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I. INTRODUCTION

Any text-critical or philological study which makes use of translations must take
into account at almost all stages of the discussion the translation technique of the
translation unit under examination. A detailed analysis of translation technique
provides concrete information for determining the translator's attitude to his
source text. Familiarity with the translator's method is necessary for deter-
mining whether differences perceived between the source text and the translation
derive from a variant source text or are to be attributed to the translator's
method.¹

¹This paper originates in the third chapter of my M.A. thesis in the Department of Bible,
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, entitled: The Translation Technique Reflected in the
Septuagint Translation of the Book of Ezekiel (in Hebrew), under the direction of Prof.
Emanuel Tov. I am grateful to him for helpful comments and encouragement and for assis-
tance in obtaining data from the CATSS (Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies)
project. My thanks also to my friends and colleagues Paul Lippi, for similar assistance, and
to Ted Bergren, for helping to restore my English and other helpful comments.

¹For the importance of the evaluation of translation technique in text-critical work with
LXX see E. Tov, The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research (Jerusalem
1981) 50-53 (hereafter: TCU), and most recently, "Computer Assisted Analysis of the
Translation Technique of the LXX", a paper delivered at the Colloquium on "The
Transformation of Biblical Research in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries" under the
auspices of the European Science Foundation at The Israel Academy of Sciences and
Humanities in Jerusalem. The proceedings are to be published soon.
The more literal a translator can be shown to be, the more he can be regarded as having faithfully preserved the elements of his source text. We thus define literalness as "the degree of closeness to the source language reflected in the language of the translation, measured relative to a perfectly literal translation". Literalness, so defined, is a feature which can be measured statistically by the application of certain criteria. The present study examines one element of a source text which can be reflected translationally more or less faithfully, namely word-order, as a criterion for the evaluation of the translation technique of the LXX of Ezekiel. The degree to which the translator reproduced exactly the word order of his source text provides a direct indication of that translator's literalness with regard to this criterion, and of his overall attitude to his source text. The theoretical background and the actual results of our investigation will be discussed in parts I and II of the study. The second part of the study lists and attempts to evaluate the deviations found in the translation from the word order of the source text by classifying them on the basis of the various factors which might account for them. For this purpose, the translator's source text is necessarily considered to be essentially identical with MT, that is, not substantially at variance with MT in regard to word order, although the possibility of a different Hebrew text is not ignored.

A literal (some might prefer "literalistic") translation reproduces as closely as possible the word order of its source. The degree of this subservience can be

---

2 From my M.A. thesis (above, n. 1), chapter II. An extensive revision of the main points of the thesis will be published soon.

3 For criteria in the evaluation of translation technique, see Tov, TCU, 54-60; "Computer Assisted Analysis" (above, n. 2); and the paper by E. Tov and B. Wright, "Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX", Textus 12 (1985) 149-188.

4 Such a listing thus includes not only deviations deriving from the translator, but also deviations which may derive from a variant Hebrew text. Since it is not possible to determine which is which from the outset, the entire list can be considered as representing the degree of variation from the source text (= MT). This entails the (incorrect but) necessary assumption that the extent of real variants, that is, deviations in the Greek which go back to a variant Hebrew text, is essentially the same for any LXX book and does not significantly throw off our statistics for degree of literalness. See E. Tov, "Computer Assisted Analysis" (above, n. 2).
expressed statistically. Some scholars are of the opinion that subservience to the word order of the source text is the primary characteristic of a literal translation. Thus Rife gives a list of the basic differences in the rules for word order between Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek in order to show how differently the two languages (that is, "Semitic" on the one hand and Greek on the other) behave and to what extent one language imposes its rules on the other. The phenomenon of literalness in regard to word order, however, can be described much more simply: since the basic word order in Hebrew is generally fixed, whereas Greek word order is relatively flexible, the degree to which the translation is subservient to the source language can be determined from a complete listing of each difference between the source language and the translation language. Since all such cases cannot reasonably be attributed to a deviant Hebrew Vorlage, a given change in word order may be due rather to the linguistic or grammatical limitations or conventions of the translation language.

5 Cf. Tov, TCU, 53.

6 J. M. Rife, "The Mechanics of Translation Greek", JBL 52 (1933) 245; C.H. Cornill, Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel (Leipzig 1886) 97. See also R.A. Martin, The Syntax of the Greek of Jeremiah, Part I: The Noun, Pronouns and Prepositions in their Case constructions (Diss. Princeton Theological Seminary 1957) 1; J. Barr, "The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations", Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 1, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Nr 11 (1979), Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens X, 300-301. Barr says that the subservience to the word order of the source should be attributed to habit and the taking of the "easy way", as opposed to a deliberate policy of literalness. This comment is misleading, since it must be assumed that a literal translator deliberately chose the way of literalness; thus, in order to characterize the translator we must assume that this choice is reflected in the word order of his translation.

7 Rife, "Translation Greek" (above, n. 6), p. 247. Rife's subsuming Hebrew and Aramaic under the rubric 'Semitic source' rather oversimplifies the situation.

8 See W. Gesenius-E. Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar (A.E. Cowley, tr.; Oxford 1910) §1411-n; §142a, f.; P.P. Jouon, Grammaire de l’Hebrew Biblique (Rome 1923) §154f, 155k.


10 See further, below, on the word order of koine Greek. The reservations expressed by Rife, "Translation Greek" (above, n. 7), 247-248, derive from the fact that his discussion is concerned with "translation Greek" in the books of the NT; he is interested in finding criteria for discovering passages which may have been translated from a Semitic language, and not in translation technique per se. This is also the chief aim of Martin (above, n. 6) and D.W. Riddle, "The Logic of the Theory of Translation Greek", JBL 51 (1932) 13-30.
Such changes, it may be claimed, should thus be excluded from the final evaluation, since there exists another factor besides a tendency for freeness in translating which accounts for the difference: the translator was forced to obey the rules of the translation language in order to preserve the meaning and not to produce incomprehensible Greek. However, a consistent, practicable and text-critically oriented definition of literalness comprises also cases resulting from the non-commensurability of the two languages, since it was always theoretically possible for the translator to remain fully subservient to the word order of his source regardless of the effect on the Greek of the translation. Any deviation from the word order of the source language demonstrates a straying away from the source text, even if this is a result of a basic difference between the grammars of the two languages. Cases of absolute adherence to the source text order, in spite of its effect on the resulting Greek, thus constitute clear Hebraisms. On the other hand, and by the same token, differences in word order deriving from a variant Hebrew Vorlage cannot be taken as demonstrating the translator's freeness, but rather his faithfulness to his variant source. Such cases, however, as will be demonstrated below, are difficult to distinguish from cases of changes in word order deriving from the translator even after a thorough analysis of the translation technique. For purposes of obtaining an indication of the translator's literalness objectively (i.e., without being based on evaluative data), such variants are necessarily included among word-order differences and can be delimited only abstractly by reference to the degree of literalness determined from the complete list of variants.

---

11 The translation of Aquila is a case in point, though no one, to my knowledge, has conducted a detailed investigation of his attitude regarding word order.


13 On word order and its role in the evaluation of translation technique see Tov, TCU, 58; Daniel, La Septante (above, n. 12) 387; G. Gerleman, "Language and Method of Translation in the Greek Book of Job", Acta Universitatis Lundensis 43 (1947) 9; Riddle, "Logic" (above, n. 10), 23-24; Rife, "Translation Greek" (above, n. 7), 245-248; Martin, Jeremiah (above, n. 6) 1; Barr, "Typology" (above, n. 6) 300-301. For a broad discussion of the various considerations influencing word order in Classical Greek see K.J. Dover, Greek Word Order (Cambridge 1960). See also the instructive article by L.D. Goodell, "The Order of Words in Greek", Transactions of the American Philological Association 21 (1890) 5-47, and the comments of W. Rhys-Roberts, "A Point of Greek and Latin Word-Order", The Classical
A free translation, by contrast, does not reveal the same subservience to the source in word order. A free translator frequently acts according to stylistic considerations and tends to write what sounds to him more correct and natural in the translation language. In a truly free translation it is the intrusive influences of the source language which comprise the exceptions to the rule (of freeness in translation). Furthermore, the translator's perception of the meaning of the source and his efforts to express his understanding in the translation, may bring about a change in the word order, thus producing a deviation from the language of his source.\textsuperscript{14}

II. THE DEGREE OF LITERALNESS REFLECTED IN WORD ORDER AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE

Having established a theoretical basis for the employment of word order as a criterion for the evaluation of translation technique, which is equivalent to the determination of the degree of literalness (as defined above and as opposed to discussions of translation technique dealing with qualitative aspects), we now present the results obtained for LXX-Ezekiel. These results were obtained by a word-by-word comparison of MT and LXX, and the listing and tabulation of differences in word order. The texts used for comparison were \textit{Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia} for MT and J. Ziegler's edition in the Göttingen series for LXX.\textsuperscript{15} The results can be generalized conveniently by taking the number of cases of differences in word order in relation to the total number of verses for chapters 1-39 (1013),\textsuperscript{16} yielding a percentage of subservience or non-subservience to word order for the total verses of the corpus. Thus for LXX-Ezekiel:

\textit{Review} (September, 1912) 177-179. Cf. also E. Kieckers, \textit{Die Stellung des Verbs im griechischen und in den verwandten Sprachen} (Strassburg 1911), though his study tends to a slightly different direction.

\textsuperscript{14}The accurate characterization of "freeness" in ancient translations, and its text-critical, exegetical, sociological and other implications, has yet to be done systematically (cf. Tov, "Computer Assisted Analysis" [above, n. 3]). Our remarks here are based mainly on the negative side of literalness as defined above.

\textsuperscript{15}J. Ziegler, ed., \textit{Ezechiel} (Septuaginta, vol. XVI pars 1; Göttingen 1952).

\textsuperscript{16}We exclude from the tabulation chapters 40-48 due to their special character and the possibly different approach of the translator (not necessarily a different one) to their translation. Cornill also excluded these chapters in his discussion of the character of the translation of LXX (above, n. 6), though only with regard to לֹא, מִדֶּנֶּה (p. 98).
100 cases out of 1013 verses yields 9.9% non-subservience
90.1% subservience

In other words, in 100 instances the word order in the translation deviated in one or more details from MT. The resulting percentages\(^{17}\) by themselves give only an impressionistic indication of the degree of literalness; a relative and more significant indication can be obtained by comparing these percentages to those obtained for other books, both literal and free translations. In the absence of complete data, we present the results obtained from a representative sample of 30 chapters each from Isaiah, Job and Psalms 1-78, and a complete listing from Jeremiah, I Samuel and 2 Kings (obtained with the aid of the computerized CATSS data base [see n. *]), in order to see how LXX-Ezekiel relates to other translations in regard to the degree of literalness reflected in word order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Non-Subservience</th>
<th>Subservience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah 1-30</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>160 differences = 33.6%</td>
<td>66.4% subservience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 1-30</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>319 differences = 46.2%</td>
<td>53.8% subservience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms 1-78</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>50 differences = 3.8%</td>
<td>96.2% subservience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah(^{18})</td>
<td>1365</td>
<td>139 differences = 10.2%</td>
<td>89.8% subservience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Samuel</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>62 differences = 7.8%</td>
<td>92.2% subservience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>1534</td>
<td>42 differences = 2.7%</td>
<td>97.3% subservience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He lists only 10 such cases in these chapters and most of these concern the Temple plans. Even if these chapters do contain passages of a more narrative character from which it is possible to glean additional examples for our categories (for example, for מַשָּׁת, it seems preferable at this stage to exclude these chapters as a unit from our tallies.

\(^{17}\)It should be noted that this percentage is only a convenient way of representing the numbers (the ratio between numbers of instances to numbers of verses). Furthermore, our count of verses does not take into account the varying length of verses in different books.

\(^{18}\)For Jeremiah the number of verses was reduced by one-seventh in order to take into account the verses not represented in the Greek. For this figure and this practice see Tov-Wright (above, n. 3). A similar reduction (by 5\%), the estimated amount of "missing" text in LXX-Ezekiel vis-à-vis MT, equivalent to some 754 words, about 45.7 verses) to take into account the LXX minuses in Ezekiel would lead to a similar modification for Ezekiel.
These figures can be presented graphically in tabular form as follows:

![Graph showing frequency of literalness in different books]

The figures for the sizeable samples taken from these books support general evaluations of their translation technique,\(^{19}\) but at the same time give more precise and concrete data concerning the degree-of-literalness relationship between them. The results indicate that LXX-Ezekiel is closest with regard to the degree of literalness reflected in the preservation of the source text word order to LXX-Jeremiah and 1 Samuel, less so to 2 Kings and Psalms, further removed from LXX-Isaiah, and at a considerable distance from LXX-Job - the latter two books being recognized as free and even paraphrastic translations. A more precise scale of degrees of literalness reflected in word order can be gained by taking larger samples and ideally, compiling exhaustive lists (with the aid

\(^{19}\)For such general evaluations see Tov, *TCU*, 62-63 and the references there. Cf. also the conclusions based on a statistical analysis of certain phenomena in Tov-Wright (above, n. 3), and R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Helsinki 1979).
of a computer) from the various books of LXX and similarly determining the results. We can, nevertheless, conclude at this stage, and on the basis of these samples, that LXX-Ezekiel appears to be quite literal according to the criterion of word order. The primary value of the abstract indication of the degree of literalness lies in its usefulness in characterizing the approach of a given translator. This should be made clear and kept separate from the stage of evaluating specific reconstructions. Practically put, if a literalness factor of 90.1% is shown for LXX–Ezekiel, this does not mean that any variant retroverted from the Greek can be automatically considered 90.1% reliable. It is again necessary to state that each case must be evaluated in and of itself. With regard to the evaluation of individual reconstructions all that can be said is that given a

---

20E. Nida, Toward a Science of Translating (Leiden 1964), 187–188, suggests a method for the relative evaluation of different types of differences in word order which gives graded weight to the different types (e.g., 1 for the simplest difference; 2 for transferring words to another place in the sentence; and 4 for changes which entail "significant grammatical relationships"). The idea is attractive, though I do not think that the determination to which type a difference belongs is entirely objective. It is preferable for our purposes to describe the data verbally and to qualify to some degree the imbalance among the various kinds of differences. The simple counting of the differences is sufficiently significant to indicate differences in the degree of literalness between different translation units. The number of potential changes in word order could conceivably be worked out on the basis of a word count, and so used as the basis for a percentage evaluation, rather than using the number of verses. It is doubtful, however, that such an approach would significantly increase the meaningfulness of the results. For the division of LXX-Ezekiel into sections and the possibility of different translators for each section, see H.St.J. Thackeray, "The Translators of Ezekiel", JTS 4 (1903) 398-411; N. Turner, "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel", JTS 7 (1956) 12-24; J. Herrmann, "Die LXX zu Ezechiel das Werk dreier Übersetzer", BWAT NF 5 (1923) 1–19; W. Danielsmeyer, Neue Untersuchungen zur Ezechiel-LXX (Diss. Münster 1936); E.H. Kase, Jr., "The Translators of Ezekiel", in The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri (ed. A.C. Johnson, H.S. Gehman, E.H. Kase, Jr.; Princeton 1938) 52-73. The computer can assist in the compiling of data for a more precise and thorough investigation of this and similar problems. Data collected by us (before the availability of the computer) point in the direction of a (partial) revision of an original translation, as shown for LXX-Jeremiah by E. Tov, The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch (HSM 8; Missoula 1976). The distribution of differences in word order in the various translational units within LXX-Ezekiel are apparently of no significance for this criterion (data for consistency, however, do reveal significant variance for the different sections, for which see my "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel", paper given at the 6th Congress of the IOSCS (in press).
translator’s strong tendency towards literalness, the possibility that a given retroverted variant derives from a variant Hebrew text is much greater and cannot be easily dismissed.

III. THE EVALUATION OF WORD-ORDER DIFFERENCES

There are two basic types of differences between MT and LXX: (1) those deriving from the translator and/or the subsequent transmission-history of the translation, and (2) those going back to a variant Hebrew text. In a translation shown to be highly literal, any word-order difference - apart from one which cannot be retroverted into grammatical Hebrew - is not only potentially (as is the case with any variant), but even probably likely to derive from a Hebrew source. These categories, however, result from an evaluation of differences; they cannot serve as a basis for evaluation. The collection and classification of word-order variants makes it possible for us to discern other factors than a variant Hebrew Vorlage - i.e. translation level factors - and to consider them as alternative explanations for a difference in word order between source and translation. The basis for our evaluation is thus the determination of these factors and the identification of instances demonstrating their operation. As we shall see below, the majority of differences may be attributed to the translator. The remaining instances, clearly in the minority, are more likely to derive from a different Hebrew source. Unfortunately, as is so often the case in textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, there is no certainty for either group (see below).

Ideally, it would be relatively easy to indicate the usual Greek word order and to note how Hebrew word order clashes with the rules of Greek word order, in an effort to identify those areas where differences may be expected.21 However, in the absence of a comprehensive grammar, especially regarding syntax, of LXX Greek, the determination of "usual Greek word order" is rather problematic. In the case of style, the situation is even less clear and at times it is extremely difficult to determine the factors which may explain a difference as deriving from the translator. Under these circumstances, the best way to discern such factors is to take as our starting point (in contrast to those who investigate the possible Semitic background of the NT) not the deviations from the regular Greek word order, but rather cases of differences in order between LXX and MT. Only

21 Cf. Rife, "Translation Greek" (above, n. 6).
after these cases are collected is it possible to examine them and make observations on their character, thereby obtaining an indication of the translator's technique which is based on concrete data.

The classification presented below is an evaluation of the changes we have listed, and reflects our decision, based on a detailed analysis, as to the most probable explanation of a difference. Words in parenthesis show the syntactic context of the words whose order differs in the translation. Square brackets indicate a plus (in Greek) or a minus (in Hebrew) in relation to the other language. Differences in word order which cannot be retroverted into good Hebrew, and thereby most likely due to purely Greek factors, are marked with an asterisk (*).

A. GREEK LANGUAGE AND STYLE

This section lists differences in word order which can be best explained as deriving from inner-Greek linguistic/stylistic considerations, and exemplifies their operation in other LXX books. These tendencies, once isolated and defined, can assist in the differentiation of differences possibly deriving from translation technique from those which are more likely to go back to a variant Hebrew text. Moreover, with due caution, it is sometimes possible to consider one way of explanation less likely if it goes counter to a tendency evidenced by a certain group of examples. At times the discernment of a certain translation-level tendency is most easily accomplished by noting that it results in a Greek sentence which cannot be retroverted into grammatical Biblical Hebrew. Such differences clearly reveal the operation of linguistic or stylistic tendency since they can

22 The examples of differences may provide raw material for the study of the grammar of koine Greek, since the differences (those which do not derive from a variant Hebrew text) may represent the influence of koine linguistic habits of the translator, as well as simultaneously revealing a less literal tendency. Such a study has not been made for LXX. Cf. the study of G. Cuendet, L’Ordre des mots dans le texte grec et dans les versions gothique arménienne et vieux slave des évangiles I, Les groupes nominaux (Paris 1929), which investigates the changes in word order in three Indo-European languages in the translations of the Gospels into these tongues (Cuendet does not deal with translation technique, however, but is interested in the evolution of these languages within the linguistic family of Indo-European languages). On LXX as a source for the study of koine Greek, see J. Psichari, "Essai sur le grec de la Septante", in Quelques travaux de linguistique de philologie et de littérature Helleniques, vol. II (Paris 1930) 161-210; H.B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge, 1902 [repr. New York 1968]) 340.
derive only from the translator. In the case of other differences revealing the same tendency, the fact that they can be retroverted into more or less grammatical Hebrew may be a matter of coincidence.

1. PARTICULAR WORDS AND ELEMENTS

Data compiled on the frequency of the following differences in word order are a good indication of the translator’s approach to his source text since the rules and behavior of the source language are particularly at odds with those of the translation language. The small number of cases (as mentioned above, they are the exceptions to the rule) points to the highly Semitic flavor of the translation, deriving from the fact that the translator essentially transferred Hebrew syntax into Greek where. The “alien” character of this type of Greek is recognizable by virtue of its difference from normal Greek.23

In many of the examples below, we have been able to compare the data for LXX-Ezekiel with those from other LXX books. The meaningfulness of our data is increased because a comparison is made possible to the practices of other translators concerning the same phenomena.

a) סבך

(1). 1:4

(2). 19:8

(3). 36:7

A search of LXX for cases of changes in word order concerning סבך yielded only three additional instances (Ex. 28:32; 39:24; 1 Ki. 7:24), as well as one additional instance in LXX-Ezekiel 40–48(40:17). Interchanges concerning סבך are thus perhaps a distinctive feature of LXX-Ezekiel.24

23 For other indicators, cf. Tov-Wright (n. 3), and the other studies mentioned in n. 3.

24 Possibly, this is an additional case of differences involving prepositions, for which see below, though this particular preposition itself and not necessarily its syntactic function seems to give rise to the difference. The isolation of distinctive features of translators is, of course, decisive in determining the identity of translators and “schools” of translating (e.g., kaige), and perhaps even in demonstrating reliance on previous translations (e.g., the Greek Pentateuch).
b). כל

(4). 16:25 אל כל ראהו דוד (basket of fruit)
(5). 32:4 והשבעתון מ몬 (מִמְּנָה) פֹּאָרָה (פֹּאָרָה)
(6). 34:6 (ועליו כל כָּל רֶוַח) (כָּל רֶוַח)
(7). 39:17 (עָלָה בָּנָה בָּנָה) (בָּנָה בָּנָה)
(8). 39:23 פֹּאָרָה (פֹּאָרָה)
(9). 51:17 בעברец כל ענף

Examples from other books:

Isa. 9:8
וַיְדַעְתָּ וְהָעָשָׂה כָּל
כֵּן יִשְׁרְאֵל שֶׁלָּו

Isa. 9:20
בַּכֵּל וְתָבְא כֶּל אֲדָם

Isa. 10:23
בֵּית קָדוֹשׁ כָּל כָּל

Isa. 14:29
אִי הָעַשְׂרֵי הַיּוֹם פֹּאָרָה כָּל פֹּאָרָה

Jer. 2:21
(וַיִּשְׁרֶה כָּל כָּל וְדַר מְלָטָה)

Ps. 44(43):18
(וַיֵּשֶׁב כָּל כָּל וְדַר מְלָטָה)

Ps. 71(70):18
(וַיֶּלֶד הַנֶּפֶשׁ כָּל כָּל וְדַר מְלָטָה)
(וַיִּשְׁמַע שָׁלֵשׁ רֹאֵי אַוָּה)

Job 2:11
(וַיְכַסְּחָר הַרְעָעָה כָּל כָּל וְדַר מְלָטָה)

c). כי

(9). 11:11
אָמַר אֶל יי כָּל כָּל וְלֹא

(10). 23:2
(וַיֵּשֶׁה מַשָּׁמֶּשׁ בָּזֵק וָזֵק) (וַיֵּלֶד הַנֶּפֶשׁ)

(11). 33:22
(וַיֵּלֶד יִשְׁמַע בַּבֵּית כָּל כָּל)

(12). 36:2
(וַיֶּלֶד יִשְׁמַע בַּבֵּית כָּל כָּל)

imestone יִשְׁמַע
(13). 36:34 וְהָשַׁתָּן שִׁמְמָה (אָשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר) הַפְּעַלְּסָמָהּ עָשָׂהּ

Items 9 and 11 may also demonstrate the influence of the indirect object (see below), or the combination of both factors in bringing about a change in word order.

In other books:

1 Sam. 3:19 καὶ ἤπειρος μετ᾿ αὐτοῦ

Jer. 2:14 ἐπὶ τοὺς προνομοὺς ἐγένετο

Jer. 8:2 καὶ ἔσονται εἰς παράδειγμα ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς

d). NEGATIVES

(1). οὐκ

(14). 8:12 οὐχ ὃπερ κύριος

(15). 9:9 οὐκ ἔφορος ὁ κύριος

(16). 13:16 καὶ εἰρήνη οὐκ ἔσται

(17). 33:32 καὶ οὐ μὴ ποιήσουσιν αὐτά

(2). οὐχ

(18). 16:29 καὶ οὐδὲ ἐν τούτως ἐνεπλήσθης

(19). 21:32(27) καὶ οὐχ ἂν τολμήσῃ ἐκταλμ

In other books:

Isa. 3:7 οὐ μὴ ἔσται ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου πάντας οὐδὲ ἵματιον

Isa. 8:20 οὐκ ἂν λαμορίζῃ θυσία
c

Jer. 37(44):14 καὶ οὐκ εἰς τοὺς χαλκάνιους ἐγώ φέουσα
Job 3:11

למה לא מראת אמו
יתר ור יקר יקtı עמק עק תכיה יסא

e). מש

For differences in word order involving מש the evidence from other books supports the conclusion that the change derives from a Greek stylistic/linguistic factor, since only one case is found for LXX-Ezekiel. This case, and the next (דוע) demonstrate the need for more comprehensive investigations.

(20). 32:25-26 מש בובוכי חללים נזר

they εἰς ἔδοξασαν

Other books:

1 Sam. 22:1 וילך דוד משם

כָּלָמֹת לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

2 Ki. 7:5 שָׁוָה שָׁוָה יניא אֲנָה

כָּלָמֹת לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

Isa. 13:21 שָׁוָה יניא אֲנָה בֶּשָּׁה

כָּלָמֹת לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

Jer. 2:6 שָׁוָה יניא אֶלְכָּל שָׁוָה יניא אֲנָה

כָּלָמֹת לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

Jer. 42(49):15 שָׁוָה יניא אֶלְכָּל שָׁוָה יניא אֲנָה

כָּלָמֹת לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

f). דוע

(21). 5:4 והמעת ירתי

Other books:

1 Sam. 23:4 וָיָצַא דּוֹד לְשָׁאָל לְבֵית

כָּלָמֹת לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

2 Ki. 2:21 יָצַא דּוֹד לְשָׁאָל לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

כָּלָמֹת לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

2 Ki. 4:6 יָצַא דּוֹד לְשָׁאָל לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

כָּלָמֹת לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

Isa. 1:5 יָצַא דּוֹד לְשָׁאָל לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

כָּלָמֹת לְהַרְבּוּ פֶּרֶד

LXX divides the verses differently from MT.
Jer. 2:31

גָּלַת נָכָא צוּד אֱלִילִי

עַל כָּל כָּל הַבֵּית

ויִצָּהֵן נַחֲשָׁה

g). Adjectives

(22). 31:6  כֹּל גוֹי רֵבִים
*פָּעֲנָה פַּלְקְהָּסָה גֶּעוֹנָה (for the use of the asterisk, see p. 68)

(23). 31:15  רוֹצֵלָאָה (מִיָּם רֵבִים
*פַּלְקְהָּסָה בֵּצָאָס

(24). 34:18  תְמוּרַת תַּנְעָב
*רַחֲצֶן כַּאֲלָמִי מָאְלַי (הֵפֵּאֶסֶדְהַה)

Other books:

Isa. 6:12  רְבָּעַת חָיוֹת (בָּכַרְבָּר חָאֵר

כַּאֲלָמִי קַנְאָלֵת פַּלְקְהָּסָה חָסְוַה

Cf. Job 10:17  רְבָּעַת חָיוֹת

*רָכִּּשְׁנָה בַּאַלְּכִּלִּי מּוֹלָ לָכַּרְחָשָׁה

Other adjectives:

2 Kings 1:11  רָעָת חָיוֹת אָנָה
*קְלַלָן פַּלְקְהָּסָה קְוֵנָרָךְ

2 Ki. 5:13  דָּבָר גוֹיָה (הֵבֵית דָּבָר אוֹלִים

מָגָנִים לֹּגוֹן

Isa. 6:1  שָׁלוֹזִים מִלְכָּאָה חָוָלָל
*כַּאֲלָמִי דָּבָר הוֹכָלָל

Isa. 10:12  אֳפָּרֵד לָכַּר (פַּרְקִין לָכַּר

לָכַּר... 26  אֲפָרֵד לָכַּר

הֵפֵּאֶסְדַּה אֵפַּלֵּי הַאֵפִּי לְאֵפִּי מָגָנִים

Job 2:13  כָּל רַאְוַא כָּל גָּדָל חָוָלָל
*כָּלֵּמָנָה כָּלֵּמָנָה חָוָלָל

h). NUMBERS

Changes in the order of the components of numerals are not listed since these are almost always reformulated according to the Greek manner and thus cannot serve as a meaningful indication of the translator's literalness. The cases involving numbers which do provide an indication of the translator's policy concern combinations of a numeral and a noun:

26 MT: מִדְלָכ
Other books:

2 Ki. 10:8

2 Ki. 25:25

Job 1:17

Job 1:2

(26-41) Number of differences

16 7 13 66

Number of verses

1013 1170 476 690

% 1.6% 0.6% 2.7% 9.6%

2. PLACING TOGETHER OF SYNTACTICALLY RELATED ELEMENTS

This category encompasses examples demonstrating a tendency, which apparently operates at the translation level, to place together various syntactically related elements. The category is defined broadly in order to include those cases in which a linguistic-syntactic factor may play a part in accounting for a dif-

27 For a discussion of a similar change involving a number and noun, also in a date, cf. S. Talmon and E. Tov, "A Commentary on the Text of Jeremiah", Textus 9 (1981) 8-9: "...both sequences are found in the LXX".
ference in word order. So defined, the cases listed here reveal a difference deriving from the translator's sense that the syntactic relations analyzed by him in the Hebrew (not always correctly) require that the word order be changed in order to reflect more closely the grammar of the source-text. Such cases thus demonstrate the effect of syntactic analysis overriding subservience to word order of the source text, when such subservience was felt by the translator to be of lesser importance than expressing a syntactic affinity. The presentation of similar examples from other books supports the contention that a general translational stylistic/linguistic factor is in operation.

a). VERB LAST - (S)OV/O(S)V

Among instances of changes in word order a clear, though only occasional tendency can be seen to place the verb after its subject or object within a sentence.

(1). PLACING SUBJECT FIRST

(42). 7:10

(43-44). 8:12,15

(45). 21:7(LXX: 12)

(46). 23:43

(47). 29:16

(48). 34:27

---

28It should be noted that the changing of word order by the translator may not be simply due to Greek stylistic preference - ordinary Greek style may give the wrong bend to literalistic renderings. The translator may, in such cases, change the word order of his source in order to preserve the relatedness of syntactic elements in the Hebrew. Such cases paradoxically reveal a type of "syntactic-semantic literalness", though the subjectivity involved in their determination does not allow the consideration of these cases in measuring degree of literalness.

29S=Subject, O=Object and V=Verb. Parentheses indicate optional occurrence.

31It seems that the translator already had a corrupt text in front of him, and made an effort to overcome the problem by changing the word order in a rather mechanical way.
(49). 37:7

καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐμὲ προφήτευσα (for the use of square brackets, see p. 68)

(2). PLACING OBJECT FIRST

(50). 13:10

τὸν λαόν μου ἔπλαν ἦσαν

(51). 23:38

ποιμανὰ ἀντὶ ἔφεσιν καὶ λαὸν ἐμὸν ἐμβαλλον

(52). 26:21

βλέποντες ἀπὸ χειλῶν σε δύσω

(53). 35:6

καὶ οἰνοῦ σε διώξεται

(54). 37:16

καὶ ὡς νῦν δευτέραν ἔκατον ἢ μᾶλλον

Noteworthy in these examples is the number of cases involving coordinate clauses (42, 45, 48, 51), for which a case can be made for a kind of syntactic harmonization. Similar examples can be found in other books of LXX:

Subject first:

2 Ki. 3:24

καὶ ἦσαν μαραθοι ἐν τῇ γη

2 Ki. 15:19

καὶ μακαρίων ἐδωκαν

Isa. 13:10

τὸ ἱλίον τὸ ἔδωκα τὸν οὐδὲν σοῦ δώσωσαν

Isa. 14:1

τὸ πολέμι τὸν ἀνθρώπινον καὶ τὸν γιώρας προστεθήσεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς

Job 1:6 (cf. 2:1)

καὶ ὁ διάβολος ἠλθεὶν µετέπειτα ἀντὶ αὐτῶν

Job 2:13

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ διάβολος (καὶ εἶπεν) ἡ πλῆθος ἡν δελυγμένην αὐτῶν καὶ μεγάλην σφόδραν (cf. above, I.g., Adjectives).

Object first:

2 Ki. 18:29

καὶ οὐ καὶ ἔστη ἡ βουνοὶ μάζας ἐξελέσαται

ὅτε οὐ μὴ δύναται ὑμᾶς ἔστηκαν
Word Order and Translation Technique

Isa. 1:15

בּוּפְרִישָׁמְךָ יַפְּנוּכָּם

זַעַנְנָה צֶעַרְזָה אֱקָטְלוּנְהָה

Isa. 5:11

יָמָה יָדוּפְּךָ יָדוּפְּךָ

וְיָרָא עֲוֹנָהּ עֲוֹנָהּ הַעָבָּר (בִּרְאָהּ)

Isa. 5:22

וָמְנוֹת (לִגְּפָא)

וְיָרָא עֲוֹנָהּ עֲוֹנָהּ הַעָבָּר (בִּרְאָהּ)

Isa. 10:7

כְּלָלִית גּוֹן כְּלָלִית

כַּאֲנֶנֶנָה אֶזְכָּלְתָּהוֹ לְעָבָּר

Isa. 14:21

וְיָרָא אַרְגָּר (וְמַלְאָאָר מְכִית עָבָּר)

וְיָרָא אַרְגָּר (וְמַלְאָאָר מְכִית עָבָּר)

Job 4:18

בּוּמְאֲכָלָה שָׁנִיס הָלָה

כַּאֲנֶנֶנָה אֶזְכָּלְתָּהוֹ לְעָבָּר

Similar examples for coordinate clauses can also be found in other books:

Isa. 9:9

כְּלָלִית גּוֹן כְּלָלִית

פֶּלְעָסְוֹ הַפַּעֲקָאָסְוֹ וּלָא לָא יַעֲכָבְּעִיתָהוֹ לְעָבָּר

וְיָרָא עֲוֹנָהּ עֲוֹנָהּ הַעָבָּר (בִּרְאָהּ)

וְיָרָא עֲוֹנָהּ עֲוֹנָהּ הַעָבָּר (בִּרְאָהּ)

Jer. 4:9

וְיָרָא עֲוֹנָהּ עֲוֹנָהּ הַעָבָּר (בִּרְאָהּ)

וְיָרָא עֲוֹנָהּ עֲוֹנָהּ הַעָבָּר (בִּרְאָהּ)

A special case could be made for putting the verb last, especially for syntactic constructions involving יָשָׁנָה = פּוּרָה:

(55). 15:5

יָשָׁנָה (וְיָרָא עֲוֹנָהּ)

פּוּרָה אֱוָתָה הַיְּאָלָוָה

(56). 15:7

יָשָׁנָה (וְיָרָא עֲוֹנָהּ)

פּוּרָה אֱוָתָה קָטָפְּאְגָּטָה

(57). 23:25

יָשָׁנָה (וְיָרָא עֲוֹנָהּ)

פּוּרָה קָטָפְּאְגָּטָה (cf. examples 53 and 54).

Compare:

Isa. 9:18

יָשָׁנָה (וְיָרָא עֲוֹנָהּ)

כְּלָלִית גּוֹן כְּלָלִית

כַּאֲנֶנֶנָה אֶזְכָּלְתָּהוֹ לְעָבָּר

Isa. 10:16

יָשָׁנָה (וְיָרָא עֲוֹנָהּ)

כְּלָלִית גּוֹן כְּלָלִית

כַּאֲנֶנֶנָה אֶזְכָּלְתָּהוֹ לְעָבָּר

פּוּרָה קָטָפְּאְגָּטָה (cf. examples 53 and 54).
b). PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES

The basic factor operating in these examples is the tendency to place elements closely related syntactically (according to the translator's understanding) next to one another when a prepositional phrase is involved. The strongest tendency seems to be to put the prepositional phrase last, as in the following:

(58). 2:6 מַעֲנוּיָם אֶל-תַּתָּה
(59). 9:5 עַרְבָּר בַּעַר אֶל-תַּתָּה
(60). 16:5 שָׁמַע אֶל-תַּתָּה
(61). 24:25 כְּוֹס כָּל-תַּתָּה
(63). 27:24 בֹּקֶל בָּעַר הַשֻּׁם (בֹּקֶל בָּעַר הַשֻּׁם)
(64). 28:23 מְחַלֵּל הַלְּחָמִית בָּעַר לְעַל אֵל מַעֲנוּיָם
(65). 29:8 מְחַלֵּל הַלְּחָמִית בָּעַר לְעַל אֵל מַעֲנוּיָם
(66). 31:14 מַעֲנוּיָם אֶל-תַּתָּה (מַעֲנוּיָם אֶל-תַּתָּה)
(67). 31:17 מַעֲנוּיָם אֶל-תַּתָּה (מַעֲנוּיָם אֶל-תַּתָּה)

32Note that according to the sequence of MT the Greek phrase stands against מַעֲנוּיָם אֶל-תַּתָּה, and may reflect a different Vorlage, though not for the internal word order of this phrase. מַעֲנוּיָם אֶל-תַּתָּה appears later in the verse (again with מַעֲנוּיָם אֶל-תַּתָּה) and is there translated literally. This may be a harmonization to מַעֲנוּיָם אֶל-תַּתָּה with regard to word order. Cf. W. Zimmerli, Ezekiel 1, BK (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969) 10.

33This understanding of the Greek is at odds with Ziegler’s versification, who begins v. 19 with אֶל-תַּתָּה. . . Rahls’ versification is closer to that of MT and seems more logical.

34BHS marks מַעֲנוּיָם as lacking in LXX and notes for מַעֲנוּיָם, “G ēn šo‘ol” (!). It seems, however, more reasonable to take מַעֲנוּיָם as a minus, especially in view of the demonstrable tendency to reposition the prepositional phrase מַעֲנוּיָם מַעֲנוּיָם may have been omitted as redundant after the transposition of מַעֲנוּיָם.
Even though these cases may result from the simple juxtaposition of other elements so that the prepositional phrase occurs last, it nevertheless seems that the main factor of difference in word order is the presence of a prepositional phrase which "disrupts" the stylistic tendencies of Greek with regard to other syntactic elements. Exceptions to this tendency are:

(70). 9:3 ἀρατὶ κατὰ Χρυστὸν, σὺ δέ εἰσαι ἔνας τῆς θεοῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔνας λέοντα (cf. example 9)
(71). 11:11 ἀναστὰ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὅπως ὠκύ ἔσται εἰς λέβητα καὶ ἐστῆ ἡ αὕτη
(72). 12:22 καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἡ θυσία τῆς ὑμῶν ἡ αὐτή
(73). 22:30 καὶ λέγεται πρὸς προσώπου μου ὀλοσχέρους καὶ ἐστῶ ἡ αὐτῶν τὰ δικαίων ἡμῶν
(74). 24:4 καὶ ἀνεἴληφτη ἡ θυσία τῆς ἡμῶν τούτων ἐν τῷ Σάμῳ τῆς ἡμῶν ἐλατίνους
(75). 27:5 οὐκ ἔστω ὁ θεὸς δικαιοῦν τὰ δικαίων ἡμῶν
(76). 27:30 ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν γῆν
(77). 34:24 ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν ἀπήγαγεν

These "exceptions" may be explained as the placing of the prepositional phrase next to the verb (in verbal sentences) or next to some other word modified by the prepositional phrase.

These cases, which comprise the most numerous category of word-order differences in LXX—Ezekiel (and apparently also in other LXX books), find parallels in other books:

1 Sam. 2:1 ἐπὶ θαλαμόν ἐπὶ ἐξθροῦσ τὸ στόμα μου
1 Sam. 2:20 ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν ἀποτείχεν Σολομών κύριος
1 Sam. 4:3 יִתָּח ( kliente µšēlē)
1 Sam. 4:13 וְאָכְלָה בַּהֲלוֹנִים בְּעֵצֹת (kolev)
2 Ki. 5:10 יֵשֵׁל אֲלֵהֶם מִלְחָמָה
2 Ki. 5:11 אוֹמַרְתָּן אֲלֵיכֶם אָצְכִּי (toσ)
Isa. 12:6 לַיְבִי לָיְבִי מַשְׁלֵה
Isa. 14:6 לִבְנָה לִבְנָה (cντη)
Jer. 1:16 וְדַרְבּוֹת מִשְׁפָּט אֵתָם (cντη)
Jer. 3:2 שֶׁבֶר יִשְׂרָאֵל נַעֲנָה (uuθ)
Jer. 29(36):10 יְבִי לָיְבִי מַשְׁלַה
Jer. 31(38):20 נַעֲנָה יִשְׂרָאֵל נַעֲנָה (uuθ)
Jer. 34(41):17 נַעֲנָה יִשְׂרָאֵל נַעֲנָה (uuθ)
Jer. 50(27):45 נַעֲנָה יִשְׂרָאֵל נַעֲנָה (uuθ)
Job 1:8 שֶׁנֶּאֱמָר לוֹ אַל יִתְנַשֶּׁת (cντη)
Job 3:7 וְאַל לֹא אֵלָה יִתְנַשֶּׁת (cντη)
Job 5:7 וְאַל לֹא לִתְנַשֶּׁת (cντη)

**d). OTHER INSTANCES**

(1) In the following examples, the translator has apparently made a modest effort to give a suitable Greek rendering of a Hebrew idiomatic expression - a consideration which overrode the tendency for strict adherence to the word order of the source text:

(78). 26:20 μαρτυρίαν ἡ"ν ἐκείς 

*εἷς βήθη τῆς μησιδὸς*
(79). 31:9  الله تعالى عון איש בנם והאלהים
לעם פארתאם הג נר ורשףם ועם ישים

(80). 32:18 לא ארוז הת纣ות
2 ח"ע דב פ"ס 2 ח"ע 2 ח"ע

(2) We list here cases where syntactic elements were apparently placed next to one another in LXX and where no reasonably clear tendency can be discovered for this modification. The reason for putting these examples here is largely intuitive, based upon syntactic and exegetical factors which tend to give more weight to the translation technique than to the presence of a real Hebrew variant (primarily a syntax problem in Hebrew, which may, it should be admitted, result from a textual accident): 35

1. 1:4 וּעֲנֵן בֵדִיב וַאֲשֶׁר מֵת לְעָלְמָה לְעָלְמָה
   וּפֹעַלִּים עָלָיו וּפֶעַלִּים הָעָבְרָיִים

2. 3:18 עָנֵי רַשָּׁע (מַעְנָה מִתּוֹם
   וּשְׁמַעְיָלֶנֶס עַל עָנָאִים

3. 3:21 אַחֲרֵיהֶם הָעָבְרָיִים (לְבֶלֶלֶת צְדִיקִים
   לֵהָלֹהוֹ אִזָּה צְדִיק

4. 20:21 אוֹמֶר לְשֵׁמֶךָ אַלּוּּ֥תָל יִפְתַּחְתָּלָת
   לַלָּלֶת בֵּית בֵּית
   תֵּלֶל יִשָּׁרְתַּמֶּר לַלָּלֶת לִפְתַּחְתָּלָת

5. 21:20(15) יִתְנָה אֲזֶה יִתְנָה עָשֶׂה לַכְּלָלָה יֵקְפֶּר מִפְּתַחְתָּלָת
   יֵקְפֶּר מִפְּתַחְתָּלָת

6. 30:5 וְלַמְּשָׁהָרָה וְלַמְּשָׁהָרָה לְכַלּוֹ הערָרָה
   כְּלַמְּשָׁהָרָה וְלַמְּשָׁהָרָה

B. POSSIBLE HEBREW VARIANTS

The examples below are those most likely to reflect a variant Hebrew Vorlage, and have been determined by sifting out those differences we have determined to be attributable to translation technique. The majority of cases listed here concerns

35In cases such as these a detailed examination of all factors is particularly necessary because on the one hand no clearly definable tendency can be discerned, and on the other, one's intuition may go against attributing such differences to the translator.

36See M. Greenberg, Ezekiel I, Anchor Bible (Garden City 1983) 43, for the problem of ל (masc.) versus נ (fem.).

37Cf. next verse.
pairs of words or lists, which are particularly susceptible, judging by the evidence, to interchanges of word order, which could have occurred quite easily in a Hebrew text.

(87) 1:26 

(88) 5:12

(89) 6:11

(90) 6:12

(91) 11:24

(92) 16:13

(93) 19:9

(94) 20:38

(95) 22:18

(96) 22:18

(97) 28:23

38 Hatch-Redpath lists both κημος and γαλεάγρα as translations for הֶן in this verse.

39 דַּעְשָׂה is translated by ἄφεσε and ἀφεσθήσῃ in Ezek. 17:15, and the same Greek word translates ἦνομι at Ezek. 20:8. In contrast, ἄφεσες does not render יָשָׁע in LXX-Ezekiel but יָשָׂע, and this is the standard equivalency (= יָשָׁע only once at Hos. 14:10).

40 It seems to me a little bit much to assume that LXX reflects כֶּסֶספִיינָה, and to suggest that this "confirms" H. L. Ginsberg's conjecture at Prov. 26:23 on the basis of Ugaritic (BASOR 98 [1945] 21, n. 55; thus Driver, Biblica 32 [1951] 191). The data are more easily accounted for by assuming a change in word order in LXX.
IV. CONCLUSION

The compilation of word-order differences in a given book of the LXX (Section II) provides a significant, concrete and objective criterion for the evaluation of a translator’s approach to his source text. This evaluation, expressed statistically, can be meaningfully compared to results obtained for other LXX books. The importance of such a general evaluation of translation technique for textual criticism lies in its providing an objective indication of a translator’s reliability in rendering his source faithfullly.

A full listing and analysis of all variations from the word order of the source text (Section III), moreover, provides detailed information which may be useful in consideration of specific instances. Thus, a case of change in word order

---

41 For the determination of the equivalents cf. 23:24, 27:10 38:5, 39:9 (נמל = πελτας, an exclusively Ezekielian equivalent). נמל is rendered by ἐπίλατον at 27:10 and κοντοῖς at 39:9, and apparently understood according to context.

42 For this and the following examples from Isaiah, cf. the editorial comments in the edition of the Hebrew University Bible Project, The Book of Isaiah, vol. I (ed. M. H. Goshen-Gottstein; Jerusalem 1975) ad locum.
encountered in LXX can be evaluated more accurately when it is possible to indicate similar instances, or to bring into account more general conclusions based on whole groups of changes which are characterized by one common aspect. An overall view of a certain phenomenon can at times support the assumption that a change in word order derives from stylistic or linguistic considerations and not from a variant Hebrew text.