THE INTERPRETATION OF כָּלָה/כָּלָה IN THE LXX:
AMBIGUITY AND INTUITIVE COMPREHENSION

Frank H. Polak

The grapheme כָּלָה (MT kulloh) occurs frequently in the books of the Latter Prophets. It is a residue of the ancient Hebrew orthography in which the pron. suffix of the 3rd-pers. masc. was indicated by heh. Seemingly innocuous, this grapheme poses severe problems:

1) The consonantal text of MT has preserved the heh, although this orthographic variant is relatively rare;

2) In the LXX of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets it is often interpreted as a derivative from kly (e.g. kālah) and translated by e.g. συντελεῖα/συντελεῖν, as against the normal rendition of kl by πᾶς.

3) Both questions relate to the same vocable and the same orthographic standard. Therefore one wonders whether they are in any way connected.

I

Let us consider first the basic data in the Hebrew Bible. The vocable כָּלָה occurs eighteen times in MT, especially in the Books of the Latter Prophets. There are two instances in Isaiah (15:3; 16:7); eight in Jeremiah (2:21; 8:6,10,10; 15:10; 20:7; 48:31,38); three in Ezekiel (11:15; 20:40; 36:10); four in the Dodekapropheton (Hos 13:2; Nah 2:1; Hab 1:9,15) — viz. altogether seventeen. This grapheme occurs only once in the Former Prophets (2 Sam 2:9),¹ and is not attested at all in the Pentateuch.

¹The main data are identical in all important manuscripts of the MT: Aleppo Codex (A), Codex Leningradensis B 19a (L), the Cairo Codex (C) and the Damascus Codex (Sasson 507, Jerusalem 24 5702), as well as in the Codex Petropolitensis (Babylonian punctuation with Tiberian influences). The MT norm is established by the Masorah Magna: ב עָלָה הַכְּלָה — three times kethib heh and likewise all of Jeremiah,
The alternative grapheme י"ל occurs seventeen times — five times in the Pentateuch (Gen 25:25; Exod 14:7; 19:18; Lev 13:13; Num 23:13 — י"ל); six times in the Latter Prophets (Isa 1:23; 9:8,16; Jer 6:13:13; Mal 3:9) and in the Hagiographa (Ps 29:9; 53:4; Prov 24:31; 30:27; Job 21:23; Cant 5:16 — י"ל). Thus, the "normal" form is found in 48.57% of all occurrences, and the "archaic" form in 51.43%.

This distribution contrasts starkly with the general spread of the grapheme כ in the Hebrew Bible. The way for pron. suffix of the 3rd-pers. masc. occurs 7710 times (apart from י"ל 7693 times), but only rarely do we find the heh. In Genesis we note six cases: את (Gen 9:21; 12:8; 13:3; 35:21), כותה (49:11), כותיה (49:11). In Exodus we note: כניער (22:4), כזמה (22:26), כערת (32:17), כערת (32:25; four cases).


3See Weil, Massorah Gedolah, signum 83, 598 and also the apparatus of Ginsburg's edition. The Masora Parva of L mentions the kethib heh for the four forms יָלוֹה (Gen 9:21; 12:8; 13:3; 35:21), but not the qere; the qere is mentioned for יָדוֹת, כמותה (Gen 49:11), יָדוֹת, שמה (Exod 22:4,26), יָדוֹת, זכאות (2 Kgs 6:10; 9:25), יָדוֹת, זכאות (Isa 39:2; 1QIsa has יָדוֹת, זכאות (Jer 17:24), יָדוֹת, זכאות (Ezek 12:14), יָדוֹת, זכאות (48:15,21), יָדוֹת, זכאות (v. 18), יָדוֹת, שמה (Ps 42:9), יָדוֹת, זכאות (Dan 11:10) and also for יָדוֹת, שמה (Gen 48:10). In A the qere is only rarely recorded. In many cases the Masora Parva of these codices does not even remark on the kethib. On the other hand, the Masora Parva of the Damascus Codex often indicates the qere with way, e.g. יָלוֹה (Gen 9:21: יָלוֹה יָדוֹת); see: Y. Shashar, The Jerusalem Manuscript 5702 24 (Sasson 507) and its Place in the Formation of the Tiberian Textus Receptus (diss. Jerusalem 1983) 168-9 (Hebrew). The Babylonian Codex Petropolitensis indicates the qere frequently, as does the Codex Reuchlinianus; the punctuation of this non-Masoretic manuscript has been analysed by: Sh. Morag, "The Vocalization of Codex Reuchlinianus: Is the 'Pre-Masoretic' Bible Pre-Masoretic?", JS 4 (1959), 216-237. Some editions, but not Ginsburg or BHK, record the kethib יָלוֹה for Ezek 48:8. Following this tradition Driver counts nine examples in Ezekiel.

The Sam. Pent. has mostly way, but reads יָלוֹה for יָלוֹה (Lev 23:13; pronounced as unisko); for יָלוֹה (Deut 34:7) the Samaritan reading is la'e ('his moisture'). On יָלוֹה (Exod 32:17) see below.
The Interpretation of קַלָּה כִּלָּה in the LXX

The remainder of the Pentateuch contains four examples: נָכְבָּה (Lev 23:13), נָכְבָּה (Num 10:36), נָכְבָּה (Num 23:8), נָכְבָּה (Deut 34:7). Altogether the Pentateuch offers fourteen instances, three or which are verbal forms (Exod 32:25; Num 10:36; 23:8; possibly also Exod 32:17).


In the books of the Latter Prophets the distribution is far from uniform. The book of Isaiah (39:2) contains only one form, and even this is paralleled by an example from 2 Kings. In Jeremiah we note three examples (2:3 — כָּלָת; 17:24 — כָּלָת; 22:18 — כָּלָת), and in Ezekiel eight: כָּלָת (12:14), כָּלָת (31:18; 32:31,32; 39:11), כָּלָת (48:15,21), כָּלָת (48:18). In the Minor Prophets the only example is כָּלָת (Hab 3:4). The Book of Psalms contains three instances: כָּלָת (Ps 10:9; 27:5), כָּלָת (42:9). The form כָּלָת occurs in Dan 11:10. Altogether 37 cases are found in the MT, 14 in the Pentateuch, 6 in the Former Prophets, 13 in the Latter Prophets and 4 in the Hagiographa.

Thus the *heh* for the suffix of the 3rd-pers. masc. occurs 55 times out of a total of 7765 (0.708%). By contrast, the grapheme כִּלָּה is found in 18 cases out of 35 (51.43%). Judging by the data for the general distribution, one would expect to find 0.248 instances out of 35 (0.708%), that is to say at the very most three cases in a text ten times as large as the Hebrew Bible. Therefore, the frequency of the grapheme כִּלָּה in MT constitutes a severe problem in itself.

II

Additional problems are posed by the LXX. The passages in which MT has the form כִּלָּה, did not cause the translators much difficulty, but the MT instances of כִּלָּה have not always fared so well. Only in one half of the occurrences of כִּלָּה do the translators offer equivalents which suit the Masoretic vocalization (2 Sam 2:9; Isa 15:3; 16:7; Jer 2:21; 48:31; Ezek 20:40; 36:10). Elsewhere they have resorted to renderings on the basis of the root *kly*, as e.g. συντάξεον/συντάξετέων. This is a remarkable fact, for the graphic indication of the 3rd-pers. masc. suffix by *heh* must have been quite common in the manuscripts used by the translators: in Papyrus Nash, found in Egypt, we note כָּלָת (line 9), כָּלָת (line 11). This shows that this form by itself was

4Note 4QSam (1 Sam 20:38; MT נָכְבָּה כִּלָּה; LXX ambiguously: ἐνακρυσώ τοῦ
not exceptionally difficult. Nevertheless, renditions such as συντέλεσιν are used ten times in the Old Greek of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets, as against five instances of GK.

The form of the 3rd-pers. fem., כִּלָּה, presents us with similar problems. This form occurs nine times in the books of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Minor Prophets (Jer 6:6; 13:19; 50:13 [27:13 LXX]; Ezek 29:2; 35:15; Amos 8:8; 9:5; Nah 3:1; Zech 4:2; cp. נְקָם Ezek 36:5 MT); in five passages the translation is in keeping with the massoretic reading (Jer 6:6; 50:13 [27:13LXX]); Ezek 29:2; Nah 3:1; Zech 4:2 and also Ezek 36:5), but in four places the translator derived it from kly (Jer 13:19; Ezek 35:15; Amos 8:8; 9:5).

The case of Am 8:8 is quite instructive. According to MT the impending divine judgment is described as an upheaval of the earth; a metaphor represents this catastrophe as the flooding of the Nile:

 подготовкְּנה (נָשֶׁקּּה) כִּי מִצְרִי

And because of this shall the land not tremble and every one mourn that lives on it? And it shall rise like the river, wholly and it will be troubled and sink like the Nile of Egypt.

The LXX, on the other hand, speaks of total disaster:

καὶ ἐτὶ τούτων οὖν ταραχθήσεται ἡ γῆ καὶ πενθήσει πᾶς ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ἀναβήσεται ὡς ποταμὸς συντέλεσιν καὶ καταβήσεται ὡς ποταμὸς Αἰγύπτου

And because of these shall the land not be convulsed, and every one mourn, that lives on it? And it will rise like a river, annihilation, and go down like the river of Egypt.

In MTحلַה refers to בְּאָוָר. Although the Old Greek identified this grapheme correctly in other contexts (Nah 3:1; Zech 4:2), here it is read as כַּלָּה: extinction is sweeping over the earth like a river (cp. 5:24). This rendering is syntactically sound. The picture is in keeping with the idea of impending divine judgment, which dominates the overall context. Viewed from this angle the reading כַּלָּה is quite suitable, παίδαριον αὐτοῦ; on this scroll see: F.I. Andersen – D. N. Freedman, “Another Look at 4Q5amh,” RevQ 53 (1989) 7-29.

Similarly Am 9:5 حَلِّل = συντέλεσιν αὐτῆς; the idea of ‘extinction’ matches בְּאָוָר (Hab 3:19); גִּלְלָה (Job 30:2, with asterisk); cp also Jer 6:11 (ברד; cp. n. 17 below); 15:16 (אכפָּל); נְקָם; so also Ezek 7:15; in 2 Chr 30:22 LXX καὶ συντέλεσαν (= נְקָם) is the original reading, as against MTיאכפָּל.
being a central concept in prophetic announcements of judgment and salvation. It is used for depicting the destruction of Israel (Isa 10:24; Ezek 11:13; 13:13; Zeph 1:18) or its enemies (Jer 46:28; Nah 1:8,9). Often the prophet announces the divine decision to refrain from utter destruction (Jer 4:27; 5:10,18; 46:28; cp. Ezek 20:17; 11:13).

The vocable כָּלַּח (MT κυλλόθ) is treated in a similar way in Habakkuk’s description of the expected onslaught of the enemy (Hab 1:8b-9a):

מרוחק יבוא יעוף כנשר ויש לאוכל כלח לוחם יבש

They will come from afar, flying like an eagle that is eager to eat; he is all set for violence;

καὶ ὄρμησον μακρὰθεν καὶ πετασθήσονται ὡς ἄετος πρόθυμος εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν συντέλεια εἰς ἀσβεστής ἡξει

They will advance from afar and fly like an eagle, eager to eat; extinction will befall the wicked.6

In this context the interpretation of the grapheme כָּלַּח as kālah suits the main theme well. The prophet presents the coming onslaught of the Babylonians as an act of retribution brought upon the violent oppressors of whom he complains (v. 3-4). This idea conditioned the Greek interpretation of the graphic constellation: disregarding the specific imagery of the immediate context which pertains only to the advancing enemy, the translator focused on the fate of the unrighteous. It would be an error to suppose that he consciously looked for a grammatical subject of the clause, for he would then have noted that the fem. lexeme kālah does not fit the masc. form כָּלַח. He would also have considered the possibility that כָּלַח, read as κυλλόθ, refers to the enemy. It appears, therefore, that his reading of our grapheme was conditioned by the wider context. This would also account for the Greek rendering of v. 14-15 in the same chapter:

תִּתְנֻשָׁה אֲרוֹם כָּרִים וּלְחָקָה נֶקְלָּתוֹ נַנְתָּר בָּתְרָם

And You made mankind like the fishes of the sea... all of it he drew up by the hook and caught it in his net

καὶ ποιῆσεις τοὺς ἄνθρωπους ὡς τοὺς ἱχθύας τῆς θακάσσης... συντέλειαν ἐν ἀγκίστρῳ ἀνέκπασε καὶ ἐιλκυσεν αὐτῶν ἐν ἀμφιβλήστρῳ

6The equation ἀσβεστής = כָּלַּח is based on an abstractum pro concreto.
And You made the people like the fishes of the sea... *extinction* he drew up by the hook, and caught it in a net.

Once again the translator disregards the specific imagery. The idea represented by συντέλεια does not suit the metaphor that likens the enemy’s victims to fish in a net. But it is in keeping with the overall theme of this pericope.

The same also holds true for the Greek rendering of the divine complaint (Mal 3:9-10):

哙בארה אתא נאוים ואהל אתא קבעש תגהיל הביא את כל מהתשר לא בית תארי

יוי פרץ ביבר

You are cursed by the curse; and yet it is Me you wrong, *all* the nation; bring all the tithes to the store-house, that there may be food in My house.

και ἀποβλέποντες ὑμεῖς ἀποβλέπετε καὶ ἐμὲ ὑμεῖς περνίζετε τὸ θηνός συντελέσθη καὶ εἰς αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ ἑκάστα τὰ ἱερά τούς θησαυροὺς (B-S* + αὐτοῦ) ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ (B-S* + αὐτοῦ)

And you look quite intently; it is Me you are spitting,* the people were annihilated;* and you have brought all the spoils to the treasury and (his) pillage will be in (his) house.

We cannot determine with certainty whether the translator read כלל with a *waw* in his *Vorlage* (as in MT), or כלל with a *heh*. Nor can we explain his specific intentions within the immediate context. However, the allusions to the plunder and the annihilation of the nation by the enemy suit the large-scale framework, as the

---

7Has the Old Greek used συντέλεια in the meaning ‘tribute’? In view of 1 Sam 8:3: συντέλεια = יבש, this suggestion might seem plausible. However, since συντέλεια = יבש seems to be the standard equivalence (cp. Ezek 22:2; Jer 6:13; Prov 1:19; Isa 10:12; Joel 2:8; Lam 2:17), it is not necessary to assume a particular shade of meaning for 1 Sam 8:3. See: E. Tov, “Three Dimensions of LXX Words,” *RB* 83 (1976) 529-544.


9Nearby we encounter the predicate יחלות (v. 6; LXX: οὐχ ἀπέσχεθε), but its meaning is quite different.
whole chapter is dominated by the announcement of the impending divine judgment (vv. 1-3; 19-24).

On the other hand, the translator’s intentions are quite obvious in his treatment of Hosea’s denouncement of the Israelite calf worship:

ממשיח וראשי כל (לומז) (v. 3)

The work of craftsmen all of it (Hos 13:2) (v.3 for them)

For this indictment the Old Greek reads:

ἐργα τεκτόνων συντετελεσµένα (αὐτοῖς)

products of work of craftsmen, perfect (for them)

This rendition constitutes a rather ironic sign of contempt for the esthetic pretensions of Hellenistic idolatry. The traditional equation of the grapheme כָּל with the root ḫlย is retained (although it is not clear which pronunciation is implied), but the translator had his own interpretation imposed on it.

Nevertheless, the assumption that the reading kālāh merely reflects the translator’s interpretation, is not necessarily valid in all cases. In the prophetic description of the destruction of Nineveh (Nah 2:1; LXX: 1:15 -- 2:1) the reading of the Greek might well be traditional:

כי ולא ישוив עוד על צора בחל מחנה נברת

For he will not continue anymore to pass through you, Belial; he has been totally destroyed.

διότι οὖ μὴ προσθήσεσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ διέλθετιν (B-S-68 + διὰ σοῦ) εἰς παλαιώσαν συντετελεσται ἡξηρται

for they will not continue anymore to pass through you because of decrepitude; it has been annihilated and eliminated.

In this passage the reading kālāh suits the context. The noun כָּל occurs twice in the preceding pericope:

ובשפת עבuctose כָּל יעשוה

But with an overrunning flood he will make an end of it (1:8; another shared lexeme is עבורה)

כָּל זה עשה לא תקפימו צור

He will make an utter end, the enemy shall not rise a second time (1:9)
Apart from the equation אֶל בְּלִיּו = εἰς παλαιῶσθω (a pseudo-variant based on ἀληθές), the Greek rendering is rather plausible. The reading καλαθ also suits the next word, וַתִּשְׁאָר, very well; the sequence καλαθ nikrat is an instance of internal parallelism. The asyndeton construction even strengthens the impression of authenticity, as e.g. אֲבֹל אֲמָלְלָה אֹרֶץ. הָעֶפֶר לַבְּנֹת קַמָּל (`The land is mourning, languishing, Lebanon is ashamed, it is withering,' Isa 33:9). The meaning reflected in the Greek is hardly less satisfactory than the idea implied in the Masoretic vocalization. Hence, this translation might well testify to an authentic tradition.

III

It is quite understandable why the the reading καλαθ was suitable in the large-scale context. But it is not clear why the translator consistently refrained from the reading κυλλοθ (κυλλαθ was identified in Nah 3:1; Zech 4:2). This fact cannot be explained by his limited knowledge of Hebrew, for this vocabulary is quite common (it is matched by Aramaic κυλλή). Nor can we ascribe this rendering to translation license, for the use of the equivalent συντέλεια seems consistent and systematic. Was the Greek translator of the Minor Prophets bound by tradition?

This explanation, though not implausible, raises another question: why did the tradition ignore the reading κυλλοθ? Or rather: what made the reading καλαθ so attractive, that other possibilities were disregarded? In answering this question we must take into account three basic data:

(1) The translator did not always analyse his text consciously (Hab 1:9,15; Mal 3:9);

(2) Although the reading καλαθ fits the general context, it is not always suitable to the immediate context (Hab 1:9,15);

(3) This reading is occasionally quite apt (Amos 8:8; Nah 2:1).

We shall now try to use the models proposed by cognitive psychology, in order to elucidate some of the thought processes underlying the LXX rendition.


11 The recognition of κυλλοθ was apparently less problematic. It was identified correctly in Nah 3:1 and Zech 4:2. Unlike in Am 8:8; 9:5, in these passages the reading καλαθ would not have been suitable.
Applying, at the root of the problem lies ambiguity. As pointed out by Barr, an unvocalized text is basically ambiguous, the consonants allowing for various possibilities of realization. Thus, the graphic constellation קלה is compatible with a number of different readings, e.g. kullah, kullah and kal.

A similar problem presents itself in the Exodus narrative (Exod 11:1), in which the LXX renders MT כל as כלו with a suffix:

כֶּלֶת וְרָשָׁנָה וַיְשָׁרְשׁוּ אָתֵךְ

Like expelling a total destruction he will cast you out.

ותנן דָּוָיָהוּתֶלֶת יָמָּה סְנָנֶנֶנָּה פֶּנֶנָּיָה הֲנָבָאֵל יָמָּה הֲנָבָאֵל

When he will throw you out with everything he will throw you out.

The question is, how does the reader make his choice between these possibilities?

Barr opines that in certain cases the translator may have rendered a given vocable according to some pronunciation tradition with which he was acquainted. But in most instances he identified the lexeme in accord with the general context, without actually forming for himself a clear idea of the correct pronunciation. This approach is in keeping with the findings of cognitive psychology and psycholinguistics. Psy-

---

12J. Barr, “Vocalization and Analysis of Hebrew among the Ancient Translators,” VTS 16 (Leiden 1967) 1-11. True to the typical Qumran orthography, 4QpNah has כל for MT כלו (Nah 3,1); for Hab 1,15 (MT כלו) 4QpHab 3,8 has [ר]. This spelling removes the inherent ambiguity. On 1QIsa 15:3; 16:7 (=MT) see below.

13The verb כָּלָה often has overtones of ‘totality’, e.g., complete execution of an order, total destruction and so on (there is no “partial” כָּלָה). In Gen 18:21 V renders כָּלָה as ‘opere completerint’; S has כָּלָה, כָּלָה. Thus, from a semantic point of view כָּל is also close to כָּל. This factor stands out in the various exegetical treatments of Gen 18:21 and Exod 11:1. In their comments on Exod 11:1 Rashi and R. Shmu’el ben Me’ir (Rashbam) explain כָּל as כָּלָה. Ibn Ezra opts for a similar solution in Gen 18:21, since the sequel has Abraham raise the question whether God will exercise judgment on all, including the innocent. A similar approach was adopted by S. D. Luzzatto’s Commentary to the Pentateuch (ed. P. Schlesinger; Tel Aviv 1965) 79, 251, followed by: A. Dillmann, Die Genesis, KHAT 11; Leipzig é1892) 269 (‘omnia’); id., Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus, Dritte Auflage ed. V. Ryssel (Kurat 12; Leipzig 1897) 107 (with reference to 2 Chr 12:12). For the emendation כָּל (Gen 18:21) see: J. Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs (Berlin é1899) 26, n. 1; C. Westermann, Genesis 12-36: A Commentary, transl. by J. J. Scullion (London – Minneapolis 1985) 285.

14Barr, “Vocalization” 1-4. For a linguistic account of reading in Israeli Hebrew see: E. Allon, The Process of Reading Unvocalized Texts in Modern Hebrew (diss. Jerusalem 1984; Hebr., Eng. Summary), who shows how the reader’s choices are conditioned by the context. The function of analogy in grammatical comprehension was discussed by: D. Weisheit,
chological experiments indicate that the reading process comprises two movements in perpetual interchange:

(1) Step-by-step construction on the basis of feature analysis, which proceeds from item to item in order to ascend to the level of sentence and paragraph (‘bottom-up’ comprehension). In this process the main question is which graphic, morphological, syntactic patterns and word-meanings the reader is able to identify.

(2) Comprehension by inference from global features (‘top-down’ analysis). This process seems to involve problems of a more general character: which overall patterns (schemes) does the reader recognize? To what extent is he influenced by contextual expectations or by innate tendencies (such as the tendency to identify a noun that opens the sentence, as the subject), thought patterns and ideology?¹⁵

These processes are particularly important in comprehension of ambiguous texts. Here every reading implies choice as well as recognition. The translator was not faced with the vocable kulloh (or kullah), but with a graphic constellation הַלְדוֹה, which is consistent with various different realizations. The reader who has to decide between these possibilities, is motivated not only by the immediate context and sentence construction, but also by innate tendencies, unconscious patterning, and general mind-sets. This holds good even for such elementary processes as the identification and recognition of graphic signs.¹⁶ Hence textual interpretation is


not only a matter of linguistic and exegetical analysis, but also of subliminal comprehension.

In view of the frequency of the noun kālāh in prophetic literature, and of its eschatologic content, it is obvious that this vocable denoted a central concept in a vital complex of thought patterns and expectations. This complex conditioned the translator’s perception of the general context on the one hand, and his comprehension of כָּלָה on the other hand. Therefore, we do not need to assume that the translator was acquainted with the reading kulloh, but consciously rejected it because of exegetic considerations. Nor is it necessary to conclude that he was unable to recognize this form. The interpretation of our grapheme as kālāh is a case of top-down reading and subliminal comprehension.

IV

Quite a different situation obtains in the Book of Ezekiel, in which we also meet the rendering of כָּלָה as συντέλεσαν, but with subtle distinctions. Consider the pericope on the illusions of those who remained in Jerusalem after the exile of 597 (Ezek 11:15):
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rendition of the threat against Edom (Ezek 35:15; MT kûlûh with the fem. suffix): שמחה ושם רומא ורמשי וכל אדום וכל — Thou shalt be desolate Mount Seir and all Edom, all of it.

The Old Greek creates a sort of parallel between שמחה in English and הלי פִּיךָ תִּשְׁרָאֵל הלי: ἐρήμων ἐσῃ ὅρος Σμρ καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰδουμαία ἐξαναλωθήσεται — Thou shalt be desolate mountain Seir and all Idumaeia will be annihilated.

The coupling הלי is not attested elsewhere. But here this interpretation of הלי fits the rules of syntax and logic. 17

The translator, however, abandoned the reading kâlâh when it did not suit the general context. In promises of salvation the phrase הלי ישות הלי is matched by πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ εἰς τέλος (‘all Israel in its entirety’; 20:40; 36:10). On the one hand this rendering suits the Masoretic vocalization; one may compare the phrase καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ τέλος ἐγκόψειν ‘and to bring to an end,’ 1 Chr 29:19), rendering לולעשא תִּהלעט תהלעט (‘and to do all these things and to build’) of MT. On the other hand, the Greek rendering of the Ezekiel passages is in keeping with the traditional equivalence חלי = סענְלֶאֵת: instead of derivations from the compound verb the translator used a noun from the simple stem. The phrase εἰς τέλος stands for הלי (Ps 74:11 [73:11

17 In Ezek 21:33(28) the Greek has ἱσπασμένη εἰς σφέτεν καὶ ἱσπασμένη εἰς συντέλειαν (‘a sword drawn for slaughter and drawn for extinction’) for MT חלי ומלך תהלעט תהלעט תהלעט (‘a sword drawn for slaughter, polished to contain’, cp. v. 8; 23:32; Jer 6:11). In this context this interpretation is almost inevitable. Therefore, we cannot know for certain whether the Hebrew Vorlage had הלי or חלי תהלעט תהלעט תהלעט (note Judg 20:40 MT חלי כה = סענְלֶאֵת LXXA,B).

18 On principle, the phrase εἰς τέλος may mean ‘forever’ (it is a frequent equivalent for לולעשא in Psalms). However, in Koine Greek this phrase regularly means ‘completely,’ as shown by: F. Preisigke, Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden, ed. E. Riessling, II. Band, 500; note Polybius οὐ, 7 τὴν δὲ Λιβυῶν εἰς τέλος ἀβλαβὴ διαμένοσαν ‘that Libya remained entirely unscathed’). In 36:10 the meaning ‘forever’ is syntactically less fitting: in 15:4.5; 22:30 the meaning ‘completely’ seems preferable (cp. 15:5 לולעשא הלי; 22:31 לולעשא; note the equivalence with דע in Deut 31:24,30; Josh 8:24; 10:20). Since Ezek 20:40 belongs to Ezek-α, the rendition of הלי as εἰς τέλος should not be attributed to the reviser Ezek-β. For a recent discussion of the strata of LXX Ezekiel see: L. J. McGregor, The Greek Text of Ezekiel: An Examination of its Homogeneity (SCSS 18; Atlanta, GA 1985). McGregor reaches the conclusion that sections 1 and 2 (according to his analysis, Ezek 1-25 and 26-39, respectively) had two different translators. However, convergences such as the similarities in the treatment of הלי suggest that section 2 represents a revision based on a text that was close to section 1, as proposed by: E. Tov, The Septuagint Translator of Jeremiah and Baruch (HSM 8; Missoula, Montana 1976) 150. See also G. Marquis’ review of McGregor, JQR LXXXIII (January-April, 1993) 440-444.
LXX]י, הֵלֵךְ (2Chr 12:12) and הֵלֵךְ (31:1). Hence, the rendering εἰς τέλος in the Old Greek of Ezekiel actually is a combination of the derivation from ἱκλή/συντελεῖν and the identification of kol.

Apparently, this solution was triggered by syntactic as well as exegetical considerations. In a promise of salvation the concept of συντελεῖα would be inappropriate, so the translator could not apply the traditional rendering. Still, his hand was forced by the syntactic construction of the phrase כל בית ישראל כלאל with its characteristic repetition of כלאל/כלאל. The traditional equation כלאל = συντελεῖν enabled him to differentiate between this particular idiom and the simple sequences מַעֲרִימָה כלאל (29:2), שָׁוָא כלאל (36:5), for which he offers: Αἰγυπτίων ὀλὴν, τὴν Ἰδουμαίαν πᾶσαν. Thus, he succeeded in finding an acceptable way of dealing with exegetical difficulties and ambiguity alike. Obviously, this delicate treatment of the text represents conscious analysis. In this respect, the methods used in this translation differ from those of the book of Minor Prophets.

V

In the Old Greek of Jeremiah, on the other hand, the reading and translation of our grapheme has nothing to do with exegetical considerations and ideology. In fact, the equivalent συντελεῖν is used only once in Jer 13:19:

בַּגְלוֹת יְהוֹרָד חָלֹת גְּלוֹת שָׁלוֹמִי

Judea has been exiled, all of it, it has been exiled in its entirety.

In this verse the translator read our grapheme as killah and rendered it accordingly:

ἀποκύσθη Ιουδας συντελεσεν ἀποκύσθαι τελεῖαν

Judea has been exiled; He has carried out a total expulsion.

It appears, however, that this rendering was not occasioned by the necessities of exegesis. If the translator had been guided by considerations of content, he might well have thought of equivalents of συντελεῖν/כלאל like those places in Minor Prophets and Ezekiel which have been discussed above. Nor can one maintain that the form כלאל itself was troublesome: the translator might certainly have recognized the parallel with שָׁלוֹם, rendered as τελεῖαν (formally similar to συντελεῖν). Apparently, the main problem confronting the translator was the repetition of כלאל, a rare and difficult form. The translator differentiated between the two occurrences of this
form. The first time it was understood, like MT, as a passive verbal form, but the second instance was rendered as a noun, such as תַּלְפָּה/טַלְפָּה. This rendering was made possible by the ambiguity of the grapheme בָּלָה, which suggested to the translator a verbal predicate for אַעְסִקֵיָּן. That is to say, the main problem in this text relates to the general pattern of the sentence and its syntactic construction. These led the translator to identify of our grapheme as a verbal form. It would, of course, be difficult to determine whether this reading reflects conscious analysis or simply resulted from subliminal patterning.

Besides συντελείν, the simplex τελείν also supplied the translator with other compound verbs. This is the case in the prophetic complaint (Jer 20:7):

Here I became unto a laughing-stock every day; all are mocking me.

The Old Greek applies the verb διστελείν: ἑγενόμην εἰς γέλωτα πᾶσαν ἤμέραν διστέλεσα μυκτηρίζόμενος — I became unto a laughing-stock all day; I was continually being mocked.

In the continuation (v.18) this lexeme stands for דַּלְפָּה בָּלָה. Hence, in v. 7 this rendering might imply the reading בָּלָה בָּלָה. Nevertheless, we must not disregard the possibility that the verb διστέλεσα — as an auxiliary for the main predicate μυκτηρίζόμενος — actually renders kalal. According to this view, the translator was acquainted with the vocalization known to us, but retained the equation בָּלָה = (συν)τελείν. This rendition, then, may represent a combination of both traditions.

At any rate, we do not need to cope with this dilemma in the complaint on Israel’s wickedness (Jer 8:6): MT: כַּלָּה שֶׁב בָּלָה (כַּלָּה בָּלָה) — every one turns away in his course; LXX: διέλπην ὁ τρέχων ἀπὸ τοῦ δρόμου σῶτο — the runner desisted from his course. The translator certainly read kalal, but he gave it the sense of ‘ceasing,’ ‘running out’ (cp. Is. 15:4; Jer 14:6). A similar interpretation is reflected in Jeremiah’s personal complaint (15:10): MT: כַּלָּה מַקְלַלָתְנָה — every one is cursing me; LXX: ἡ ἱσχύς μου εξέλπην ἐν τοῖς καταρωμένοις με — ‘I was exhausted by those cursing me.’

The translator apparently interpreted the problematic grapheme מַקְלַלָתְנָה as מַמְקַלֵּלָתְנָה (or less likely: בָּמַקְלַלָתְנָה). The phrase ἡ ἱσχύς μου is required by the Greek context; in

---

Hebrew we meet a similar phrase in Neh. 4:4: כְּלָה חָזְבַּל עַצְגֵּז (‘the strength of the burden carriers fails them’).

The Book of Jeremiah contains only two passages in which the rendering of our grapheme matches the masoretic reading completely and unequivocally.²⁰

Traditional pronunciation might explain why the translators identified כְּלָה as a form of כֶּל in Jer 6:6. Here the LXX reads πόλις πειρᾶς Όλη καταδονοστέια εν αὐτῇ — untruthful city, all oppression in it. This rendering seems to reflect a Hebrew Vorlage, such as ערי הפרק והשקר, כְּלָה אֹשֶּׁךְ בַּכֵּרָה, והשָׁקָה — the city was vindicated, all oppression in her. In this case the translator could not have taken his clue from contextual indications of the meaning and reading of the grapheme כְּלָה.²¹ Still, he may have been acquainted with certain traditions of interpretation and pronunciation. The prophecy of Nahum 3:1 represents Nineveh as עְרֵי דְּרִים כְּלָה הַמִּלְטָה פרְקֵךְ מִלְטַה — the blood-spilling town, all lies, full of plunder. The attribute פרְקֵךְ מִלְטַה enabled the translator to understand this sentence as: πόλις αἰματόν Όλη πειρᾶς ἀδικίας πλήρης — city of blood, wholly mendacious, full of injustice.’ This verse may have been the basis for the Greek interpretation of the similar phrase in Jer 6:6.

The divine address to Israel (and I had planted you a noble vine, wholly a right seed, Jer 2:21), is rendered as: εἶδο δὲ ἐφύτευσά σε ἀμπελόν καρποφόρον πάσαν ἁληθεύην — I have planted you as a fruit-bearing, entirely true vine (for our argument it does not matter that this rendition does not reflect עָדוֹן). The Hebrew parent text may have read כְּלָה with a וָ הוֹ (cp. 6:13, where LXX = MT), but on the other hand the translator may have been acquainted with certain pronunciation traditions, for example, by way of lections from the prophetic literature (not unlike the haphtarot read in the synagogue after the weekly Torah portion). In the Old Greek of Jeremiah (Jer-α) the equation כְּלָה = καλᾶ is not to be attributed to the original Old Greek (Jer-α), but to the revision (Jer-β). The LXX to Jer 48:38 (31:38 LXX) does not offer an equivalent for מִטָּחָה. Jer 8:10 is not extant in the Old Greek. On the revisions in Jeremiah LXX see: Tov, Jeremiah 41-75.

²⁰The rendering πάνωθεν = כְּלָה (Jer 48:30[31:31LXX]) is not to be attributed to the original Old Greek (Jer-α), but to the revision (Jer-β). The LXX to Jer 48:38 (31:38LXX) does not offer an equivalent for מִטָּחָה. Jer 8:10 is not extant in the Old Greek. On the revisions in Jeremiah LXX see: Tov, Jeremiah 41-75.

²¹The Madin ha’e tradition on Jer 6:6 mentions כְּלָה for MT כְּלָה.
It is difficult, therefore, to avoid the conclusion that we are dealing with different translators, all following the same tradition and belonging to the same circle or ‘school,’ but nevertheless quite different in method and outlook.\(^{22}\)

In view of this result, we must ask how this ‘school’ came to adopt the equation נלה = קולא. Was it their own invention, or did they receive it from an already existing tradition? Both positions might be defended, but the latter alternative seems preferable for the following reasons:

(1) As shown above, the same problem presents itself in the divine announcement to Moses in Exod 11:1 (כנחא אריש גרש אתי מוז נניהק — ὃταν δὲ ἔξοποστάληση ὑμῶν σὺν παντὶ ἐπιθαλαι ὑμῶν ἐπιθαλη). Here the LXX read κολος, whereas MT reads קולא. Possibly the translators of the prophetic books were aware of the second reading and treated other instances of לカラー accordingly.

(2) The reading קולא is not implausible in at least one biblical passage: כשנה (Nah 2:1; MT כלה). This reading cannot be dismissed as impossible also in the threat against Edom: שמה תוהה ור עני כלה יאום (Ezek 35:15; MT כולה with the fem. suffix; cf Am 8:8).

VI

There are additional cases of two different interpretations of an ambiguous grapheme coexisting in the Hebrew tradition. Talmon has pointed to the alternation of the readings כלה/רבע in MT, LXX and 1QIsaa (1 Sam 2:31; Isa 17:5).\(^{23}\) The tale of the Golden Calf contains an instance of ambiguity involving the vowel letter "heh. According to MT, Moses and Joshua heard the people רבע ‘as they were shouting’ (Exod 32:17; = LXX krazóntvn, ‘shouting’); but the Samaritans read רבע ‘ra,\(^{24}\) which fits Aaron’s argument that the people רבע ‘is set on evil’ (32:22; here Sam. Pent. has רבע ‘broken loose,’ on the basis of v. 25; LXX aliter). In this case the context suggested two different identifications of the lexeme involved, and hence

\(^{22}\)This possibility has also been suggested by Thackeray, “Translators” 579. Although Tov (Jeremiah, 136-9) focuses on the common features of Jer-α and the LXX of the Minor Prophets, he also records some subtle differences between these sections.


\(^{24}\)Quoted according to Z. Ben-Hayyim, The Literary and Oral tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic among the Samaritans, IV: The Words of the Pentateuch (Jerusalem 1977) 436. This reading is also presupposed by the Sam. Tg., and is thus based on ancient tradition.
two different readings. Although the MT-LXX reading of the unique *nomen actionis* is preferable (lectio difficilior; the equivalence MT=LXX represents the ancient reading), one cannot dismiss the Samaritan variant at the outset; this reading also represents an authentic Hebrew tradition.

Similarly, the ambiguity of the graphic representation causes severe problems in the poetic account of the theophany in the blessing of Moses (Deut 33:2). The enumeration of locations of the theophany closes with the words: ُلَّهُمَّ رَبُّنا خَيْرُنا ‘and He came from the holy myriads.’ The MT reading derives the vocable ُلَّهُمَّا from the verb َذَيَّا, ‘to come,’ in keeping with the predicates of the previous clauses: ‘The Lord came from Sinai, and rose from Se’ir upon them; He shined forth from Mount Paran’; ُلَّهُمَّا is understood as the abstract noun. On the other hand, the Tg. Onq. offers ُعَمْهَا رَبُّ خَيْرُنا (‘and with Him myriads of holy ones’; so also Peshitta, Frg. Tg., Tg. Neof. and Vulgate), recognizing the grapheme ُلَّهُمَّا as the

---

25Ambiguity seems to be involved also in readings like ُبيِّنَة (‘his beasts,’ Exod 22:4), similar to ُبَعُدَة (‘the fire,’ v. 5). In Jer 37:19 the reading of the *kethib* ُلَّهُمَّا interchanges with ُقَرَأ (originally for ‘a’yyah ?). In Num 10:36 the Sam. Pent. has ُبَعُدَة (‘at rest; similarly LXX v. 35) for MT ُلَّهُمَّا, possibly based on ُلَّهُمَّا (v. 33).

For the opinion that in many cases the *heh* might reflect a feminine suffix (מַעְשֶׁה, Lev. 23:13, because of ُمַעְשֶׁה; for ُלֻכַּה Jer 17:24, because of ُלֻכַּה) see: F. Boettcher, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der Hebräischen Sprache* (ed. F. Muhlau) (Leipzig 1866), II, 19-20 ([§872-B]). In Ezek 43:13 (LXX = מַעְשֶׁה) the suffix might refer to ُלֻכַּה (fem.) or to ُמַעְשֶׁה (masc.); hence we find מַעְשֶׁה (representing ُלֻכַּה), מַעְשֶׁה (representing ُמַעְשֶׁה). Sometimes a tradition reflects the masc. suffix, whereas the fem. form is expected. In Jer 2:24 the *kethib* ُقְנֵנִים interchanges with the ُقְנֵנִים, which is also reflected by LXX. The Sam. Pent. has ُכְנֵנִים and ُכְנֵנִים for MT ُכְנֵנִים (Gen 50:11), ُאֲרָמִים (Lev 1:16, 27:12) and ُכְנֵנִים (Lev 1:16); the text of Gen 17:16 poses complicated problems. For MT ُשַׁמְיִם (Gen 38:2) the LXX reads ُשַׁמְיִים, taking Shua as the name of Jehudah’s wife. In Ezek 33:27 MT has ُכְנֵנִים, whereas LXX reflects ُכְנֵנִים, as usual (see also Ezek 1:4). For MT ُכְנֵנִים (1 Sam 5:9) 4QSam* reads תְּמֻנָּה, taking ُכְנֵנִים for an object particle, i.e., ُכְנֵנִים, the scribe of Proto-MT wrote ُכְנֵנִים. Driver, *Samuel xxxiii*, refers to some passages in which LXX reflects the original reading with the suffix *heh* for the masculine, whereas in MT this form has not been preserved, notably 2 Sam 21:1 (LXX = אֲרָמִים לֶא), ُכְנֵנִים (אֲרָמִים לֶא, cp. v. 4 ُגְנֵנִים שָׁמַא בִּעַל יִשְׂרָאֵל). On the other hand, in Exod 18:6 MT has ُכְנֵנִים (אֲרָמִים לֶא, 4QSam* reads ُכְנֵנִים תְּמֻנָּה, referring to Zipporah. But for ُכְנֵנִים the LXX offers ُכְנֵנִים (= Sam. Pent.), referring to Zipporah. For a discussion of the various possibilities see: S. R. Driver, *Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh 1895) 392; E. König, *Das Deuteronomium* (KAT 3; Leipzig 1917) 216-7. The post-exilic eschatologic prophecy proclaims ُכְנֵנִים (‘and the Lord my God shall come, and all the holy ones with Thee’, Zech 14:5). If this were an allusion to Deut 33:2, it would imply both readings of ُלֻכַּה, equating it with ُכְנֵנִים (אֲרָמִים לֶא) alike.

---
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preposition נָשׁ with the suffix -oh. This interpretation fits the reading of the Sam. Pent., אֲנָה רוֹשׁ. The abstractum שֶׁרֶשׁ is understood as a reference to the holy angels (the לֶשֶׁן 4). Quite a different interpretation is offered by the LXX: σῶν μυρίσσων καδης ('with the myriads of Kadesh'), taking שֶׁרֶשׁ as a place name, like the preceding names Sinai, Se’ir and Paran. The preposition סּוּנ might reflect לֶשֶׁן or אֲנָה. This case is an excellent example of contextually conditioned ‘deep ambiguity,’ which affects the understanding of the context, as well as sentence structure and the identification of individual lexemes.27

The problem of the reading כָּל, although less extreme, is similar. We conclude, then, that the Greek translators of the books of the Prophets were acquainted with a traditional interpretation (and pronunciation) of כָּל which differed from that of the massoretic punctuation.

VI

Finally, we have to address the problem of the relationship between the Greek rendering and the frequency of the grapheme כָּל in the consonantal text of MT. We have already seen how striking the figures are: altogether the pron. suffix for the 3rd-pers. masc. occurs 7765 times in MT, of which 55 (0.71%) with the heh. On the other hand, out of 35 instances of כָּל with this suffix, 18 have the heh (51.43%). Judging by the figures for the general distribution one would expect 0.25 cases (0.71% of 35), that is to say at most three instances in a text ten times as large as the Hebrew Bible. From a statistical point of view, the probability of this constellation is less than one in a hundred (see table 2). Thus, the grapheme כָּל occupies a quite exceptional position.

27Kess – Hope, Ambiguity 89-100; Taylor, Psycholinguistics 154-158,168.
Table 1: The Distribution of קָלָל/כָּלָל

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus\Form</th>
<th>קָלָל/כָּלָל</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>קָלָל</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pentateuch</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form. Proph</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer-Ez-MP</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagiogr</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The Distribution of הָה

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus\Form</th>
<th>הָה</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>קָלָל</th>
<th>expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pentateuch</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form. Proph</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah-MP</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hagiogr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is more, in this respect the convergence between the orthography of MT and the consonantal reading implied by the Old Greek is rather striking, even though not quite significant from a statistical point of view:

Table 3: LXX - MT compared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus\Form</th>
<th>קָלָל</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>kālāh kol</th>
<th>ambiguous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Proph</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (3)**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8 (3)**</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Jer שֶׁל: 2:21; 8:6; 15:10; 20:17; קָלָל: 6:13,13; irrelevant: 48:31,38 (1:13,38 LXX-b); not represented in LXX: 8:10,10
**2:21; 6:13,13 (כָּלָל)

How is this convergence to be accounted for? One might suggest that the orthographic configuration קָלָל was common to the consonantal parent text of the MT and the

---

28For table 2,\( X^2 = 11.897 \), significant at 0.01 (for \( v=3 \), \( a=11.34 \)). \( p \) indicates the frequency of the grapheme per one hundred; the term 'expectation' indicates the figure expected according to the general frequency of the הָה and the total number of occurrences of נָחֶל \( = p \times N \). The figures for Isaiah have been combined with those for Jer-Ezek-Minor Prophets in order to facilitate the computation of \( X^2 \) (for Isaiah alone the expectation would be too small).
**Vorlage** of the Old Greek. Thus, it might have been a feature of the ancient archetype. However, in view of the supposed common usage of the *heh* for indicating the suffix -oh in ancient manuscripts, this explanation is no more than a truism. The problem is not whether the ancient parent text of MT contained the form כָּלָה, but rather why it was not replaced with כָּל כָּל as in other sections of the Massoretic Bible.

On the other hand, the LXX suggests that the preservation of our grapheme might be related to its ambiguity. The data justify the assumption that at a certain stage the scribes were acquainted with two reading traditions, viz. קָלָה and קֻלּוֹ. Consequently, the transition to the use of the *waw* for indicating the suffix of the 3rd-pers. masc. sing. would have obliged them to decide between these readings. In the Pentateuch the context mostly required the form כָּל (Gen 25:25; Exod 14:7; 19:18; Lev 13:13; Num 23:13), but the reading כָּל קּוֹל prevailed in Gen 18:21; Exod 11:1. In the Hagiographa the preference for the spelling כָּל (Ps 29:9; 53:4; Prov 24:31; 30:27; Cant 5:16) can be understood in the light of the context. Only in one case there is *prima facie* evidence for the reading קָלָה (Job 21:23: כָּל הזְיָה בֵּעָמָה מְנוֹרָה — ‘One dies in his full strength, being wholly at ease and quiet’). The reading קָלָה would fit the parallel verb בֵּעָמָה מְנוֹרָה but the nearby phrase כָּל בֵּעָמָה מְנוֹרָה warrants the reading קֻלּוֹ, adopted also by LXX-Theodotion (under the asterisk).

In the books of the Prophets, however, the situation was far more complicated. As we have seen, in these books the concept קָלָה is so prominent, that it may be considered an inherent element of basic ideology and speech-forms. Thus the translators’ minds may have been predisposed towards the reading קָלָה. Nevertheless, at times the form קֻלּוֹ is easily identified: in Jer 6:13 our vocable occurs together with meristic phrases indicating ‘totality’: כִּי מְסַכְּלָה עַד גִּבֹּלָם כָּל פָּרֹת בֵּעָמָה מְנוֹרָה וּלְכָל כָּל שָׁשָׁה בּוֹ (‘For from the least of them unto the greatest of them, every one is keen on gain; and from the priest unto the prophet everyone deals falsely’). Here neither the scribe nor the translator had any difficulty in identifying קֻלּוֹ; small wonder, then, that the waw was preferred. In Mal 3:9 the reading הָגָּוֶי קָלָה (as reflected by the LXX) is not self-understood. How could the people be ordered to bring their offerings to the temple (v. 10) if they had been annihilated? In this case, one readily understands why the scribe opted for כָּל. In the same way one may explain why the spelling כָּל prevailed in such places as Isa 9:16 (כָּל אָמַת שָׁמֶה וּמַמָּר וּכָל פָּרֹת דְּרוֹר עַלְוָה; cp. 9:8). For כָּל אָמַת שָׁמֶה (Isa 1:23) the 1QIsa* offers כָּל אָמַת שָׁמֶה; in 9:8,16 it reads כָּל (= MT).
On the other hand, if the context supported both readings (as was the case in the instances discussed in the previous chapters), the scribes would not know how to decide. Confronted with two possible readings, viz. kālāh as well as kullo, they might well decide to retain the heh in order to keep both possibilities open. This is what happened in the lament over Moab’s destruction (Isa 15:3; 16:7; MT קְלַּעַ = kulloh, supported by LXX, T, S, V; so also Jer 48:31,38). In this description of doom, the reading kālāh is not impossible. It is a notable fact that in these verses the Qumran scroll also reads קְלַעַ, although elsewhere it uses the וָו (39:2 נָבְאָה for MT נבואה, נבואה; 37:24; 2 Kings 19:23). Apparently, the context induced the scribe to refrain from an explicit decision in favor of kullo (in fact, he may have read kālāh). This mechanism would be comparable to that of the double reading, enabling the scribe to transmit two variants at one and the same time. 29 Presumably, this is why the archaic grapheme קְלַעַ was perpetuated in the prophetic books. In the event the reading kulloh prevailed, but by then the standard orthography of this vocable had already been fixed as קְלַעַ. Moreover, in a sense this orthographic constellation might become a traditional spelling scheme. 30 Along these lines one might venture an explanation for the description of the Saulidic kingdom as קְלַעַ יִשְׂרָאֵל (2 Sam 2:9). Possibly, the official character of the name strengthened this constellation. Or should we think of some tendentious reading of the ‘al tiqre type, alluding to the eventual downfall of this kingdom and its takeover by David? In any case, this is the only instance open to doubt.

One concludes, therefore, that the proto-massoretic scribes of the prophetic books tended to preserve the graphic configuration קְלַעַ because of its ambiguity. Ultimately, then, the problems of pattern recognition and subliminal interpretation affect not only the ancient translations, but also the Hebrew tradition itself.

---


30This assumption would also account for such recurring configurations as קְלַעַ (four times in Genesis without any reason for ambiguity), and the kethibה (Ezek 31:18; 32:31,32; 39:11; compared with המכת, 7:12,13,14; 29:19; 30:4; 32:12,16,24,25,26).