ARE THE SYRIAC AND GREEK VERSIONS OF THE אשה רדה (Prov 1 to 9) IDENTICAL? (ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PESHITTA AND THE SEPTUAGINT)

Johann Cook

Hush for a great man has passed by!¹

1. Introduction
It was apparent to anyone who had the privilege of meeting and listening to Prof. Goshen-Gottstein that he had a few pet aversions, as well as specific favorite research areas (sic!). He was a fierce opponent of overspecialization and it would certainly be correct to say that he had a special love for the Peshitta. The original work he did on the Septuagint, for example his article on the text-critical use of the Septuagint,² proved groundbreaking. I therefore risk my hand in an endeavor to honor the memory of the one man who really made a difference to the field of textual criticism. His scientific rigor and solid know-how will be sorely missed but fortunately not lost for ever. Few text-critical projects have the sound theoretical basis of the Hebrew University Bible project.³ It will remain an example of just how variants should be approached.

2. The problem
The relationship between the Peshitta and the Septuagint has been formulated divergently in the course of the research. Many generalizations on the exact content of this relationship have been recorded. On the one hand, scholars have argued for

¹This article is devoted to the memory of Prof. M. H. Goshen-Gottstein.


an all-encompassing relationship. Hänel, for example, overestimated the impact the Septuagint exerted on the Syriac version. He accepted many examples that were ambivalent or failed to provide sufficient proof. Unfortunately, he affected many researchers. Würthwein, for example, held the opinion that of all the texts that influenced the Peshitta (Septuagint, Syro-Hexapla, MT, etc.) the LXX had the greatest influence, leaving the impression that it actually had a major imprint on this version. This view has been reproduced and accepted by many, albeit in varied forms. Würthwein, for instance, did take into account the complicated tradition history of the Peshitta to a much greater extent than Hänel.

On the other hand, a group of scholars have argued that the Peshitta was influenced by the Septuagint to a limited extent only. Barnes, who researched precisely this relationship, came to the conclusion that the Septuagint had only a minimal effect on the Peshitta. In his opinion evidence of direct influence is encountered sporadically. The view held by Kahle concurs to a large extent with that of Barnes. Kahle actually thought the entire text of the Peshitta Old Testament is of similar character to the Pentateuch (Peshitta). In addition, he argued that those parts in the Peshitta that correspond with the Massoretic text are evidence of the oldest parts of the Peshitta.

As to be expected, Goshen-Gottstein had his own view on this relationship. Even though he recognized that the Peshitta bears deposits of the LXX, he nevertheless

4J. Hänel, Die aussermasoretischen übereinstimmungen zwischen der Septuaginta und der Peshitta in der Genesis (BZAW; Giessen 1911).

5E. Würthwein, The Text of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids 1979) 81: “The Septuagint was the most influential.”

6Würthwein, ibid. “The later history of the text is also complicated and only partially clear” and “Thus the Peshitta has been shaped by many different hands, and in different books is very uneven.”

7W. E. Barnes, “On the Influence of the Septuagint on the Peshitta,” JTS 2 (1901) 186-97: “The influence of the Septuagint is for the most part sporadic, affecting the translation of a word here and of a word there. The Syriac translators must indeed have known that their own knowledge of Hebrew was far in advance of the knowledge possessed by the Septuagint, and yet the stress of Greek fashion has its way now and again. The Syriac transcribers on the contrary were ignorant of Hebrew and ready to introduce readings found in a Greek version or recommended by a Greek father. So the Peshitta in its later text has more of the Septuagint than in its earlier form.”

expressed the view that these sediments are of a secondary nature. He was probably the first scholar who persisted that Septuagintal influence had been overstated in the past and he saw to it that this view was thoroughly tested and propagated by his students. Concerning the book Isaiah he found very limited ground for direct dependence. It is clear that his perception of the origin and transmission history of the Septuagint was determinitive for his nuanced definitions. He believed that the LXX was essentially Targumic. He was also one of the few scholars who adhered to some of the views of his tutor Paul Kahle.

So clearly scholars have deviating points of view on the exact relationship between the Peshitta and the LXX. Was the Peshitta indeed influenced fundamentally by the LXX, or did the translator use the Septuagint sparingly by only consulting it when necessary, or perhaps not at all? Is the Peshitta really only a daughter version of the Septuagint, or is it indeed a Targum-like translation — (a Targum?), or perhaps an independent translation?

It should be evident that all these interrelated questions cannot be treated within the limited scope of this paper. However, approaching these issues specific methodical premises should be kept in mind, premises that Goshen-Gottstein more than any other Peshitta scholar formulated and implemented. Firstly, it is simply a fact that both the Septuagint and the Peshitta have highly complicated tradition

---

9Goshen-Gottstein, "Theory and Practice of Textual Criticism," 140: "In a few cases the deviation has obviously arisen within the Greek text, but these are so few that each case must be investigated separately."


11Goshen-Gottstein, "Theory and practice...", 140: "and even as regards these, one may press the evidence so as to deny direct dependence altogether."

12Goshen-Gottstein, "Introduction," Text and Language in Bible and Qumran (Tel Aviv 1960) XII, "Precisely because I believe that those scholars who stress the character of the LXX as embodying an ancient exegetical-targumic tradition are on the right path, I ought to add that recognizing this fact also means that most proofs for the alleged large-scale dependance of Peshitta on LXX become invalid."
and composition histories. Consequently one must distinguish between the origin and the later transmission history of these translations. It is nowhere clearer than in the corpus analysed for the purpose of this contribution. Whereas the excellent publication of the Peshitta Institute could be used as a reasonable basis for text-critical research, the Göttingen edition of the Septuagint is unfortunately not yet available and Rahlfs must suffice. It is also, secondly, methodically false to take either the Septuagint or the Peshitta as homogeneous works. Prof. Goshen-Gottstein consistently reminded us that each smaller translation unit, each book, each chapter and even each individual pericope had first of all to be analysed individually. As a further methodical step data could be compared with those of other books. To reverse or upset this order is a sure recipe for unnuanced interpretations.

3. Theoretical premises

In addition to the problems discussed above a host of additional ones confront the interpreter, which in itself makes this research area a problematic one. The careful reader of the Peshitta and the Septuagint will immediately observe that these versions differ to a greater or lesser extent from each other as well as from the Massoretic text. The possibilities of explaining each individual deviation are legion. It stands to reason that the individual translators could have been responsible for many, if not all of the changes. Deviating Hebrew Vorlagen are a further possibility, whereas inner-Greek (Syriac) corruptions are also more than just a vague option. A determinative factor is of course the composition of each version. One should, for instance, not be misled by the fact that the Peshitta has fewer additions than the LXX. It is apparently part of the intention of many of the translators of the Peshitta to use individual readings for exegetical purposes. Readings thus have to be scrutinized and read extremely carefully.

In order to determine to what extent the LXX and Peshitta in Proverbs were dependent on one another, I chose to approach the problem from a somewhat

---


14Does it need reminding that this manuscript (codex L) is used solely as a basis for comparison?
different perspective, although still implementing the above-mentioned principles. A small, restricted but representative corpus of material was used for analytical purposes. I studied selected passages from the first nine chapters of Proverbs only. In addition, partly because of the nature of the wisdom literature and partly for the sake of experimentation, I chose to concentrate on a specific theme, namely the depiction of the דאר אשה in these chapters. This theme fills a central position in the above-mentioned corpus. In order to obtain a holistic perspective I analysed each of the chapters in which the theme occurs, concentrating on the significant variants.

The theoretical premises on which these interpretations rest are twofold. One is an evaluation of the translation technique followed by these individual translators. The Peshitta translator rendered his parent text fairly literally, whereas the Greek translator followed a much more liberal mode. Proverbs is an example of one of the more paraphrastic renderings in the Greek Bible and, as a working hypothesis, one can accept that changes compared to some basis (MT) were brought about by the translator. The second premise is a realization of the textual variety that prevailed during the formation of the biblical text.

4. Peshitta dependent on LXX?

Proverbs 2

This chapter contains a warning against the strange and adulterous woman (vss. 16 to 19). On face value it would seem that the reference to the דאר אשה is to be taken literally, although there are ample indications that this figure is effectively a metaphor. She is the adversary of Lady Wisdom, which should certainly not be interpreted in a literal way either. In this chapter the concept of תבל נשים is personified and she cautions against the perils of folly (דאר אשה). The dangers of Madame Folly are not what is at hand — the sexual licentiousness of the loose woman — but rather foreign wisdom. She is depicted as one who has forsaken the teacher of her youth and has forgotten the covenant of her God (verse 17).

In comparison with the Septuagint the Peshitta has far fewer deviations from the MT. The first is encountered in verse 1 where בת ליה instead of תבל נשים is used. It is obviously an interpretation by the translator based on verse 2. Perhaps the same

15I have treated this issue exhaustively in: “” (Proverbs 1-9 Septuagint): A Metaphor for Foreign Wisdom?” ZAW 1994 (forthcoming) and in “Hellenistic Influence in the Septuagint Once Again,” VT (forthcoming).
principle was followed when a prefix conjugation was used in verse 2, where the MT has an infinitive (cf. also verse 16).

Examples of smaller deviations in the Peshitta that could have been brought about on account of the Septuagint can be multiplied. However, the problem is that in these instances it is difficult to provide determinative proof. Nevertheless, concerning the figure of the היה הנשים there are specific changes that are directly related to the Greek. In verse 11 two significant additions are encountered in the Syriac. The adjectives נשים מילא in connection with קשת וжал in connection with עשה were added. The LXX has similar additions to this verse, which can be translated as: "A good mind (βουλή καλή) will keep you and a pure understanding (ἐννοια δὲ σοια) will guide you." These adjectives play an all important role in the Greek translator's depiction of the foreign woman. They must be read together with verses 16 and 17. In the Greek the interpretation of verse 17 is of fundamental importance to the understanding of the Septuagint. The Hebrew phrase התבנה אלוהי ניאוֹר היא ברית אלוהים ת()=> in order to make the point that it is not the outward things like a loose woman that contaminate man, but the inner things such as wisdom. The Greek terms κακή βουλή are nuanced references to the well-known concepts of της σοφίας και της προφητείας. The Greek translator is therefore stating that it is the inclination of man that leads him astray. In this instance it is indeed foreign wisdom, which is depicted in typical Judaic terminology, that is the source of the misleading.

The Peshitta has a related but apparently different view. Whereas the LXX interprets verse 17 extensively, the Peshitta has a nuanced interpretation in verse 16. It adds the noun הנותרה and omits the reference to the הוה. Verse 16 in the Hebrew reads ל얊יקא מואה ויה מברוח אמירה הרל的回答, which is interpreted as follows in the Syriac: "Wisdom will deliver you from the foreign woman who turns, changes her words."

One encounters here an interesting and at the same time unique approach towards the parent text. The Hebrew is followed to the extent that its intention, at least as the Syriac translator understood it, is expressed. When the whole pericope is read from verse 10 onwards it is clear that the Hebrew actually intends stating that it is wisdom that will act as lifesaving guide. Accordingly the noun קשת וжал is added explicatively to verse 16. This nuanced addition is a clear indication that the Syriac translator experienced some problems with this pericope. The Greek was apparently taken into account in connection with a small number of readings. The added
adjectives discussed above are found only in these two versions. It is also possible that the Syriac translator actually followed the Greek in respect of the treatment of אֶשֶׁת וְרָעָה and נְכֶרִי as synonymous parallels, although one could argue that it was actually the intention of the Hebrew text. I shall indicate below that the LXX was indeed consulted in passages concerning these lexemes.

It also seems viable to accept that the Peshitta translator probably did not understand the Greek translator’s intention fully. The key to this whole passage in the Septuagint is verse 17 as outlined above. The person responsible for the Syriac probably did not grasp the Jewish background to the concepts βουλή καλή and βουλή κακή or, more unlikely, it was not relevant to him. He did experience some difficulty with this passage and he then consulted the Septuagint. It is important to understand that he applied the gained perspectives in a unique, concise manner. This must certainly be attributed to the difference in historical contexts between these writings and their respective compositions.

Proverbs 5
This chapter includes two warnings against the גנבת (5:1-11, 15-23) which has a direct bearing on the theme of this contribution.

The Septuagint once again has pluses compared to MT in this pericope as indicated in the italicized phrases. Verse 3’ (μὴ πρόσεχε φαύλη γυναίκι, “Do not heed to a worthless woman”), has no equivalent in MT. However, it has a significant parallel in Midrash Mishle. There is no additional corresponding external textual material and it is just possible that the translator actually endeavored to contrast verses 1 and 2 with 3 through 6 by means of this addition. The transition between these two poles is consequently more nuanced in the Septuagint. The same tendency is located in verse 3’, where the addition of γυναικός acts as a specification for גנבת (“for honey drips from the lips of an adulterous woman”). Verse 3’ was rewritten to a large extent and the other additions could also be attributed to the translator. The pluses in verses 3, 4 and 5 stress the destructive influence of the harlot. However, the translator suggests that he indeed has a metaphor in mind by the significant addition of the reference to folly in verse 5 (“for the feet of folly lead [τῆς γὰρ ἀφροσύνης οἱ πόδες κατάγουσιν] those who deal with her to Hades, with death, and her footsteps are not yet established”).

The Peshitta again has a small number of exegetical renderings in this chapter. גנבת is interpreted as the foreign woman (אֶשֶׁת הָגַעא). The same reading is found in
the Peshitta version of 2:16. That the translator actually consulted this passage is clear from the use of the noun תנמה ("her words") as equivalent for הבנה.

The second warning (vss. 15-23) against the זר in the Septuagint contains references to adulterous relations with foreigners. A pattern similar as to that mentioned above is followed in these verses by the Greek translator. He stresses even more than the Hebrew text the lurking dangers of the strange woman. These dangers are at face value physical, fleshly things. However, the translator (and the Hebrew) draws a parallel between the harlot/adulterous woman, on the one hand, and folly, on the other hand. In the LXX it is done by reapplying perspectives mentioned in specific parts of the chapter. A representative interpretation occurs in the last verse: "Such a (foolish) man dies with the uninstructed, and he is cast forth from the abundance of his own substance (the reference to σῶν βίον is found in verse 9), and he perished through folly (καὶ ἀπόλεστο δι’ ἀφοροχύννην)."

The parallel becomes even clearer in the light of verse 18, which is part of the second warning against the זר in this chapter. In this pericope the son is warned against extra-marital relations. The metaphor of the fountain with its own waters is used in order to remind the youngster not to get involved sexually with a strange woman (verse 20), the woman who is "not your own" (τῆς μὴ ἰδίας for בנה). Verse 18 connects this unique source (ἡ πηγὴ; the LXX apparently has לברך as Vorlage as in verse 18 instead of בנה, although this could also be a harmonization with the previous verse) with "the wife of your youth." The author of Proverbs 5 evidently intended to draw some parallel between this chapter and 2:16. I demonstrated above that the characteristic of the strange woman (2:17) is that she deserted the love (teaching) of her youth and consequently became a foreigner. The Greek translator of chapter 5 issues stern warnings against things foreign (foreigners; vss. 10 (2x), 17 and 20), that is, that which are not your own (vss 18, 19 and 20).

In conclusion then, the Greek translator deliberately added phrases and interpreted yet others in order to underscore the catastrophic results of identifying with foreigners. In this chapter he interprets the foreign woman as a worthless woman (φαύλη γυναική) and a harlot (γυναικός πόρνης). Apparently the extramarital relations the uninformed son is warned against are liaisons with unmarried women. In chapter 6 on the contrary, the category married woman is treated. A significant pattern of translation emerges from these passages. However, in the final analysis it is foreign things in the form of folly (foreign wisdom) that lead astray.
The Peshitta, however, sticks to its task of making its Hebrew text clear. As in the previous chapter, this is done by translating consistently and applying intertextual harmonizations. The reference to the נָּזָה in verses 3 and 20 is consequently rendered as נָּזָּר as in the other corresponding contexts.

Proverbs 6

This chapter can be divided into two parts. Verses 1-19 contain a miscellaneous collection of disparate pieces acting as warnings for the student against surety, laziness, etc. Verses 20-35 comprise a lengthy instruction, including a warning against the אֶּרֶץ (vs. 24). Once again the Septuagint has a number of added strophes that have no equivalent in the MT.

Verses 24-29 hold interesting perspectives for the theme of this article. In verse 24 the reference to a married woman (τοῦ διαφυλάσσειν σε ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ὑπάνδρου —“to keep you from the married woman”) was probably brought about by verse 29 being taken into account. Although it is possible that the LXX translator could have read a Hebrew reading אֶּרֶץ, as in the MT (verse 29), I think he actually changed the text in order to make a specific ‘theological’ point. The pertinent addition of αὐτῆς in connection with the man (בּוֹרָא) mentioned in verse 34 corroborates this view. The Hebrew refers here to any man. The Septuagint, however, explicitly states that it is her man, the husband of the married woman (μέστος γὰρ ζήκου θυμὸς ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς οὐ φέσεται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ).

There are significant parallels between verse 24 and 2:16 in the Hebrew. Even though different lexemes are used the semantic content is practically the same. However, in the LXX the differences are conspicuous, verse 16 being totally rewritten as I indicated above. The only real difference in the rendering of 6:24, on the contrary, is the interpretation of the bad woman as a married one. However, by using nuanced additions the Septuagint devotes this whole pericope to the dangers of liaisons with a married woman. The Hebrew version does refer to this in verse 29, though this is not interpreted in connection with the whole chapter. The Septuagint, on the contrary, is more consistent in its rendering and applies it to the whole chapter.

This interpretation has implications for determining the intention of the translator regarding the theme of this article. It is important to note that the other “dangerous” women have already been warned against in the previous chapters. In chapter 6, therefore, the category married women is addressed. A definite pattern is found in
these nine chapters. The LXX translator did not render his Hebrew text haphazardly, but appears to have nuanced his translation, making explicit theological statements concerning the youth’s attitude towards various women. Chapter 7 also fits this picture. A significant aspect of these depictions is that they are all in some way or another connected to foreign wisdom. In the chapter under discussion the dangerous “married” woman is one with a foreign and slanderous tongue (καὶ ἀπὸ διαβολῆς γλῶσσης ἀλλοτρίας — verse 24).

The Peshitta, on the contrary, does not exhibit the extensive systematic approach of the Septuagint, even though as indicated above, it does have a unique approach. Consequently, it has different exegetical renderings in different verses. Verse 24 is rendered literally in line with the MT. Whereas LXX interprets the ירָה הָשַׁי as a married woman, the Peshitta stays near its unique approach by interpreting her as a bad woman, but again nuancing in conjunction with the LXX. Its rendering of לְפַרְפַּר for נְפֵרָה seems to be an interpretation. The Hebrew noun has the nuance of smoothness, whereas the Syriac expresses the literal nuance of “a meal of biting” with the apparent meaning of “backbiting, slandering.” This is exactly what the Greek reading διαβολῆς (calumny, backbiting) expresses. This interpretation is underscored by the plus found in verse 25, which only occurs in these two versions. The Greek reads as follows: μὴ δὲ ἄρεσθήσῃ σοὶ ὑπακολούθων. The Peshitta, even though following the Septuagint, interprets this phrase uniquely, reading: “Do not be caught by her (LXX reads your) eyes.” The translator of the Peshitta again uses an addition in the LXX uniquely, by harmonizing it with the rest of the verse in the Hebrew. The last strophe in the MT contains a reference to “her eyelashes” (יוֹרִים), which is apparently the source of this interpretation.

Proverbs 7
Chapter 7 can be divided into three large parts: vss. 1-5 deal with instructions against the strange woman; vss. 6-23 offer an example of the ways in which this woman acts; and the chapter is concluded in vss. 24-27 with a final warning of the consequences of these dealings.

The opening section is of special importance. The LXX has an added two strophes in vs. 1 and some other significant interpretations (1: “My son keep my words, and hide my commandments with you”; 1a: “My son honor the Lord and be strong, do not fear anyone but him”; νῦν τίμα τὸν κύριον, καὶ ἴσχύεσθε, πλην δὲ αὐτοῦ μὴ φοβοῦ ἄλλον).
In verse 2 the noun λόγος instead of הַרְתִּי is used and the suffix of “pupil of your eye,” יִנֶּה, is omitted. The particle δὲ is added twice in verse 3 for stylistic reasons.

Significantly, verse 5 is practically identical to 2:16 in the Hebrew, although in LXX it differs. As indicated above the passage in chapter 2 was totally rewritten. The verse under discussion also differs from MT, although not as extensively as in 2:16. Firstly, the two references “strange” (טַבָּרָה) and “adulteress” (רֹאָז) are inverted. Secondly, they are paratactically connected (ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀλλοτρίας καὶ πονηρᾶς). Although the Hebrew has two independent clauses it could be interpreted as one category. It would therefore seem as if the two categories are identified by the translator. Therefore one should probably not read too much into the inversion of the two lexemes. The translator apparently understood them as an entity. The reason for the fact that the translator chose not to change the contents of verse 5 extensively is found in the above-mentioned systematizing approach of this translator referred to earlier. He has discussed various aspects of the shady women and the characteristic of them all is not primarily their physical appearance, but that they can mislead with their words. The dangers surrounding these women is to be found not in their outward appearance, but in their strangeness, in their strange words, in their foreign wisdom, in their enticing words!

The Peshitta was possibly influenced by the Septuagint to some extent even though again it contains few exegetical renderings and also renders uniquely. It reads only one lexeme, יַשְׂרֵא הַרְתִּי and not יִנְה הַרְתִּי as is the case in 2:16. However, the reading (seducing, enticing) for הַלַיֵּם (smooth) is more in line with the LXX reading ἐμβάλλεται. Again the translator is extremely selective in his use of the LXX. Significantly, he does not follow the identical pattern as in 2:16. The difference between these two passages in the Peshitta concerns the lexeme לַיֵּם. In chapter 2 it is rendered by (entice), which is based on בָּאָשׁ in verse 14.

Proverbs 9
A total of 17 strophes and several individual pluses are added to this chapter in the LXX in comparison to MT. Some of these strophes occur in the Peshitta as well. It remains a problem to accept readily that a translator would have been apt to add such a large number of strophes without any Hebrew textual basis. However, it must be remembered that the translator was, after all, a free renderer. Whether the translator or a later scribe was actually responsible for these pluses should be
determined from the content of these individual pluses as well as the language. I have endeavored to do this in another context and I am relatively certain that these additions should be taken as part of the Old Greek.\textsuperscript{16}

The chapter divides into three parts, the two banquets, Wisdom’s (vss. 1-6) and Folly’s (13-18) being kept apart by an insertion (vss. 7-12), which according to many commentators was added later in the Hebrew tradition.\textsuperscript{17} Verses 13-18 are of interest here. The LXX pluses are given in italics.

A. Invitation to Wisdom’s banquet (1-6)
B. The mocker and the wise (7-12)

12 My son, if you are wise for yourself, you must be wise for the sake of your neighbors,
but if you turn out to be wicked you alone will bear the evil.

12a he that stands/stays on falsehood, he attempts to rule the wind,
and he will pursue birds in their flight

12b for he has forsaken the ways of his vineyard,
and he has caused the axles of his own husbandry to go astray,

12c and he travels through a dry desert,
and (he travels) a land appointed to drought
and he gathers barrenness with his hands.

C. Lady Folly (13-18)

18 But he does not know that mighty men die by her
and he falls in with a snare of Hades.

18a But run away, do not delay in this place,
neither fix your eyes on her,

18b for thus will you go through foreign water
and pass through a foreign river.

18c However, abstain from foreign water
and do not drink from a foreign fountain,

18d that you may live for a long time
and years of life may be added to you.

\textsuperscript{16} See my contribution mentioned in 13.

\textsuperscript{17} W. McKane, Proverbs - a New Approach (SCM: London 1970) 359.
The pluses in this chapter are aimed at contrasting the wise and the foolish. The extensive additions to verse 12 describe the foolish man who has forsaken the traditions of old and consequently now is lost, gathering nothingness. He has adopted a novel mode of living which leads to nothing.

Those added to verse 18, on the contrary, describe the dangers attached to Madame Folly, here called a foolish and audacious woman (γυνὴ ἁφόρον καὶ θρασεία). In order to demonstrate the dangers of Madame Folly ancient traditions are used by the translator in verse 18. Hades is described in terms similar to those used in the tale of Sodom, for the uninstructed are warned: “But run away, do not delay in this place, neither fix your eyes on her.” Surely this is a reference to the wife of Lot (Gen. 19:26), so that the foolish woman (אשה כמולה) is likened to Lot’s wife. Her disobedience and foolishness led to utter destruction.

The reference to foreign waters is also significant. Verse 18b reads as follows: “For thus will you go through foreign water and pass through a foreign river.” The question of water is a central issue in Proverbs and in connection with 5:17 McKane\(^{18}\) agrees with Böström,\(^{19}\) who equates the springs and channels of water with male sperms. At face value it seems correct to take these additions as references to the dangers of sexuality. However, there is a metaphorical side to the image. An interesting phrase is the reference to a foreign river. In Greek mythology the passing through the River Styx on the way to Hades is a prominent theme. It seems possible that here the author actually called to mind this Greek tradition. However, he does not link up with it positively. He rather uses it in a negative manner, connecting it with the foolish woman, warning the novice of the lurking dangers at Madame Folly’s (whore)house.

The reference to foreign things in these pluses, namely foreign water (twice), a foreign river and a foreign fountain, is clearly a recurring theme. The translator used passages from the earlier parts of Proverbs in this regard. Chapter 5, verses 15-23 contain warnings against the foreign woman, although she is called a worthless and adulterous woman (5: 3). It is instructive to follow the description of the different shady ladies in the Septuagint version of Proverbs 1-9. There is an interesting application of metaphor in the description of the harlot on the one hand, and folly.


\(^{19}\)G. Böström, Proverbia Studien: Die Weisheit und das fremde Weib in Spr. 1-9 (Lund 1935) 140.
on the other. Consequently one could draw a parallel between the foreign, strange woman and foreign, anti-Israelite wisdom.

In the discussion it becomes clear that the translator of the LXX, and this applies to a large extent to the author of the Hebrew as well, is drawing a significant parallel between the strange woman (women), on the one hand, and foreign wisdom, on the other hand. All the women mentioned in the passages discussed above are metaphors of this one concept. It is difficult to determine exactly what this foreign wisdom was. In the Hebrew it could certainly be an array of Near Eastern wisdoms, as suggested by McKane, Böström, etc. and depending on the localizing of the Entstehungsort.\(^\text{20}\) In the Septuagint however, it can, to my mind, be only one "dangerous" wisdom, namely Greek philosophy of the kind encountered in the Hellenistic period.

I have argued in different articles that no traces of Hellenistic ideas, that is Greek philosophical perspectives, are to be found in the first nine chapters of the Septuagint book of Proverbs.\(^\text{21}\) The Hellenistic influence in the Greek Proverbs is, to my mind, limited to literary perspectives. As a matter of fact, I find anti-Hellenistic interpretations in 2:16-17, 8:22-32 and chapter 9. The foreign wisdom the uninformed youth is therefore warned against is actually Hellenistic, Greek philosophical views concerning God, man, creation and wisdom in general.

It is more difficult to determine what the true situation with the Peshitta was. It does agree with the LXX concerning some significant additions in chapter 9. Verse 12 was probably taken from the Septuagint, where the anti-individualistic view can at the same time be interpreted as an anti-Hellenistic statement: "My son, if you are wise be wise for your own sake as well as for the sake of your neighbor. However, if you are evil you alone will bear the evil. He that talks idly will be fed on the wind and will pursue the birds of heaven for he leaves the paths of his vines and strays from the paths of his farming to travel through a desert without any water. From a country thrashed he

\(^{20}\)M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (J. C. B. Mohr: Tübingen 1973) 282, apparently thought of some ancient near eastern system as possible background to the Hebrew (phönizisch-kanaanäische Kult der Liebes- und Muttermöglich?).

travels in thirst and he gathers emptiness." This plus is a description of the foolish man.

Verse 18 also concurs to a large extent with the LXX. "He does not know that giants die by her and in the valley of Sheol all are prepared (called/invited) unto her. Therefore turn away and do not delay in that place, do not set your eye on it, for thus you will pass through foreign water and go through a foreign river. But turn away from the foreign water and from the foreign water you should not drink, thus a multitude of days and years of life will be added to you."

Keeping in mind the general approach of the Peshitta translator one would expect him to have used these pluses in a unique way in order to make a pertinent point. Clearly, the foreign wisdom at stake here would not be of the same nature as that argued in connection with the Septuagint. The fact that the Syriac translator endeavored to determine the intention of the Hebrew text in most instances certainly impedes the problem. To my mind this translator had as a general guideline the intention to make the Hebrew understood. It is therefore quite possible that what he thought was presented by the Hebrew as foreign wisdom was accurately rendered in his translation. On the other hand, this version came to be within a specific historical milieu and traces of this context could very well be found in the text. Perhaps Steyn\textsuperscript{22} is correct in surmising that the waters mentioned in chapter 9 could refer to baptism or the purification by water. Dating, however, plays an all-important role in this regard.

5. Conclusions
The answer to the question of whether the Peshitta was dependent on the Septuagint must be negative. If the Peshitta was in any book dependent on the Septuagint to a large extent, it would have been in the book of Proverbs. In the Pentateuch the Peshitta translator often consulted the Targumim and consequently reflects a relation to these writings. In the book of Proverbs, on the contrary, the relation is inverted. The Targum is actually dependent on the Peshitta.\textsuperscript{23} It is true that there is a relationship of some sort between the Peshitta and the Septuagint. However, the conclusion by Goshen-Gottstein formulated some thirty years ago in regard to the book of Isaiah holds also for the book of Proverbs: "I myself am still in doubt as to whether


\textsuperscript{23}P.E. Steyn, External Influence, 10, has demonstrated it convincingly again.
there are even five to ten such possible instances in the whole book of Isaiah, and most of these occur in connection with a specific problem the translator had to face. The resulting picture is that of the secondary influence of the Septuagint in a few specific cases." In the discussion above I demonstrated that the translator of the Peshitta only consulted the Septuagint when in the dark about the meaning of a specific passage or lexeme.  

The nuanced composition of the Peshitta clearly has an impact on this issue, as well as on the first question posed in the title. The conception of the הָרָּשָׁא is not identical in these respective translations even though both translators understood all the passages where the loose woman is encountered as only one figure. To the Greek translator she was a depiction, in symbolical dressing, of foreign wisdom, more specifically Hellenism, and the Jews living in Alexandria had to be warned against her. The most that can be said about the Peshitta is that the translator did not have the same understanding of foreign wisdom, primarily due to a totally different historical setting.

---

24 I reached a similar conclusion regarding the pentateuch. See Cook, "Composition...," 168.