ALEXANDRINIAN ANALOGICAL WORD-ANALYSIS AND SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES

A CASE STUDY OF אֵלֶּל - הַלֵּל *

DAVID WEISSELT

Whenever we find seeming discrepancies between MT and G, the question of the reasons for such discrepancies arises: is it that G read a text which differed from that underlying the MT; did the translator prefer a rendition by way of interpretation, or are we concerned with plain misunderstanding of the Hebrew? Before resorting to the first possibility for explaining the variant, one should ask whether or not G’s Vorlage may not have read the same Hebrew text as the MT, but that the translator understood it differently since he started out from linguistic conceptions which differed from ours which are based on the Tiberian Hebrew grammar. The problem has repeatedly been dealt with in recent years, and it is very much in the focus of HUP. It is hoped that the examination of seven occurrences of the roots אֵלֶּל / אֵלֶּל and אֵלֶּל in which G supposedly read other forms of the roots than MT, may contribute to the clarification of the issue under review.¹

KB: (L. Koehler-) W. Baumgartner, Hebräisches... Lexikon zum AT, 3rd. ed. (Leiden 1967)
HR: E. Hatch-H. A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint (Oxford 1897)
Mand: S. Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, 5th. ed. (Jerusalem/Tel Aviv 1962)

¹ Cp. especially: A. Sperber, A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew (Leiden 1966); J. Barr, “Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew among the Ancient Translators” SVT 16 (1967) 1–11, and Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament (Oxford 1968).— For the purpose of the present paper we exclude instances of alleged confusion between אֵלֶּל / אֵלֶּל on one hand and אֵלֶּל / אֵלֶּל on the other. — We leave out the etymological questions concerning the Semitic roots involved (cp. J. Barr, op. cit., 252, 327) and all theories about bilateral roots (cp. A. Sperber, op. cit., 595 sq.). — We shall make no distinction between cases of assumed readings of G which were proposed in the context of interpreting G per se, and cases of the application of assumed G-readings in the context of conjectural criticism of MT.
1. Mich. 1:12 הַנִּיחֹתָה; Schleusner\(^2\): G reads "הַנִּיחֹתָה"; Smith\(^4\): G reads "הַנִּיחֹתָה".
2. Ps. 77:11 הַנִּיחֹתָה; Schleusner\(^6\), Briggs\(^7\): G reads "הַנִּיחֹתָה".
3. Num. 25:1 הַנִּיחֹתָה; Gray\(^9\), BHK\(^10\): G reads "הַנִּיחֹתָה".
4. Ps. 10:5 הַנִּיחֹתָה; Briggs\(^12\): G reads "הַנִּיחֹתָה".
5. 1 Sam. 31:3 הַנִּיחֹתָה; Driver\(^14\): G reads "הַנִּיחֹתָה"; BHK\(^15\): G reads "הַנִּיחֹתָה".
6. Ps. 109:22 הַנִּיחֹתָה; Briggs\(^17\): G reads "הַנִּיחֹתָה" (= Ps. 55:5); BHK/BHS\(^18\): G reads "הַנִּיחֹתָה"; Kraus\(^19\): G reads "הַנִּיחֹתָה".
7. 1 Chr. 10:3 הַנִּיחֹתָה; (Luc) הַנִּיחֹתָה; BHK\(^21\): G l. reads "הַנִּיחֹתָה".

It was the common goal of all scholars quoted to explain what appeared to be cases of striking incongruity between the Hebrew forms and their Greek equivalents. Given the fact that numerous G-translations of the roots הַנִּיחֹתָה are congruous with what is believed to be the empirically established grammar of Biblical Hebrew, it was taken as improbable that in the above-mentioned seven instances of divergent translations, G read the same forms that are found in MT, and it was assumed that one could define the

---

2 Mand., 374, qal הַנִּיחֹתָה I?; 375, qal הַנִּיחֹתָה II?; BDB, 296, qal הַנִּיחֹתָה [ם]וֹדֵע I; KB, 298, pi’el הַנִּיחֹתָה; HR, 163, crux.
3 J. F. Schleusner, Novus Thesaurus... (Glasgow 1822) I, 369.
4 J. M. P. Smith, Micah (ICC, Edinburgh 1911), 43.
5 Mand., 394, pi’el הַנִּיחֹתָה?; 395, qal הַנִּיחֹתָה I?; BDB, 317, pi’el הַנִּיחֹתָה I; KB, 304, qal הַנִּיחֹתָה I; HR, 163, crux.
6 Loc. cit.
7 C. A. Briggs, Psalms (ICC, Edinburgh 1906) II, 177.
8 Mand., 397, hif’il הַנִּיחֹתָה (IV); BDB, 320, idem (III); KB, 307, idem (I); HR, 216, idem.
10 W. Rudolph (1935), 237.
11 Mand., 389, qal הַנִּיחֹתָה; BDB, 298, qal הַנִּיחֹתָה [ם]וֹדֵע II; KB, 298, הַנִּיחֹתָה; HR, 216, crux.
13 Mand., 374, qal הַנִּיחֹתָה I; 394, qal הַנִּיחֹתָה; BDB, 297, qal הַנִּיחֹתָה [ם]וֹדֵע I; KB, 304, nif’al הַנִּיחֹתָה I; HR, 1370, הַנִּיחֹתָה.
15 R. Kittel (1933), 456.
16 Mand., 395, qal הַנִּיחֹתָה I; BDB, 319, idem; KB, 298, polal הַנִּיחֹתָה; HR, 1336, הַנִּיחֹתָה.
19 H. J. Kraus, BKAT XV (Neukirchen 1960), 746.
21 J. Begrich (1937), 1345.
Hebrew forms which were found in the Vorlage of G. Due to the fact that out of fifty-four instances of הָלַךְ in the hif’il with the meaning “to begin”, fifty are translated by forms of ἐρχόμεθα (ἐν-), it was inferred that in Mich. 1:12 (case no. 1) and Ps. 77:11 (case no. 2) G too read a hif’il of הָלַךְ. It was believed as well that in Num. 25:1 (case no. 3) and Ps. 10:5 (case no. 4) G read a nif’al of הָלַךְ, since out of ten instances of הָלַךְ in the nif’al meaning “to be profaned”, seven are translated by forms of βεβηλοῦσθαι. In 1 Sam. 31:3 (case no. 5) a nif’al of הָלַךְ meaning “he was wounded” (not attested in MT) was construed as the Vorlage of G, apparently because of the parallel in Is. 53:5 הָלַךְ — ἐπαράβασθη. In order to find the Vorlage of G “it is in distress” in Ps. 109:22 (case no. 6) it was inferred from translations like Ps. 55:5 הָלַךְ — ἐπαράβασθη, Ez. 30:16 Q הָלַךְ — τορπισθεὶσαται and Esth. 4:4 הָלַךְ — καὶ ἐπαράβασθη, that G read qal or polal of the root(s) הָלַךְ/לָךְ.

The origin of the seventh conjecture (case no. 7) is far more complicated; here we have a striking example of inconsiderate use of HR combined with a wrong application of analogy:

a. Giving the Hebrew equivalents of G, HR were extremely inconsistent in the case of הָלַךְ/לָךְ/לָךְ. It goes without saying that in many instances HR were right in giving exact descriptions, e.g. Is. 23:9 (_pagination) παράβαται: “הלך πο.”; Is. 53:5 (_pagination) ἐπαράβασθη: “הלך po.”; Ez. 21:30 (_pagination) βεβηλε: “הלך”. There are instances, where HR stated only the root, e.g. 2 Sam. 3:29 (_pagination) κατακυνήγωσαν: “הלך”. In some instances we find the sign +: Mich. 1:12 (_pagination) ἔξησε (our case no. 1), Ps. 10:5 (_pagination) βεβηλοῦσται (our case no. 4), Ps. 77:11 (_pagination) ἔσχαμαι (our case no. 2). There is no reasonable justification for their not giving the root here as well; or when they preferred the “crux” — for giving the problematic root in a case like 1 Sam. 31:3 (_pagination) καὶ ἐπαράβασθη: “הלך” (our case no. 5) and exact descriptions in far more difficult cases, like Josh. 11:6 (_pagination) τετροποιημένους: “הלך”, Num. 25:1 (_pagination) καὶ ἐβεβηλωθη: “הלך hi.” (our case no. 3), and Ps. 109:22 (_pagination) τετάρακται: “הלך” (our case no. 6).

b. The nif’al הָלַךְ is the assumed Vorlage of καὶ ἐπαράβασθη in 1 Sam. 31:3 (MT הָלַךְ: our case no. 5); related to this verbal stem is the noun הָלַך, which in HR generally is the correct equivalent of τραυματικός. But, as said, for τετροποιημένους in Josh. 11:6 (“men turned to flight”) HR gave also the equivalent הָלַךְ, as if this were self-evident. Thus Begrich seems to have concluded that τετροποιημένους is a normal translation of מִשָּׂרֶיך, related to the nif’al of הָלַךְ, and that the Vorlage of the finite form ἐπαράβασθη must be evidently a finite form of the nif’al of הָלַךְ: “L(egendum) pr(o)b(abiliter) c(um) GL (ἐπαράβασθη) הָלַךְ.”
Underlying this critical approach is the assumption that in regard to the conjugation-system of ʕayin-verbs and yod-verbs G followed basically the same rules as those of the established Tiberian grammar, i.e. the translators knew in which respects these verbs are similar to and in which respects they differ from each other. This enabled them to judge which forms belong either to the first or to the second category, and which forms belong to both.

Many instances in G indeed corroborate such an assumption. Excepting the problem of vocalization and dealing only with forms which are differentiated by the gemination or non-gemination\(^{22}\) of the second strong, radical consonant, it is possible to argue that, e.g., in the cases of הָיְדָה — הָיְדֵה and רָוֹר — רָוֹרֶ in G knew how to differentiate between:

a. geminated forms belonging only to yod-verbs: Gen. 29:3 רְלֵּל (qal לְלֵל) — קָאַיְּלַל (qal לְלַל) — קַיְּיִלַל (qal לְלַל) — קָאַיְּלַל (qal לְלַל); Ps. 74:14 בֵּן (pī'el בֵּן) — בֵּן (qal בֵּן) — בֵּן (pī'el בֵּן) — בֵּן (qal בֵּן);

b. geminated forms belonging both to יָי-verbs: Gen. 29:10 הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה) — הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה) — הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה) — הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה);

c. geminated forms belonging both to יָי-verbs and to יָי-verbs: Judg. 10:8 הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה) — הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה) — הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה) — הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה); Nah. 2:5 הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה) — הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה) — הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה) — הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה);

d. non-geminated forms belonging both to yod-verbs and to yod-verbs: Ps. 16:9 הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה) — הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה); Gen. 29:10 הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה) — הָיְדָה (qal הָיְדָה)

It is true that in some of these examples the grammatical forms themselves do not indicate to which verb they belong — whether to a יָי-verb or to a יָי-verb. Yet in all cases the semantic differences between the יָי-verbs and the yod-verbs are so clear, especially in respect to the intransitive force of the one and the transitive of the other, that the translators could rely on the context in judging which is which. It would therefore be erroneous to conclude on the basis of such “correct” translations that G always knew exactly in which conjugations 1. only a יָי-verb can have geminated form,

\(^{22}\) In the present discussion the terms “gemination” and “geminated” refer to

1. Hebrew verb-forms, in which the second strong radical is repeated, i.e. in which the second and the third strong radical is identical: qal, pī'el, pu'al, hippa'el of יָי-verbs, polel, pulal, hitpolel of yod-verbs; hitpalpel;

2. Greek reduplicated verb-forms.

The terms “non-gemination”, “non-geminated” (= “simple”) refer, accordingly, to

1. Hebrew verb-forms belonging to the above-mentioned verb-classes without a written third strong radical (the question of dagesh and non-dagesh forms is of no relevance for the present discussion);

2. Greek non-reduplicated verb-forms.
2. only a יִּתְנָה-verb can have non-geminated forms, 3. both a יִּתְנָה-verb and a יִּתְנָה-verb can have geminated forms, and 4. both a יִּתְנָה-verb and a יִּתְנָה-verb can have non-geminated forms.

III

One can only infer indirectly from the translation the scope of the Greek translators’ knowledge of Hebrew grammar in general and their method of discovering the root of a given biblical verb-form in particular. In order to achieve a better understanding of the methods of G, it may be useful to glance at the methods applied by their Greek teachers — the Alexandrian grammarians — in defining the basic stem of a given Homeric verb-form. This can be illustrated by two instances in which Aristarchos (the head of the analogistic school in Alexandria, first half of the second century B.C.E.) tried to reduce two difficult Homeric verb-forms to their present stem:

a. Aristarchos thought, that Iliad 13:543 ἔκφθη (till today unexplained) derives from ἔποματο, the aorist of which in his opinion ought to be Ἡρόθη or ἐφρθη — both mere conjectural forms, which became by “diaeresis” ἔκφθη, as ἥγη became ἔγη, ἥλη became ἔαλη, ἥλω became ἔαλω. Neither Aristarchos nor his pupils knew, that the forms ἔαγη, ἔαλη, ἔαλω are the basic ones, with an original digamma before the -α-, and that the first η- in the forms ἥγη, ἥλη, ἥλω, is the result of the contraction of εα-.

b. Aristarchos read II. 2:137 (15:10; 24:84; Od. 20:106) ἐλαται/ἐλατο instead of ἐλαταί/ἐλατο. The latter belongs to ἔμαι/ἐμμην; Aristarchos derived his form from ἐναι by the analogy between Homeric ἐμμην and non-Homeric ἐμμην, which in New Attic and koinè is the same as ἐν.

23 This does not involve any theory concerning the time or the place of origin of the Greek translation(s), recension(s) and revision(s). The formal grammar of Greek taught throughout the Greek ὀλκομενε in the period between 200 B.C.E. and 1300 C.E. was essentially the Alexandrian grammar.


26 There is a form ὑφθη only from ἀποτο.

27 A. Lentz, Herodiani Technici reliquiae (Leipzig 1868) II, 87.


29 Lehrs, op. cit., 326.

30 Schwyzer, op. cit., 679 ff.

31 Lentz, op. cit., II, 92; 125; 163.

Three aspects of this method are of special importance for the present discussion:

1. The Alexandrinian grammarians taught the necessity of finding the basic stem in order to determine a given verb-form.

2. Already at that time the grammarians thought — due to an erroneous conception of the “basic” stem — that the present indicative is the basic form of the verb and that the other tense-stems of the verb had to be derived from or reduced to the present indicative.

3. In problematic cases the derivation or the reduction of certain verb-forms was accomplished by the method of analogy or form-association.

IV

We may assume that the translators of OT had learned Greek grammar as anyone in those days who was not illiterate, and that they would have been able to find without difficulty the present indicative of most of the Greek verbs then used. They certainly knew the following principles of the Greek verb-system: the perfect-stem is characterized by geminated (reduplicated) forms — λέλοιπε, γέγονε, δέδωκε, which correspond to simple (non-geminated/non-reduplicated) forms in the basic stem — ἔλιπε, ἔγένετο, ἔδωκε (in our cases, like in many others, the strong aorist stem), and which correspond either to simple (non-geminated/non-reduplicated) forms or to geminated (reduplicated) forms in the present-stem — λέπει, γί(γ)νεται, δίδωσι.

In most cases they would have known whether the present-stem (the grammarians pseudo-basic stem) is simple or geminated. However, there are cases where they could not have been positive about it, primarily concerning those verbs, which in a certain tense-stem gave birth to a whole new paradigm in Hellenistic Greek, as is the case with the perfect-stem in the following “Septuagint-paradigm”: present ἐγείρεται intransitive “he awakes”, future ἐγερθήσεται, aorist ἐγέρθη, perfect ἐγρήγορε “he is awake”, pluperfect ἐγρηγόρει “he was awake”, — new present γρηγορεῖ also “he is awake”, imperfect ἐγρηγόρει also “he was awake”, future γρηγορήσει, aorist ἐγρηγό-ρησε / ἐγρηγορήθη.

There are in G many new forms of κραζέω “to shout”: besides the older forms κραζέω, κεκραζέω, ἐκραζέω, κέκραζο, we find geminated ἐκέκραζο and ἐκέκραζε, and the simple κραζέω and ἐκραζέ. The old intransitive perfect ἐστηκόμεν “to stand” acquires a parallel form in the present στήκειν, complete with many indicative forms, participles, compounds, etc.

33 Thackeray, ib., 224 f.; 247 f.; 252 f.; 263; 266; 273. Cp. also πείθω and πέτομαι, 281 f.
Given the mixture of simple and geminated forms in one and the same paradigm (the old contrast of simple and geminated forms having lost its grammatical and semantic function) and a linguistic competence on the part of the Jewish translators which could hardly be greater than that of the great Alexandrian scholars, it is probably not correct to assume that they were able to judge with certainty, wether the “basic” stem in each of the above-mentioned Greek forms was a simple or a geminated one. On the contrary, we may assume that because of their analogistic linguistic approach (which was, as we have said, the prevalent one among their contemporary pagan scholars) they were inclined to adopt the theory that any simple or geminated form in one part of the paradigm might belong to a simple and/or geminated “basic” stem, without there being any clear-cut semantic differences between the simple forms on the one hand and the geminated ones on the other hand. Thus, like all their contemporaries, who had to deal with questions of Greek grammar (and who were not strongly influenced by atticism), the Jewish translators would have maintained that 1. the geminated form ἐκκράγηςε is pluperfect of geminated perfect κεκράγαςε, which belongs to simple present κράξε, and/or geminated strong aorist belonging to the same simple present, and/or imperfect of geminated present κεκράγες; 2. παρέστηκε is a compound-form of (geminated) perfect ἔστηκε, which belongs to (geminated) present ἵσταται, and/or a compound-form of imperfect ἔστηκε of simple present στήκα; 3. ἐγρηγόρευς is pluperfect of geminated perfect ἐγρηγόρευ, which belongs to simple present ἐγείρεται, and/or imperfect of geminated present γηγορεῖ.

V

After this short digression into problems of Greek grammar, we can now return to the question of how did G presumably cope with problematic Hebrew verb-forms. Basically, there is no great difference between the above illustrations and the way of answering the question as to which bases the Hebrew forms יהוה and ויהיה belong? It can be said, mutatis mutandis, that the simple form יהוה is imperfect hif’īl of the geminated base(s) יהוה, and/or imperfect hif’īl of the simple base(s) יהוה/יהוה, and/or imperfect qal of the simple base יהוה; the geminated form יהוה is po’el of the geminated base(s) יהוה, and/or po’el of the simple base(s) יהוה/יהוה.

This comparison between Greek and Hebrew is not meant to suggest any similarity between the function of gemination (reduplication) in the Greek verb-system and the function of germination in the Hebrew verb-system. Of importance here is the fact, that there are external similarities between certain Greek and Hebrew verb-forms, which allow us to assume that the Greek
translators, faced with forms of הבָּלַה, שלָלַה, and לֶלַה, came to conclusions which were much the same as those presented above in relation to certain ambiguous Greek verbs.

Thus it was possible for G to suppose that a gminated nominal form like בֶּלַח belongs not only to a gminated base יָלָה “to wound”, but also to a simple base ‘לָה “to turn”, and hence to translate מִשְׁלָה not only by τραυματία “wounded men” (passim), but also Josh. 11:6 τετροπωμένως “men turned (to flight)”, i.e. מִשְׁלָה as belonging to 2 Sam. 3:29 דֶּלָה — כַּתְנַתְנָהוֹסָן “they shall turn upon...” 34 Different translators offered different translations of Is. 51:9 שלָלַח by reducing it to different members of the family של: LXX: κατακόψασα, καταστρώσασα (καταστρώσα?), διαρρήξασα; α’: τραυματίσασα; θ’: διαλύσασα; α’: ὡς δινοποιήσας / ὀδινοποιήσας. 35

The problems involved in cases like these are far greater than those involved in the above-mentioned Greek verbs or in Hebrew forms like הָלַח and מִשְׁלָח. In the first case no problems of semantics are involved, in spite of the mixture of gminated and simple forms; both the perfect-stem and the two possible present-stems have basically the same meaning: κακραγέναι, κακράγεναι and κράζειν mean “to shout”; both ἔστάναι / ἐστήκέναι and στήκειν mean “to stand”, and ἔστασθαι means “to stand up”; both γρηγορεῖναι and γρηγορεῖν mean “to be awake”, and ἐγείρεσθαι means (intransitive) “to awake”. In the second case, it was as easy then as it is today to judge by the context to which verbs belong the ambiguous forms הָלַח and מִשְׁלָח. But in some occurrences of הבָּלַה, שלָלַה it was apparently as impossible then as now to decide by the context not only whether a given verb-form belongs to הבָּלַה or to שלָלַה, but also to which of the different של it belongs. Is. 53:5 שלָלַח, according to LXX (ἐπτραυματίσθη) and BDB (319) belongs to של “pierce”, whereas according to α’ (βεβηλωμένως) and KB (307) it belongs to של “profane” 36. Lev. 21:7 (14) שלָלַח, according to LXX (βεβηλωμένα) and BDB (321) belongs to של “profane”, whereas according to KB (307) it belongs to של “pierce”. In cases like these the decisions are apparently not based either on grammar, syntax, or context, but rather on theology, etymology, or literary preference.

34 Cp. (Ps. 19:7) מְשַׁלַח — כַּתְנַתְנָה with (Job 38:33) מְשַׁלַח — τροπαίοι.
36 H. Hegermann, Jesaja 53 (Gütersloh 1954), 39 f.
In view of all these difficulties on the one hand and G’s limited knowledge of grammar and etymology on the other, it can cause no wonder that analogical reasoning was the only safe way by which G could hope to arrive at acceptable solutions. Therefore the translators assumed for the verbs לַהֲזָה/רָיָה/לַהֲזָה the same relationship which they found to exist between other verbs in general and other "שֶׁ-ְרְשא" verbs in particular.

VI

A. Mich. 1:12 רָיָה - הָרְצָה (case no. 1) and Ps. 77:11 רָיָה - הָרְצָה (case no. 2):

1. Hif"il of רַכִּי (Ex. 40:21 רָיָה - וַיִּכְּפֵס וּפֶדֶת; Job 38:8 - אָפַרְגַּע וְדָעֵל) is semantically the same as qal of רַכִּי (Ex. 40:3 רַכִּי - וַיִּכְּפֵס וּפֶדֶת; Ex. 33:22 רַכִּי - וַיִּכְּפֵס וּפֶדֶת)37. By analogy G could conclude: Gen. 9:20 רָיָה - וַיִּכְּפֵס; therefore Ps. 77:11 רָיָה - הָרְצָה; i.e. hif"il and qal of לַהֲזָה can have one and the same meaning.

2. a. qal of רַכִּי (Ex. 33:22 רַכִּי - וַיִּכְּפֵס וּפֶדֶת) is the same as qal of רַכִּי (Job 1:10 רַכִּי - וְהָרְגַּע פְּרַגַּז; b. qal of לַהֲזָה (Ps. 38:7 רָיָה - וַיִּכְּפֵס וּפֶדֶת; c. qal of רַכִּי (Ex. 23:27 רַכִּי - וַיִּכְּפֵס וּפֶדֶת) is the same as qal of רַכִּי (Deut. 7:23 רַכִּי - וַיִּכְּפֵס וּפֶדֶת) and d. qal of רַכִּי (Ex. 33:19 רַכִּי - וַיִּכְּפֵס וּפֶדֶת) is the same as qal of לַהֲזָה (Job 41:4 לַהֲזָה - וַיִּכְּפֵס וּפֶדֶת).

3. By analogy G could conclude: perfect qal of רָיָה in Mich. 1:12 רָיָה - הָרְצָה is the same as perfect qal of לַהֲזָה in Ps. 77:11 (רָיָה - הָרְצָה; which is the same as imperfect hif"il, and/or qal of לַהֲזָה, and/or hif"il of לַהֲזָה in Gen. 9:20 לַהֲזָה - וַיִּכְּפֵס).

4. This we may summarize in two equations of proportion:

\[
\frac{רָיָה}{הָרְצָה} = \frac{רַכִּי}{רַכִּי} = \frac{לַהֲזָה}{רָיָה}
\]

B. Num. 25:1 לַהֲזָה - וַיֵּכְּפֵס וּפֶדֶת (case no. 3) and Ps. 10:5 לַהֲזָה - וַיֵּכְּפֵס וּפֶדֶת (case no. 4):

37 The nouns which belong to the verbs סְכֵּפַס and (פֵּרְשָׁה) סְכֵּפַס are used synonymously also in translating nominal forms of the root נַשְׁכֵּס: (Ps. 105:39 נַשְׁכֵּס - סְכֵּפַס). (Is. 5:5 נַשְׁכֵּס - פְּרַגַּז).
38 כָּפַס and כָּפַס are used synonymously also in translating אִשֵּׁה; the first passim, the second in Job 31:10.
39 אִשֵּׁה and אִשֵּׁה are used synonymously also in translating אוֹרָה; the first passim, the second in Ex. 30:14.
1. Intransitive present בֶּבֶּתַלְדוּתָּא translates generally imperfect nif'al of לַלְוָה (e.g. Is. 48:11 בַּלְוָהוּ - present בֶּבֶתַלְדוּתָּא; Ez. 22:26 לַלְוָהוּ - imperfect of בַּבִּתַלְדוּתָּא); intransitive aorist בֶּבֶתַלדְּוָתָּא translates generally perfect nif'al of לַלְוָה (e.g. Ez. 25:3 בַּלְוָהוּ - בֶּבֶתַלדְּוָתָּא).

2. There are forty-six instances where intransitive forms of the root אָכַם are translated by intransitive forms of מַעְיָן (which in seven instances translates forms of לַלְוָה, as בֶּבֶתַלדְּוָתָּא in two instances translates forms of אָכַם):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>אָכַם</th>
<th>present מַעְיָן(ומַעְיָן)</th>
<th>future מַעְיָן(ומַעְיָן)</th>
<th>aorist יְמִינָן(וּמַעְיָן)</th>
<th>perfect יְמִינָן(וּמַעְיָן)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 × qal</td>
<td>1 ×</td>
<td>3 ×</td>
<td>9 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 × nif'al</td>
<td>5 ×</td>
<td>6 ×</td>
<td>5 ×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 × pu'al</td>
<td>5 ×</td>
<td>1 ×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 × hitpa'el</td>
<td>5 ×</td>
<td>10 ×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 × hotpa'el</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 ×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The forms לַלְוָה and לַלְוָהוּ are both imperfect qal of לַלְוָה.

4. G could conclude: if intransitive מַעְיָן(וּמַעְיָן) translates both nif'al and qal of אָכַם, than intransitive בֶּבֶתַלדְּוָתָּא may translate both nif'al and qal of לַלְוָהוּ; qal of לַלְוָה and qal of לַלְוָהוּ being the same, as shown above, the analogy is obvious; intransitive בֶּבֶתַלדְּוָתָּא may translate (intransitive) qal of לַלְוָה as it translates nif'al of לַלְוָהוּ. That means in our special cases: the aorist יְבֶבֶתַלדְּוָתָּא translates imperfect qal of לַלְוָה in Num. 25:1 (לַלְוָהוּ) as the aorist יְמִינָן translates imperfect qal of אָכַם in (e.g.) Lev. 18:25 (אָכַם); the present בֶּבֶתַלדְּוָתָּא translates imperfect qal of לַלְוָה in Ps. 10:5 (לַלְוָהוּ) as the imperfect יָמִינָן translates perfect qal of אָכַם in Ez. 22:4 (אָכַם).

5. This can be summarized in a formula of analogy:

Since perfect qal of לַלְוָה (Ps. 77:11 לַלְוָהוּ - הֹמֵמִ יְמִינָן) is the same as perfect qal of לַלְוָה (Mich. 1:12 לַלְוָהוּ - הֹמֵמִ יְמִינָן), the relation between perfect nif'al of אָכַם (Hos. 5:3 אָכַם - יְמִינָן) and consecutive imperfect qal of אָכַם (Lev. 18:25 אָכַם - יְמִינָן) is the same as that between perfect nif'al of לַלְוָה (Ez. 25:3 לַלְוָהוּ - יְבֶבֶתַלדְּוָתָּא) and consecutive imperfect qal of לַלְוָה (Num. 25:1 לַלְוָהוּ - יְבֶבֶתַלדְּוָתָּא).
C. 1 Sam. 31:3 ἔλεος — καὶ ἑτραυματίσθη (case no. 5):
1. There is no difference between τετράσκεσθαι and τραυματίζεσθαι, the latter being the denominative verb of τραύμα, which is the regular nomen rei actae of the root τρα'
2. τραύμα means not only “wound”, but also “damage, harm, defeat”
3. Intransitive τετράσκεσθαι and μαλακισθῆναι, πονεῖν and ἄσθενεῖν are synonym translations of intransitive qal as well as of nif'al and hof'al of יָלִין:
   qal: Cant. 2:5 (and 5:8) יָלִין — τετραμένη; Is. 38:1 יָלַי — μαλακίσθη;
   1 Ki. 15:23 יָלַי — ἐπώνεσσα; Prov. 23:35 יָלִין — ἐπόνεσσα; Jud. 16:7 (and: 11:17) יָלִין — καὶ ἄσθενήσω (cp. further Deut. 7:21 יִרְעה אַל — οὗ τρώθηστε); nif'al: Dan. 8:27 יָלִין — LXX καὶ ἄσθενήσως ... θ' καὶ ἐμαλακίσθην; hof'al: 1 Ki. 22:34 יָלִין — τέτρωμαι; 2 Chr. 18:33 (and 35:23) ἐπόνεσσα.
4. G could conclude: if intransitive τετράσκεσθαι, ἄσθενεῖν, πονεῖν translate both hof'al and qal of יָלִין, and intransitive μαλακισθῆναι translates both nif'al and qal of יָלִין, then also intransitive τραυματισθῆναι may translate both nif'al and qal of יָלִין; the latter is the same as qal of יָלִין, as shown above; יָלִין in 1 Sam. 31:1 is (intransitive) imperfect qal of יָלִין; therefore it has to be translated ἕτραυματίσθη in the same way as ἕλεος in Joel 2:6 is translated by συντρίβονται, i.e. by a similarly intransitive form of a verb whose meaning is the most suitable in the context.
5. Thus we acquire the following formula of analogy:
   Since perfect qal of יָלִין (Ps. 77:11 וַיַּלָּא — וַיֵּרֶא) is the same as perfect qal of לִיָּהוּ (Mich. 1:12 לָיַהוּ — וַיֵּרֶא),
   the relation between perfect hof'al of יָלִין (1 Ki. 22:34 וַיַּלָּא — וַיְתַרְּפֵּא) and participle qal of יָלִין (Cant. 2:5 וַיַּלָּא — וַיִּתֵּרְפֵּא)
   is invertedly the same as
   that between participle polal of יָלִין (Is. 53:5 וַיַּלָּא — וַיִּתְרַעֲמָה) and consecutive imperfect qal of יָלִין (1 Sam. 31:1 וַיַּלָּא — וַיְתַרְּפֵּא).

40 Frisk, op. cit., II, 905. — Thucydides, for instance, uses both verbs indiscriminately:
   present 5:10, 8 τετράσκεσται, 4:129, 4 τραυματιζόμενος; perfect 4:57, 3 τετραμένος,
   7:80, 1 κατατετραματιζόμενον.
41 τετράσκεσθαι and τραυματίζεσθαι can mean ‘cause harm, cause bad condition’ (τραυματικά φόρμακα certainly are not ‘wounding’ medicaments). The old use of (ἐκ-) τετράσκεσθαι, ἐκτρομοῦ in the meaning ‘miscarriage’ is well attested in G: Num. 12:12; Ps. 58:9; Job 3:16; 21:10 (σ';); Eccl. 6:3.
42 συντρίβω translates יָשָׂם in 1 Ki. 20:37.
D. Ps. 109: 22 הֶלְכֶּנֶּה — тетάρακται (case no. 6):
1. In translating the intransitive forms of the root(s) חָשׁ/חֶשׁ/חָשׁ, G used
different genera verbi without different meaning: qal of חָשׁ/חֶשׁ in Ps. 44:26 חָשׁ — ἐπαστεινόνθη; qal of חֶשׁ in Hab. 3:6 חֶשׁ — ἐτάκτησαν; in Ps. 38:7 חֶשָּׁה — κατεκαμφθήσασθαι; in Prov. 14:19 חֶשָּׁה — δολισθήσονσιν; in Job 9:13 חֶשֶׁך — ἐκάμψθησαν; hitpolel of חֶשֶׁך — ταραχθήσθησαν; Ps. 42:7 חֶשֶׁךְ — ταραχθήσαται; in Ps. 42:6 (and: 12; 43:5: חֶשֶׁךְ — περιλύθησαν ἐξ (42:12 σ' κατατήκης). This indicates, that both the active forms and the medio-
passive forms have the same intransitive force.
2. Thus we can understand G's translation of the qal and hitpolel of חָשׁ/חֶשׁ by medio-passive forms: Ez. 30:16 חָשׁ — ταραχθήσαται; Joel 2:6 חֶשֶׁך — συντριβήσονται; Zech. 9:5 חָשֶׁךְ — καὶ δυννηθήσεται; Ps. 55:5 חָשֶׁךְ — ταραχθήσθαι; Ps. 77:17 חֶשֶׁךְ — ἐφοβήθησαν; Ps. 96:9 חֶשֶׁךְ — σαλεωθήσεται; 1 Chr. 16:30 φοβηθήσω (the plural in MT is due to constructio ad sensum: פְּלַפְּלָה); Esth. 4:4 חֶשֹׁתָהָה — καὶ ταραχθήσης.
3. From here it is only a small step to the establishment of a formula of
analogy:

The relation between qal of חָשׁ/חֶשׁ (Ps. 44:26 חָשׁ — ἐπαστεινόνθη)
and qal of חֶשׁ (Job 9:13 חֶשׁ — ἐκάμψθησαν)
and hitpolel of חָשׁ/חֶשׁ (Ps. 42:7 חָשֶׁךְ — ταραχθήσαται)

is the same as

that between qal of חָשׁ/חֶשׁ (Is. 66:8 חָשֶׁךְ — ὅδινε)
and qal of חָשֶׁךְ (Ps. 109:22 חָשֶׁךְ — τετάρακται)
and hitpolel of חָשֶׁךְ/חֶשׁ (Esth. 4:4 חָשֶׁךְ — καὶ ταράχθη-
θη).

E. 1 Chr. 10:3 הָלִיךְ — (Luc) και ἐτρωπόθη (case no. 7):
1. We have shown, why הָלִיךְ in 1 Sam. 31:3 could be translated by και ἐτρωπόθη (VI A, case no. 5); why הָלִיךְ in Num. 21:1 could be translated by ἐβεβηλώθη (VI B, case no. 3); and why מִלְכָּה in Josh. 11:6 could be translated by τετροποιούμενος (V).

From this derives the following formula of analogy:

The relation between passim מִלְכָּה — τραυματιάι
and 1 Sam. 31:3 הָלִיךְ — και ἐτρωπόθη
is the same as

that between Lev. 21:7 (14) מִלְכָּה — βεβηλομένη

44 Cp. Jer. 4:24 מִלְכָּה — ταρασσομένος; Dan. 8:7 מִלְכָּה — LXX και ἐπίθετο, θ’
καὶ ἐξηγιράνθη; Dan. 11:11 מִלְכָּה — LXX και ὀργίσθησαται, θ’ καὶ ἀγριανθησαται.
We may summarize our results in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>case no. 4: Ps. 10:5</td>
<td>case no. 3: Num. 25:1</td>
<td>Lev. 21:7 (v14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθρώποι</td>
<td>ἄνθρωποι</td>
<td>ἰδρυματίας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ ἁρματούσαι</td>
<td>καὶ ἢρμάτωσαν</td>
<td>ἢρματοσσαν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>passim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱεράτα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταντησάτωσαν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>case no. 1: Mich. 1:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπίθετο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἢρξατο</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ps. 55:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπικράτησι</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII
CONCLUSIONS

In seven cases, where G is supposed to have read forms of the roots חליים/יהו which are different from the forms found in MT, a close examination reveals that there is no valid evidence of such different readings. On the contrary, the theory of different readings, certainly in relation to the seven instances under discussion, is based upon improbable presuppositions concerning G. Having proven that G tended at times to apply linguistic methods which had their counterpart in Greek grammar of the time, i.e. methods based on the heuristic principle of analogy or form-association, we may assume that in all seven instances G read the same forms as found in MT.

It should be noted that we concerned ourselves here only with the theory of analogy in regard to the Hebrew forms involved which the translators seem to have followed. We do not believe that a theory like this one should be applied, without modification, to the textual interpretation of the Hebrew forms *per se*. We did not attempt to explain MT; we only tried to contribute to a better understanding of G.