definition of doublet is different from that expressed by Cook, he cautions against haphazardly attributing some of these doublets to a revisor, emphasizing “le nécessité d'étudier les *Proverbes* LXX comme un véritable texte et non comme la copie plus ou moins aberrante d'un modèle hébreu supposé intangible.”<sup>19</sup> For the examples under study here, D'Hammonville uses the term *traduction redoublée*, a description that he leaves poorly defined. For example, he describes Proverbs 1:7 as *redoublé*, which he no doubt concludes because both 7a and 7c reflect the surface structure and partially the semantics of Hebrew 1:7a. But 1:7ab shadows material from the Psalms.

Psalm 110 [111]:10ab	ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου σύνεσις ἀγαθῆ πᾶσι τοῖς ποιοῦσιν αὐτήν
Proverbs 1:7ab	ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος θεοῦ σύνεσις δὲ ἀγαθῆ πᾶσι τοῖς ποιοῦσιν αὐτήν

This example will be dealt with more comprehensively below. But for now it suffices to say that, assuming the lines are from the translator, classifying this verse as doubly rendered is not straightforward. Line 7a certainly fits the description, but 7b does not and

---

<sup>15</sup>Jan de Waard, *Proverbs*, Biblia Hebraica Quinta 17, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008, 6-7.

<sup>16</sup>Fox, *Proverbs: An Eclectic Edition*, 36.

<sup>17</sup>D'Hammonville, *Les Proverbs*, 59.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, 50.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, 52.

there exists no clear path back to the Hebrew. What we have in this verse is addition through assimilation that *results* in an apparent double rendering.

Fritsch combs through the Syro-Hexapla for double renderings.<sup>20</sup> He notes four different types of double translation: of verses, a single *stichos* of a verse, phrases, and of words. In the end he finds 76 total cases of what he calls “doublets” in the Greek text. He then draws conclusions from the Syro-Hexapla about the accuracy of the Origenic signs and the originality of the doubles. It should be amply evident by now that although the common scholarly vocabulary used to describe this phenomenon is fairly uniform, the exact definitions can vary widely. An obvious shortcoming of this study is that he acknowledges that some of the Origenic signs are incorrect or out of place, yet still leans on them in other places for deliberations about originality. The dividing line between accurate and inaccurate sign is left a bit obscured.

Talshir defines double translations quite clearly: “cases of one item in the Masoretic Text (MT) being matched with two items in the Septuagint (LXX).”<sup>21</sup> For the present introduction, a few things from Talshir are worthy of note. Firstly, Talshir makes no meaningful distinction between double translations and doublets. The terms are used interchangeably. Secondly, she explains that original double translations must be established on the basis of the translation technique as a whole, a point that I intend to emphasize in the present paper. If the translator is known to be fairly strict throughout, doubles in the text are more likely to be the result of transmission errors unless it can be convincingly demonstrated otherwise. Thirdly, similar to Fritsch, her analysis of double translations is much more microscopic, studying doubles of individual words. In contrast, the present study will only consider double translations of a colon. Finally, her study is

---

<sup>20</sup>Charles T. Fritsch, “The Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs in the Syro-Heaplar of Proverbs”, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72 (1953), 169-186.

<sup>21</sup>Zipora Talshir, “Double Translations in the Septuagint”, in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23, Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1986, 21-63.

limited to decidedly prose examples.

With respect to the present study, Talshir's work has been influential in a secondary way. Her scope and corpus is quite different than my own, but her examples and explanations are certainly relevant. Greek Proverbs has plenty of examples where the translator used two words for one in the Hebrew parent, a type of translational *hendiadys*. However, there are likely better ways to explain this phenomenon than double translation. For the present study, Talshir's paradigm, but not necessarily her conclusions, will be considered heavily for a way forward in analyzing Greek Proverbs 1-9. Because Greek Proverbs is remarkably free in approach, Talshir's premises allow for a high degree of probability that they are, in fact, original.

### **Outline and Argument**

The chapter that follows the present one will provide the verse reference, followed the type and subtype category (where applicable), and the Greek and Hebrew texts side-by-side without translation. Textual criticism will be given a prominent place where I believe it sheds light on the translation, or, alternatively, to demonstrate the actual complexity of the case. Conclusions drawn from comparative and inner-Greek textual criticism may shed light on the resulting translation, though in most cases it merely shows that Greek Proverbs has a very complicated history. In the main, I will proceed as though the Hebrew base text of OG Proverbs was remarkably close to what we have in *BHQ*, and that the text as found in Rhalfs *Septuaginta* is the best Greek text of Proverbs at our disposal.

Following chapter two of this study will be a conclusion that relates the studied features to the work of the translator as a whole. I will show that the lines traditionally viewed as secondary are in many ways consistent with the overall technique of the translator. This does not prove that they are OG. Rather, it demonstrates that internal considerations allow for this *possibility*. In my view, these consideration should be taken

more seriously. In antiquity, this feature of the translation would have been known and detected. Perhaps, in the course of time after revisions were underway, a scribe, being aware of the double renderings in Proverbs, mistakenly added lines from later revisors because he thought they belonged in the text and fit the general pattern of translation. This process does not have to be attributed to one scribe. Once double translations were introduced that were not original, the difficulty of determining which lines belong and which do not compounds upon itself. In other words, the corrupted text begets a more corrupted text.

I will also argue, in a related manner, that the double renderings fit within an overall of framework addition. This phenomenon is so prominent in Greek Proverbs that it is almost *the* macro-structural feature of the translation. Everything else falls under this broader category. This says nothing about the translator's theological or ideological motivations. Rather, the additions are a poetical and stylistic in nature and are the vehicle that the translator found appropriate to communicate his own unique take on Proverbs.

OG Proverbs has been comparatively neglected in Septuagint studies (likely because of its uniqueness and difficulty), and the aim of the present study is to contribute to our understanding of one particular feature. Done effectively, this will give a surer foundation upon which to do textual criticism, both within the Greek tradition and in comparison with the Hebrew text. My hope is that the work reflected here moves us one (small) step closer to a critical edition, a long-needed foundation for the next generation of students of the Septuagint.

## CHAPTER 2

### DOUBLE RENDERINGS IN GREEK PROVERBS 1-9

What follows is a running survey of the doubly rendered verses in Greek Proverbs 1–9. The criterion for choosing these verses have been outlined above. The commentary for each example below will deal with the translation technique for the verse, the options for understanding the double rendering, and scholarly conclusions, not necessarily in that order. In a few cases, where comparison with the daughter versions sheds additional light on the problem, text-critical considerations will be accounted for. In many cases the translator appears to be either directly influenced by or passively succumbing to other wisdom literature, whether canonical or deuterocanonical. In these places, the secondary context will receive a great deal of attention. *In lieu* of a critical edition, the perceivable technique of the translator must frame the initial discussion for what is and is not the Old Greek.

#### **Proverbs 1:7 – II, ii**

יראת יהוה ראשית דעת Ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος θεοῦ  
חכמה ומוסר אילים בזו σύνεσις δὲ ἀγαθὴ πᾶσι τοῖς ποιοῦσιν αὐτήν  
εὐσέβεια δὲ εἰς θεὸν ἀρχὴ αἰσθήσεως  
σοφίαν δὲ καὶ παιδείαν ἀσεβεῖς ἐξουθενήσουσιν

Greek Proverbs 1:7 is noticeably longer than the MT (4 *stichoi* versus 2). Line 7a corresponds closely to Hb and could be considered a fairly literal translation, with the subject and predicate reversed and the choice of σοφία for דעת. Hb 7b appears quite literally translated in line 7d, which leaves 7bc as apparently extraneous to the parent. Lines 7bc, then, could potentially be free translator additions sandwiched between the original two lines. A difficulty arises in 7c, however, as the line could reasonably be

considered a free translation of Hb 7a. In 7d, ἀσεβείζ for Hb אוילים would then exemplify the moralizing tendency of the translator throughout OG.<sup>1</sup> This is not to say that the author of Hebrew Proverbs considered foolishness a morally neutral category, but the translator typically strengthens and shifts the language to more explicitly moral terms.

Before more can be said about translation technique, the difficulty of the additional lines must be addressed. Two preliminary options are available: double rendering or assimilation. If taken to be a double rendering, this would mark the first of many in the translation as a whole. However, another difficulty arises, namely, that it breaks from the most common pattern for doubles in Greek Proverbs. Double renderings typically take the form of a *bistich* where the two lines lie adjacent in the text and where both clearly correspond to a single line in the parent. In the case of Greek 1:7, either the Hebrew in its entirety has been translated twice or Hebrew 7a alone has been translated twice (OG 7ac) and is separated by an additional *stich*. In either case, OG 7b stands out as either exegetical provision of context or the translator’s creativity with no clear semantic path from parent text to translation.

Alternatively, the translator assimilated the text of Psalm 110:10 [Hb 111:10] into his translation without a doubling of the usual pattern.<sup>2</sup> The texts of the Psalm in Greek and Hebrew are presented below:

ראשית חכמה יראת יהוה	ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου
שכל טוב לכל עשיהם	σύνεσις ἀγαθὴ πᾶσι τοῖς ποιοῦσιν αὐτήν
תהלתו עמדת לעד	ἡ αἴνεσις αὐτοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος

D’Hamonville remarks that there is both doubling (where 7cd correspond to Hb) and a “borrowing” from Psalm 110 (111) for 7ab, who also views 7a (and 5a) as forming an

---

<sup>1</sup>What Cook refers to as “religious motivations”. Johann Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, no. 69, Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1997 30.

<sup>2</sup>See the apparatus at 1:7 in Jan de Waard, *Proverbs*, Biblia Hebraica Quinta 17, Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008. No variant is given in BHS.

*inclusio* of sorts with 9:9a and 10a.<sup>3</sup> Doubling, for D’Hamonville, is essentially on the basis of two Hebrew lines reflected by 4 Greek lines. He rejects the idea that the additional material is Hexaplaric. Cook likewise rejects Hexaplaric origins and believes that the translator “deliberately quotes from the Psalm in order to make a clear statement as to where knowledge and wisdom originate”.<sup>4</sup> Joosten’s comment is the most thorough:

The additional lines undoubtedly have their origin in the Psalms. The problem is that it is hard to know at what stage the addition was made. It is possible that the translator was the one who borrowed the addition from the Greek version of Psalms. But other scenarios can be imagined as well. The additional lines may have been present already in the Hebrew source text of Prov. 1:7. If so, the Greek translation could be original in Proverbs and borrowed in Psalms. Another possibility is that the additional lines were added into the Greek text of Proverbs secondarily, in the course of scribal transmission.<sup>5</sup>

In other words, tracing the origin of the material is a tricky business indeed.

Regarding a variant Hebrew tradition, the external evidence does not provide enough to support it.<sup>6</sup> Two traditions which have an established dependence on the OG, Peshitta (in Proverbs) and *Vetus Latina* (all of OG), support the stichometric structure in MT:

<p>ܠܘܝܢܐ ܡܘܬܠܐ ܠܚܘܒܐ ܘܝܘܨܐ ܠܘܝܢܐ ܡܘܬܠܐ ܠܚܘܒܐ ܘܝܘܨܐ ܠܘܝܢܐ ܡܘܬܠܐ ܠܚܘܒܐ ܘܝܘܨܐ</p>	<p>The beginning of wisdom is fear of the Lord, knowledge and discipline the unjust despise Fear of the Lord is the beginning of understanding, but prudence and discipline the impious despise.</p>
<p>Timor Domini, initium sensus, sapientiam autem et disciplinam impii spernunt</p>	<p></p>

<sup>3</sup>“Dans la LXX, le v. 7 est redoublé...Ce sont les stiques cd qui correspondent au TM, le « addition » ab apparaissant comme un emprunt au Ps 110 (111), 10”. David-Marc D’Hammonville, *Les Proverbs*, Paris: Cerf, 2000, 160-161.

<sup>4</sup>Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 61.

<sup>5</sup>Jan Joosten, “The Relation of the Septuagint of Proverbs to Psalms”, *Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture: Studies in Honour of Johann Cook*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 172, eds. Randall X. Gauthier, Gideon R. Kotzé, and Gert J. Steyn (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016).

<sup>6</sup>This fact does not make it an impossible option, but rather a doubtful option.

<sup>7</sup>The Syriac particle ܘܝܘܨܐ is borrowed from Greek δέ and shows primarily the influence of the Greek language on Syriac, but also the influence of Septuagint in Peshitta. Similarly, ܠܘܝܢܐ (= νόμος) in v. 8. See J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus by R. Payne Smith* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1998), 90 for lexical entry. For a discussion of the relationship between LXX and Peshitta in Proverbs, see Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 59 as well as *idem*, “The Relationship Between the Peshitta and the Septuagint (Proverbs)”, *Textus* 14 (1994), 117-132.

The *Vetus Latina* is particularly noteworthy, as it is well known that the entire translation was produced from the OG and is lacking the additional lines seen in Greek Proverbs.<sup>8</sup> As well, this translation maintains the Hebrew word order for 7a, and even a better translation equivalent for דעת (*sensus*). The Peshitta translator in Proverbs does show a marked dependence on the Septuagint, but this is not an exclusive dependence. His base text was in fact a Hebrew text from which he routinely deviates. Syriac حة, “unjust, unrighteous, lawless”, is interesting in this respect, as it is semantically closer to ἀσεβῆς, “ungodly, unholy, profane”, than it is to אוילים, “foolish; fool, idiot”. On the one hand, this could indicate some influence of the Greek tradition in Peshitta at 1:7, which would be a strong suggestion that he was looking at a Greek text closer to MT than the present text in Rahlfs. On the other hand, of the 4 occurrences of אוילים (pl.) in Proverbs, the Peshitta translator used حة for three of them (1:7, 10:21, and 14:9; the other is 16:22), which makes this a fairly generic rendering for the translator.

Additionally, 7a in Peshitta reflects Greek 7a more closely than Hebrew, both in the word order and the choice of lexical equivalents (Syriac حة and Greek σοφίος). This could indicate that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX and Peshitta read closer to the text at Psalm 111:10a rather than what is present in MT. Equally as likely, however, is that the translator of LXX appropriated the translation of the passage in the Psalms which then influenced the word order in Peshitta. Line 7b in Peshitta also lines up closer to Greek 7d than Hebrew 7b. The presence of וּגַם in 7b matches Greek δὲ καὶ in 7d and allows for the possibility that he did have an eye on the LXX. This problem is complex and solving it requires much more than can be elaborated on in this paper. As such, what follows will assume that the lines from Psalm 110 were added on purpose by the translator for one main reason: the presence of δέ in 7bcd indicates the work of an composer, not a copyist. The translator loves Greek particles, especially δέ, and viewing

---

<sup>8</sup>Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 2nd Ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 91.

this as a mark of his work is an adequate way forward.

Greek 7a has σοφία for דעת, a near but not exact rendering. Greek αἴσθησις is almost always a translation of דעת in Proverbs, though the translator shows some variation in his lexical choices. Both 7a and 7c use θεός for יהוה instead of κύριος, which is not remarkable. The translator tends to alternate between these two words throughout the translation.<sup>9</sup> Line 7b is almost identical to Greek Psalm 110:10, the exception being δὲ. Though my assumption for the present is that it is from the translator, it is not impossible to see the hand of a later revisor who stitched the text together. The line is unbound to the base text, and as such it is not strictly a double rendering but an addition. Whether from the translator or a later hand, the line is present in the text of Proverbs because of its relationship to 7a.

Greek εὐσέβεια δὲ εἰς θεὸν in 7c represents a semi-free translation of Hb 7a, but sensible one nonetheless. Hebrew יראה when used with יהוה implies a type of fear much different than, for example, a fear of thorns (Isa. 7:25). By rendering with εὐσέβεια this line captures the contextual sense of יראה that our English glosses often fail to capture. In this way, εὐσέβεια is an entirely appropriate translation. Greek εἰς θεὸν is an exegetical rendering of יהוה necessitated by εὐσέβεια. Εὐσέβεια in Greek literature is often followed by a preposition of motion expressing the one for whom reverence is shown, though the only other example with εἰς in the Septuagint is 4 Maccabees 11:20.<sup>10</sup> If he had rendered the Hebrew construct chain with a noun + genitive construction typical of more literal translations, it would have altered the meaning of the Hebrew. The only other occurrence of εὐσέβεια in Proverbs is in 13:11b. The line is a free translator addition that is likewise unbound to the *Vorlage*. Αἴσθησις has already been discussed as a stereotypical rendering for דעת. The word occurs 20 times in Greek Proverbs, 19 of

---

<sup>9</sup>Rahlfs notes that A reads κυριου.

<sup>10</sup>See LSJ, s.v εὐσέβεια. 4 Maccabees 14:6 and Isaiah 33:6 both have εὐσέβεια πρὸς. For pre-biblical Greek, cf. Plato's Republic, 615ε, εἰς δὲ θεοῦς ἀσεβείας τε καὶ εὐσεβείας.



exactness. Cook states that 14c has “no equivalent in the MT,” but this is categorically misleading.<sup>13</sup> The extra line in Greek *does* have an underlying Hebrew text: 14b. He further concludes that 14c is hexaplaric, on the basis of the Syro-Hexapla, Vulgate and *Vetus Latina*. I must assume that what Cook is doing – because he does not state it exactly – is comparing the two Greek lines to the single line in the Latin sources and determining which is closest, because the Vulgate and *VL rarely* have the double lines of Greek Proverbs.<sup>14</sup> The lack of double lines in Vulgate is unremarkable because it was translated from Hebrew. *Vetus Latina* is not just missing the double lines, but *all* of verse 14 is lacuna.<sup>15</sup> Cook may well be correct, but the path he took to get there is entirely unconvincing.

Tauberschmidt’s treatment is admittedly an attempt at a *translational* explanation for the present text in Rahlfs. For him, the translator “added the second colon apparently to explicate further the figure ‘one purse’ by substituting ‘common’ for ‘one’ (τῆς)...and at the same time producing a line that is parallel to the more literally rendered colon that follows.”<sup>16</sup> It is not impossible to see that translator in the light that Tauberschmidt paints him, but his thoughts are little more than passing ruminations that do not bear any evidentiary weight. He may well be correct, but there is a legitimate possibility of a later addition that Tauberschmidt’s methodology cannot properly address.

D’Hamonville, like Cook, considers the possibility that 14c is the work of a revisor, stating that it is “*très littéral*.”<sup>17</sup> This line, though in some respects matching the Hebrew text more closely, is not free of its own liberties, namely the addition of καί and

---

<sup>13</sup>Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 74.

<sup>14</sup>See notes on 3:15 as an example as well as the challenges associated with that verse.

<sup>15</sup>See Pierre Sabatier, *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae, Seu Vetus Italica*, Turnhout, Belgium: Brepolis, 1987, 298.

<sup>16</sup>Gerhard Tauberschmidt, *Secondary Parallelism: A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs*, Academia Biblica 15, Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004, 102.

<sup>17</sup>D’Hamonville, *Proverbs*, 162.

the absence of a lexeme for כּ.<sup>18</sup> He also points out the resonance between βάλλε in 14a and βαλλάντιον in 14b, κοινόν in 14b and κοινώνησον in 11a, κτησώμεθα in 14b and κτήσιν in 13a, presumably as evidence that 14b is more likely original.

The rendering of verse 1 is basically literal and needs little comment. Out of eight occurrences of תּוֹב only two are rendered with the pentateuchal stereotype ἐν μέσῳ (5:14; 27:22), and once with ἀνά (8:20). Both occurrences of ἐν μέσῳ are used with religious assemblies (5:14, ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας καὶ συναγωγῆς; 27:22, ἐν μέσῳ συνεδρίου). The addition of δέ serves to carry the direct speech forward from the preceding verses and is in keeping with the translator's general favor for conjunctions.

Greek 1:14b exhibits much more dynamic equivalence than 1:14c.

D'Hamonville, as mentioned above, identifies the resonances that this verse shares with its surrounding context. Greek κοινόν for Hebrew תּוֹב is a dynamic translation that captures the intended meaning. The lexeme is almost exclusively attested to in the apocryphal books, with the two exceptions being Greek Proverbs and Esther. The choice of κοινόν (along with βαλλάντιον) was likely motivated by assonance with 14a (τὸν δὲ σὸν κλῆρον). The third line also shares this feature in μαρσίπτιον, but the effect is greatly diminished. Βαλλάντιον is rare in the LXX, occurring only here and in Job 14:17, and creates a further assonance with βάλλε. Hebrew כּ is likewise rare, occurring five times across the canon. In three cases (not including 1:14), כּ is translated by μάρσιππος/μαρσίπτιον. Interestingly, in Proverbs 16:11 כּל־אבני־כּיס is rendered simply by στάθμιον δίκαια, “righteous weights”, a dynamic but accurate translation. It appears to allude to Deuteronomy 25:13, Οὐκ ἔσται ἐν τῷ μαρσίππῳ σου στάθμιον καὶ στάθμιον, μέγα ἢ μικρόν, an allusion which is not present in Hebrew and is likely intentional on the part of the translator. In 16:11 he has כּיס in his *Vorlage* and still renders

---

<sup>18</sup>Taubersmidt points out that 14c does not represent כּ of the Hebrew because 14b already has it. Likewise, 14b does not translate the ל preposition because the translator intended to represent it in 14c. Taubersmidt, *Secondary Parallelism*, 102. This is a correct observation, which is why I labeled it SubType *i*.

the verse without an equivalent lexeme. One is left to wonder why the translator would have done that if כִּיס = μαρσίπιον appears in 1:14. He is known for variety, which may be a valid explanation. Hatch and Redpath note that Theodotion reads μάρσιππος in 16:11, and perhaps in 1:14 the same attribution should be applied.<sup>19</sup>

Hebrew יהיה לכלנו is rendered freely by κτησώμεθα πάντες. This is the only example of κτάομαι for ל היה in the LXX. The lexeme is used frequently by the translator, ten times in total, and in both Proverbs and the broader septuagintal corpus it is typically a translation of קנה. In 17:21, an example of an inverse double rendering,<sup>20</sup> κτάομαι seemingly reflects יָד in the *Vorlage*. In 31:29, the translator appears to have misunderstood the Hebrew idiom, taking עָשָׂה חֵיל to mean “make wealth” rather than “act bravely,” and translated it with ἐκτήσαντο πλοῦτον. In 16:22, however, he translates בעליו, “the one who owns it/has it,” with τοῖς κεκτημένοις, which is more contextually appropriate for this readers than κύριος and much more savvy than ἔχω. These examples show both the translator’s preference for this lexeme and his willingness to use it where he felt necessary.

Returning to 1:14, κτησώμεθα serves as a rendering for יהיה as well as the personal suffix on לכלנו. The new semantic import of the Greek line makes rendering the ל preposition unnecessary. Greek πάντες is in apposition to the implied subject of κτησώμεθα, and is an example of the translator’s attention to the demands of the target language. The addition of δὲ can be attributed either to the translator’s freedom and attention to the target language, or the Hebrew lost a ו at the beginning of 14b due to the preceding ו in לכלנו.

---

<sup>19</sup>See s.v. μάρσιππος in Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, Graz: Akademische Druck-Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

<sup>20</sup>An inverse double rendering has two lines for 1 Hebrew line, as expected, but the second line is the inverse of the first. In Proverbs 17:21, for example, lines b and c read: (b) οὐκ εὐφραίνεται πατήρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ ἀπαιδεύτῳ, (c) υἱὸς δὲ φρόνιμος εὐφραίνει μητέρα αὐτοῦ. Line c has impetus from the base text, but is the inverse, an addendum, to line b.

**Proverbs 1:21 – I, ii**

בראש המיות תקרא ἐπὶ ἄκρων δὲ τειχέων κηρύσσεται,  
בפתחי שערים בעיר אמריה תאמר ἐπὶ δὲ πύλαις δυναστῶν παρεδρεύει,  
ἐπὶ δὲ πύλαις πόλεως θαρροῦσα λέγει

If the final line in 1:14 is determined to be a later addition, partly due to its literalism and partly to its characteristics that do not match the observed patterns of the translator elsewhere, 1:21c may also fit this description. Greek τειχέων appears to reflect חמות rather than המיות. This perhaps indicates a different *Vorlage*, but could just as plausibly be a careless error or the translator's own adaptation to create what he considered a better parallel with פתח and שער in the next line. I consider the latter much more likely because the translator rendered the three other occurrences of חמה in Proverbs reasonably well (7:11, 9:13, and 20:1), at least enough to indicate that he could identify the word and understood what it meant. Additionally in 21a, a superficial analysis of κηρύσσεται would indicate that תקרא was read as a *Nifal*, תִּקְרָא, but active/passive transformations are commonplace in Greek Proverbs 1-9.<sup>21</sup> In both 1:20 and 8:1, תרנה is rendered with passive ὑμνῆται (see more below). The translator does not normally appear to be timid of anthropomorphisms concerning wisdom (see the verses that follow 1:20 and 8:1), but in these introductory statements he appears to intentionally avoid them. Lastly, for 1:21a, חכמות is rendered in Greek with the singular σοφία. Both Loader and Fox give attention to חכמות, but neither achieve a convincing resolution.<sup>22</sup> In all likelihood, the translator understood the singular context (תרנה) and rendered appropriately.

Like 1:14bc, Greek 1:21b is very free and 1:21c much closer to literal. Jan de

---

<sup>21</sup>1:20 (ὑμνῆται / תרנה), 3:33 (εὐλογοῦνται / יברך), 4:17 (μεθύσκονται / ישתו), 5:20 (συνέχου / תחבק), 6:28 (κατακαύσει / תכוניה), 8:3 (ὑμνῆται / תרנה), 8:25 (γεννᾷ / חוללתי), 8:35 (ἐτοιμάζεται / ויפק), to list a few.

<sup>22</sup>Fox, *Proverbs*, 97–97. James Alfred Loader, *Proverbs 1-9*, Historical Commentary on the Old Testament (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2014), 92.

Waard explains both of them as the product of an alternative Hebrew text, but his explanation is not entirely convincing.<sup>23</sup> There is a strong connection between Proverbs 1:20ff and 8:1ff in Hebrew, a connection that is still quite present in Greek. Both begin an interlude in which Lady Wisdom is introduced, speaks, and addresses the “simple.” The texts in Hebrew and Greek are presented below for comparison.

<p>חכמות בחוץ תרנה <sup>1:20</sup>  ברחבות תתן קולה  בראש חמיות תקרא <sup>1:21</sup>  בפתחי שערים בעיר אמריה תאמר</p>	<p>הלא חכמה תקרא <sup>8:1</sup>  ותבונה תתן קולה  בראש מרומים עלי דרך <sup>8:2</sup>  בית נתיבות נצבה  ליד שערים לפי קרת <sup>8:3</sup>  מבוא פתחים תרנה</p>
<p><sup>1:20</sup> σοφία ἐν ἐξόδοις ὑμνεῖται  ἐν δὲ πλατείαις παρρησίαν ἄγει</p> <p><sup>1:21</sup> ἐπ’ ἄκρων δὲ τειχεῶν κηρύσσεται  ἐπὶ δὲ πύλαις δυναστῶν παρεδρεύει  ἐπὶ δὲ πύλαις πόλεως θαρροῦσα λέγει</p>	<p><sup>8:1</sup> σὺ τὴν σοφίαν κηρύξεις,  ἵνα φρόνησίς σοι ὑπακούσῃ</p> <p><sup>8:2</sup> ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν ὑψηλῶν ἄκρων ἐστίν,  ἀνὰ μέσον δὲ τῶν τρίβων ἕστηκεν</p> <p><sup>8:3</sup> παρὰ γὰρ πύλαις δυναστῶν παρεδρεύει,  ἐν δὲ εἰσόδοις ὑμνεῖται</p>

In both Hebrew and Greek the verbal overlap is immediately obvious. These two sections are setting up and describing the same basic scene: the presence and approach of Lady Wisdom prior to her address. In light of the strong relationship between these two contexts, determining with certainty the originality or lack thereof for 1:21bc is difficult. There are places in Greek Proverbs where a line has been repeated more than once, even where the line is discordant with the Hebrew. Two of these occur in the third chapter, 3:2/3:16<sup>24</sup> and 3:8/3:22A,<sup>25</sup> and a doubly rendered line occurs in 4:10 that appears to

<sup>23</sup> de Waard, *Proverbs*, 31\*.

<sup>24</sup> μήκος γὰρ βίου καὶ ἔτη ζωῆς.

<sup>25</sup> 3:8 – τότε ἴασις ἔσται τῷ σώματί σου, καὶ ἐπιμέλεια τοῖς ὀστέοις σου. 3:22A - ἔσται δὲ ἴασις ταῖς σαρκί σου, καὶ ἐπιμέλεια τοῖς σοῖς ὀστέοις. 3:22A is an addition that Rhahls marks with a capital letter to distinguish it as a raw addition, presumably because it stands alone as a unit and has no contextual binding to the Hebrew. There are many of these in Greek Proverbs and their exact nature has not been convincingly explained. Moreover there are many bicola that should probably be marked similarly, but are not.

shadow the same expression (see my discussion at 4:10).<sup>26</sup> More comparable examples can be found in 3:28c/27:1b and 1:25a/5:7b.<sup>27</sup> Though the pattern is not dominant throughout Greek Proverbs, it is well established. This fact complicates this issue in 1:21b, because the originality here is in some ways dependent on establishing the originality of the others. If the others are corruptions in the text, then the pattern is not so well established.

The exact expression בפתחי שערים בעיר does not occur elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, but a similar expression can be found in Joshua 8:29, 20:4, Judges 9:35, and 9:44, פתח שער העיר, and in two of the four it is translated πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ τῆς πύλης τῆς πόλεως. In Joshua 8:29, the expression is glossed, εἰς τὸν βόθρον, and in Judges 9:44 it is shortened to παρὰ τὴν πύλην τῆς πόλεως. There are dozens of other examples of פתח and שער occurring in combination (both פתח שער and פתח השער) and these are normally translated with θύρα + πύλη. In 1 Kings 22:10, like Judges 9:44, the expression is shortened to ἐν ταῖς πύλαις. Similarly, in 2 Kings 7:3 the expression is translated παρὰ τὴν θύραν τῆς πόλεως. In Jeremiah the preferred expression is πρόθυρον πύλης. Ezekiel, too, use this expression, albeit inconsistently. In Psalm 24:7 and 9, פתח and שער are used in parallel lines but both translated with πύλη.

The foregoing data has an important bearing on whether the translator had שרים in his text or whether he glossed בפתחי שערים with ἐπὶ δὲ πύλαις. Moreover, because 1:21b and 8:3a are likely intentionally connected in some way, they must be analyzed together. Regarding שרים for שערים in 8:3, it is plausible that the Hebrew text was different, that the translator misread his text, or that he was influenced by a later section. Verses 15 and 16 describe royal figures, all of whom execute their duties by way

---

<sup>26</sup>καὶ πληθυνθήσεται ἔτη ζωῆς σου, ἵνα σοι γένωνται πολλὰ ὁδοὶ βίου.

<sup>27</sup>A full list of this phenomenon in the Hebrew text can be found in D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 60. This is what he refers to as a *doublet*, “la présence de deux stiques quasiment identiques en deux endroits du livre.”

of Lady Wisdom.<sup>28</sup> This royal language, though playing a very small role in chapter 8, is entirely absent from chapter 1. Assuming the royal language was a contributing factor in chapter 8, one must assume that chapter 8 was read backwards into chapter 1.

Cook believes that it was possible the translator returned to previously translated chapters and adapted them, and his evidence for this is the work of modern translators.<sup>29</sup> The theory could perhaps explain the origin of some double renderings, where the translator altered or added as he reviewed his work in light of the whole. Even in this explanation, though, the line in 8:3 is still somewhat enigmatic. If the translator's text did read שרים, this still does not explain παρεδρεύει (either here or in 1:21b). As well, πύλας is out of place in 8:3b, but perhaps can be attributed to מבוא פתחים in the second half of the line. Superficially it would appear that the translator rendered at least מבוא with ἐν εἰσόδοις (cf. ἐν ἐξόδοις in 1:20a), which would leave only פתחים to account for πύλας. But later, in 8:34, the translator renders פתחי with εἰσόδων which makes it entirely likely that פתחים accounts for ἐν εἰσόδοις, and מבוא for πύλας. This is how Hatch and Redpath account for the lexeme, which is an unattested pairing anywhere else in the LXX.<sup>30</sup> It would appear, then, that the translator jumped through several hoops to arrive at the rendering of his line, which suggests to me that that best understanding is that he adapted 8:3b to 1:21b. Of course, this conclusion is predicated on 1:21b being original to the translator.

Now, how does one account for the translation in 1:21b if 8:3b did not exert any influence over it? Wolters identifies the similarity between 1:21b and Wisdom of Solomon 6:14.<sup>31</sup> There Wisdom is described as πάρεδρον...τῶν πυλῶν, “sitting by the

---

<sup>28</sup> מלכים / βασιλεῖς (15a), רוזנים / δυνάσται (15b), שרים / μεγιστᾶνες (16a), נדיבים כל שפטי / ארץ / τύραννοι ... κρατούσι γῆς (16b).

<sup>29</sup> Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 84.

<sup>30</sup> Hatch and Redpath, *s.v.*, εἴσοδος.

<sup>31</sup> Al Wolters, *Proverbs: A Commentary based on Paroimiai in Codex Vaticanus*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Leiden, Brill: 2020), 130.

gates.” What should be added to Wolter’s helpful identification is that the entirety of Wisdom chapter 6 addresses the failure of royalty and rulers, and the presence of Wisdom before them. The most relevant section, vv. 12–14, are presented below for comparison.

<sup>6:12</sup> λαμπρὰ καὶ ἀμάραντός ἐστιν ἡ σοφία  
καὶ εὐχερῶς θεωρεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγαπώντων αὐτήν  
καὶ εὐρίσκεται ὑπὸ τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν,  
<sup>6:13</sup> φθάνει τοὺς ἐπιθημοῦντας προγνωσθῆναι  
<sup>6:14</sup> ὁ ὀρθρῖσας ἐπ’ αὐτήν οὐ κοπιᾶσει  
πάρεδρον γὰρ εὐρήσει τῶν πολλῶν αὐτοῦ

The entirety of the chapter is an instruction to rulers, so that they rule in wisdom. Wisdom never speaks, but is described in a similar fashion to the interludes in Proverbs 1:20ff and 8:1ff. Importantly, after the speaker addresses wicked rulers and powers, he presents Wisdom as near to those who seek her diligently, culminating in the phrase identified by Wolters, “for she is found beside his [the one who rises early for her] gates.” Wisdom of Solomon 9:4 as well, identified by D’Hamonville, depicts Wisdom sitting beside the throne of God (τὴν τῶν σῶν θρόνων παρέδρον σοφίαν).<sup>32</sup> Because Wisdom sits beside the throne of God and presumably is his companion (cf. Proverbs 8:22ff), so too should Wisdom be near to earthly rulers so that they would rule justly. Though the lexical stock in Wisdom of Solomon differs in many ways when compared to Proverbs, the thematic continuity between the two texts is consistent enough to posit either dependence or influence. Moreover, the two texts differ sufficiently enough to suppose that Proverbs 1:21b did not make its way into the text through inner-Greek corruption. I would content that the translator was aware of the deep connection between Proverbs 1 and 8, and leaned on Wisdom when translating both chapters, more so in chapter 8.

If this theory is correct, *pace* de Waard, *et al.*, the translator’s *Vorlage* did not read שׂרִים. He adapted his text to connect other contemporary conceptions of Wisdom to

---

<sup>32</sup>D’Hamonville, *Proverbs*, 165.

his own.<sup>33</sup> The remainder of line 21b, ἐπὶ δὲ πύλαις, need not necessarily be a rendering of either פתח or שערים. Because the translator has incorporated foreign material into his text that uses πύλη, it makes more sense to view the *Vorlage* as the inspiration for the line, but not the source. In 1:21c, the translator does render בפתחי שערים but condenses it into a single word, πύλαις. As was shown above (i.e., 1 Kings 22:10 and Judges 9:44), this is uncommon but does happen. Hebrew בעיר was rendered more idiomatically by the genitive πόλεως. Four examples were given above of a comparable expression and rendering, so this should be considered stereotypical within the septuagintal canon.

Greek θαρροῦσα, according to Cook, was the result of אמרייה, which he explains as emphatic, similar to an infinitive absolute.<sup>34</sup> Loader, similarly, identifies this as *figura etymologica*, and explains that it identifies the special nature of Wisdom's words.<sup>35</sup> So, perhaps Cook is correct to see θαρροῦσα as a freer translation of the Hebrew phrase. In Proverbs 9:13 Lady Folly is described as boisterous (המיה, cf 1:21a), which the translator renders with θρασεῖα, from the same root as θαρροῦσα. The root המה is rendered differently in each of its occurrences, so I doubt that המיות had any bearing on the presence of θαρροῦσα in 21c. Lady Wisdom and Lady folly often preach their messages in the same spaces in Proverbs, so it makes sense that the translator would, intentionally or unintentionally, use common vocabulary for their appearances.

### Proverbs 2:2 – II, ii

להקשיב לחכמה אנך	ὕπακούσεται σοφίας τὸ οὖς σου,
תטה לבך לתבונה	καὶ παραβαλεῖς καρδίαν σου εἰς σύνεσιν,
	παραβαλεῖς δὲ αὐτήν ἐπὶ νοθέτησιν τῷ υἱῷ σου.

There are hints of double rendering in 2:2. Initially it appears that line 2c

---

<sup>33</sup>Consider also the addition of the bee in 6:8.

<sup>34</sup>Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 85.

<sup>35</sup>Loader, *Proverbs*, 91.

introduces a new idea that is foreign to the Hebrew text, namely, passing wisdom on to the next generation. In this regard, the line also bears the marks of a translator addition. Difficulty with labeling this an addition is first encountered in παραβαλεῖς repeated in lines b and c. Greek παραβάλλω is infrequent in the Old Greek/Septuagint, attested only 10x (6x in Gk. Proverbs, all translating the *Hiphil* of פָּשַׁן). Two of the six occurrences in Proverbs are here in 2:2. This line is also unique, in that every other occurrence of παραβάλλω in Greek Proverbs takes οὖς as the direct object, “incline the ear/give heed.” The expressions are not pragmatically different in any substantial way from the example in 2:2b: to extend the ear or extend the heart is to offer up one's faculties for understanding. As well, these examples all match their corresponding Hebrew base text. The use of παραβάλλω in 2c is more consistent with Classical usage, “throw beside or by, throw to one, as fodder for horses”.<sup>36</sup> Examples can also be found in Judges 19:21 and Ruth 2:16.<sup>37</sup> There are many examples of the Classical lexicon or grammar in the first 9 chapters of Greek Proverbs. Whether these are authentic or later additions (i.e., from the Classical Renaissance) must be determined in each instance. My understanding for line 2c is that it is a double rendering of Hebrew 2:2b, which will be explained below.

D'Hamonville entertains the idea that the third stich (for both verses 2 and 3; see below) is doubly rendered, while still accounting for its potential originality: “il est tentant d'y voir la leçon d'un réviseur, plus littéraliste, mais on ne peut tout à fait exclure un dédoublement originel, emphatique.”<sup>38</sup> He adds that feminine αὐτήν refers to σοφία or σύνεσις, and as such it is much more likely that this verse is original to the translator,

---

<sup>36</sup>See entry in LSJ, s.v παραβάλλω. Cook missed this in his contribution to the NETS translation.

<sup>37</sup>Judges 19:21 – καὶ εἰσήγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ παρέβαλεν τοῖς ὑποζυγίοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνίψαντο τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον. Ruth 2:16 – καὶ βαστάζοντες βαστάξατε αὐτῇ καὶ γε παραβάλλοντες παραβαλεῖτε αὐτῇ ἐκ τῶν βεβουνησμένων, καὶ ἄφετε καὶ συλλέξει, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιτιμήσετε αὐτῇ.

<sup>38</sup>D'Hamonville, *Proverbs*, 168.

not a later addition. The pronoun could possibly refer to καρδίαν in 2b. If we suppose this is true, the line could perhaps be translated “you will set your heart on instruction for [the benefit of] your son.”

Cook reads the third line as original, but the second he considers hexaplaric. He, like D’Hamonville, is working from the understanding that this is an example of double rendering. His line of reasoning is that the third line “is less literal and is therefore most probably the Old Greek, whilst the second stich is the ‘hexaplaric text’”.<sup>39</sup> He continues:

There is one reading in the last stich that could be the result of a deviant Hebrew text, or the translator could have read it differently. τῷ υἱῷ σου for אֲבִיבִי could have been based on the Hebrew אֲבִיבִי. υἱός is used abundantly in the LXX and in Proverbs too. It is also in practically all instances a translation for אָבִי. However, according to HR [Hatch & Redpath] it has no underlying Hebrew verse. If the translator did not actually have אֲבִיבִי in his *Vorlage*, then the OG represents an interpretation by the translator. Once he had opted for making wisdom (αὐτήν) and not “your heart” the object of the stich, he was probably forced to interpret the Hebrew as referring to your son (אֲבִיבִי).<sup>40</sup>

Cook’s argument that υἱός is abundantly used in the OG is a moot point, as is the fact that it normally represents אָבִי. The close orthographic similarity between אֲבִיבִי and אֲבִיבִי is much more compelling. Jan de Waard, citing Jäger,<sup>41</sup> likewise mentions the possibility of a variant Hebrew text containing אֲבִיבִי as the origin of the doublet.<sup>42</sup> However, positing an alternative base text for τῷ υἱῷ σου is not necessarily required to account for the changes. The translator had enough contextual reasons to intentionally alter the text, or was unduly influenced by the context that he misread אֲבִיבִי.

In chapter 2, the translator exhibits a tremendous amount of freedom, perhaps

---

<sup>39</sup>Cook, 113.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., 114.

<sup>41</sup>Johann Gottlob Jäger, *Observationes in Proverbiorum Salomonis versionem alexandrinum*, Leipzig, Germany: Reinhold Jacob Boie, 1788, 20–21.

<sup>42</sup>de Waard, *Proverbs*, 32\*. Legarde, *Anmerkungen*, 10, also mentions this alternative from Jäger, which is probably where Cook got it.

more so than others. This is already seen in 2:1, where a stereotypical address to the son in Hebrew has been refactored and collapsed into a single line with a subordinate clause. In verse 13, he adds ὦ, “Oh!,” creating a disjunction between what precedes and what follows. The Hebrew contains a grammatical problem, namely that the plural participles in verses 13ff appear to modify singular אישׁ. The translator likely did not detect that אישׁ was used in the abstract for “men” and read the next section as an exclamatory address to new subjects. Similarly, in verse 17, the translator added a new address to the son by inserting υἱέ. Hebrew 2:16, like 2:12, further amplifies the protection of Wisdom, this time to protect the hearer from אשה זרה. This figure will play a prominent role in the coming chapters, but the translator has entirely removed her. The new reference is not אשה זרה, but ὁδὸς εὐθεία, and it forms an envelope with ὁδοὺς εὐθείας in 2:13. In verse 17, the translator began a new discourse where the operative enemy is κακὴ βουλή.

Many more examples could be adduced, but the general pattern has been established. The translator provided his own layer of interpretation to the entirety of chapter 2 and the changes leave only echoes of the Hebrew. Verse 2:2c, if it can be supposed that it does reflect an alternative Hebrew text, is a re-interpreted, alternative (double) rendering of 2:2b. The direct object of the Hebrew line, לבך, became an indirect object because the direct object of תטה was inferred from 2:2b through virtual elision. The new reading also required a new interpretation of לתבונה, now as a prepositional complement in ἐπὶ νοουθέντων. This is not an expected or literal translation of תבונה, and exemplifies the translator’s creativity. In Proverbs 1–9, תבונה occurs 8 times and the translator shows a high degree of flexibility in his renderings. In Greek Proverbs as a whole, there is a marked preference for φρόνησις/φρονημός.

Verse 2:2b, then, could still be considered a later revision. Fritsch notes that 2c is under the obelus in the Syro-Hexapla, which is perhaps a strong indication that 2b is a

later addition.<sup>43</sup> However, he later identifies numerous examples in the Syro-Hexapla where the signs are incorrectly used, but he offers little by way of adjudicating between correctly marked and incorrectly marked verses. The line is very freely rendered, the only exception being καί at the head. In both 2:2b and 2:3b, תבונה is rendered by σύνησις, but 2:3b is also uncertain (see *infra*). In the rest of the book, the translator shows a marked preference for φρόνησις/φρόνιμος, with φρήν occurring once in 18:2. In fact, in Proverbs 10–31, the translator almost exclusively uses this word group. Of the four occurrences in chapter 2, however, none are rendered this way. Out of eight total occurrences in chapters 1–9, only three are rendered with φρόνησις. The internal evidence allows for the possibility that 2:2b is original, and in my view excluding it would go beyond the data. Chapter 2 has been largely rewritten through the translator’s own commanding dispositions, but most of the heavy interpretation starts in verse 13. Only minor, though noticeable, changes occur up to that point. Without more granular data, including the external evidence and transmission history, any firm judgement here is a shot in the dark.

**Proverbs 2:3 – II, ii**

<p>כי אם לבינה תקרא לתבונה תתן קולך</p>	<p>ἐὰν γὰρ τὴν σοφίαν ἐπικαλέσῃ καὶ τῇ συνέσει δῶς φωνήν σου, τὴν δὲ αἴσθησιν ζητήσῃς μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ</p>
---	--

Greek 2:3, like 2:2, contains a double rendering and is conjoined like 2:2 with καί...δέ. Cook opts initially to take 3c as a secondary insertion, but adds a strong reservation that it is possible that the translator added the phrase based on contextual factors.<sup>44</sup> The data at this point is admittedly complex, as 3c is missing from B\* and S,

---

<sup>43</sup>Fritsch, “The Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs”, 172.

<sup>44</sup>Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 116.

and is under the ✱ in Origenic manuscripts.<sup>45</sup> Cook normally follows Lagarde, but at this point Lagarde takes 3c as secondary and 3b as original.<sup>46</sup> D’Hamonville’s reasons similarly to Lagarde: “l’hébraïme rendu dans la LXX par *phōnēn dídonai*, que le traducteur a très librement glosé in 1, 20, désigne le stique b comme le produit possible d’une révision littéraliste.”<sup>47</sup> Frisch likewise labels 3b hexaplaric based on the Syro-Hexapla.<sup>48</sup>

Line 3a has been rendered fairly literally, unlike 2:2a, where the translator used a future for the Hebrew infinitive construct לִהְקַשִּׁיב, and transformed the object of that infinitive into the subject. In 2:3a, apart from the לְ preposition, the line is rendered essentially one-to-one. Verse 2b is almost exactly one-to-one, which does not necessarily make it secondary; verses 4–6 also exhibit the same level of literalistic fidelity to the *Vorlage*. D’Hamonville points out that that the expression נָתַן קוֹל was translated freely in 1:20 and De Lagarde, citing Jäger, notes the same expression in 8:1 and a similar expression in 26:25, both rendered freely.<sup>49</sup> These examples do cast doubt on the line’s originality, but as a general rule the translator does not apply his technique evenly throughout the book.

Greek σύνεσις is far less frequent in Proverbs than αἴσθησις, and in every example except two it occurs where the text is in question.<sup>50</sup> Αἴσθησις, on the other hand, is never used for תְּבוּנָה or בִּינָה in all of the LXX.<sup>51</sup> If it can be established that 3c is original, this

<sup>45</sup>See apparatus in Rahlfs. Also Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, 10.

<sup>46</sup>Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, 11.

<sup>47</sup>D’Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 169.

<sup>48</sup>Frisch, “The Hexaplaric Signs”, 178.

<sup>49</sup>D’Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 169. Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, 10-11.

<sup>50</sup>1:7; 2:2, 3; 9:6, 10; 13:15. In 1:7, the text was assimilated from the Psalm 110. 9:6 is an unusual translation, perhaps a double rendering. In Rahlfs, 9:10 is followed by 9:10A, which is identical to 13:15b and even there the line has no obvious corresponding Hebrew base. Only in 2:6 and 24:3 does σύνεσις with little difficulty.

<sup>51</sup>Hatch and Redpath offer no translational equivalent for this verse. Hatch and Redpath, *s.v.*, αἴσθησις.

may indeed be the only example.

Greek ζητήσης has no corresponding Hebrew lexeme and appears to be a free translation. The following line, 2:4a, begins similarly: καὶ ἐὰν ζητήσης. For this reason Cook believes that it is possible that the two lines (2:3c and 2:4a) were translated together.<sup>52</sup> This suggestion raises a new question: Is it possible that the translator rendered 2:3 literally and the additional line actually belongs at the head of 2:4? We know that the translator adds lines where he sees fit. A relevant example, already mentioned, is 2:17a. Though most line-level additions in the book are contextual and do not easily map onto the Hebrew text, I believe it is entirely possible that this line was intended by the translator to lead into verse 4. This proposal, if true, would lend validity the originality of Greek 2:2b. In other words, if Greek 2:3c is an addition and not a double rendering, the likelihood is that 2:3b is from the translator and not a later revisor.

The end of line 3c, μεγάλη τῆ φωνῆ, appears to correspond to קול in the *Vorlage*, but given the previous proposal it may have been the translator's intention simply to use this as a bridge from the previous material to what follows. A similar expression occurs in Proverbs 26:25, mentioned above, where the translator rendered קול with μεγάλη τῆ φωνῆ. In the three occurrences of this expression in Greek Proverbs, only one represents the Hebrew text.<sup>53</sup>

### **Proverbs 2:19 – II, i/ii**

כל באיה לא ישובון πάντες οἱ πορευόμενοι ἐν αὐτῇ οὐκ ἀναστρέψουσιν  
ולא ישיגו ארחות חיים οὐδὲ μὴ καταλάβωσιν τρίβους εὐθείας·  
οὐ γὰρ καταλαμβάνονται ὑπὸ ἐνιαυτῶν ζωῆς.

Proverbs 2:19a has a couple noteworthy translational features. In the first

---

<sup>52</sup>Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 115.

<sup>53</sup>The Hebrew text at 27:14 actually contains this expression: בקול גדול.

place, this is the only occurrence of πορεύομαι for בוא in Proverbs and this pairing exceptionally rare in the broader LXX.<sup>54</sup> In verse 16, the אשה זרה of the Hebrew text has been conceptualized as ὁδός εὐθείας, and a new concept, κακή βουλή, is introduced in verse 17 and stands in contrast to the βουλή καλή in verse 11. Greek βουλή is typically a translation for the אע"פ word group, usually אע"פ, though still the translator shows variety. So, rather than the young פתי being ensnared by entering a strange woman, here he is warned be on the lookout for bad counsel because it will set him on a poor path.<sup>55</sup> Translating בוא with πορεύομαι makes sense now that the translator has recast the strange woman as an undesirable path. This also explains ἐν αὐτῇ for the pronominal suffix on בוא. The preposition is pragmatically obligatory to fulfill the role of the Hebrew suffix, since πορεύομαι is intransitive.

Cook believes that this double rendering does not fit the usual pattern and expresses doubts about the use of Lagarde's axioms at this point. He explains that, rather than one literal line and one free line, 2:19bc are *both* free, assuming that the *Vorlage* corresponds to MT.<sup>56</sup> Actually, 19b is more literal than 19c and fits the usual pattern almost perfectly. As I have shown in the examples so far, the more literal lines still tend to exhibit some freedom, even if that is only in the addition of a conjunction where the Hebrew has none. The only real freedom in 19b is εὐθείας for חיים.

The lexemes τρίβος and εὐθύς/εὐθεῖα occur four times each,<sup>57</sup> from verse 13 onward.<sup>58</sup> The section is framed, or enveloped, by ὁδός in 2:13 and 2:22. In the latter, the translator rendered אשעים with ὁδοὶ ἀσεβῶν, which demonstrates the new emphasis that he gave to the chapter. I mentioned above that the אשה זרה has been dispensed with and

---

<sup>54</sup>ἐμπορεύομαι occurs in 31:14.

<sup>55</sup>Loader, *Proverbs*, 131, explains that באיה refers both to entering the woman as well as her house.

<sup>56</sup>Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 142.

<sup>57</sup>εὐθεῖς in 21 may not be original. See my comments at 1:21.

<sup>58</sup>ὁδός also, in 2:13 (2x) and 2:16.

recast using the metaphor of “path” or “way.” The translator’s understanding of the plural participle, **העזבים**, and its apparent lack of congruity with what precedes may have affected this decision. In any case, a new narrative is the result where good paths must be sought and all others avoided, presumably guided by **βουλή καλή**. The occurrences of **τρίβος** in chapter 2 are all reasonable translations. The lexeme occurs throughout the book and is used for a variety of Hebrew lexemes.

Just as the translator is created a sharp distinction between **βουλή καλή** and **κακή βουλή**, so, too, he added a stronger emphasis in the distinction between the “paths” that naturally follow the counsel one takes. This best accounts for the presence of **εὐθείας** at the end of 19b, if it is original. Lagarde’s believes, to the contrary, that the **εὐθ** in **εὐθείας** comes from the similar sound at the end of **τρίβους**, and that the **είας** in **εὐθείας** has its origin in the final syllable of **ζωῆς**. One could also understand how a scribe may have seen **εὐθείας** in verses 13 or 16 and mistakenly added it here. With such a strong tendency toward adaptation and an emphasis on the character of counsel and the quality of the path, my own view is that the likelihood that this lexeme came from translator is very high. There is no need to lean on the forces of transmission history when the forces of context provide a sufficient explanation. It should be noted, however, that the presence of **εὐθεῖα** in 2:19 is unusual for the translator. In all but 2:16 and 2:19, **εὐθύς** always renders the **רשי** word group. The fact that he does this not once but twice in chapter 2 confirms my conclusion that he reinterpreted the chapter and added emphasis to its polar contrast.

More liberty is taken in 2:19c than in 2:19b. In the first place, **גישׁו** is rendered by present passive **καταλαμβάνονται**. Rendering a Hebrew *yiqtol* form with a Greek present happens regularly in Proverbs. For example, in 2:6 the translator rendered **תן** with present **δίδωσιν**. Transformations between active and passive voice in chapters 1–9

are not abundant, but they occur enough to identify them as a tendency.<sup>59</sup> Wolters explains that the new passive transformation appears to mean “that if only wayward people had been ‘taken down’ – that is, worn down or chastened – by the experiences of of lifetime, they might have turned back and found the right paths again.”<sup>60</sup> Alternatively, it may simply mean that this person will not reach old age with folly as a close friend. The line appears conceptually out of place in the chapter, but it may perhaps be intended to advance the idea 17b, διδασκαλία νεότητος.

Greek ἐνιαιτός in the LXX is almost always a rendering of שונה, except here in Proverbs 2:19.<sup>61</sup> This is also the only example of ἐνιαιτός in the book. The expression שנות חיים occurs several times in Proverbs, all translated by ἔτη ζωῆς.<sup>62</sup> If the translator was familiar with his source (or the Wisdom tradition more generally), this may have influenced the translator’s approach to 19c. The translator also added γάρ where the Hebrew texts lacks any causal notion. This likely accounts for the conditional that introduces 2:20, rather than the purpose clause with למען in Hebrew.

Cook points out that the translator appears to have split Hebrew 19b into two lines, and acknowledges that both lines may be original.<sup>63</sup> This is my preferred understanding and a similar phenomenon can be found in 1:21 and 9:6. It appears generally accepted that between the doubled lines this one is more likely to be original. I have attempted to show above that 19b is original, which for some may necessitate that I regard 19c as a later addition. In some ways, it is entirely possible that every double rendering in Greek Proverbs is the product of textual mixing, whether from later

---

<sup>59</sup>See note 20 above for a list.

<sup>60</sup>Wolters, *Proverbs*, 134.

<sup>61</sup>Hatch and Redpath (*s.v.* ἐνιαιτός) list only שונה. Muraoka also adds one occurrence of ארח but with no reference to its location. See Takimitsu Muraoka, *A Greek ≈ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2010), 42.

<sup>62</sup>3:2, 4:10, and 9:11.

<sup>63</sup>Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 143.

hexaplaric material, incorporation of catena, etc. Until such can be demonstrated, I consider both lines in 2:19 to be in keeping with the translator's particular translation character.

**Proverbs 2:21 – IV**

כי ישרים ישכנו ארץ      χρηστοὶ ἔσονται οἰκίτορες γῆς,  
ותמימים יותרו בה      ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ,  
   ὅτι εὐθεῖς κατασκηνώσουσι γῆν,  
   καὶ ὅσοι ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ.

Greek 2:21 contains an unusual double rendering, one where the entire verse appears to be rendered twice. Something similar was encountered in 1:7 (see my comments earlier) as well as Proverbs 15:6. Like 15:6, the latter two lines are considered far more literal than the former and for this reason are typically understood as secondary. Fritsch notes that 21ab are under the obelus in Syro-Hexapla, and accordingly he accepts 21cd as hexaplaric.<sup>64</sup> Lagarde, Cook, and D'Hammonville all conclude that the second pair of lines are secondary.<sup>65</sup> Vaticanus is missing the 21ab, but Wolters comments that what is left makes little sense in context.<sup>66</sup>

Several difficulties are encountered immediately when deciding on the original reading. On the one hand, the translator has shown a distinct preference for εὐθύς in chapter 2, and all three of the occurrences of the lexeme outside of chapter 2 (20:11, 28:10, 29:10) are renderings of ישר. This fact makes a decision between 21a and 21c on the basis of lexical choice or rendering style slightly more difficult. A further complicating factor is the similarity between 21bc and Psalm 24:21. The text is as follows:

---

<sup>64</sup>Fritsch, "The Hexaplaric Signs", 172.

<sup>65</sup>Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, 12. Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 144–145. D'Hammonville, *Proverbs*, 173.

<sup>66</sup>Wolters, *Proverbs*, 134. This is because the Hebrew purpose clause was rendered by a conditional.

ἄκακοι καὶ εὐθεῖς ἐκολλῶντο μοι,  
ὅτι ὑπέμεινά σε, κύριε

The translation at Proverbs 1:7 includes two lines that originate in Psalm 110 [111]. The Hebrew of 1:7a in Proverbs and of Psalm 110:10a are remarkably close, which makes sense of the assimilation. However 1:7b is entirely out of place and one can only imagine that it was carried over (intentionally or not) as a companion to 1:7a. If this is correct, Proverbs 2:21 may further exemplify the influence of the Psalms on the translator. Psalm 24 and Proverbs 2 share certain thematic elements that would make a purposeful allusion sensible. For example, Psalm 24:4 speaks of the “ways” and “paths” of the Lord (ὁδός, τρίβος). The chapter also speaks of the “sins of youth” (ἁμαρτία νεότητος) as well as the covenant (διαθήκη). Most significantly, in Psalm 24:8, the text refers to the Lord as χρηστὸς καὶ εὐθής and also states that the progeny of the person who fears the Lord will “inherit the land” (καὶ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ κληρονομήσει γῆν). Though there are many contextual differences, there are also enough similarities to make one wonder if the translator was intentionally shadowing the context of Psalm 24. In any case, one need not posit direct dependence on the Psalm to account for the present state of the text of Greek Proverbs. Even without an eye on the other text, the translator almost certainly would have been aware of the Psalm, and many others that describe the way of the innocent before the Lord and the rewards that they find. The similarities are close enough to accept that the text is in its present shape because the translator intentionally cast it that way. Incorporated, external material in Greek Proverbs is worthy of its own study for verification, but the use of Psalm 110 in 1:7 and Wisdom of Solomon 6 and 8 in 1:21 are justification enough to plausibly consider the double rendering original.

The sentence typology in 21a has changed fairly remarkably, from subject-verb-object to subject-verb-subject complement. As well, the object of the Hebrew phrase could not be maintained in a copulative construction and was translated as a genitive modifier of the subject complement. Greek χρηστός is used only here in Proverbs and is

the only example in the LXX of this lexeme paired with the  $\text{יִשְׂר}$  word group. The translator shows a lot of variety in how he renders this word group, sometimes leaving it untranslated, but in general he prefers the  $\text{ορθ-}$  and  $\text{δικαι-}$  roots. Though the rendering is different, it fits the translator's preference for variety. I mentioned Psalm 24 above, where the translator described the Lord as  $\text{χρηστὸς καὶ εὐθής}$  in verse 8. This may account for the lexeme here and is meant to allude to the context there.

The causal  $\text{כי}$  in 21a has also been left out. Verse 20 was transformed from a purpose clause with  $\text{למען}$  into a causal-conditional with  $\text{εἰ γάρ}$ . Beginning the next verse with  $\text{ὅτι}$ , as Wolters suggested, makes for an unusual literary structure. Perhaps there is a correlation between the translator's adaptation in verse 20 and the additional lines. This is not to say that 21ab are merely the product of the translator's linguistic awareness, or that Wolters' sense of insensibility is even valid, but that there may be a correlation. Verse 20 now closes out the preceding section and verse 21 begins the conclusion. I already explained that this entire chapter has been repurposed with new topic and focus, so it makes sense that the literary breaks and groupings in the text would shift as well.

Hebrew  $\text{יִשְׁבְּנוּ}$  was rendered by  $\text{ἔσονται οἰκίητορες}$ . A similar transformation from subject-verb-object to subject-verb-subject complement is exemplified also in 1:5. Greek  $\text{οἰκίητωρ}$  is rare, both in the Septuagint and in the broader Hellenistic period. The word occurs elsewhere in the Septuagint only in Wisdom of Solomon 12:3.<sup>67</sup> I showed above a strong allusion to Wisdom of Solomon in Proverbs 1:21, so there is a possibility that this is also true of 2:21. Though the context is slightly different, it deals with the ancient inhabitants of Canaan ( $\text{τοὺς πάλαι οἰκίητορας}$ ) and their destruction by Israel because of their misdeeds. If the connection is valid it serves to contrast the wickedness of the previous inhabitants with the moral uprightness of the future inhabitants. As mentioned,  $\text{γῆς}$  is in the (objective) genitive because the previous transformation requires

---

<sup>67</sup>Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 144, incorrectly states that it occurs in 1 Chronicles 4:41.

it.

Line 21b is a literal translation of the Hebrew, though ἄκακος = תמים is attested only here. The literal technique demonstrates that the translator does not always opt for extreme freedom. Greek ἄκακος is almost exclusively used in the wisdom literature, with the one exception being Jeremiah 11:19. In Greek Proverbs, the lexeme is often a rendering of פתי, though the translator shows variety in how he handles פתי. Greek ὑπολείπω is a common rendering for יתר in the *Nifal* and the final expression, ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ, is a word-for-word translation of the Hebrew. The same expression occurs in 21d. In the two other clear examples of doubly rendered tetracola, 1:7 and 15:6,<sup>68</sup> there is a clear distinction between the first bicolon and the second. In chapter 15, for example, it is very clear that 6b is rendered freely and 6d quite literally. The same cannot be said for 2:21bd where the two counterpart lines are semantically equivalent.

Line 21c begins the disputed verses. The line is rendered more literally, but this does not necessarily indicate a later revisor. However, εὐθύς for תמים is unattested elsewhere in the translated books of the Greek Bible. Yet still there is justification for considering the originality of the line since the translator has shown preference for this word already in chapter 2, even where he altered his Hebrew text (i.e., verse 16). Κατασκηνόω is regular for the root שכן, in both the Hebrew and Aramaic books. Unlike 21a, which used εἶμι plus a noun, here the translator matches the Hebrew finite verb in person, number, and time reference. Line 21d, like 21b, is rendered word-for-word. The difference between them is in the choice of lexeme for תמימים and καί versus δέ. Similar alternations between καί and δέ in doubly rendered verses can be found at 2:2, 3 and 8:10. This feature could indicate a later revision but could also simply exemplify the translator's demonstrated preference for variation. Occasionally ὅσιος is a rendering of

---

<sup>68</sup>3:15 may also count here, but see my discussion for the complexities.

the תם word group in the septuagintal corpus and is used for a variety of lexemes in Greek Proverbs. The word only occurs twice in Proverbs 1–9, both in chapter 2. In 2:11, the word is a free addition in the expression ἔννοια ὁσία, “holy insight,” for תבונה. The end of the line is identical to 21b and literal.

**Proverbs 3:15 – III, ii**

יקרה היא מפניים τιμωτέρα δέ ἐστιν λίθων πολυτελῶν  
 וכל הפציד לא ישוו בה οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται αὐτῇ οὐδὲν πονηρόν  
 εὐγνωστός ἐστιν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐγγίζουσιν αὐτῇ  
 πᾶν δὲ τίμιον οὐκ ἄξιον αὐτῆς ἐστιν

Proverbs 3:15 is included here because it shares much in common with the other double renderings, though it is dissimilar in other ways. Fritsch notes that the Syro-Hexapla has 15bc under the obelus, and accordingly considers it Old Greek.<sup>69</sup> Fox concludes the same, presumably based on Fritsch.<sup>70</sup> While the additional lines are potentially hexaplaric, they correspond very closely to the Hebrew text at 8:11. This is due to the similarity between 3:15 and 8:11 in Hebrew, especially the second colon. The Hebrew and Greek for 8:11 are presented below.

כי טובה חכמה מפנינים κρείσσων γὰρ σοφία λίθων πολυτελῶν  
 וכל הפצים לא ישוו בה πᾶν δὲ τίμιον οὐκ ἄξιον αὐτῆς ἐστιν

Lagarde notes the similarity between these two verses and concludes that this is not a true double rendering.<sup>71</sup> My own definition of double rendering in this study is broad enough to account for genuine double renderings as well as doublets that are the product of later revision, so this presents no real problem for including the verse here for study. The conclusion of the previous scholars is very possible, perhaps even probable and likely. In every example of double rendering so far I have attempted to leave room for originality

<sup>69</sup>Fritsch, “The Hexaplaric Signs”, 172.

<sup>70</sup>Fox, *Proverbs*, 379–380.

<sup>71</sup>“EGrabe sah dass eine doppelte übersetzung vorliegt, irrte aber”. Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, 14.

based on internal evidence, rather than following the consensus. What follows will outline some difficulties with their conclusion.

In the first place, the text of 3:15ad follows the same basic translation technique of 8:11ab. This does not prove anything conclusive, but it does indicate that the translator, when encountering a very similar Hebrew text in chapter 8, translated it nearly literally, almost exactly as (but appropriately differing from) 3:15. The main difference is τιμιωτέρα δέ ἐστὶν in 3:15 and κρείσσων γὰρ σοφία in 8:11; the rest is identical. This must at least indicate the possibility that these lines in chapter 3 *could* have come from the translator, unless one also posit that 8:11 is secondary as well. The Hebrew texts in these two verses do differ, but not substantially enough to account for remarkably different translations. In 3:15a, the text reads מפניים, rather than מפניים in 8:11 (but see the *Qere* at 3:15). And in 3:15 the text reads חפציד, rather than חפצים. The words in chapter 3 are handled differently by commentators and textual critics, but it is very unlikely that either word would have made 3:15ad impossible for the translator.

Additionally, Proverbs 31:10 presents another interesting case to consider. There, רחק מפניים מכרה is rendered by τιμιωτέρα δέ ἐστὶν λίθων πολυτελῶν. Greek τίμιον occurs several times throughout Proverbs, but the comparative only occurs in these two verses. One could read this as the potential source for 3:15a, or better as another example of the translator's linguistic tendency. In Greek Proverbs, chapter 31 has been broken up and spread across numerous locations. Verses 10–31, however, still fall at the end of the book. Intra-textual corruption or influence is entirely possible,<sup>72</sup> but I find it unconvincing in this case, unless the translator was both translating *and* compiling his source text.<sup>73</sup> The two texts are sufficiently different to say with reasonable certainty that

---

<sup>72</sup>This occurs three times in chapter 3: in 3:6 line c, 3:16 line a, what Rhalfs labels 22a, that is, the *second* verse 22, as well as the second 16a. Other literature, i.e. D'Hamonville, labels this 3:16A, 3:22A, etc. In 3:6, the third line originates in 3:23. Verse 22A is almost identical to 3:8. Verse 16A is just a plus. The nature of these pluses has not been convincingly explained.

<sup>73</sup>By compiling, I mean that he was working not with a single *Vorlage*, but a collection of proverbs that were not a unified text. Translator-as-compiler may be an adequate explanation for the

3:15a is not the result of intra-textual corruption with 31:10b.

Another problem with the consensus is the two plusses in chapter 3. In Rahlfs text, he frequently labels verses with a lowercase letter, i.e., 16a, referring not to verse 16, line a, but to the *second* verse 16. The rationale behind his labels are mysterious, but in general they are bicola or stanzas that do not constitute translated text, at least not indisputably. Two of these occur in chapter 3, one after 3:16 and another after 3:22. They will be designated henceforth by capital letters, i.e. 3:16A. The main issue that these present to the current problem is their obscurity and designation. Rahlfs identifies and labels the surface structure changes, but this is to say nothing about the phenomenon that produced them. Presumably, if the translator felt enough freedom to insert bicola or stanzas into his text, he could have done the same in the middle of any verse he encountered. This is basically what he did, I argued, in 1:7, though in that case he assimilated from a Psalm. In 6:8ABC, it appears that the translator added content that was at least popularized by Aristotle, but was appropriate to his own context.<sup>74</sup>

I consider it at least marginally possible that these same contextual additions occur in other places that are not so easily broken in to their own verses by a modern editor. Applied to 3:15, what evidence do we have to say that 15bc are not precisely this, a pure addition added between two basically literal lines that fit the translator's needs in context? Of course proving this is as difficult as disproving it, but the question remains nonetheless. Fox admits that 15bc "cannot be reconciled to MT," though for him they reflect a different Hebrew text.<sup>75</sup> I consider it equally as likely that 15bc are simply the translator's own addition and need not be justified by positing a lost Hebrew text.

The foregoing discussion only serves to outline a few difficulties with the consensus, and offer potential alternatives. Cook has said that "it is not possible to speak

---

dispersed nature of chapter 31, but as of this writing cannot be proven beyond a reasonable doubt.

<sup>74</sup>Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 166.

<sup>75</sup>Fox, *Proverbs*, 379.

of a high level of translational predictability” for Greek Proverbs.<sup>76</sup> The only sure characteristic of the translator’s technique is that it is nearly impossible to quantify consistently. He appears in most cases to have translated “off the cuff”, choosing whatever suited his needs in the moment. A governing paradigm, at this point, has not been conclusively detected that applies to the translation as a whole. This fact makes any thesis subject to quick revision, and often it is easier to demonstrate why a thesis cannot work, rather than offer a convincing alternative.

The first line, 15a, is basically literal with minor changes to better reflect Greek idiom. Hebrew **איה** did not need to be brought over directly because of **ἐστίν**, and so was omitted. The conjunction **δέ** was added, presumably to connect this comparison with the comparisons made in 3:14. In the three places that **פנינים**<sup>77</sup> occur in Proverbs, all are translated by **λίθων πολυτελών**, which makes this a stereotypical rendering for the translator. The translator also captured the comparison with good Greek idiom, using the comparative **τιμιωτέρα** (from **τίμιον**) for the **מן** preposition.

The second line, 15b, is far more free than 15a, and is a rendering not of Hebrew 15a, but of 15b. Greek **ἀντιτάσσω** occurs infrequently in the Septuagint and this is the only example where it renders **שׁוה**. Typically **ἀντιτάσσω** is taken in a hostile sense, “resist” or “oppose.”<sup>78</sup> On this, Wolters remarks that “this meaning does not fit the context very well...all three cola assert the superior value of wisdom over that of other things...It is also the meaning which is assigned to the verb in the present context by LSJ s.v. II, 3.”<sup>79</sup> Greek **οὐδὲν πονηρόν** is a free rendering for **חפצײך**, though various explanations have been given for it. Often **חפצײך** is emended to **חפצײם** typically to

<sup>76</sup>Johann Cook, “Proverbs”, in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title*, Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., Oxford: OUP, 2007, 621.

<sup>77</sup>The text at Proverbs 3:15 reads **פנינים**, but the *qere* corrects to **פנינים**.

<sup>78</sup>See, for example, the NETS translation; Fox, *Proverbs*, 379; D’Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 177. LSJ s.v. **ἀντιτάσσω** II, 2.

<sup>79</sup>Wolters, *Proverbs*, 136.

eliminate the lone second person reference and presumably to conform to the same expression in 8:11.<sup>80</sup> In any case, the translator’s demonstrated tendency to recast a context in explicitly dualistic categories accounts for the addition of *πονηρόν*. De Waard explains that the translator understood *חֶפֶץ* to mean “thing,” and “with the preceding *כֹּל* and the following negation generated the rendering *οὐδέν*, and that *πονηρόν* has been added as a further qualification.”<sup>81</sup>

The third line is also very freely rendered, so much so that at first glance it appears to be a free addition. Moreover, this line is a translation of Hebrew 15a, which means that the cola traditionally understood to be OG were translated in reverse. De Waard offers a compelling explanation for *τοῖς ἐγγίζουσιν αὐτῆ*. He explains that the translator may have attempted to “give a meaning to the *katib* פִּנְיִים by taking it as a *hifil* participle of the verb פִּנָּה.”<sup>82</sup> This is a very plausible explanation, but is unfortunately difficult to demonstrate. Only once does *ἐγγίζω* occur for פִּנָּה, in Ben Sira 37:30 in the Qal stem.<sup>83</sup> This is still, however, the best explanation proposed outside of the translator’s own creativity (which is still a valid explanation). The lexeme *εὐγνώστος* is only used in Greek Proverbs, in 3:15, 5:6, and 26:26. Wolters explains that the word probably means “easy to know”, rather than “well known.”<sup>84</sup> In each of the three occurrences in Greek Proverbs, the term is used differently.

The fourth colon, like 15a, is very literal and identical to 8:11b. The Hebrew between the two texts differ only in one word, *חֶפֶץ* versus *חֶפְצִים*. The proposed emendation of the Hebrew is beyond the scope of this paper, but using the Greek text in

---

<sup>80</sup>See, for example, Fox, *Proverbs*, 379, who appeals to Greek 15a as a witness to such a text, and *ibid.*, 157, where he avoids the personal suffix. See also Waltke, *Proverbs*, 251, n. 9, who appeals to the proto-Hebrew script. Alternatively, see Loader, *Proverbs*, 170–171, who rejects the emendation, as well as BHQ.

<sup>81</sup>De Waard, *Proverbs*, 32\*. See also Fox, *Proverbs*, 157.

<sup>82</sup>De Waard, *Proverbs*, 33\*.

<sup>83</sup>See Appendix II in Hatch & Redpath, 172, as well as Muraoka, *Index*, 34, 315.

<sup>84</sup>Wolters, *Proverbs*, 136.

this way proves to be a minefield of difficulty and should probably be avoided in this case. It is interesting, however, that חפציד is rendered by τίμιον. Even if the line is later than OG, it does raise questions about that translator's *Vorlage*. The lexeme ἄξιος is used only twice in Greek Proverbs, here and in 8:11, and in the Greek Bible it commonly renders שׁוה. Their semantic fields overlap in many ways, though ἄξιος carries a moral nuance that שׁוה does not inherently have. Yet again this draws parallels from Wisdom of Solomon, though this time only incidental. There the word is used 11 times, all in affirmative clauses rather than negative clauses. The first half of the book mainly speaks of those worthy of righteous things, while the second half deals exclusively with those worthy of punishment. Wisdom 6:16 has already been mentioned, but it applies here as well. The context is similar, in the first place, because of the manner of address that begins the chapter, Ἀκούσατε οὖν, βασιλεῖς. Verse 16 describes Lady Wisdom's search of those who are worthy (τοὺς ἀξίους αὐτῆς) of her, a slightly different description. In Proverbs 3:15, she is "easy to know"<sup>85</sup> by those who approach her. Seeking harmony between the two texts is only necessary if there is demonstrated dependence. What should be seen here is a snapshot of the broader wisdom tradition that influenced the translator of Proverbs.

My tentative proposal for revolving the text-critical difficulties here are that all lines are original to the translator. He translated Hebrew 15a literally and followed it by a freer translation for 15b. Then, he re-translated 15a interpretively and followed it by a basically literal rendering for 15b. What may also be operative here was two different understandings of the consonants, either from a difficulty in the translator's own reading or from interpretive differences in his community or Jewish schools more broadly. Sufficiently explaining his motives for these decisions would be to go beyond the data.

---

<sup>85</sup>Or "well known." See comments above.

**Proverbs 4:10 – II, i**

שמע בני וקח אמרי      Ἀκούε, υἱέ, καὶ δέξαι ἔμοις λόγους,  
וירבו לך שנות היים      καὶ πληθυνθήσεται ἔτη ζωῆς σου,  
   ἵνα σοι γένωνται πολλὰ ὁδοὶ βίου

Greek Proverbs 4:10 is another double rendering of the typical type, where two Greek lines correspond to a single Hebrew line, making a tricolon. The same text-critical problems that have been dealt with above apply here also. The first line is literal without qualification. The translator often uses *λόγος* where it is out of place (5:1 for *תבונה*, for example), but it also appears consistently for both *אמר* and *דבר*. The doubled lines follow the usual pattern, one being more literal than the other, in this case 10b. The consensus view is that this line is secondary, probably hexaplaric.<sup>86</sup> Fox additionally notes that *ὁδοί* stands in for *שנות* here, but in the double at 2:19 a semantically opposite substitution occurs, *ἐνιαυτός* for *ארה*.<sup>87</sup>

Verse 10b is the more literal line between the doubly rendered verses, but freedom is not absent. Greek *πληθύνω* occurs four times in Greek Proverbs and is always a rendering for *רבה*. This pairing is stereotypical in the broader septuagintal corpus as well. I indicated above that active/passive transformations are not uncommon in Greek Proverbs.<sup>88</sup> The transformation here, *πληθυνθήσεται*, was likely motivated by Greek idiom rather than the translator's interpretation of the consonants. The resulting translation made *לך* unnecessary, though *σοι* is found in A and S<sup>c</sup>. The expression *ἔτη ζωῆς* occurs five times in Proverbs, all in the first nine chapters. Only three of these reflect an underlying Hebrew text (3:2, 4:10, and 9:11). Of the other two, 9:18d is a pure addition and its status as OG is disputable.

---

<sup>86</sup>D'Hamonville, *Proverbs*, 183–184; De Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, 18; Fritsch, “Hexaplaric Signs”, 173, notes that it is under the obelus in Syh.

<sup>87</sup>Fox, *Proverbs*, 385. See my comments there.

<sup>88</sup>See note 21 above for some examples.

Line 10c is much freer than 10b, though that does not come without caveat. In the first place, ἵνα has been added at the head of the clause, which is a much closer rendering of the Hebrew *w<sup>3</sup>yaqtol*. This is not to say that ἵνα is a *more* literal translation than καί in 10b, but rather it better reflects the correct vocalization of the text. In other words, וירבו, following the imperative שמע in 10a, is correctly vocalized as a *w<sup>3</sup>yaqtol* in MT, rather than *wayyaqtol*. Greek καί, whether intentional or not, reflects *wayyaqtol*. There is a possibility that, if both lines are original, the double rendering is the translator's effort to reflect what he considered possible, alternative interpretations. The finite verb has been replaced with a Greek copulative phrase using γίνομαι. A similar translation occurs in 3:15, treated above, where finite שוה was replaced with a copulative expression using εἶμι. Other examples with γίνομαι can be found in 1:23, 6:6, and 9:12. This type of rendering is not prevalent, but it does occur enough to label it a feature of the translator. Whereas לך was not rendered in 10b, in 10c it is rendered by σοι, which may account for its presence in 10b in A and S<sup>c</sup>.

D'Hamonville is correct when he remarks that 10c “est bien dans la manière du traducteur.”<sup>89</sup> The additional line continues the theme of the “paths” of Wisdom which the translator brings out with more force in chapter 2. In chapter 3, he continues the theme and binds it to the length or fullness of one's life. In 3:2 the Hebrew reads כי ארך ימים ושנות חיים, which is appropriately rendered by μήκος γὰρ βίου καὶ ἔτη ζωῆς. In Greek 3:16, the same expression appears, though the Hebrew reads only ארך ימים.<sup>90</sup> Tauberschmidt explains that the addition of ὁδός was perhaps intended to connect this verse with verse 11, which begins with ὁδοὺς γὰρ σοφίας, and provide a new parallelism with ἔτη ζωῆς.<sup>91</sup> He assumes that 10b is original. In another place, 5:9, the

---

<sup>89</sup>D'Hamonville, *Proverbs*, 184.

<sup>90</sup>The second occurrence could be dittography. “Jäger sah dass καὶ ἔτη ζωῆς aus 2 stammt.” De Legarde, *Anmerkungen*, 14.

<sup>91</sup>Tauberschmidt, *Secondary Parallelism*, 62.

translator creates a similar pairing between ζωή and βίος, there rendering דוד with ζωή and שנה with βίος. The same pair can also be seen in 16:17ab where neither are a literal rendering of the Hebrew. These verses, along with 3:2 and 3:16, may indicate a preferred word pair for the translator. If this is the case, it lends credibility to the view that 10b and 10c are both original.

Determining the originality of 10b, like every example prior, is largely dependent on establishing whether or not the translator had a hand in *any* of the double renderings. If he did, then every example of double rendering is subject to reevaluation. This example is reminiscent of 2:2 and 2:3, where the second line was rendered more literally and the third quite free. Though 10c is in keeping with the translator's concerns, this does not mean *prima facie* that 10b is an impossible rendering for him. His penchant is not for unqualified freedom and where he has no reason to add his own layer of interpretation he translates quite literally, 10a being an obvious example. The line is perhaps secondary, but in my view this is not as well as established as consensus would suggest.

### **Proverbs 6:25 – I**

אל תחמד יפיה בלבבך μή σε νικήση κάλλους ἐπιθυμία,  
 ואל תקחך בעפעפיה μηδὲ ἀγρουθῆς σοῖς ὀφθαμοῖς  
 μηδὲ συναρπασθῆς ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῆς βλεφάρων

Proverbs 6:25 is another unusual case because the doubled lines (25bc) both show a certain degree of freedom. The first line is also quite freely rendered. Even still, 25b is typically considered the freer of the doubly rendered lines and labeled secondary. Fritsch also notes that 25b is under the obelus in Syro-Hexapla.<sup>92</sup> Lagarde mentions an alternative reading for 25c, μηδὲ συναρπασάτω ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῆς βλεφάρων, which he

---

<sup>92</sup>Fritsch, "The Hexaplaric Signs", 173.

considers a later change.<sup>93</sup>

All three Revisers correct 25a to read closer to MT: μὴ ἐπιθυμῆσης κάλλους αὐτῆς ἐν καρδίᾳ σου.<sup>94</sup> The line is perplexing in that, apart from the translator's penchant for freedom, there is nothing contextually that indicates why he would have translated in this way. The lexeme νικάω is used only this once in Greek Proverbs and in the septuagintal corpus is mostly attested in 2–4 Maccabees. With Muraoka I agree that νικήση is not a translation for תַּחַמַּד.<sup>95</sup> The lexeme is a contextual addition that was prioritized enough to fulfill the verbal slot. The prepositional phrase, בַּלְבַּב, was omitted entirely. Interestingly, in 6:20–35 the translator appears to avoid לֵב and לִבָּב. In 6:21 עַל לֵב is altered to ἐπὶ σῆ ψυχῆ. And in 6:32 the לֵב חָסַר is described as ἔνδεια φρενῶν. He shows no hesitance with most instances of לֵב or לִבָּב in his *Vorlage*, so these changes may be a measured decision.

The main verb in Hebrew, תַּחַמַּד, was not omitted or translated by νικάω. After the translator added a different verbal constituent, he rendered the main Hebrew verb with a noun, ἐπιθυμία. Fox believes that the change in Greek indicates that man's danger comes from within, from unhindered lust, but this overstates the change.<sup>96</sup> If anything the Greek *obscures* the the internal nature of unhinged human lust. Hebrew פִּיָּה was rendered by κάλλους, with the personal suffix omitted. The missing suffix creates a disjunction between the current verse and subject of the previous, the γυνὴ ὑπάνδρου. Whereas the Hebrew construes the אִשָּׁת רַע in prototypical terms, it would appear that the translator understood her generically, “any married woman” or “any loose lady”, and his translation of 25a then gives a warning in generic terms.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup>Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, 24.

<sup>94</sup>Frederick Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae Supersunt: Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*, Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1964, 322.

<sup>95</sup>Muraoka suggests a delete from Hatch & Redpath. Muraoka, *Index*, 81.

<sup>96</sup>Fox, *Proverbs*, 401.

<sup>97</sup>Whether רַע in verse 24 should be read as MT, רַע, or with LXX, רַע, is debated.

The personal suffix on בעפעפיה in 25b may have been omitted, like יפיה in 25a, but may have also been altered to σοῖς. If omitted, it may indicate that 25c is in fact secondary due to the presence of αὐτῆς. What makes this conclusion difficult is the translator's demonstrated preference for βλέφαρον. Though he normally varies his choice of lexical equivalent, in this case, barring the present example with ὀφθαλμός, he chooses this lexeme exclusively for העפע. This is also the only example of ὀφθαλμός = העפע in the septuagintal canon, the eight other occurrences all being rendered by βλέφαρον. The verb ἀγρευθῆς is a rendering of תקת, though it was transformed to a passive. This phenomenon has been treated above. I doubt that he vocalized the Hebrew as a *Nifal*, though it is possible. He shows a great deal of variation in his renderings for תקל, but on the whole he tends to use δέχομαι. He also altered the verb's personal reference. Though the 2ms and 3fs in Hebrew are identical, the presence of a 2ms objective suffix on the Hebrew verb would make such an interpretation unexpected. The presence of σοῖς may be accounted for as a reinterpretation of the possessive suffix on בעפעפיה. This is consistent with his transformation of the verb to second person. Alternatively, and in my view preferentially, the possessive suffix was simply left off and he adapted the objective suffix on תקת.

In 25c the second person reference from 25b is maintained in συναρπασθῆς. One is led to wonder why a later revisor would have rendered the last part of the verse more literally and not corrected the verb, assuming the ת was present in his *Vorlage*. The two letters in the old Hebrew script (𐤓 and 𐤔) do resemble one another, especially if a text is damaged or smudged, and these two letters next to one another may have led to graphemic *parablepsis*. In this case, תקת could reasonably be read as a *Nifal* and the Greek may in fact give testimony to it. The final portion of the line is translated literally, though rendering Hebrew כ with ἀπό only occurs elsewhere in Greek Proverbs in 7:6. The presence of αὐτῆς is strange in context when the other references to the γυνὴ ὑπάνδρου has been removed. This is perhaps evidence of the line's secondary nature if

one is also willing to accept a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

### Proverbs 8:10

קחו מוסרי ואל כסף  
ודעת מחרוזת נבחר  
λάβετε παιδείαν καὶ μὴ ἀργύριον  
καὶ γνώσιν ὑπὲρ χρυσίου δεδοκιμασμένον  
ἀνθαιρεῖσθε δὲ αἴσθησιν χρυσίου καταροῦ

The consensus view, again, is that 10b is secondary due to its more literal quality, though Fritsch notes that the line is unmarked in Syro-Hexapla.<sup>98</sup> Cook gives pause to this conclusion in a variety of ways.<sup>99</sup> In the first place, the Peshitta reads closer to the third colon rather than the first, but as I explained earlier, discerning the degree to which the translator of Peshitta relied on LXX is not as obvious as some suggest (cf. the discussion at 1:7). A further consideration is that the third line is missing in B\*, S, and Rhalfs' O group. Cook ultimately expresses the difficulty of drawing a concrete conclusion here. Chapter 8 is structurally close to the Hebrew, but on the whole the chapter is incredibly free. For example, both 8:22 and 8:23 have been collapsed from a bicolon in Hebrew to a single colon in Greek, which introduces a new parallelism between the two verses. In verses 26 and 28, the translator uses the expression τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανόν for a Hebrew text that reads differently. Verse 33 as well was left out completely, and line 32b was transposed and reincorporated at 34b. Additionally, Lady Wisdom has been reimagined in 8:1 as the subject to be preached, rather than the preacher. A similar phenomenon happens in 1:22, though in both contexts the substance of her speeches are preserved. Three times (8:2, 8:4, and 8:6) the translator adds a verb where the Hebrew elides it.

Line 10a is mostly literal which corresponds the typical pattern for the doubly rendered verses. The one change is from מוסרי, “my instruction”, to παιδείαν,

---

<sup>98</sup>Fritsch, “The Hexaplaric Signs”, 180. De Lagarde, *Anmerkungen*, 27. Fox, *Proverbs*, 409.

<sup>99</sup>Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 204–205.

“instruction”. BHS offers מוסר as the possible *Vorlage* based on parallelism with דעת in 10b. BHQ similarly notes that παιδεία is a contextual harmonization by the translator, presumably to bring מוסר and דעת into closer parallelism. Tauberschmidt expresses the same view.<sup>100</sup> This could be another example of graphemic *parablepsis*, where the י on מוסר was skipped over because of the ו on ואל. This would be less likely in the Paleo script (י and ף), but is a distinct possibility in the later Hasmonean script. Peshitta and Targum likewise omit the personal suffix. There is a known genealogical relationship from LXX to Peshitta to Targum, though the particulars are not well established. The missing suffix in Peshitta lends support to the view that the version leaned on LXX in this case, and in Targum this may be more evidence of its reliance on Peshitta or LXX. In any case, the result in Greek is a closer parallelism. Greek παιδεία is the stereotypical rendering of מוסר, though variation appears regularly and is often very free.

Line 10b is likewise rendered literally and also conforms to the trend in Proverbs. Greek ἀσθησις is the most common rendering for דעת in Greek Proverbs (see 10c), not γνῶσις, but in almost every occurrence of γνῶσις it stands in for דעת.<sup>101</sup> Out of the 8 occurrences of בחר in Proverbs, 6 of them are *Nifal*. Only twice does the translator repeat the same Greek lexeme (16:16 and 21:1, ἀίρετός). In 8:10b, δεδοκιμασμένον is the lone example of this pairing in the LXX. Only once does בחר *Nifal* mean “tested/refined” (10:20), which the translator correctly renders with πυρόω. In the other examples he correctly detects the difference in meaning and renders it appropriately, which makes δοκιμάζω a peculiar translation given his pattern elsewhere. It is possible that he simply missed this case, though it is difficult to see how he missed the מן preposition that always occurs with this use of בחר. Interestingly in 10c, which is considered OG, בחר is translated in a semantically similar way (καθαρός). More will be

---

<sup>100</sup>Tauberschmidt, *Secondary Parallelism*, 71.

<sup>101</sup>In 9:6, the translator either misread בדרך as בדעת, intentionally altered the word, or his *Vorlage* read בדעת. In 13:9, 16:8, and 19:23 (among others) he rendered his text interpretively.

said on this below.

Line 10c exhibits more freedom than the previous two lines. Fox believes that נבחר was understood as an imperative and rendered by ἀνθαιρείσθε, but his explanation fails to account for καθαρός.<sup>102</sup> More likely, the translator added the verb to better parallel λάβετε in 10a and is itself also a rendering of קחו. I mentioned above that the translator added a verb in three places where it was elided in Hebrew (8:2, 8:4, and 8:6) and this is likely in keeping with that trend. The semantic value that this lexeme adds is that which was lacking in the previous line: a lexeme semantically parallel to λάβετε that also captures the comparative nuance of Hebrew נבחר. Ἀνθαιρέομαι occurs only here in the LXX (none at all in the New Testament) and this, along with his use of the genitive of comparison, may further evidence the translator's tendency to imitate a higher order of Greek, perhaps classical. Greek αἴσθησις for דעת in Proverbs has been mentioned many times already, so little more needs to be added. Likewise χρυσίου, though a genitive of comparison in this instance, is the standard translation for קרוין in Proverbs. Καθαρός fulfills the same role that δεδοκιμασμένον fulfills in the previous line, though their semantic fields only overlap at points.

Though 8:10c is omitted in B\* and S\*, it is not insignificant in this case that later hands supplied it. I find 10c entirely in keeping with the translator's overall approach and based on the foregoing discussion believe the line to be OG. Line 10b, however, though bearing some of the translator's tendencies, does not conform to his translational pattern with בחר (*Nifal*) + מן. He rightly detects the nuances of the verb in every other example. This does not preclude the line from being original, especially given his penchant for freedom, variety, and modification. I find the arguments against its originality unconvincing, though I still believe the conclusion is entirely possible.

---

<sup>102</sup>Fox, *Proverbs*, 40.

## CHAPTER 2

### CONCLUSIONS

The double renderings in Greek Proverbs present a unique challenge to any student of the translation. The phenomenon as it exists in Proverbs is unique in the LXX. Double renderings occur in other places, but the density and shape of the doublets in Proverbs requires an approach that is much more specific than what is normally applied to the other translations. I have identified 11 examples of double renderings of at least an entire cola in Proverbs 1–9. Many other verses were studied for this paper for their fitness to be included in the data. For example, Proverbs 9:6, a tricolon in Greek and bicolon in Hebrew, was close to making the cut. On the surface it would seem that the verse meets the mark. However it becomes clear on closer inspection that the verse really contains a new addition, likely from the translator, where he intentionally created an antithetically parallel colon that resembles, in part, a Hebrew line already translated (6a). This same phenomenon occurs many times later in the book. But this raises an interesting question for future study, namely, double renderings as additions.

#### **Double Renderings as Additions**

Little is needed by way of argument that double renderings, in some ways, constitute additions where they are original. Though a single Hebrew line may be rendered twice, technically one of the two Greek lines is *additional*. The nature of these lines are unique, however, in that they appear to have supporting text, rather than *pure* additions that are compositional rather than translational. Worthy of consideration and future study is the exact relationship between these two distinct but prominent types of translator freedom. But again, the originality of both the doubles and pure additions must be established, for a double

produced through incorporation, assimilation, or any other common transmission error is but an historical malady that must be sorted out.

My conclusions above left room for every double rendering to be original based on the translator's demonstrated technique throughout. This becomes, in my view, even more of a possibility if the doubles can be categorized more generally as additions. Additions are another hallmark of the translation and are more abundant than double renderings, though many of these are also in doubt. I find it unlikely, however, that every addition should be questioned the way double renderings have. Additions in Proverbs fit into two relatively contrived categories: additions within a verse and additions of entire stanzas. The latter is marked in Rahlfs with lowercase letters (i.e., 6:16a) but the secondary literature typically uses uppercase (i.e., 6:16A). The former is unmarked in Rahlfs but easily identified, and to my knowledge no comprehensive study of either group has been conducted.

Though the idea that double renderings serve to explicate some idea latent in the *Vorlage* is typically eschewed, there is some truth to it, even if only trivially. Of the double renderings studied in this paper, none of them could be accurately described as communicating *the same thing twice*. The meanings are very close, to be sure, but each bears the basic meaning of the Hebrew in its own way. Sometimes, the lexical choices are the main distinguishing factor (i.e., 1:14) though the syntax is different. At other times, the syntax or sentence typology changes (i.e., 4:10). The additions in Greek Proverbs always appear to serve an exegetical function regardless of the status of their originality. The translator of Greek Proverbs can be classified most simply as an *additus*, an “add-er”, who translated his *Vorlage* with an expansive approach. Yes, the translation is subject to every other category that is fitting of freer translations, but most fundamental to the technique of this translator is his willingness to expand – and occasionally expound upon – a concept.

If, as I have suggested, addition or explication is the main hallmark of the translator's approach, the presence of double renderings are not just normal, they are expected. In other words, if the translator was concerned with clarity of meaning through

verbosity of expression, doubly rendered lines are a natural consequence, especially if the Hebrew consonants could be interpreted in several ways (i.e., 4:10). The possibility of a damaged or different Hebrew text, of course, is always an option. As well, it is clear that the translator was reading stichometrically or poetically and undoubtedly much of his work is indebted to his attention to conceptual parallelism. My contention, at the close of this paper, is that if we view the double renderings as belonging to the broader category of contextual addition, the double lines become much more sensible as a feature to his framework. Rather than viewing most doubly rendered lines as secondary and a few original, I would argue that the opposite is true: given the translator's overall preference for addition, the double renderings are more than likely original, with some that potentially arose later due to this pattern in other places.

### **Character of the Double Renderings**

I identified and classified the examples above into types and subtypes. Types *I* and *II* are the most common, being a tricolon where lines 2 and 3 are doubled and one of the additional lines is freer than the other. The difference between type *I* and type *II* is the location of the more freely rendered line – first or second. Both of the lines do exhibit freedoms, and never is one line translated with perfect literalism. Often, some portion of the *Vorlage* is spread across both lines, what I have labeled subtype *i*. For example, 1:14, where 14c is much more literal than 14b. However the lexeme כָּל is untranslated in 14c, having been included in 14b, while in 14b a new lexeme is introduced, κτάομαι, and חָסַד is dynamically rendered by κοινός.

Types *III* and *IV* are tetracola, only three in total. Two of them have material that is extraneous to the *Vorlage*, subtype *ii*. For 1:7, the translator assimilated a portion of Psalm 110 [111], most likely due to the semantic similarity between the opening lines and perhaps from a desire to create a link between the two texts. The translator shows an awareness of the the Psalms throughout his work (as well as Wisdom of Solomon), so finding him assimilating

the text at one place should not be shocking. The lone example of type *IV* is 2:21, which is an example of a double rendering of the entire verse. Only 21a is rendered freely and the difference between 21b and 21d is a single word. This verse is another example of potential influence from the Psalms, this time Psalm 24:21, on the basis of lexical items and context. In Psalm 24:4, Δαυιδ asks of the LORD to make his ways and paths known. In Proverbs 2, both Greek and Hebrew, the ὁδός and τρίβος of the righteous play a prominent role. As well, Psalm 24:13 resembles Proverbs 2:21bd. These connections indicate that the extra material in Proverbs 2:21 is there on purpose.

The motivation for each double rendering is different and must be accounted for individually. I find these broad categories to effectively group them into a workable system for future study. These categories are surface-structure categories. What is needed now is motivational categories that explain the potential origin of each double rendering. Some have been proposed here, but no system has been offered.

### Summary

On the whole I believe that the double renderings in Greek Proverbs belong in the broader category of addition. The character and count of additional material in the translation shows that his tendency was to *explicate* the perceived meaning through *addenda*. Some would argue that the double renderings are duplicate and therefore redundant. None of the examples in this paper would support that theory. Every one has some additional nuance, lexical or syntactical variety, or poetic flair that makes it unique in context. Sometimes he creates assonance. Other times he borrows a context or concept that is common to the broader wisdom tradition. Still at other times he reuses words or phrase that occur elsewhere, presumably in imitation of the Hebrew author.

If the above conclusion is correct, the best way forward for analysis of the doubled lines and the translation as a whole is not to assume that they are corruptions. They fit well within the translator's operational framework and are consistent with his technique

throughout. The external evidence is important, no doubt. But no comprehensive study of that material has been conducted, and no critical edition exists. Until that time, the best way forward is a conservative way forward on the basis of internal evidence.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Revised and expanded edition. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 50. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2007.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. “The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation- Technical Study of the Septuagint” in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta: Scholar's Press. 1986.
- Barr, James. *The Typology of Literalism in ancient biblical translations*. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens XV. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament, Tome 5: Job, Proverbes, Qohélet, et Cantique des Cantiques*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis vol. 50.5. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Bauer, Hans and Pontus Leander. *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*. 3rd ed. Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms, 1991.
- Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.
- Boas, Evert van Emde, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink, and Matthieu de Bakker. *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge, UK: CUP, 2019.
- Boyd-Taylor, Cameron. *Reading Between the Lines: The Intelinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies*. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2011.
- Cook, Johann. “Proverbs” in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford, UK: OUP, 2007.
- Cook, Johann. *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, vol. 69. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1997.
- Cook, Johann. “The Relationship Between the Peshitta and the Septuagint (Proverbs).” *Textus* 14. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1994.
- Cook, Johann. “The Translator of Septuagint Proverbs – Is His Style the Result of Platonic

- and/or Stoic Influence?" *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*. Herausgegeben von Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Cox, Claude. Review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs* by Johann Cook. *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*, vol. 3. 1998. <http://jbtc.org/v03/Cook1998rev.html>.
- D'Hammonville, David-Marc. *Les Proverbs in La Bible D'Alexandrie*. Paris: Cerf, 2000.
- de Lagarde, Paul. *Anmerkungen zur Griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien*. Leipzig, Germany: Brockhaus, 1863.
- De Troyer, Kristen. *Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us About the Literary Growth of the Bible*. Text-Critical Studies 4. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2003.
- de Waard, Jan. *Proverbs*. Biblia Hebraica Quinta 17. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008.
- Field, Frederick. *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt: Sive Veterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. Vol 2, Job-Malachi. Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms, 1964.
- Fox, Michael V. *Proverbs: An Eclectic Edition with Introduction and Commentary*. The Hebrew Bible: A Critical Edition, vol. 1. Atlanta: SBL, 2015.
- Fox, Michael V. *Proverbs 1-9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible, vol. 18A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Fox, Michael V. Review of *Secondary Parallelism* by Gehard Tauberschmidt. *Review of Biblical Literature* 11, 2004.
- Fritsch, Charles T. "The Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs in the Syro-Heaplar of Proverbs." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72 (1953).
- Geise Jr., Ronald L. "Dualism in the LXX of Prov 2:17: A Case Study in the LXX as Revisionary Translation." *Journal for the Evangelical Theological Society*, vol. 36.3. September 1993.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe Henry. "Bible Exegesis and Textual Criticism: Isaiah 49,11 MT and LXX". *Melanges Dominique Barthelemy: Etudes Bibliques Offertes a l'Occasion de son 60e Anniversaire*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 38. Edited by Pierre Casetti, Othmar Keet, et Adrian Schenker. Göttingen, Germany: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. vol. 1, A-I. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1954.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. vol. 2, K-Ω. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Jäger, Johann Gottlob. *Observationes in Proverbiorum Salomonis versionem alexandrinum*.

- Leipzig, Germany: Reinhold Jacob Boie, 1788.
- Joosten, Jan. "Reflections on the Interlinear Paradigm in Septuagintal Studies." *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Rajja Sollamo*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, vol. 12. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill.
- Joosten, Jan. "Rhetorical Ornamentation in the Septuagint: The case of grammatical variation." *Et sapienter et eloquenter: Studies on Rhetorical and Stylistic Feature of the Septuagint*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, vol. 241. Eds. Eberhard Bons and Thomas J. Kraus. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Joosten, Jan. "The Relation of the Septuagint of Proverbs to Psalms." *Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture: Studies in Honour of Johann Cook*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 172. Eds. Randall X. Gauthier, Gideon R. Kotzé, and Gert J. Steyn. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2016.
- Longman III, Tremper and Peter Enns, eds. *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Wisdom, Poetry, & Writings*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008.
- Loader, James Alfred. *Proverbs 1-9*. Historical Commentary on the Old Testament. Leuven, Belgium: Paris, 2014.
- Marquis, Galen. "Consistency of Lexical Equivalence as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique." *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta: Scholar's Press. 1986.
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th ed. New York: Oxford, 2005.
- Muraoka, Takimitsu. *A Greek ≈ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-way Index to the Septuagint*. Louvain, Belgium: Peeters, 2010.
- Olafsson, Steffan. *Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis. Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version*. Coniectanea Biblica. Old Testament Series 57. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin G. Wright, "To the Reader of NETS." *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title*. Eds. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford, UK: OUP. 2007.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, editio altera. ed. Robert Hanhart. Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Sabatier, Pierre. *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae, Seu Vetus Italica*. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepolis, 1987.
- Smith, J. Payne. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus by R. Payne Smith*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1998.
- Talshir, Zipora. "Double Translations in the Septuagint." *VI Congress of the International*

- Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. pp. 21-63, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 23, Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1986.
- Tauberschmidt, Gerhard. *Secondary Parallelism: A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs*. Academia Biblica 15. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2004.
- van der Louw, Theo A. W. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. Contributions to Biblical Theology & Exegesis 47. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2007.
- van der Louw, Theo A. W. "Did the Septuagint Translators Really Intend the Greek Text as it is?" *Die Septuaginta - Orte und Intentionen*. Herausgegeben von Sigfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, und Marcus Sigismund. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Waltke, Bruce. *The Book of Proverbs Chapters 1-15*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Wolters, Al. *Proverbs: A Commentary based on Paroimiai in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 2020.
- Wright, Benjamin G. "The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating 'Literalism' in the LXX." *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986*. *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 23. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1987.
- Würthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

ABSTRACT

DOUBLE RENDERINGS IN THE SEPTUAGINT OF  
PROVERBS 1–9

Jonathan Mark Whittle, Th.M.  
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2020  
Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Peter J. Gentry

This thesis investigates the doubly rendered lines in Greek Proverbs 1–9 in light of the translation technique in the rest of the book.

Chapter 1 provides background to the study of Greek Proverbs by introducing the current topic and relevant scholarly treatments. This chapter also provides a definition of a double rendering as well as a classification system that groups the specific features and their relationship to the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

Chapter 2 gives a discussion for every double rendering and compares it the translation technique in the rest of Greek Proverbs and other LXX literature. As well, this chapter interacts with scholarly treatments of the double renderings and considers the validity of their theses. In many cases, previous treatments conclude that one of the doubly rendered lines is a later addition, but my own research shows that the additional lines are consistent with the translator's tendencies in other places.

Chapter 3 draws conclusions based on the data from chapter 2. I argue that the double renderings should be seen within a broader framework of addition that the translator applied throughout the book.

## VITA

Jonathan Mark Whittle

### EDUCATION

B.A., Clemson University, 2013

M.Div., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2018

### ORGANIZATIONS

International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

### MINISTERIAL EMPLOYMENT

Pastoral Intern, Crosspoint Church, Clemson, SC, 2013-15