TRANSLITERATIONS OF HEBREW WORDS IN THE GREEK VERSIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

A FURTHER CHARACTERISTIC OF THE kaige–TH. REVISION?

EMANUEL TOV

I

Theories tend to be perpetuated in research, especially so in textual studies. The data to be collected and analysed in this field are so numerous that sometimes scholars are unable to reinvestigate in detail all the evidence on which previous conclusions have been based. As a result, such conclusions will often be repeated in the professional literature without being checked. This is the case with the description of the translation techniques of Theodotion (hereinafter: Th.).

Ancient and modern presentations of Th. stress (1) that Th. had much in common with the LXX\(^1\) and (2) that he is best characterized by his tendency merely to transliterate Hebrew words instead of translating them. The latter characterization of Th. depends chiefly on F. Field’s analysis,\(^2\) which includes a list of 110 transliterations,\(^3\) and is corroborated by a remark of Jerome’s on Is. 19:15.\(^4\)

---

1 Cp. H. B. Swete, An Introduction to the O.T. in Greek\(^2\) (Cambridge 1914) 43.

2 F. Field, Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt (Oxonii 1875) xxxix: “Styli autem proprietas, qua Noster a ceteris interpretibus maxime differt (my italics, E.T.), mos est ejus voces Hebraeas, etiam eas quorum translatio non ita difficilis erat, ánepímuçuç relinquenti, Graecis tantum characteribus pro Hebraicis positis”. Field’s analysis and terminology are influenced by the description of Th. by B. de Montfaucon, Hexaplorum Origens Quae Supersunt (Lipsiae et Lubec 1769) 128–130.


4 Theodotio more suo ipsa verba Hebraica posuit chephpha et agmon (P.L. 24, 254C).
It was inevitable that the labeling of Th. as the transliterator *par excellence* would influence scholars in their opinions about transliterations in the LXX. One striking example to the point is the theory of C. Torrey, who noted a wealth of transliterations in the LXX of Chr.-Ezr.-Neh. and therefore concluded that these books must have been rendered by Th.\(^5\)

The number of transliterations listed by Field has impressed many scholars, but it appears that a good many of them should not be adduced as corroborative evidence for his thesis. His list should be reduced accordingly, by cutting out:

1. Transliterations that are common to the LXX and Th. versions of a certain verse, especially when they occur *passim* in the LXX such as μανᾶ and αραβία, both of which are attested several times for Th. as well. In some cases both the LXX and Th. have a transliteration of the same word, but in different forms. This indicates that the transliterations might have been made independently.

2. Transliterations occurring in Th.-Dan. It has been shown recently in a convincing manner by Schmitt (op. n. 3) that Th. and Th.-Dan. cannot be identified as the same reviser. As a result, examples for Th. should not be quoted from Th.-Dan. (see also n. 31).

3. Collective readings such as α’θ or α’σθ (e.g., Is. 13:22α’σθ τιμ). Since both Aq. and Sym. also are known to have transliterated Hebrew words,\(^6\) Field should not have included these examples in his list, even though intui-

Jerome's statement on Theodotion has not influenced the research of the last centuries: To the best of my knowledge, Jerome's words have been quoted only by Schmitt, *op. cit.*, 57, n. 1.

---


For a more moderate view on this issue, see H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the O.T. in Greek according to the Septuagint* (Cambridge 1909) 31. Thackeray assumed that many transliterations in the LXX of Jud.–2 Chr. and 2 Esdr. (i.e., the transliterations only) “are probably derived from him (scil. Th.).”

tively he may have acted correctly. Moreover, many collective readings are imprecisely transmitted.8

4. Anonymous readings denoted "anon." by Field himself,9 even though some readings are not marked as such, e.g. Jud. 8:26 σπωνον (cp. Field and Brooke-McLean ad loc.).

Thus, according to our count, Field’s original number of 110 transliterations is reduced to 64. This reduction in the number of Field’s examples is not drastic, nor is it a necessary link in our series of arguments, if only because not all the transliterations of Th. have been transmitted to us.10 It merely puts in relief the narrowness of the evidence on which Field’s description is based. It also proves that scholars have followed Field without checking his findings.

II

A second criticism of Field’s characterization of Th. refers to the relation between the number of transliterations in Th. and in the LXX. If Th. is considered the transliterator par excellence, the number of transliterations transmitted for Th. should by definition outnumber those of the LXX. However, the transliterations of the LXX have never been systematically investigated or classified, nor has their distribution among the various books of the LXX been described adequately.11 Thus there is no basis for such a comparison.

An analysis of the transliterations of the LXX and Th. is a conditio sine qua non for a proper understanding of the issue. The subject deserves to be treated in a detailed monograph; however, for the purpose of the present paper it will suffice to indicate only some outlines of such an analysis.

7 D. Barthélemy, Les Devanciers d’Aquila, Supplements to V.T. X (Leiden 1963) 246–53, 261–5 and K. G. O’Connell, The Theodotian Revision of the Book of Exodus, Harvard Semitic Monographs 3 (Cambridge, Mass. 1972) have made it plausible that Aq. and Sym. did not revise the Old Greek translation, but improved upon the kaige-Th. revision. If proved correct, this opinion may pinpoint the origin of many if not most of the collective readings as kaige-Th.


9 A few anonymous readings, however, may be attributed plausibly to Th. in accordance with some other of his readings.

10 See also n. 15.

11 Some work has been done by H. St. J. Thackeray, A Grammar etc., 31–8; H. B. Swete, op. cit., 324–5; F. Wutz, “Die Bedeutung der Transkriptionen in der LXX”, BZ 16 (1924) 193–203, esp. 194; id., Die Transkriptionen von der LXX bis zum Hieronymus (Stuttgart 1933). Cp. further N. Simota’s (incomplete) list of transliterations, AI ΑΜΕΤΑΦΡΑΣΤΟΙ ΔΕΣΕΙΣ EN ΤΩ ΚΕΙΜΕΝΩ ΤΩΝ Ο’ (Salonika 1969), based on the Concordance of the LXX by Hatch and Redpath.
Attention must be paid to the uneven distribution of the transliterations among the various books of the LXX. If we exclude from our statistics transliterations of proper nouns (see below), some books (the Pent. and the Hagiographa with the exception of the historical books and Cant.) contain only a very small number of transliterations or none at all. At the other extreme stand the historiographies Jud.-Chr., among which 2 Ki. presents the largest number, according to our count.

It is important to realize that the number of transliterations in 2 Ki. is relatively much larger than in Th. In other words, if the translator of 2 Ki. had rendered the whole O.T., transliterating by the same ratio, his transliterations would have outnumbered by far those of Th., as far as known, even if all of Field’s 110 examples are upheld. In view of this, Field’s claim that the method of transliteration is characteristic of Th. becomes untenable. It should at least be pointed out that the transliterations of 2 Ki. relatively outnumber those of Th.

In view of the fact that both the LXX of 2 Ki. and Th. contain a remarkable number of transliterations, it is legitimate to ask whether the two Greek versions have something in common. Thanks to the results of Septuagint research of the last decade, the question can be answered in the positive. While it has always been known that Th. revised the LXX, it was only recently that D. Barthélemy and J. D. Shenkel have proven beyond any doubt that the “LXX” of 1 Ki. 22—2 Ki. (Reigns γδ of Thackeray) does not present the Old Greek translation of Kings, but a subsequent revision which Barthé-

12 The numbers of transliterations occurring in the LXX mentioned below are derived from the present writer’s paper “Towards a Classification of the Transliterations in the Septuagint”, presented to Prof. E. Goetchius of the Episcopal Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass. (1967).

13 This fact has not remained unobserved, see H. St. J. Thackeray, A Grammar etc., 31; A. Rahlfis, Septuagintastudien III (Göttingen 1911) 85, n. 2; G. Gerleman, op. cit., 7; J. W. Wevers, “Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Book of the Kingdoms (3 K. 22:1–4 K. 25:30)”, CBQ 14 (1952) 42–3.

The relatively large number of transliterations in 2 Ki. is not justified by the number of hapax legomena or rare words in that book, since 2 Ki. does not contain a larger number of hapax legomena than the other books of the O.T. Cp. M. Schloessinger, “Hapax Legomena”, The Jewish Encyclopedia 6 (1904) 226 ff. For this reference I am indebted to Prof. C. Rabin.

14 For the number and for the method of calculation see below.

15 It should be remembered that not all the transliterations of Th. are transmitted to us (note that the preserved evidence refers mainly to Job, Is. and Ez.). The original translation of Th., therefore, doubtlessly contained a notable number of transliterations.
lemly has called "kaige". It may therefore be assumed that transliteration was inherent in the revision technique as understood by both revisers.

III

A classification of the transliterations of the LXX and Th. helps us to determine why the revisers adopted this technique. The transliterations may be grouped in four categories, each of which has a different raison d'être:

1. proper nouns;
2. technical terms;
3. words probably unknown to the translator, which thus remained untranslated. All these are either *hapax legomena* or very rare;
4. Transliterations of common nouns erroneously transliterated as proper nouns because of the context (such as lists of names, cp. *e.g.*, the transliteration of חָדֶרֶם שְׁיָרִים in 1 Chr. 4:22).

For the present issue it is important to determine which of the four groups of transliterations is most represented in the LXX and Th. Our statistics are based upon the data presented in the *Concordance* of Hatch and Redpath on the one hand, and on Field's list of Th.'s transliterations on the other hand. We count the lexicographical incidence of transliterations only and not their actual occurrences. The transliterations of proper nouns (10 in Th. and an

17 Personal names, geographic and ethnic names, both single and compound.
18 The majority of these are in the field of religion and architecture or are measures and weights. Technical terms may occur *passim* in the LXX (*e.g.*, χερουβιν, μαναας), or occasionally (*e.g.*, ναζαρης, άλοτος), Jud. 13:5, 7; 16:17).
19 We distinguish between (a) unknown words that are left untranslated, and (b) unknown words that are transliterated when probably understood, *faute de mieux*, as proper nouns (*e.g.*, 1 Sam. 20:20 —Δικαίωματον εξ την Αρματαρη [or sim.]; מִמְּשָׁר is a rare word in the O.T.). It is sometimes quite difficult to determine whether a given word has been transliterated as a result of its being a technical term or whether it was left untranslated because it was unknown to the translator. Therefore, numbers of the two groups given below should be considered tentative. See further the appendix.
20 The preponderance of such transliterations in 1 Chr. and 2 Esdr. is readily explained by the fact that these books contain various lists of names.
21 However, when a certain word was left untranslated by two different translators because apparently it was unknown to them, the two transliterations must be counted separately because the same development occurred twice independently. This procedure, however, is not followed in the counting of transliterations of technical terms, since by their very nature they tend to recur in many books of the LXX. This fact explains why we did not count the actual appearances of transliterations. If we would have done so, the transliterations of technical terms would certainly have outnumbered those of unknown
uncountable number in the LXX) may be disregarded, because by their very nature they are a necessary feature of any translation.

The upshot of our investigation is that both in the LXX and in Th. transliterations of unknown words form the largest group (LXX: 108; Th.: 46; cp. appendix), followed by transliterations of technical terms (LXX: 39; Th.: 8) and by group 4 (16 for the LXX).

That the largest group of transliterations is that of unknown words is compatible with our previous conclusion that the largest number of transliterations is evidenced for the two revisers Th. and Reigns γδ (καίγε). When trying to explain the facts, one should be aware that we are dealing with transliterations of unknown words, and then ask: to which techniques could the ancient translators resort in such cases, having neither lexica nor concordances at their disposal? The evidence shows that the translators of the Old Greek translation either attempted to render such a word simply by context, or by its meaning in later Hebrew, or tried to read it in a slightly different way (changing, e.g., the vocalization or interchanging similar letters, e.g., daleth and resh). In rare instances, as a counsel of despair, they left the word altogether untranslated.

The above-mentioned two revisers, too, probably sometimes resorted to sheer guesses of the meaning of unknown words according to the context. However, they apparently preferred to retain the original form by leaving the word untranslated. For the comparison of translation techniques, it is interesting to see how the translators of the LXX dealt with unknown words in the ways described above, while other sources (not necessarily revisers) simply transliterated them. In fact, when comparing Th.'s transliterations

words. But statistics based upon such a method would have given a wrong impression of the translation techniques of the LXX translators.

22 Our explanation of the transliterations of the LXX and Th. differs from that presented by P. Kahle, op. cit., 254–5 for the transliterations of Th.: “names of animals, plants, garments and all sorts of technical terms” which were transliterated because “the Greek-speaking Jews were familiar with such Hebrew words”. Kahle apparently was unaware that the majority of Th.'s transliterations represent hapax legomena or are very rare in the O.T.

23 The relationship between the two main groups of transliterations in Reigns γδ (unknown words 24: technical terms 6 = 4:1) resembles that between the two groups in the whole LXX (107:39 = approximately 3:1).

24 In Jud. 5:7, A... transliterate מִדְרָךְ while δυνατοῖ of B... is a mere guess according to the context. The same is true for the variants κρατοῦσας and κατακυκλωσας (see Brooke-McLean). In v. 11 מִדְרָךְ is rendered אֵדְגֶּשָׁנָּה in B... and διάσχεσαν in A..., both in accord with the preceding δικαίωσάς (cp. further vv. 12, 14 in A...). Other translation guesses of the same Hebrew root are found in Ez. 38:11 מִדְרָךְ — γῆν ἀπερριμμένην and Zach. 2:8 מִדְרָךְ — κατακυκλώσας. The translators of Deut. 3:5
with the renditions he replaced, one notes that the great majority of these renditions are translation guesses. The practice of transliterating was considered adequate by revisers who looked for precision, since it left room for them or for later generations to replace the transliteration by a correct rendition. It is true that this assumption does presuppose a rather highly developed linguistic sensitivity on the part of the revisers. But, in view of kaige-Th.'s root-linked renditions and scrutinous distinctions between translation options, this is hardly surprising.

The above description is not meant to imply that all revisers left unknown words untranslated, or that at the source of the transliteration of a difficult word there always lies a revision: The reviser of Reigns γδ (kaige) and Th. and 1 Sam. 6:18 changed the vocalization of יִרְיָץ to יִרְיָץ (see appendix 1, list b). Only the translation of חַיָּם in Esth. 9:19 approximates our understanding of the Hebrew. The root does not occur elsewhere in the O.T.

יִרְיָץ is transliterated in 2 Ki. 11:8, 15, while in the parallel account in 2 Chr. 23:14 it is inappropriately rendered by the general noun ולך. The word occurs elsewhere only in 1 Ki. 6:9 and 2 Chr. 23:14, both not represented in the LXX.

A difficult word such as מֶשֶׁח is transliterated in 1 Chr. 29:2, while other translators searched for a correct identification of the precious stone: παράλης (Gen. 2:12), σπάρτιον (Ex. 25:7), σμαράγδος (Ex. 28:9), βηρύλλιον (Ex. 28:20). The same applies to the different renditions of מִשְׁרֵי in Ex. 27:3, Num. 4:14, 1 Ki. 7:26(40), 31(45), 2 Chr. 4:11, 16, and Jer. 52:18, while the word is simply transliterated in 2 Ki. 25:14. See further the various renditions of מָשְׂרֵי as opposed to its transliteration in Jer. 8:7.

The transliterations of Reigns γδ (kaige) cannot be compared to the Old Greek translation of that section because it has not been preserved nor to the parallel accounts in Chr. which lack the majority of the sections in which the difficult words occur.

The appendix lists for the LXX (a) unknown words which were left untranslated, and (b) transliterations of unknown words which were probably understood as proper nouns. For Th. no examples of subgroup b could be found (see n. 14 of the appendix). The reason for the transliteration of words listed in both groups is the same. However, the examples of sub-group b (5 for 2 Ki.) are not indicative of precision on the part of the translators.

That at least some of these transliterations were subsequently replaced by translations can still be seen from several doublings in the MSS of the LXX consisting of a transliteration and a translation, e.g. Gen. 22:13 — בְּנֵס הָעַל — ēv φυτὸν σαβεκ. Cp. Wutz, op. cit., 54 ff.; I. L. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah (Leiden 1948) 59.

Transliterations of technical terms are, of course, not covered by this explanation. Their raison d'être differs notably from that of the transliterations of unknown words: the translator had either difficulty finding an appropriate word in the target language or the Hebrew term was so well known to his (Jewish) readers that a translation would detract from the quality of his version. Our explanation of the transliterations of unknown words (the majority in the LXX and Th.) is not affected by that of the transliterations of technical terms. The two groups have a different background.
did not invent this practice for the technique had been used previously in the Old Greek translation.

The practice of leaving unknown words untranslated has been shown to be characteristic of *kaige* in Reigns γδ and of Th. Unfortunately, the present state of our knowledge does not allow us to be more specific in our statements about the relationship between Reigns γδ and Th. (i.e. the notes referring to the contents of Origen’s sixth column). It is probable that Barthélemy is correct in assuming that the two⁳⁰ are identical, or, should one rather say, belonged to the same revisional school. O’Connell’s monograph on Th.-Ex. (see n. 7) points in the same direction. If their opinion can be corroborated by further evidence, the practice discussed here can be seen not only as a common feature of two different revisers, but as a characteristic element of one and the same revisional school. Or, to phrase our conclusion, with due caution, in a different way: we were able to point out a new characteristic common to two members of the *kaige*-Th. group. When used critically, this criterion may also be applied to other members of the same group.³¹ External evidence corroborates our findings: Theodotion, with whom the *kaige*-Th. revision was connected in antiquity, is said (by Jerome, see n. 4) to have frequently used this practice.

Finally, we may note that, if our line of argument can be sustained, the scholarly consensus about Th.’s transliterations founded on Field’s work is proved to be intrinsically correct, although a reformulation, based upon different evidence, is required.

---

³⁰ i.e. *kaige* — Reigns γδ and the quotations from Origen’s sixth column except for those books in which “0” clearly does not refer to Th.-*kaige*, viz. 2 Sam. 11:2–1 Ki. 2:11 and Dodekapropheton (see D. Barthélemy, *op. cit.*, 128–36, 253–60 and F. M. Cross, Jr., “The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert”, *HTHR 57* (1964) 295). See also n. 15 of the appendix.
³¹ Using Barthélemy’s list of members of this group, we have found transliterations of unknown words in Th.-Job and Th.-Jer. (both in asterized and non-asterized passages), Th.-Dan. (since Th. and Th.-Dan. are not to be identified as one reviser, the *kaige*-Th. group must be composed of at least two layers; cp. also J. A. Grindel, *CBQ* 31 (1969) 511), Cant. and 2 Chr., the last one belonging to a *kaige*-like revision. The Dodekapropheton scroll from the Judaean desert also contains one transliteration of an unknown word (ψευδόμενος in Zeph. 1:4 = Th. *ad loc.* = *kaige* 2 Ki. 23:5!). It should, however, be stressed that (1) transliterations do not necessarily point to *kaige* and (2) that the lack of transliterations cannot exclude a certain section from belonging to *kaige*-Th.
APPENDIX

I

The following list, culled from the *Concordance* by Hatch and Redpath, contains transliterated words that were apparently unknown to the translators of the LXX. The majority of the words in the list are *hapax legomena* or rare words in the O.T. (sometimes rare in a certain book). If there appears to be a prefixed article or suffixed element in the transliteration, it is written as part of that word. Transliterations which are components of doublets (see n. 27 above) are denoted “d.”

In a monograph on transliterations in the Greek versions of the O.T., each individual case undoubtedly deserves to be discussed at length. For our limited purpose it will suffice merely to list the examples.

a. **Unknown(?) Words Which Were Left Untranslated**

- Gen. 22:13 סבר
- Jud. 5:7 שורון
- Jud. 5:16 מְמֹאֹתִים
- Jud. 5:22 מַשְׁרֹת
- Jud. 6:26 צְעָה
- Jud. 8:7, 16 נַרְקִים
- Jud. 8:26 ניספחת d.
- Jud. *ib.* שָׁרוֹנֶים
- Jud. 9:27 בַּלְלִים
- 1 Sam. 5:4 נְפֶסֶךְ d.
- 1 Sam. 6:8, 11, 15 בָּאוּר תַּחְנוֹת (v. 8) d.
- 1 Sam. 14:6, 11, 12, 15 מְצֹבָּה (v. 8) d.
- 1 Sam. 14:25 יִירע
- 1 Sam. 20:19, 41 אַזְרִיב d.

1 We cannot claim to have exhausted the evidence, if only because the *Concordance* does not list transliterations reconstructed from hellenized forms, e.g. Jer. 31(38):21 מְדֹרְיָם — תמוּרִים Spohn ὑψομένων codd. gr. et verss. Moreover, opinions may differ concerning certain transliterations that we classify as technical terms while others may claim that the Hebrew was actually unknown to the translator.

2 The word is reconstructed as אֵרִוב by S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of Samuel* (Oxford 1913) 167-8 according to the form of the Greek transliteration (αργαβ, αργαβ). MT has אֵרִיב in 20:19 and מְבֻב in 20:41.
1 Sam. 21:8(7) ננער
1 Sam. 30:8, 15, 15, 23 ננער (LXX: ננער)
2 Sam. 17:19 תורוד
2 Sam. 17:29 שלמה
1 Ki. 5:25 (11) המלך (LXX: μαχειρ or sim.)
1 Ki. 14:28 אל
1 Ki. 19:4 כהן
2 Ki. 2:14 אחיו
2 Ki. 3:4 יבר
2 Ki. 4:39 ארצה
(2 Ki. 4:42 אלקוק)
2 Ki. 8:15 מכר (cp. n. 15 below)
2 Ki. 9:13 גרג
2 Ki. 10:10 אומא
2 Ki. 10:22 מלטה d. (LXX: μεσθαλ or sim.)
2 Ki. 11:8, 15 מתוריה
2 Ki. 11:12 יבר
2 Ki. 12 passim 22:5, 6 בסך (דְבָרִים)
2 Ki. 15:5 התוריה
2 Ki. 20:13 נביכה
2 Ki. 23:5 כופיר
2 Ki. ib. מולdea (LXX: בְּיִם (?) cp. n. 15 below)
2 Ki. 23:7 ייב
2 Ki. 25:12 נבום (LXX: נבום)
2 Ki. 25:14 ב... ניבים
2 Ki. 25:17 ter מחיה (LXX: χεθαρ)
2 Ki. ib. שבעה
1 Chr. 12:21 ננער (LXX: ננער)
1 Chr. 15:20 עלalmת
1 Chr. 15:21 על ושםinden
1 Chr. 21:20 זָמְחָת (םָאני)
1 Chr. 26:15, 17 משים
1 Chr. 28:11 (20) גנרי (LXX: ζακχω αυτοῦ)
1 Chr. 28:17 A... כופיר
1 Chr. 29:2 שמים

3 Cp. 2 Ki. 12:8(9) βδέλυγμα B] AM omnes βδέκ.
4 The translator of 1 Chr. 21:20 possibly knew the meaning of the verb, but the syntax of his translation was so completely different from that of MT that he was unable to translate the verb adequately and consequently he left it untranslated.
2 Chr. 3:16
2 Chr. 4:12, 13
2 Chr. ib.
2 Chr. 25:18 bis
2 Chr. 26:21
Esdr. 1:9(10); 8:27
Esdr. 2:62
Neh. 1:1 7:2;
Cant. 4:4
Cant. 4:14
Cant. 5:11
Am. 1:1
Is. 5:2
Is. 39:2
Jer. 7:18 44(51):19
Jer. 8:7
Jer. ib.
Jer. 31(38):21
Jer. ib.
Jer. 37(44):16
Jer. 52:19
Jer. ib.
(Ez. 1:14 A...
Ez. 27:16
Ez. ib.
Ez. 40, 41 passim
Ez. 40 passim
Ez. 41:8

b. TRANSLITERATIONS OF UNKNOWN OR DIFFICULT WORDS WHICH WERE PROBABLY UNDERSTOOD AS PROPER NOUNS9

Gen. 15:2
Gen. 35:16; 48:7

5 All MSS read ἀγρός which doubtlessly resulted from ἀγοῦς, cp. J. Ziegler, Beiträge zur Jeremias Septuaginta, Nachr. der Ak. der Wiss. in Gött., Phil.-Hist. Kl. (Göttingen 1958) 84.
6 See J. Ziegler, op. cit., 85
7 Cp. n. 1 of the appendix.
8 J. Ziegler, op. cit., 86.
9 These examples should not be explained as reflecting different interpretations of the
Hebrew. In all these instances the word or immediate context caused difficulties to the translator who, therefore, avoided the problem by representing the Hebrew as a proper noun.

10 רְכָּב was transliterated as Ῥχαβ because of contextual difficulties.
11 1 Sam. 23:14 Μασεραμ Β...; 19 Β... Νεσσαρα, Α... Μεσσαρα; 24:23 Β... Μεσσαρα.
12 The translator transliterated because of contextual difficulties. Note that while B... have a transliteration of מִזְּמַר Mss A... contain only a transliteration of מִזְּמַר.
a. Transliterations of Unknown (?) Words Transmitted as Th.\textsuperscript{14}

The following list is based on the data provided by Field and is compiled in accordance with the principles described on pp. 54–55 above.\textsuperscript{15}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew Version</th>
<th>Greek Version (Th.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 13:6</td>
<td>מַסְפַּת</td>
<td>נבל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev. 18:23</td>
<td>נבל</td>
<td>נבל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam. 19:13</td>
<td>כָּבִית</td>
<td>כבירה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam. 26:7</td>
<td>מִצְפָּל</td>
<td>מצל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ki. 8:15</td>
<td>מָכָבֵר</td>
<td>מבאר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ki. 9:13</td>
<td>נְגִּר</td>
<td>נגר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ki. 11:12</td>
<td>נְג</td>
<td>נגר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Ki. 23:7</td>
<td>נְתֵית</td>
<td>נתים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 8:11</td>
<td>אָוָה</td>
<td>אָוָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 36:30 (sub ×)</td>
<td>אָוָה (Th.: †דְי)</td>
<td>אָוָה (Th.: †דְי)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 37:12 (sub ×)</td>
<td>נְתֵית (Th.: θεσθηνατονό)</td>
<td>נְתֵית (Th.: θεσθηνατονό)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 39:13 (sub ×)</td>
<td>נְכֵר (Th.: θεονό)</td>
<td>נְכֵר (Th.: θεονό)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. 1:1</td>
<td>נְכֵר</td>
<td>נְכֵר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeph. 1:4</td>
<td>נְכֵר</td>
<td>נְכֵר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is. 2:20</td>
<td>לֵוֵיׁ (MT: חָפֵר בַּהַר)</td>
<td>לֵוֵיׁ (MT: חָפֵר בַּהַר)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is. 3:24</td>
<td>מִתֶּנִיל</td>
<td>מִתֶּנִיל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{14} Th.’s readings are generally transmitted piecemeal, which leaves us in the dark as to his rendering of the whole context. As a result, one is unable to ascertain whether some difficult words, when transliterated, were considered proper nouns, as in some cases in the LXX (see list 1b above). However, the words that were transliterated by Th., when viewed in their Hebrew context, do not seem to allow for the inclusion of such a subgroup c.

\textsuperscript{15} The fifth column of Origen’s Hexapla in Reigns βγ contains the kaige-Th. revision. It is therefore difficult to assume that one would find Theodotion’s revision in its usual place, viz. the sixth column. Barthélemy, op. cit., 128–36, proved in detail that the text of the sixth column is virtually identical with boc2. Thus it is for him a representative of the Old Greek translation, while for F. M. Cross, Jr. *HTR* 57 (1964) 295 it contains the Proto-Lucianic recension “in relatively pure form”. To the best of my knowledge, no detailed study of the sixth column of the section Reigns γδ has been made.

Four transliterations are listed for the sixth column of Reigns γδ. Interestingly enough, the same Hebrew words were transliterated also by kaige-Th. (= “LXX”). However, the Hebrew basis of two of them differed from that of kaige-Th.: 2 Ki. 23:7 kaige-Th. χρησιμον(ν) = מַסְיַד (?), sixth column βεθθἰεμ = MT בֵּית הָיוֹם. 2 Ki. 8:15 kaige-Th. γαββα B, αβρα A (= ?), sixth column αυξβαρ = MT אַיְו. The evidence is too scanty to be decisive. However, it appears that the sixth column of Reigns γδ, similar to its counterpart in Reigns βγ, is not identical with kaige-Th. of the same section.
TRANSLITERATIONS IN THE GREEK VERSIONS

Is. 17:9
Is. ib.
Is. 19:15
Is. ib.
Is. 22:15
Is. 22:24 (sub ×)
Is. 23:13 (sub ×)
Is. 38:14
Is. ib.
Is. 41:19 (sub ×); 60:13
Is. ib., ib.
Is. 43:20
Is. 47:2
Is. 63:3
Is. 64:5(6)
Jer. 8:7
Jer. 29(36):17 (sub ×)
Jer. 38(45):12 (sub ×)
Jer. 52:16
Ez. 9:2, 11
Ez. 16:10, 13
Ez. 27:16
Ez. 27:19
Ez. 27:24
Ez. ib.
Ez. ib.
Ez. 27:27
Ez. 41:13; 42:1
Ez. 44:18
Ez. 46:17

Cp. further the following transliterations which were not mentioned by Field:

Job 28:18 (sub ×)
Job 38:32 (sub ×)
Job 39:13 (sub ×)
Job ib. (sub ×)
Is. 3:24
Is. 19:7
Jer. 44(51):19 (sub ×)
b. TRANSLITERATIONS OF UNKNOWN WORDS IN TH.-DAN.\textsuperscript{16}

1:3  
4:10, 14, 20 (13, 17, 23)  
8:2, 3, 6  
8:13  
10:5; 12:6, 7  
11:38  
11:45  

c. TRANSLITERATIONS OF UNKNOWN WORDS, TRANSMITTED AS COLLECTIVE READINGS\textsuperscript{17}

Job 30:4  
Is. 5:2  
Is. 13:21; 34:14  
Is. 40:15

\textsuperscript{16} Cp. above 54 and n. 31.  
\textsuperscript{17} Cp. above 54 and n. 7.