THE INTERPRETATIVE ELEMENT IN TRANSLITERATION

BENJAMIN KEDAR-KOPFSTEIN

Occurrences of Transliteration

1.0 Every act of translation is an act of interpretation. This commonplace is generally taken as referring to our empiric recognition that messages of some ambiguity or obscurity in the source language sometimes are elucidated through the process of translation. The statement, however, from the linguist’s point of view possesses also a theoretic validity: the structural singularity of any language precludes the existence of an accurate equivalent for any of its constituents within the framework of another language. Thus even the rendering of the most simple lexical item and of the most ordinary grammatical construction, comprises an element of interpretation.1 The present paper aims to demonstrate that a most direct interpretation takes place at an even more elementary stage of the translator’s work, namely whenever he refrains from substituting a word from the target language for a word of the source language, but leaves it untranslated. In other words, even whenever the translator just transliterates, he inevitably offers an interpretation.

1.1 For the present comparison of the Bible and some of its VSS it seems convenient to employ the common term ‘transliteration’ as broadly as possible to cover cases in which a word is left untranslated, and is presented in its original form, either in (graphic) transliteration or in (phonetic) transcription.2

1.2 Essentially, transliteration runs counter to the very purpose of translation which is meant to make the original text comprehensible to the speaker of a foreign language. Yet transliteration is a constant companion of translation.


Consequently there must be very compelling reasons for its use. Augustine (354–430 C.E.) remarks on these\(^3\): “quamquam et hebraea verba non interpretata saepe inveniamus in libris... quorum partim propter sanctiorem auctoritatem, quamvis interpretari potuissent, servata est antiquitas ..., partim vero in aliam linguam transferri non potuisse dicuntur”. Here, then, a distinction is made between a volitional reason (religious reverence, style) and a linguistic compulsory one (unfeasibility of translation). A more systematic survey would present the following motives for using transliteration:

1.21 a) *Desire for the Preservation of some of the Original Mood.* The translator may wish to remind his readers of the original setting and locality. A considerable number of examples may be culled from the classical and modern Bible VSS. Augustine in the passage quoted above, mentions ‘amen’ and ‘halleluia’. G and V maintain οἶψαι and ‘ephi’ respectively for נדיבא in some places, though a translation (μετρον and ‘modius’) is available in others. Similarly, HS has ‘Epha’ against Lth ‘Scheffel’.\(^4\)

1.22 b) *Nonexistence of an Equivalent in the Target Language.* The translator may be unable to find a term in the target language by which could be adequately rendered the word in the source language. Sometimes this amounts to a confession of ignorance: the translator does not understand the original and thus cannot even look for a proper equivalent, let alone find one. Yet it would be unjustified to attribute the majority of transliterations in the biblical VSS to the translators’ ignorance. On the contrary, many cases, if not most, obviously resulted from their judging the original word so peculiar that no counterpart for it can be found in the target language.\(^5\) Such judgment is hardly justifiable on objective grounds, since in theory no lexical item of one language does ever have an accurate equivalent in another. In practice, though, an approximation to the meaning of any word of the source language is always possible.\(^6\) This can be proved by the fact that what one VS transliterates,

---

\(^3\) Doctr. christ. ii, 11–16.

\(^4\) The number of VSS to be compared in this study had to be limited. It is hoped that the juxtaposition of ancient VSS, (LXX, V, P, T), the classical first translations into European vernaculars (Lth, KJ), and modern scholarly renderings (NWT, HS, BR) suffices to put the problems in full relief.


\(^6\) R. Jakobson, “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation” (*Harvard Studies*, see above note 1), 233: “... on the level of interlingual translation, there is ordinarily no full equivalence between code-units, while messages may serve as adequate interpretations of alien code-units or messages”. 234: “All cognitive experience and its classification is conveyable in any existing language. Whenever there is deficiency, terminology may be
i.e. considers untranslatable, another VS translates, e.g.:

Is. 34:14  שָׁמָּהֲנוּ אָנֹ Humanities in the Bible
LXX:  δαμόνια ὁνοκενταυροῖς

Aqu., Sym., Th.: σιμ... ιωμ

Moreover, other reasons than semantic considerations for the introduction of transliteration can be discerned: VSS translate ἱερός (LXX ἱερός, V ‘sacerdos’, KJ ‘priest’ and the like), but transliterate לֶוֶת (LXX λεβίτης, V ‘levite’, KJ ‘Levite’). The use of transliteration here is not due to the inavailability of approximate equivalents, 7 but can best be explained by the fact that לֶוֶת is also a proper name for which transliteration is the usual procedure (cp. below). In the practice of translation, however, there admittedly exists a remarkable difference between say יְהוּדָה and כְּרוֹב as regards the facility of finding some substitute for them in the target language. 8

1.23 c) Proper Names. Theory and practice of translation agree on the principle that proper names should be transliterated. This category includes names of persons, place-names, ethnic names, terms for unique objects, and the like. 9 The subcategory of personal names is the most clearly delimited one; here the demand for transliteration seems to be strict as well as uncomplicated. Thus it appears to be methodologically advisable to confine this study to the personal names in the Bible and their treatment in the VSS. From the problems recognizable here, we may deduce the even greater difficulties in other subcategories.

Semantics of Proper Names

2.1 The function of a proper name is, to a certain extent, opposed to that of a common noun; it is identification rather than classification. Whereas the common noun (henceforth: noun) subsumes particular specimens under one class-concept with a varying degree of comprehensiveness, the proper name (henceforth: name) aims to single out one person (place, object, etc.) from

qualified and amplified by loanwords, or loan-translations, neologisms or semantic shifts, and finally, by circumlocution”.

7 This applies to LXX in the first place; other VSS followed its lead. Yet respect for a sanctioned rendering is in conflict with semantic translating.

8 In theory, however, Greek σωφός for חכם is hardly more accurate than γράφω would be for כריסט. Yet the latter is transliterated by LXX and the later Greek VSS: χριστός. As to the lack of equivalence between ‘sages’ of different peoples, cp. ‘σοφοτατ’ (Plato, Apology iv) rendered by ‘Gelehrte’ (Claudius) but transliterated ‘Sophisten’ in another translation (Schleiermacher).

9 The uniqueness of an object is open to debate. Cp. Jerome’s remark on מוסא (Epist. 64, 15). Further: the Kaaba (a sacred building housing a sacred black stone), the Taj Mahal (a mausoleum), the Colosseum (an amphitheater) and the like.
among the group of similar beings (or items). On this function there exists consensus among scholars. The matter in dispute, however, is whether names do or do not have a meaning; whether they are “the most significative of all words” (Breal), or rather should be judged “unmeaning marks” (J. S. Mill). The correct position seems to be the one that views personal names as part of the whole semantic system. Nouns differ in the degree of their generalization: the narrower their range, the more information they supply. Names are the most specific, the narrowest terms possible. Thus, to the informed hearer, they convey the greatest amount of information. In other words, they are most meaningful. Because of their extreme specification, names — each applicable exclusively to one person — neither need nor permit translation.

2.2 Yet a name is not only an identification mark the way a serial number would be. On the contrary, in its formation a name is very similar to, if not identical with, other ordinary linguistic units. Its formal elements may provide a clue as to the sex of its bearer and the period and region in which the person lived. The name sometimes exhibits recognizable morphemic elements that testify to beliefs and customs, fears and hopes of the name-givers. The significant elements of a name may be irrelevant to its function as an identification mark; but their existence remains a linguistic fact. Transliteration completely obliterates these elements. This becomes especially crucial in the case of biblical names, the significant elements of which have special importance in certain contexts.

Formal Aspects of Transliteration

3.0 The status of biblical names, Hebrew and foreign, within the framework of the Hebrew text, necessarily differs from their status within the framework of

10 M. Breal, *Semantics* (repr. Dover Publications, N.Y. 1964), 176 f.: “It has been maintained that proper names, such as Alexander, Caesar, Turenne, Bonaparte, formed a species apart, and were beyond the pale of Language. And this opinion has some argument in its favour. First of all, the etymological sense of proper names is of no value at all; again the names pass from one language to another without being translated; finally, their phonetic transformation is far less rapid. Nevertheless it may be said that between proper names and common names there is but a difference of degree ....... If names were classified according to the variety of ideas which they evoke, proper names should head the list: being the most individual, they are the most significative of all”.— J. S. Mill, *A System of Logic I*, ch. 2: “A proper name is but an unmeaning mark... whenever the mark meets our eyes or occurs to our thoughts, we (may) think of that individual object”.

11 Crystal, *op. cit.*, 121 f.— S. Ullmann, *Semantics* (Oxford 1962), 71–79.— The fact that a proper name has a rich connotation only “when applied to persons or places well known to both speaker and hearer (Ullmann, *ibid.*, 74) is not exclusively characteristic of it. It has this in common with every specific term. The term ‘a nippet of sycamore (fruit)’ (Amos 7:14) will be for many as uninformative as the name ‘Amos’.
a VS. The response of a Hebrew reader to names like ישעיהו, יחזקאל, יששכר, is essentially different from that of, say, an English reader who finds these names transliterated in his version. To the latter, all of them have the same alien quality. The former distinguishes between the foreign and indigenous names; in these he may recognize a lexical item, detect, a root or pattern and the like. We will have more to say later about the semantic aspect of transliterating of Hebrew names. At this point we wish to mention the formal implications of transliterating. One example will suffice: ישעיהו,  יששכר (Josh. 7:1 ff.), a name that has neither lexical value nor a root otherwise attested within the biblical Hebrew.12 Thus it differs from יששכר and יששכר with which it shares the qātāl-pattern. No Hebrew reader fails to take notice of these characteristics, for whatever they are. Moreover, the passage in which the name יששכר appears, employs verbal forms derived from the root רושם. The similarity of sound is obviously intentional and provides the clue to the story. All this, of course, is lost in the VSS.13

3.1 An immediate practical question for the translator is to what extent a Hebrew name should (and could) be adapted to formal patterns of the target language. The dilemma can easily be discerned from the inconsistency of the Greek and Latin VSS as regards the addition of case-endings to the transliterated Hebrew names. Thus, e.g., for יששכר we have מושא, מוש, מוש, מוש and ‘moyses, -i, -e, -en, -e’ respectively, but for יששכר only the basic form: יששכר (‘david’).14 What interests us in the present study is the observation that the addition, or dialectically also, the omission of case-markers may become the nucleus of a commentary, e.g.:

Dt. 26:5
ארוים אבר יב
LXX συριαν ἀπέβαλεν ὁ πατήρ μου
V syrus persequebatur patrem meum

Neither of the two VSS identifies ארוים אבר with יששכר, yet they differ in their interpretation as to what is the subject of the clause, and what - the object.

Jer. 30:9
הברא את א, אלעזר את דוד מלכесь ואתם שלחتم
LXX (37:9) καὶ ἔγραψαν τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ αὐτῶν καὶ τῷ δαυὶδ βασιλεὰν αὐτῶν ἀναστήσον αὐτὸς

12 But in later Hebrew and in Aramaic עֵכֶּר and עֵכֶּר respectively denote ‘snake’ (Lev. Rabba s. 16; Baba Mets. 84b.). Cp. also Sanhedrin 44b: לַחַת גְּרֶא שָׂמַי עֵכֶּר שְׁדָי עַוּד שֶׁדֶּי. עֵכֶּר.

13 The lingual nexus between עֵכֶּר and עֵכֶּר is so strongly felt that the Chronicler substitutes עֵכֶּר for עֵכֶּר in our passage Josh. 7, but even so LXX fails, of course, to convey the motivation of the name.

14 Similarly the degree of Aramaization in P and T could be compared: שְׁמוֹ, vs. שְׁמוֹ; מַאוֹל, vs. מַאוֹל; מַאוֹל, vs. מַאוֹל, אֲבִילָא, אֱבִילָא etc.
sed servient domino deo suo et david regi suo quem suscitabo eis. LXX, by employing two different cases, comments that only God, not David, will be the object of the people’s service. Not so V (cp. Sym.: τῷ θεῷ... τῷ δαυίδ).

Jer. 23:5

et suscitabo david germen iustum

The Latin text is grammatically ambiguous: it may be David himself who will be raised as a righteous branch (but LXX: τῷ δαυίδ...15).

1 Sam. 9:17

cumque aspexisset samuel saulem

but —

1 Sam. 15:35

non vidit samuel ultra saul

The omission of the case-ending which we have come to expect, is apt to create a doubt as to who of the two forwent seeing the other. More examples could easily be adduced.16

3.2 A more seriously complicating factor in the process of transliteration is the phenomenon that the Hebrew Bible not infrequently uses variant forms of the same name. The most diligent translator cannot aspire to mirror in transliteration the variants and differences of the Hebrew, or even and דן ורינר. Thus even NWT which attempts to transcribe phonetically, makes no differentiation between חנפ and חנפ (2K 8:8, 9) rendering both by ‘Haz’a:el’. We notice a tendency towards standardization of names. This tendency creates a new set of problems.

3.21 Where is the limit of legitimate standardization?

2 Sam. 13:20

VSS transliterate ‘Ammon’ (i.e. ‘Ammon, the usual form of this name). However, the variant אובנ may have a stylistic significance; cp. Qimhi: דָּרָן בְּעוּר. The standardized transliteration practically amounts to judging the variant as insignificant. A standardized transliteration of אָמָרָא (Ezra 4:11) and אָמָרָא (Ezra 7:1) blurs what seems an important information indicated by the graphic variation: in each case the reference may be to a different king (Artaxerxes I and Artaxerxes II).

3.22 The VSS differ in what they consider an insignificant variant, and one important enough to be reflected in transliteration:

15 Cp. Aq.: ‘βλαβτημα τον δικαιον’ against Sym.: ‘βλαβτημα δικαιον’.

16 Jer. 46:17 (LXX 26:17) תְּרֵעַ שַׁפָּרָא, LXX το άνωμα φαραο, V nomen pharaonis (both VSS read שַׁפָּרָא, but LXX ‘the name: Pharao’, while V ‘the name of Pharao...’). 1 Sam. 18:16, 29 — V ‘saul... david’ (it is grammatically ambivalent who is the subject of these clauses). — Nu. 2:9 V ‘in castris iudae’ but ib. 26:19 ‘filii iuda her et onan’ (as if: ‘the sons were Judah, Er and Onan’) etc.
The Interpretative Element

LXX, V, Lth, HS transliterate both forms the same way (e.g. V: ‘nabuchodonosor’). KJ, NWT, BR differentiate.

(1 Chr. 3:5): here VSS use the transliteration of the usual form הבשבי (-eschub), except for KJ, Lth (‘Bathshua’; ‘Bath-Sua’).

(2 Ki 15:1, 13), here only LXX, V harmonize, the other VSS mirror the two different forms. This amounts to an implicit commentary that these are not two variants of the same name, but two different names of the same person.

3.23 This leads to the question of a more radical harmonization that substitutes the usual name of a person for an occasional one. In this respect most VSS are more hesitant, but the phenomenon can still be observed here and there.

All the VSS (incl. NWT, BR) transliterate ירותי (Ex. 4:18) as if it were written the usual way ירחוב. On the other hand, most VSS transliterate faithfully the name ירוחם (Ex. 2:18). But LXXα: Ὀθόρ.

Jer. 22:11

The problem of identification is well known. Most VSS pass the problem on to their readers. Yet a few Greek MSS are the noteworthy exception. They equate with Jehoahaz and Jehoiakim. The Rabbinical commentators took it as an epithet of Zedekiah (Rashi) or Jehoiachin (Qimhi). Little wonder that Jerome, basing himself on Jewish tradition, interprets the name ילוח as referring to three persons (iv, 989): “hebraei putant hoc omnibus convenire, id est et IOCHAZ et IECHONIAE et SEDECEIAE; appellarique omnes filios iosiae SELLEM... quod interpretatur ‘consummatio’ sive ‘completio’; eo quod regnum iuda in ipsis finitum sit”. According to this view the epithet is appropriate for the last kings of Judah because of its lexical meaning ‘consummation’. Here we approach the semantic aspect of names.

Semantic Aspects of Transliteration

4.1 Many a biblical name is identical with a lexical unit ( ينبא, נוצר, לכל, פילך, מֶלֶךְ), exhibits a transparent etymology (よかった, יפורח, יפורח, יפרח), or is composed of recognizable morphemes ( billions, ביביא). The recognition of semantic constituents in a name may be doubtful (e.g. ינקי, ינקי, derived from יד or יד?), or erroneous (לבוש, לבוש), according to the Midrash connected with יפרח, yet it is an unavoidable response on behalf of a Hebrew speaking person. The frequent etymologizing of the Bible is well known, and even more so, the later Midrash is very fond of supplying interpretative legends on personal names.17

17 Qimhi on 1 Sam. 5:4: יפרח יפרח, מפוגה, למסוף, יפרח, דוד, למסוף יפרח, דוד.

Metsudath David on Ezra 2:2: יפרח יפרח, מפוגה, למסוף, יפרח, דוד, למסוף יפרח, דוד.
In most contexts the lexical value of a name is irrelevant and may be ignored by the reader and thus also by the translator. One would be mistaken to draw conclusions from the name מִלֵּךְ (1 Chr. 8:35) or וֹכֵד (Ezra 8:6) as to the social status of their bearer. But on the other hand, a reader of the Hebrew Bible cannot help making a mental note of their identity with the common nouns for ‘king’ and ‘servant’ respectively. And indeed, when one finds that a king’s servant bears the name עֶבֶד-מִלֵּךְ (Jer. 38:7 ff.), this is not without interest. In all these instances all VSS use transliteration, and thus withhold suggestive information. They practice what one is inclined to call negative interpretation.

4.2 This negative interpretation becomes more questionable whenever the lexical value inherent in the proper name has a bearing on the narrative in which it appears. In some cases this linkage between the significant element of a name and the story about its bearer is not expressly stated by the narrator. It remains a matter of dispute in each specific case to what extent the symbolism is intentional: נַחֲלָה (Gen. 4:1), מָלָכֶה, עָרָם, רַע (Ruth Ch. 1), אָרוֹב (Job 1:1). But it is undeniable that in the Hebrew Bible these names and their like are suggestive, or possibly suggestive, of their bearers’ destiny and deeds. Transliteration, as practiced in this instances by all the VSS without exception, blurs the covert linguistic motif and by precluding any symbolical interpretation strengthens the impression of the historicity of the narrative.

4.3 In many biblical stories the lexical value of a name explicitly indicates its significance. The inveterate belief in ‘nomen atque omen’, the biblical כָּנְפֵד (1 Sam. 25:25), finds its expression wherever the biblical author expressly links a person’s name with an event in the narrative. This situation poses a crucial dilemma to the translator. If he fails to reflect the verbal linkage between the name and the background narrative, he not only blurs a most important aspect of the story, but the whole passage in his version may become

---

Such midrashic interpretations of names found their ways into some of the VSS. E.g. Jud. 3:8, 10 קָרָןָּב הַשָּׁוְאָה פָּרָשָׁה; cp. Qimhi: יְקָרָה שַׁמֵּי אָסִיפֵי וֹרִיתָים, אֲבָרֵה מָזְדַּה אֲשֶׁר הָשָּׁמִית שֵׁרַלְתֵיהוּ בְּרָמְשֶׁלָה נָבִיָּה וּשְׁתֵּהוּ. B. Meissner, Babylonien und Assyrien II (1925), 353 maintains that the Semites exhibit an unfortunate fondness of etymology. A glimpse at the Upanishads and Plato’s dialogue Cratylus should convince us that etymological speculations on language can be found among non-Semitic peoples. — Cp. also I. L. Seeligmann, “Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese”, VT-Suppl. I (1953) 150-181.


19 Ibn Ezra on Ruth 1:2: יָדְעוּ מַעֲרַתָּה שְׁתֵּי עָלַיּוֹ שְׁכַרְנוֹ וֶאֱכֶלָה אֲמָרָם שָׁמְתֵיהוּ שִׁיָּרָה עָבֹר בְּכֵד-מִלְךָ (cp. 1 Chr. 4:22). On Job cp. Baba Bathra 15a; Maimonides, Moreh Nebuchim iii, 22.
incomprehensible (cp. below, Gen. 30:13 — V, KJ, Lth). If, on the other hand, the translator chooses to translate the name, thus preserving its lingual nexus with the story, he deprives it of its character as a proper name since most other names are transliterated, as e.g. Aquila’s rendering of ישיםמאלי by σιοσκοὴ θεοῦ in Gen. 16:11 vs. his transliteration of the same name יִסְמַעֵל in Jer. 40:14.20 Some VSS attempt to steer a middle course between Scylla and Charybdis: they transliterate the name but add a qualifier (cp. below Gen. 30:13 – L, HS, BR). Also, this technique entails a deviation from the principle that a name should be transliterated. The VS assumes the character of a commentary, sometimes of dubious reliability (cp. below, Gen. 30:13 – L). Moreover there exists the following complicating factor: in a number of cases the linkage between name and verbal motif may be one of similarity of sounds rather than one of root identity, e.g.: Gen. 5:29 וַיַּחֲלֻם וַיִּתְנַחֲמֵם... והֶלְחָתִים... surely a VS that has opted for transliteration plus qualifier is not entitled to strengthen the linkage; but can it hope to be able to reflect the loose nexus?22

The examples to be adduced are meant to bring into relief the translators’ predicament. It should be noted that not only do the VSS disagree among them in each and every case but also each VS itself exhibits extraordinary inconsistency.

4.31 Gen. 30:13 (בָּאֶשֶרְךָ יְהוֹיָדָע בִּנְךָ יְהוֹשֻעַ אֱלֹהֵיךָ) The VSS transliterate, except for:

L aser quod est dives (cp. LXX some MSS: aσηρ δ ἐστι πλοῦτος)

BR Ascher, Wohl

HS “Aser” (glueckselig)

This is only one example from among the many names in that chapter which are invested with an etymological explanation. There is no consistency to be found in any of the VSS. Thus, e.g. the three that add a qualifier in the verse quoted above, do not add one in v. 24.23

20 On Aquila’s transliterations and renderings cp. Reider-Turner, An Index to Aquila (VT-Suppl. 1966), especially the Hebrew-Greek Index of Proper Names, 319–323.
21 Jerome states in his commentary (quaest. hebr. in genes., ad loc.) “Iste requiescere nos faciet... noe requies interpretatur”; yet in his Vulgate translation, he prefers the rendering ‘iste consolabitur nos’.
22 LXX (and L) strengthen the linkage Gen. 3:20 LXX: ζωή (L: ‘vita’). But the uninformed reader who finds the transliterations εως (eva) in Gen. 4:1 must conclude that Adam had two wives.
23 E.g. HS: “Sie nannte ihn ‘Joseph’ und sprach...”, against: “Aser” (glueckselig), “Gad” (Glueck), “Issachar” (Mietling) etc. — It is noteworthy that P and T forgo the linkage יִשְׁמַעֵל — by using the verb兽 בות for the latter.
4.32 1 Sam. 25:25

בבל רכוסר מן והба נבל יום נבל ה-

LXX δὶ φι κατὰ τὸ ὀνόμα αὐτοῦ συντός ἐστὶν ναβαλ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ
ἀφροσύνῃ μετ’ αὐτῷ

V nabal quoniam secundum nomen suum stultus est et stultitia est
cum eo

KJ Nabal, for as his name is, is so is he; Nabal is his name and folly is
with him

NWT Nabal ... Nabal ... senslessness

Lth Nabal, er ist ein Narr, wie sein Name heisst, und Narrheit ist bei ihm

HS Nabal ... Tor ... Torheit

BR Nabal ... Nabal ist sein Name, und Nebala, Schande, ...

P ... Nabal... יתמרותה

T ... נבל... נבל... ספשתה

Most VSS fail to convey clearly the meaning of נבל, let alone to mirror the
linkage נבל... נבל. V and in its wake Lth, treat only the first occurrence of
נבל as a proper name to be transliterated; the second is taken as a noun and
is translated. Thereby the word-play is reflected. BR preferred the rather
peculiar way of transliterating the noun נבל, adding an explanatory translation.

4.33 1 Sam. 4:21 לא כן... לבל נבל מושךאל

VSS transliterate (e.g. V 'ichabod... translata est gloria').

The only exception is:

BR Ikabod, Ehrelos ... Gewandert ist die Ehre

4.34 Jud. 7:25 כְּבֹּר עַבָּר... בִּיקָס אֲבָא

LXX αρηβ... ζηβ σουρ αρηβ... ικεφκηφ

V oreb ... zeb petra oreb ... torculari zeb

KJ Oreb ... Zeeb rock Oreb ... winepress of Zeeb

NWT Oreb ... Zeeb rock of Oreb ... wine vat of Zeeb

Lth Oreb ... Seeb Fels Oreb ... Kelter Seeb

HS Oreb ... Seeb Rabenfels ... Wolfskelter

BR Rabe ... Wolf Rabenfels ... Wolfthorkel

P בובר... ביתו כביר

T במר... ויב

VSS differ widely in their treatment of the nexus between the personal names
and the place-names. LXX is most consistent in transliterating the names,
including the two elements of the place-names. Most VSS limit their trans-
literation to the elements of the personal name. HS disconnects the personal
names from the place-names, transliterating here and translating there. BR
is the VSS most strongly opposed to LXX, employing translation throughout.
It should not be overlooked that each of these methods contains the nucleus of a commentary: LXX ignores the actual local features and reduces the place-names to mere signposts; BR removes the heroes from the ordinary sphere into that of totemism,24 and so on.

4.35 Well-known are the symbolic names given by the prophets. By their very nature, the lexical values of these names are of utmost importance and thus cannot easily be ignored by the translator. On the other hand, taken as names, these items should be transliterated. Illustrative of the translators’ predicament are the names of Hosea’s children as they appear in the Hebrew Bible and the VSS.

Hos. 1: 4, 6, 9

2:2, 3

ירשאלו... אל רודה... לא עמי

LXX ἰεραθελ... οὐκ ἦλθεμένη... οὐ λαός μου

V izrahel... absque misericordia... non populus meus

KJ Jezreel... Lo-Ruhamah... Lo-Ammi

NWT Jezreel... Lo-ruhamah... Lo-ammi

Jezreel... O woman shown mercy... My people

Lth Jesreel... Lo-Ruhamah... Lo-Ammi

Jesreel... in Gnaden... mein Volk

HS Jezreel... Unbegaend... Nichtmeinvolk

Jezreel... Begnadiigt... Mein Volk

BR Jesreel, “den Gott saet” ... Lo-ruchama, “Thr-wird-Erbarmennacht” ... Lo-Ammi, “Nicht-mein-Volk”

Den Gott saet... Dir wird Erbarmen... Mein Volk

The comparison speaks for itself. Some points are especially note-worthy: most VSS differentiate unjustifiably between ירשאלו and the other two names. Only KJ abides by the principle of transliteration for every name, negative or positive; the motivation of the names thus becomes absolutely enigmatic. NWT and Lth obscure the fact that the same names are used negatively and positively.

24 Whether the names are totemistic or not need not concern us here. The difference between the Hebrew and BR stems from the difference between these two lists: רוחל, אשר, חلد, מחלי... against Kaleb, Nachasch, Chulda... Rabe, Wolf. Cp. Ps. 83:12 BR: ‘Mache sie, ihre Edeln, wie Rabe und Wolf, wie Sebach und Zalmunna...’. — Against LXX cp. Aq., Sym. εν πέτρε (וב discrepan), Sym. εν τῇ κουλάδα (ב Insets).
The first occurrence is transliterated by all VSS. But BR (like some Greek MSS before it\textsuperscript{25}) adds a qualifier: ‘Immanuel, Bei-uns-ist-Gott’. The problem, of course, is the second occurrence. The Jewish scribes had already commented upon this: (Sofarim 84, 5): הרמְשׁוֹן והטָשֵּׁמֶר. הרמְשׁוֹן. אתנְשֶׁךָ והטָשֵּׁמֶר. It is evident that the procedure of each VS constitutes an implicit commentary: if it translates the second occurrence, it interprets like the scribes, if it gives preference to transliteration, it equates this occurrence with the name given in the previous instance. V, KJ, NWT, Lth, P transliterate, but —

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{LXX} μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός
\item \textbf{HS} denn mit uns ist Gott\textsuperscript{26}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{4.37 Is. 7:3} ישוע ישעיהו (יִשְׁעֵי)

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{LXX} καὶ ὁ καταλειφθεὶς Ιασουβ
\item \textbf{V} et qui derelictus est iasub
\item \textbf{KJ} Shear-jashub
\item \textbf{NWT} Shear-jashub
\item \textbf{Lth} Sear-Jasub
\item \textbf{HS} Schearjaschub
\item \textbf{BR} Rest-kehr-um
\item \textbf{P} ישוריהו
\item \textbf{T} ישוע ישעיהו
\end{itemize}

LXX and V take only the element ישעיהו as name. Only BR informs the reader as to the meaning of the name, thus establishing the link with 10:21 ישוע ישעיהו, which is translated by all VSS.\textsuperscript{27}

\textbf{4.4} In addition to his name, a person may be known by a descriptive appellative. To leave such an epithet untranslated and just transliterate it, would be unwarranted: firstly, because the epithet, unlike the person’s name, cannot claim to be an essential part of his personality and thus be unchangeable; secondly, because by definition its lexical value is of significance. Therefore, in order to convey the meaning of an epithet, the VSS tend to translate it. But exceptions are found.

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Cp. Ziegler, Septuagint Isaiah, 147.}
\textsuperscript{26} \textit{BR also in the second occurrence: ‘Immanuel, Bei-uns-ist-Gott’.}
\textsuperscript{27} \textit{Qimhi: ישוע ישעיהו. Ibn Ezra on 10:21: ישוע ישעיהו. The name ישוע ישעיהו (Is. 8:3) is transliterated only by KJ, NWT. The other VSS regard it as symbolic epithet to be translated; see the following examples.}
4.41 Jer. 20:3 (לא) פשחתו (קָרָא ה' שמך)... מֶנְוֶרי מַסְכִּיב
LXX πασχαρ... μέτοικον
V phassur... pavorem undique
KJ Pashur... Magor-missabib
NWT Pashhur... Fright all around
Lth Pashur... Schrecken um und um
HS Paschscur... Grauen ringsum
BR Pashchur... Magor, Grauen
P פשחתו... מלך
T פשחתו... המלך... קהל

The translation found in all the VSS but one aims at establishing a contact with the following verse (והיה ונשך לֵבָב). Curiously enough, T forgoes the linkage and translates v. 4: אנא ממר... מבאר. KJ alone uses only transliteration, and severs also the connection between verses 3 and 4 ("I will make thee a terror..."). At this point it is well to show that the evident tendency towards consistent transliteration is not exclusively dominant throughout KJ:

Zach. 6:12 זכאי שם
KJ whose name is The Branch

The deviation from the principle was caused by the christological interpretation (cp. Is. 11:1 בק דב 'Branch').

4.42 Is. 62:4 לא יאמר... ולא יאמר... לא יאמר... ולא שפמה
cי... כי יקרא תמים הב... לארץ בEnumerator

All the VSS but one translate throughout, e.g.
V derelicta... desolata... voluntas mea in ea... inhabita

Yet Jerome in his commentary (iv, 740/1), stresses the character of these words as proper names where he transliterates them: 'azuba... semema... ephsi-ba... bula'. He further remarks: "hoc est autem hebraicae consuetudinis, ut ex eventu rebus vocabula semper imponent". — The only exception is KJ Forsaken... Desolate... Hephzi-bah... Beulah.

The VSS by translating the words, tend to stress that these are not permanent epithets, let alone actual names. KJ takes as names two of the words but consequently obscures their meaning. There is one remarkable, though inevitable obliteraton in the VSS: The prophet used the words מִצְפָּרָה and וּנְחָבָה probably on purpose so that his hearers be reminded of the names of two queen-mothers of Judah (1 Ki. 22:42, 2 Ki. 21:1). These names are transliterated by all VSS and thus cannot be associated with renderings such as the one quoted above.28

4.43 To a certain extent, then, the choice of either transliteration or trans-

28 E.g. LXX αἰγία (2 Ki. 21:1) vs. θέλημα ἐμόν (Is. 62:4). In Is. also the three later Greek VSS translate, cp. Ziegler. ad loc.
transliteration,  
*i.e.* proper name  
*translation,*  
*i.e.* epithet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>LXX, KJ, NWT, Lth, HS, BR, P</th>
<th>V, Lth, HS, BR, T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen. 41:45</td>
<td>טפצה עשתנה</td>
<td>V, Lth, HS, BR, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt. 32:15</td>
<td>יושדר</td>
<td>LXX, V, P, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam. 12:11</td>
<td>בנים</td>
<td>LXX, HS, BR, P, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 12:25</td>
<td>ידריה</td>
<td>LXX, V, HS, BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 21:19</td>
<td>ממוקד נבי יד</td>
<td>V, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam. 23:8</td>
<td>נפתלי</td>
<td>LXX, V, P, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov. 30:1</td>
<td>אוגר בן יעה</td>
<td>LXX, V, HS, P, T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 42:14</td>
<td>מתחמם קנייה</td>
<td>(LXX), V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth 1:20</td>
<td>מרד</td>
<td>LXX, V, HS, P, T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

29 See above, note 17.


31 LXX: ἄνοιξα θαυματουργος (Is. 44:4 ἄνοιξα θαυματουργος ἁράσια), V: d'dilectus' (Dt. 33:5, 26, Is. 44:2 'rectissimus'), P, T, substitute 'Israel' for the epithet.

32 Here we do not find real translations but explanatory substitution for what appears to be an appellative. LXX, HS, BR, have 'Barak' for בנים, P and T 'Gedeon' and 'Samson'.

33 V: 'amabilis deo'; HS: 'Jedidia (= Geliebter des Herrn)', BR: ('Schlomo, Friedrich... Jedidja, Freund Ihm'.


36 (LXX read the Hebr. differently). V: 'verba' congregantis filii vomentis'. This refers to Solomon; cp. Rashi: ינִכְרֵי שְׁתֵּא הַיָּדָה תַאַ הַחַקְיָה כֶּכֶּרֶסֶת מִרְפָּאִים.- Aq. and Sym. transliterate.

37 LXX: ἡμέραν... κασιῶν... ἁμαλθείας κύριος. V: 'diem... cassiam... cornubis', HS: 'Taucubchen... Zimbblute... Schminkhoeurnchen'.— Aq. and Sym. transliterate.

38 LXX: πικρὰν (δὲ τι ἐπικράνθη...), V: 'noemis id est pulchram...') mara id est amaram'. HS: 'Noemi (Liebliche)... Mara, denn Bitteres...'. (The translation of an appellative frequently brings about the translation of a name, hitherto left untranslated.)
Ambivalence of Function

5.0 Finally we reach the translator's most salient dilemma: words that are employed sometimes as common nouns, at other times as proper names. In specific instances their function is ambivalent. It is obvious that here the translator's decision to offer either translation or transliteration turns out to be a clear-cut commentary.

The dichotomy of a word arises in a variety of ways. It will suffice here to distinguish the three main ones as they present themselves to the translator: a) an ordinary word appears in a context (e.g. in a list) that makes one inclined to assume that the word denotes a person, e.g. מְפִיר (Ezra 2:2), אָבָיווי (1 Chr. 24:31), and the like; b) a word has a strange formation, e.g. נָזִיר (Prov. 30:1), or was taken over from a foreign language, e.g. רַבִּים (Jer. 39:3); so that its quality, name or noun, is not safely discernible; c) the word obviously functions in some contexts as a common noun, in others, just as obviously as a proper name; e.g. אָבָן (Gen. 9:6 'man', 5:3 'Adam'), פִּסָּר (1 Ki. 11:14 – 'adversary', 1 Chr. 21:1 'Satan'). In some instances no final decision as to the character of the word may be reached. Again, the choice between translation and transliteration amounts to an act of interpretation.

5.11 We shall adduce, at first, a few instances where virtually all VSS agree on the character of the word in question:

2 Ki. 15:25 (וּדָהְו תַּא אָדֹנָי). VSS transliterate, but T: אָדֹנָי. Also Rashi: שֵׁל טַעְמוֹר וּרְמָק (but Qimhi: שֵׁל טַעְמוֹר וּעָשֹׁה בָּאָרָהּ שָׁל שָׁל גוֹרָו). 1 Chr. 7:12 (וּלְהוּ אָרוֹן). VSS transliterate, but Qimhi: אֵשׁ שָׁוָא אֶלֶף מְכֹרְמִים. 1 Chr. 15:18 (וּלְהוּ אָרוֹן). VSS transliterate, but P: אָרוֹן.

Ezra 2:2 (מָשְׁרִי נְעָשֶׁה גְּדוֹלָהוּ). VSS transliterate (cp. Rashi: הָשְׁרִי נְעָשֶׁה גְּדוֹלָהוּ), similarly Qimhi:, but P: מְתָבִינָא... מְתָבִינָא. 1 Chr. 24:31 (וּלְהוּ אֶלֶף הקָפָנָא). VSS translate; this interpretation contrasts with the Massora, Qimhi: בַּת וַיְהַמֵּמ אָבֹה (etc).

2 Sam. 10:6 (וְאָבָתָה שֵׁיָּרֵם אֵלֶּה שֵׁיָּרֵם). VSS transliterate, but BR 'Mannschaft von Tob'. BR does not take the word in question as a compound name, but takes it as denoting 'troupes' and only, transliterated, as a name. 2 Chr. 33:19 (וְחָלַת עֵלֶּה גַּבְרִים וְרָהִים). VSS translate (e.g. LXX τῶν ὀρῶν), but V transliterates 'hozáj'.

5.12 2 Sam. 6:3 (וְהָיָה יָפָר אֲבוּאָבָה). 1 Chr. 13:7 (וְהָיָה יָפָר אֲבוּאָבָה). The vocalization constitutes one possible interpretation (cp. 1 Chr. 8:14, Mass. Orient.: וְהָיָה יָפָר אֲבוּאָבָה). The VSS felt free to interpret the consonant form. In order to bring into relief the disagreement between the VSS as well as the inconsistency within one VS, we shall employ the English rendition ('brother') and the transliteration ('Ahio') also for the other VSS.
LXX translate the first occurrence, transliterate the second.\textsuperscript{39}

V translates both. All the other VSS transliterate both occurrences.

The problem is well-known. It concerns the opening verse of the book: does the word under review indicate the prophet’s name or has it the same value as in the second occurrence? Most VSS disconnect the two verses. They translate in 3:1 but transliterate in 1:1 (note, however, BR Malachi, “Meinen Boten”), thus indicating in the latter instance its character as name. Only LXX has in both instances ‘\(\alpha\gamma\gamma\alpha\lambda\omicron\zeta\) (\(\mu\omicron\nu\)).’ According to this conception, ‘messenger’ (1:1) must be considered an epithet and the question arises as to who is its bearer.

Tradition has it that this was Ezra, the scribe; cp. T: מלאכי דרשתך שםיה חנוך (but Ibn Ezra: יש א��ים שםיה חנוך ברא ירוי UITableViewDataSource). Jerome remarks (vi, 939–942): “LXX transtulerunt ‘angelus eius’ ... pro quo in hebraeo legitur MALACHI, quod rectius et expressius dicitur ‘angelus’, id est ‘nuntius meus’. Nec putandum est iuxta quorundam opinionem, angelum venisse de caelo et assumisse corpus humanum... denique exceptis LXX, aliī interpretēs nomen MALACHI, ita ut in hebraeo legitur, transtulerunt. malachi autem hebraei ezram aemintam sacerdotem”.

This is one example how a difficult, or perhaps corrupt passage compels the translator to make his decision. The first words of the verse are obviously names but this makes the problem of ירוי רב לם only more acute, it does not solve it. By combining the two words and transliterating them, KJ, NWT

\textsuperscript{39} 2 Sam. 23:24 רדר LXX exhibits a double rendering: δουδι πατραδεξφου.
present them as a name (cp. Metzudat David)\textsuperscript{40}; V, Lth transliterate only the second component, thus turning it into a place-name (cp. Qimhi)\textsuperscript{41}; LXX, HS treat the two items as common words (רשון ולחם?).

5.22 Jer. 39:3, 13

LXX, V, KJ, NWT transliterate. Of course, they may have considered this to be an untranslatable foreign title. But a reader who encounters this transliteration amongst other personal names (Nergal Sharezer Samgar-Nebo etc.) will probably regard it too as a name; perhaps the VSS also did so. Lth, HS translate (‘der Oberste der Weisen’, ‘Obermagier’). A similar situation can be observed in respect to other titles in the same chapter, or in respect to ריבנשק (2 Ki. 18:17, Is. 36:2).\textsuperscript{42}

5.23 Jer. 46:25 וה множество (מאת) (נהניכא

Nah. 3:8

Most VSS transliterate the word taking it as the name of an Egyptian god. But V, and in its wake KJ, regard the word as a graphic variant of множн; they translate: —

Jer. 46:25 V super tumultum

KJ the multitude

Nah. V (... alexandria) populorum

KJ ... populous (No)

5.31 A most illustrative example of a word of dual function, is אדון. There can be no doubt as to its employment as a proper name in some contexts, e.g.:

Gen. 5:3 שרי אדון. Here all VSS transliterate. On the other hand, the same word functions as a common noun in verses like —

Gen. 6:5 רוחה רוחה האדומים בראש. All VSS translate.

The factual explanation of this duality is irrelevant to our purpose. The biblical narrative implies that the name of the first human being in due course became the appellation of the species. The VSS depart slightly from this view when right at the beginning they speak of ‘man’ and not of ‘Adam’.

Gen. 1:26 נפש המש האדום. All VSS translate.

The problem which the translators now face, lies in the opposite direction: when should they change from the translation ‘man’ to the transliteration ‘Adam’? It is noteworthy that there is no agreement between more than two VSS on this point.

Gen. 2:7 וירא יי אלדים את האדומים P, T O, J and some Latin MSS transliterate

\textsuperscript{40} ר.shape לוחם, כשם אייש.

\textsuperscript{41} שלprimaryKey לוחם נושם ממאסטר, ובי ספר לוחם שרו מפי לוחם ידוע.

\textsuperscript{42} E.g. V: ‘rabsace’ vs. Lth: ‘Erzschenk’.
‘Adam’, the others translate. LXX begins to employ transliteration in Gen. 2:16 (Ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἦσσε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἡμῶν; Β, KJ in 2:19 ἄνθρωπος ἦσσε τὸν άνθρωπον; HS in 2:20 הַמֵּאָרִים); Lth in 3:8 (הַמֵּאָרִים); NWT, BR in 3:17 (הַמֵּאָרִים).

Yet the translator’s individual decision by no means settles the question once and for all. On the contrary, he is now obliged to examine every specific occurrence of the word אדם and decide on its character.

Gen. 2:18แล้ว ביאת אדם לבדו

Only P, TO,J transliterate. The other VSS turn the phrase into a statement of a general truth.

Gen. 5:1 זה ספר תולדות אדם (olicitud אדום)

LXX ἀνθρώπος ... αδαμ
V adam ... hominem
KJ Adam ... man
NWT Adam ... Adam
Lth Mensch ... Mensch
HS Adam ... Adam
BR Adam ... Mensch
P,T adam

The varied employment or avoidance of transliteration points to a broad spectrum of interpretation:

a) ‘this is the history of Adam: when God had created this Adam...’ (NWT, HS, P, T); b) ‘this is the history of Adam; when God set out to create a man...’ (V, KJ, BR); c) ‘this is the history of man; first God created Adam...’ (LXX); ‘this is the history of man; when man was first created...’ (Lth).

Gen. 5:2וירכדו אדם באים את אדם

Most VSS transliterate, but NWT, Lth, HS translate and thus attempt to reapproach the biblical conception as to the semantic evolution of the word.

The translators’ dilemma is not limited to the first chapters of Genesis. There are later occurrences of the word under review that are ambivalent.

Deut. 4:32לָמוּר הָעֵדֶּה אָדָם וַעֲנַיִם אָדָם

The VSS translate, except for TO,J that regard the word as proper name.

Deut. 32:8בָּמֵל פְּרוֹזֵי אָדָם

LXX, V, KJ, BR transliterate ‘Adam’. The implication is, of course, that the Song of Moses refers to an episode which had been told in Genesis; (cp. TJ; Rashi: דוד המלוה).
V is especially prone to introduce the name ‘Adam’ since he associates it with the original sin.

Hos. 6:7: תמהו אהפם וְכָּרֵר הָאָדָם.

V, Lth transliterate; cp. Rashi: אָדָם רָאָשָׁן.

Jerome remarks on this verse (vi, 65): “ipsi autem imitati sunt adam, ut quod ille in paradiso fecerat, pactum meum legemque praeteriens, isti in terra facerent.”

Zach. 13:5 כְּגַם הַקְּנֶּר מִנְּשׂוֹרִי.

Only V transliterates ‘adam’. Jerome states (vi, 908/9): “...agriculturae deditus hominem se probabit, deique subiacere sententiae qui locutas est ad adam ‘maledicta terra in opere tuo...’”.

2 Sam. 7:19 רוא מש וּרְתַחְתָּהּ.

Only V transliterates, ‘lex adam’. Cp. Rashi: בָּשְׂר רָדָם...דַּבֵּר אָוֹר עָשָׂה לְכָּל כָּמוֹ שֶׁשָּׂתֵהוּ לְאָדָם וּרְאָשָׁן.

Eccl. 3:21 רַחֲבָּה בְּכָל הָאָדָם חַיָּה לְמַעַלָּהּ.

Only V transliterates. The lemma to Jerome’s commentary — composed earlier than the translation — reads (iii, 415/6): ‘spiritus filiorum hominis’. Yet in the commentary the theological conception which later caused the V wording, becomes clear (ibid): “hoc autem dicit, non quod animam putet perire cum corpore, vel unum bestiis et homini praeparati locum, sed quod ante adventum christi omnia ad inferos pariter ducerentur”.

Eccl. 7:29 ארָשֵׁה שְׁתֵּא הָאָדָם אֲדָם יִשְׁרָאֵל; cp. Rashi: אַחֲרוּ אֵת הָאָדָם וְרָאָשָׁן יִשְׁרָאֵל, אֱלֹהָיו וְהָאָדָם יִשְׁרָאֵל.

This instance of combined translation and transliteration is taken from the NT:

Gen. 2:7 יְרֵיחַ הָאָדָם לְפָשֵׁת וַיַּחָיה

LXX ἐγένετο δ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζώσαν

1 Cor. 15:45 ἐγένετο δ ἄνθρωπος αὐτόν εἰς ψυχὴν ζώσαν

5.32 The semantic change of the word שֶׁשָּׂתֵהוּ from denoting any adversary to denoting a distinct personality whose task it is to accuse and tempt men, is well known. Later, שֶׁשָּׂתֵהוּ without the article, becomes the proper name of this personality. The translator faces the various shades of meaning in what is to him one linguistic corpus, the Bible. His problem is whether and when to vary his renderings so as to reflect faithfully the meaning of the original.

1 Sam. 29:4 וַתָּהָה לֶאָשֵׁי לְשׁוֹנָה בְּמַלְכָּהָהּ.

44 The logical consequence is the interpretation of this verse as a reference to Eve: שֶׁשָּׂתֵהוּ לֶאָשֵׁי לְלָשׁוֹנָה (Rashi).

45 Here the name ‘Adam’ was introduced in order to put in relief the theological thought (i.e. the radical difference between Adam and Jesus).
Here the VSS, with the exception of T, take it as a common noun.

VSS transliterate, except LXX: ‘διάβολος’, the standard rendering of מִלָּחַם מָזִיר, but some MSS ‘σατανά’.

From these simple cases we turn to the more complicated ones:

Most VSS translate and thus dissociate this angel from Satan. But P, T (and Aq.: σατανα) transliterate.

V, Lth, P, T transliterate. This creates the impression that the people addressed are regarded as adiutores diaboli.

V, P, T transliterate. They convey the idea that in addition to the peace all around, there reigned piety and justice among the people of Israel: the “Tempter” had no dominion over them.

5.33 בֶּן is a noun denoting ‘owner’. But it is also the name of the deity Baal. In its former meaning, the word is translated by all the VSS (e.g. Is. 1:3; Ex. 21:34 etc.). The name of the god is transliterated by all (e.g. Hos. 2:15), except BR: ‘Obmeister’. This latter procedure is an attempt to retain the linkage between בֶּן — ‘owner’ (Is. 1:3 ‘Meister’) and בֵּית — deity (‘Obmeister’). Like all these artificial attempts also this one is doomed to failure: BR translates

---

46 Greek διάβολος (on which see Liddell-Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 568) became the accepted loan-word in the Latin-speaking Christian world (G. Koerting, *Lateinisch-Romanisches Woerterbuch*, 349), and was then borrowed and adapted by the modern vernaculars of Europe (devil, diable, Teufel etc.)

47 Cp. Jerome (vi, 24): “lingua hebreae et syra BAAL interpretatur εξος, id est, ‘habens’. si voluerimus dicere ‘habens me’, dicamus BAALI: et apud utramque gentem uxores viros suos vocant BAALI, id est ‘vir meus... qui me habet in coniugio’. ...denique Aquila diligens et curiosus interpres ‘vocabit me vir meus et non vocabit me ultra habens me’”.
Ex. 21:34 "Eigner...", and ib. 21:3 "Gatte...". The unified translation could not be maintained after all.

Hos. 2:18 תכָּרַא אָשֶׁר אֵלָה תכָּרַא יֵל דֶּרֶךְ בָּלָה.

Most VSS transliterate, thus bringing into relief the rejection of the Canaanite deity. But —

NWT my husband... my owner (cp. Aq.: ὁ ἡμέρα ἡμῶν... ἐχόν με)

BR Mein Mann... Mein Ehemeister

A secondary question arises as to the rendering of a compound name, one element of which is בְּעֵל (2 Ki. 1:2ff.), and בְּעֵל בָּרִית (Ju. 8:33, 9:4). It will suffice to demonstrate the inconsistency of the VSS by a few examples: (the elements translated and not transliterated are in italics).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>KJ, NWT</th>
<th>Lth</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>BR</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בָּאַל μοῦσαν</td>
<td>בָּאַל διαθήκην</td>
<td>בָּאַל βερειθ</td>
<td>בָּאַל-זֶבֻּב</td>
<td>בָּאַל-סֶבּוּב</td>
<td>בָּאַל-בֶרְיָה</td>
<td>בָּאַל-בֵּרְיָה</td>
<td>בָּאַל-בַּרְיָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>beelzebub</td>
<td>baal foedus</td>
<td>baal baalberit</td>
<td>Baal-zebub</td>
<td>Baal-Sebub</td>
<td>Fliegen-Meister</td>
<td>Baal-Berith</td>
<td>Bundesbaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
<td>בָּעֵל בָּרִית</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.34 בְּעֵל בָּרִית occurs in the sense of wickedness (e.g. 1 Sam. 25:25), but also in a more abstract sense of 'utter destruction, death, underworld'. Having such a meaning (the history of which does not concern us here), the word is used in the NT as a name for Satan (2 Cor. 6:15). Thus the word is sometimes transliterated in V, KJ (and Theodotion). The other VSS translate.

Deut. 15:9 דוֹר שׁמֶנֶבֶךָ בְּעֵל בָּרִית

V impia cogitatio et dicas in corde tuo

KJ wicked heart

Deut. 13:14 בֵּנֵי בָלִיָּיא

V filii belial

KJ children of Belial

Nah. 2:1 כִּי לא וְתַסוּכְךָ עֵד לוֹמֵר-בָּרִית

V belial

KJ the wicked

Jud. 20:13 בֵּנֵי בָלִיָּיא

V qui hoc flagitium perpetrarunt

KJ children of Belial

Transliteration implies strongly the personification of evil. It is noteworthy that KJ is not directly dependent on V.

5.35 In the majority of occurrences is the pl. of the common Hebrew term — ‘beast’. Yet in some instances it seems to denote one particular animal with mythical traits. Indeed, apocryphal and rabbinical literature interprets our word in some context as denoting a mythical monster.\(^{49}\) The validity of this interpretation does not concern us here, yet we have to note the fact that the VSS by use or avoidance of transliteration respectively support or reject it.

Job 40:15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>KJV, NWT, Lth</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behemoth</td>
<td>(\theta\eta\rho\iota\alpha)</td>
<td>behemoth</td>
<td>Behemoth</td>
<td>Nilpferd</td>
<td>behemoth</td>
<td>בְּנֵריִי</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In distinction from the rabbis who find this monster also mentioned in Ps. 50:10,\(^{50}\) and from some modern commentators who thus interpret Is. 30:6,\(^{51}\) none of the VSS transliterates the word except in the case under review. Little wonder that this strange word, unique in some VSS, has gained an extraordinary symbolical connotation in several modern languages.

**CONCLUSION**

The rendering of names reflects the ‘misery and splendour’\(^{52}\) of the translation process. Each and every case poses problems that call upon the translator’s utmost ingenuity, but that proves to be theoretically insoluble, in the final analysis. But a number of practical solutions suggests themselves. In each such solution, exegesis is inherent. The choice of one solution constitutes a preference for one way of interpretation and the rejection of others. This dictum decidedly applies to transliteration: the employment of transliteration instead of translation signifies the adoption of one specific interpretation. Transliteration is open to debate in each specific case, like any piece of exegesis.

---

49 Baba Bathra 74b; Enoch 60:7; Slav. Apoc. Baruch 29:4.
50 T: הָרֹר בְּרֶדֶרִי בְּכֵל הָאָוָם (Cp. Rashi).
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