DOUBTS ABOUT HOMOEOPHONY IN THE SEPTUAGINT

James Barr

(a) Introduction

It has been generally recognized for a long time that the Greek translators sometimes chose a Greek word that was similar in form, phonetically similar, to the Hebrew word being translated. Various well-known scholars, such as Wellhausen and Thackeray, listed some examples, and recent times have seen essays that considered the matter more fully: so Walters, Caird and Tov, with Tov providing a suitable summary of the previous discussion up to his own time of writing. It may be considered as common scholarly opinion that phonetic resemblance was a factor that played some considerable role in the choice and use of vocabulary by the LXX.

---

1 I use the word homoeophony following Caird; but Tov's homophony in this context means the same thing. Walters' homonymy covers the same ground but is confusing and is used confusingly. On these writers, see next notes. Within this article I generally use the term 'phonetic resemblance'.


3 P. Walters (Katz), The Text of the Septuagint. Its Corruptions and Their Emendation, ed. D.W. Gooding (Cambridge 1973), and on its use of terms see my review in
Before going farther, the question to discuss should be carefully delimited. We are not concerned with words of Hebrew or other Semitic origin which came to be borrowed into Greek and then were used in the LXX, such as σήκλος (Hebrew שֶׁקֶל) or λίβανος (Hebrew לִבְנָה). Nor are we concerned with real transliterations, i.e. instances where the translators, instead of providing a Greek semantic equivalent, have written the Hebrew word in Greek characters, as is the case with εφούδ 'ephod' (Hebrew עַפָּד) or δαβίρ 'inner room of temple' (Hebrew דָּבָר). We are concerned with the case where the translators, having before them a Hebrew word, have rendered it with an actual and normal Greek word, but one that has considerable similarity in form to the Hebrew word translated. In other words, we are concerned with the case of Hebrew דְּמָה, understood to mean 'oppression' in that language, but translated in the LXX with τόκος which means 'interest' (on a loan) in Greek; or with Hebrew חֶפֶס 'ox-goad', translated as δρέπανον which means 'sickle' in Greek. In both cases the point is that the Greek word chosen as rendering seems to have substantial resemblance, which means ultimately


[2]
phonic resemblance, to the Hebrew word rendered. Of Tov’s three categories, (1) Loan-words; (2) Homophony (sound resemblance); and (3) Transliteration, we are here concerned only with the second. Moreover, similar tendencies have been noticed in the later Greek translators, and particularly in Aquila, and this article, though concerned mainly with the LXX, will take note of some of these later renderings as well.

Now in principle there is no reason why such approaches to translating on the basis of phonetic resemblance should not have taken place. Apart from the natural experience of mutual unintelligibility, there was no well-understood theoretical reason why a word in one language should not be paralleled by a word of similar form in another that had some common elements of meaning. In later antiquity we can easily show that various biblical words were said to be identical with similar words in Latin or Greek. St Jerome, for instance, said that יסוד 'sign' or 'idol', was a Latin word, taken from

4 If a word has been cited as a case of translation through phonetic resemblance, and if it can be shown that it was a transliteration, then it simply falls out of our discussion: for instance, if we find γῆ standing where the Hebrew has נִּיחַ 'valley', this may well be a transliteration: the translator has simply transcribed his Hebrew word in Greek letters, and it has later been taken, or mistakenly transcribed, as if it was the Greek word γῆ 'land': so some texts at II Chron. 28:3, 33:6; Caird, p. 84. This is a different thing from rendering with γῆ because it was taken to be a Greek word suitable through its phonetic form to stand for Hebrew נִיחַ.
the same source as similitudo or simulacrum. Rabbis occasionally said similar things about biblical words. The practice of offering etymologies based on Hebrew for the personal names of Romans and Greeks implied the same idea: Pilatus was a Roman name, but this did not stop people interpreting it as 'the mouth of the hammerer' (os malleatoris, i.e. ψυχή ἀλατού). These evidences belong to later antiquity, but it is possible that similar tendencies existed as early as the time when the LXX was created. It is not difficult to grant, therefore, that ideological assumptions which favoured phonetic-resemblance translation of occasional words may have existed.

The fact remains that at least one LXX scholar, after long reading in the texts and long pondering of this question, finds it difficult to believe that the translators really did this. It seems so out of character with the whole nature of their work as the massive preponderance of the evidence displays it. After all, one could not practically translate dozens of pages of the Bible without learning, unconsciously at least, that a Hebrew word is not a Greek word and that occasional phonetic similarities of a syllable or a word could not be indications for semantic identification. One could not do

5 For these and other examples see my "St Jerome's Appreciation of Hebrew", Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 49 (1966-67) 281-302, and especially 297-300.
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anything unless one was clear in one's mind that Hebrew יִשְׁד had nothing to do with Greek μέν, that Hebrew יִשְׁד had nothing to do with Greek δόρνον. People who frequently established such connections in their minds would inevitably have been incompetent translators, and would have produced a text which in its totality would have been very different from the LXX as we have it. And, after all, those ideas that words might be common to Hebrew and to Greek and Latin were seldom incorporated in actual translations, where sense had to be made in the context; more often they were remarks in commentaries, which did not alter the fact that in the running context of a translation these ideas had to be ignored. In spite of these thoughts, it may be argued, the LXX translators may occasionally have slipped into a practice which was inconsistent with their own normal usage; and indeed no one has pretended that phonetic-resemblance renderings are more than a very small part of their procedure. But that is just the point of this present article: how small a part are they? Or, even more seriously, how far is there secure evidence that they did this at all?

Now the many examples that have been listed by various scholars as examples of phonetic-resemblance translation appear to fall into two categories, the very strong and the very weak. There are a few instances that seem highly convincing, so convincing that no other explanation of these renderings appears natural. These strong instances thus convince us that phonetic-resemblance renderings do indeed
exist. But for the presence of these strong instances, I
would suggest, the weak instances would have credibility.
Only because the principle appears to have been established
through the strong instances do scholars feel emboldened to
add long lists of further examples, which in themselves would
carry little weight. This article will re-examine the strong
category, and in the light of the examination will come back
briefly to look at the weak.

But what are the features that define an example as
strong, the lack of which define it as weak? I would answer:
features on two levels, one phonetic and one semantic. On
the phonetic level, a Greek word must have a very striking
and impressive likeness to the Hebrew word concerned, for it
to count as belonging to the strong category. Naturally, it
is difficult or impossible to define this likeness in the
abstract, and it seems sufficient to provide examples. I
consider that ὅραμανον as a rendering of סָרַע and τόκος as a
rendering of יִשְׂרָאֵל are indubitably strong examples. By contrast,
ἀγαλλιασθαί as a rendering of גָּרָה seems to me to be
indubitably a weak example. Although the two words do have
two consonants in common, as a whole they are wildly different,
and only the strongest evidence would convince me that any
ancient translator saw the slightest resemblance between one
and the other. The alleged phonetic resemblance between הָנַע
and ἀγάπη 'love' seems to me also to be a weak instance,
although perhaps not as weak as the one just quoted.
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The semantic criterion is also difficult to define, and perhaps it can be stated at this point in only a tentative way, to be modified after our discussion has gone farther. Tov states it in this way: 'The first condition ... is that the Hebrew and Greek words differ in meaning. If the Hebrew and Greek words should be identical in meaning or if the Greek word should reflect an exegetical rendering, the resemblance could be coincidental'.\(^6\) This is in principle right but states the principle in perhaps too hard a form. It is because ὀξωτάς does not mean 'ox-goad' but 'sickle' that its use as rendering of קָרַב is a strong example: if it did in any case really mean 'ox-goad' then it would not belong to the strong category. It is not so much that, if the meaning is correct, the rendering cannot have been phonetically motivated, but rather that, if it is correct, it is difficult or impossible for us to judge. Another criterion comes into play: normality as the term for the meaning required. It could be that a Greek word has the same meaning as the Hebrew it renders, but that it is not the common or normal term for that meaning, and has been chosen over other terms with the same meaning because it has some element of phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew. This seems, for instance, to be Caird's argument.

\(^6\) Tov, p. 224.
about cases like ἀγαθός/יה and ἀγάμα : 'a similarity of sound has dictated the choice of an adequate, but not otherwise obvious, counterpart'. That is, there were in Greek other words that would have been good renderings for 'rejoice' or 'love', and these particular ones were selected because of phonetic resemblance. This argument, it should be noted, if it is true must have repercussions on other aspects of vocabulary study: that is, it must obviously imply that ἀγαθός was not then the natural or obvious word for 'rejoice' and similarly that ἀγάμα was not the natural or obvious word for 'love'. This could obviously be a serious matter, and we shall return to it.

We put it in this way, therefore: if the Greek word not only has a phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew but is also very close to being a semantically good equivalent for it, it follows that it constitutes a weak example from which we can prove very little. Weak examples may indeed turn out in the end to be valid instances but, as already said, they depend upon the evidence of strong examples to demonstrate that phonetic-resemblance translation was going on at all. If the

7 Caird, p. 80.
8 On this question, and on the words for love in general, see my "Words for Love in Biblical Greek", in the memorial volume for G.B. Caird, forthcoming.
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rendering is, after all, the normal and natural Greek word for the Hebrew meaning, it may be that the phonetic resemblance had no effect whatever upon the translator’s mind.

To this, however, there is another side: a rendering motivated by phonetic resemblance will not be identifiable with assurance if its meaning is identical with that of the Hebrew original, but on the other hand its meaning will not usually be totally unconnectable with that of the Hebrew original. If it is to fit into the context at all, it must have some common ground with the sense in the Hebrew. Thus δρήσανον does not mean 'ox-goad' but it is some kind of tool that required to be sharpened and therefore fits within a list of such tools, in Greek as in the Hebrew. τόκος is 'interest' and not 'oppression' but the paying of interest may be felt as something like oppression and may have some way of fitting into the context. In cases of this kind, though the meanings are certainly not identical with the original, some kind of semantic community has been preserved. In another set of examples, however, little or no semantic connection seems to remain, at least if the customary explanations are correct: at Jer. 6:29 ἡπέρ 'they are not removed' is rendered by ἐκάκη 'it has not been melted' and there is little semantic connection beyond the fact that both are verbs; similarly perhaps with ἀποκοιμάω 'I will lead them' as against αὐλιζων 'causing them to lodge' at Jer. 31(38):9. These are the cases, in Caird’s words, 'in which a reliance on homoeophony has
resulted in a radical change of meaning; in this sense they are 'mistranslations' (though not all those listed by him under this heading actually belong to this category).\textsuperscript{9} It seems, therefore, that in this discussion we arrive at three possibilities. If a rendering is chosen on the basis of phonetic similarity to the Hebrew, then:

1. If it produces a meaning very close to that of the Hebrew, or identical with it, we may have difficulty in being sure that phonetic similarity was the real motivation after all.

2. If it produces a meaning different from the Hebrew but still having some degree of community with it, it is much more likely that phonetic resemblance can be proved, and it also shows that the translator used it well and fitted it into the general context creatively.

3. If it produces a meaning vastly or totally remote from that of the Hebrew, it means that phonetic resemblance is fairly certain and that it influenced the translator so much as to overcome his normal competence in dealing with the text - unless, of course, we can find another explanation.

One other preliminary consideration should here be added. The degree to which we can estimate the closeness or remoteness of meanings as between the Hebrew and the Greek

\textsuperscript{9} Caird, p. 83.
Doubts about homoeophony in the Septuagint

depends on the kind of translator we are dealing with. If he is a rather free translator, divergence of meaning may be no more than a sign of his customary freedom in recasting the text; if he is a painfully diligent and literal translator, we may expect that the same divergences require a more definite explanation, whether through phonetic-resemblance technique or through some other factor. ¹⁰

The procedure of this article will be as follows. After this introduction it will consider four 'key examples' which seemed to the writer to be crucial instances of the problem: these are ὄρθανον, τόκος, βωμὸς and σκηνή. Thereafter it will list a series of other examples in alphabetical order. There will then be a short survey of 'weak cases', followed by a study of verb examples, and a conclusion.

(b) four key examples

1. δρέπανον

To this writer the most striking and convincing single example was always δρέπανον for דָּרֶךְ at I Sam. 13:20-21. The Hebrew דָּרֶךְ meant a 'goad' for an ox and occurs only twice in the Bible; at the other place it is correctly rendered with βοσκεντρον, Qoh. 12:11. δρέπανον itself means 'sickle' and apart from this passage is used for three normal words meaning this sort of thing, וּרְכִּב, שֶׁמֶר, and רוּכֵנָה. If it were certain that δρέπανον in I Sam. 13:20f. had actually been written for דָּרֶךְ, it would be a very powerful example. Unfortunately, it is not clear that this is so, and the balance of probability is that δρέπανον was used to translate some other word. If this is so, then the case has nothing to do with phonetic resemblance.

The passage lists various agricultural implements that the Israelites had to take to the Philistines in order to have them sharpened. Putting the MT and the LXX together, the list, which appears in two successive verses, appears to have the following components:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v. 20</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>מַחֲשָׁבָה</th>
<th>זָרָה</th>
<th>Θερστρον</th>
<th>Σκευός</th>
<th>κρύς</th>
<th>מַחֲשָׁבָה</th>
<th>δέρπανον</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>מַהֲרָה</td>
<td>זָרָה</td>
<td>Αξίου</td>
<td>δέρπανον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>v. 21</th>
<th>מַחֲשָׁבָה</th>
<th>זָרָה</th>
<th>Θερφείν</th>
<th>Σκευός</th>
<th>extra</th>
<th>κρύς</th>
<th>רוּכֵנָה</th>
<th>δέρפανον</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and</td>
<td>obscure words</td>
<td>Αξίου</td>
<td>δέρפανον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the earlier verse it is very peculiar that the term מַחְשָׁבָה occurs twice in the list, and it is in its second occurrence that we have ὁρπᾶνον in the same place in the Greek. The Hebrew is itself doubtful here. Moreover, if we do accept the MT we then have the highly peculiar situation that ὁρπᾶνον is used in two successive verses, the first time to render מַחְשָׁבָה and the second time to render דָּרְכָּן. If this were right it would itself make less likely the explanation through phonetic resemblance, since it would be strange if a translator so motivated were to use the same Greek word twice in successive sentences to translate quite different Hebrew words and if he were to use the phonetically imitative rendering only the second time. There has in fact been considerable consensus among scholars that this oddity should be overcome by reading מַחְשָׁבָה in the place of מַחְשָׁבָה in v. 20: we would then have דָּרְכָּן twice, and ὁρπᾶνον twice translating it.¹¹ But this remains an emendation, and perhaps others might be considered.

I am personally more convinced by the contrary possibility, as argued by Kyle McCarter: the original word at the end of v. 20 was מַחְשָׁבָה, literally and actually 'his sickle'.¹² The LXX ὁρπᾶνον was a correct rendering of this;

¹¹ Wellhausen, p. 84.
the MT at this point is a mixed-up combination of the same letters.

This is confirmed by the further fact that the text in v. 21 is clearly in a seriously confused state. It contains the highly enigmatic sequence ולשון קצף in the middle of the list of implements. Moreover, even if we accept the MT, it remains uncertain whether ו📋 δραπάνω is in fact a rendering of the וירוק with which the verse ends. The final words of the verse go thus:

MT וירוק ונקרא וה очередь וירוק
LXX καὶ τῷ δεξιῶν καὶ τῷ δραπάνῳ προστασίας ξύν ἐν αὐτῇ.

Now, since the translator seems to be working in a very literal manner at this point, we are probably entitled to expect considerable agreement in word order. The προστασίας of LXX doubtless stands for something like the בletics of MT. But MT shows nothing like ξύν ἐν αὐτῇ, and LXX προστασίας comes after ו📋 δραπάνω and does not come between it and וירוק ונקרא as in MT, nor does ו📋 δραπάνω appear to be object of וירוק, rather it suggests a noun preceded by δ like the others in the series before it.

It seems to me fairly likely that δραπάνων in v. 21 is a rendering of another word, most probably שלם, which has been largely lost from the Hebrew text, and that the וה очередь at the end of v. 21 is a remnant of another piece of text.

In favour of this is another point attaching to the realism of the narrative. The whole narrative is about the
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inferior technology of the Hebrews: only the Philistines had the resources or the knowledge for the provision and the sharpening of essential agricultural implements. With the axe, the sickle and the ploughshare this makes good sense: once blunted, these would lose their usefulness. But it is hard to see that an ox-goad would become ineffective if its iron point became blunt, or indeed if it was merely a wooden goad and had never had any iron point at all. Its bluntness would surely not be a serious disadvantage as was the case with the other implements described.

It seems, then, considerably doubtful whether ἰρεπανον in this passage is a genuine rendering of יִבְּנֵי; and if that is so the entire validity of the example for the consideration of phonetic-resemblance translation disappears.

2. τόκος

In some ways a more impressive example, because it occurs more then once, is the rendering τόκος for Hebrew גְּנִה. גְּנִה is understood to mean 'oppression'; it is a rare term, occurring only four times, Ps. 10:7, 55:12, 72:14, Prov. 29:13. In two of these four places (and in fact in another, as we shall see) the LXX translated with τόκος 'interest' (on a loan). It is very natural to suppose that the rendering was motivated by the phonetic resemblance

13 Tov, p. 224.
between the two words; the result was to give a rather inexact but still possible meaning, the general Hebrew concept 'oppression' being narrowed and made more specific by the Greek. The classic cases are:

**Ps. 55:12 MT**

הנָכַר הָעֵשָׁי מִשְׁלָהּ אֲלֵי

54:12 LXX

cαι οὐκ ἔξελπεν ἐκ τῶν πλατείων αὐτῆς τόκος
cαι δόλος

**Ps. 72:14 MT**

םִפְחֵכְכִי בְּעַלְמֵךְ

71:14 LXX

dκ τόκου καὶ ἐξ ὁμίκης λυτρώσεται τὰς ψυχὰς
aὐτῶν

LXX Ps. 54:12 has a variant reading κόσος in place of τόκος but the other example strongly supports the reading as quoted above. At Ps. 10:7 (LXX 9:28) the Greek is δόλος 'deceit'.

There is, however, another case to be added, for at Jer. 9:5 the word גֵּן, which we understand as 'midst', is taken by the LXX as another example of our word, and the first part of the first word of the verse is taken separately and attached to the syntax of the preceding verse:

**Jer. 9:5 MT**

גֵּן בַּֽקָּר וּטְרוּ הָעָרָה

LXX

... τοῦ ἐπιστρέφατ. τόκος ἐπὶ τόκῳ, δόλος

ἐπὶ δόλῳ

The analysis of the LXX has much to recommend it, and is in fact widely followed: cf. for example RSV and NEB. גֵּן is read as בִּשַּׁ and goes with the preceding verse; this verse begins גֵּן.
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So this is a clear third instance.

It is very reasonable, then, that the rendering τόκος has been widely taken as a good example of a rendering motivated by phonetic resemblance. Before finally accepting this, however, we should ask ourselves whether there may be any alternative explanation. I will suggest that there is a semantic explanation which follows a quite different path. The translators understood ἡρμηνεία as a term of finance: it was, for them, not just oppression, as our modern dictionaries have it, but financial oppression: profit, debt, interest. And they treated the word in this way quite independently of phonetic resemblance, in other words, in places where they rendered it not by τόκος but in some quite other way.

The key place is Prov. 29:13:

MT אֲנִי וְאָנְיָהַנָּחַמ
LXX δανιστός καὶ χρεοφειλέτου ἄλληλοις συνελθόντων

Like much of Prov., this verse is freely translated, and the order of the two persons is reversed: שֶׁלֶחֶת, the poor man, is the χρεοφειλέτης, the debtor; and the שֶׁלֶחֶת is the δανιστής, the money-lender or creditor - a word, not unnaturally, common in the papyri. The 'oppressor' of our modern translations may be correct for the Hebrew; but the translators understood something more specific.
Another verse that seems to go in the same direction is:

Ezek. 28:16 MT לְרָבָּךְ רֵעַ הַקָּכֶבֹּתָךְ
LXX ἀπὸ πλήθους τῆς ἐμπορίας σου ἐξῆλθας τὰ ταμίευτα σου ἀνομίας

ταμίευτα is a rather strange word for the Ezek. translator to use if he identified ἀνομία as from the familiar ἄνοι 'midst'; it is possible, perhaps probable, that he was influenced by the sense of our הָן 'oppression'. The main older sense of ταμίευτα is 'treasury, storehouse for valuables'. This may then support the idea that הָן was thought to have a financial ring about it.

Still more evidence comes from the later translators. Very strikingly, at Ps. 55:12 Aq. renders הָן with ὀφέλημα originally 'fine incurred in a lawsuit, judgement debt', but in papyri mostly just 'debt' (LSJ), while Sym. has ζημία 'money penalty, fine'. Jerome, similarly, at Ps. 72:14 (71:14) in the iuxta Hebraeos retained ab usura (previous Latin ex usuris), which may indicate that this was in his time still understood to be the sense of הָן (contrast Jer. 9:5(6), where his habitatio tua in medio doli goes over to the sense implied by the MT and loses all trace of the sense 'interest'). At Ps. 55(54):12 the older Latin had usura, and in the iuxta Hebraeos Jerome uses a different word, damnun 'loss', but this again is a financial word and again suggests that the term was understood in a financial sense.
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If ḫn, then, was understood to be a term for financial pressure, interest and debt, rather than for general oppression, can we offer any philological reason for this on the Hebrew side? The only suggestion I can offer comes from the Prov. passage. The term מָכֵה שָׁאוֹן was occasionally discussed by the rabbis and understood to be 'a man of medium wealth'. This, even if deriving (wrongly) from the sense of ḫn, at least points in a financial direction. Moreover, the verb מָכֵה seems at times to have been used with the sense 'to fine', so - even if it is a very late text - in the Targum of Prov. 17:26 (Hebrew מַיַּע).

In the case of τόκος, then, it is difficult to make a final balance of the probabilities. We have shown, I believe, that motivation by phonetic resemblance is not the only or the necessary route to this rendering. There is also a semantic route which could operate quite independently of any phonetic resemblance: the word was understood, in a good proportion of cases, actually to mean financial pressure, of which the payment of interest is an outstanding example. I do not think that this understanding could have been originated by the similarity to the Greek word. It would still be possible, however, that both factors operated: that the semantic tradition influenced translators in favour of some kind of financial interpretation, but that in two or three cases the phonetic similarity exercised an attraction in favour of τόκος as the actual rendering. A decision about this may depend on the general consideration that is to
follow, that is, on the answer to the question how many indubitable cases of phonetic-resemblance translation can be found.

3. בָּהֲמֶס for נַעֲבוּ

The rendering of נַעֲבוּ by בָּהֲמֶס is another impressive example. Among the instances that I would deem to be 'strong' ones, this has the advantage of being more numerous: there are seven cases, all in the Prophets: Isa. 15:2, 16:12, Jer. 16:12, 32:35 (LXX 39:35), 48:35 (LXX 31:35), Hos. 10:8, Am. 7:9. The phonetic condition is adequately fulfilled: בָּהֲמֶס is fairly similar to נַעֲבוּ. The semantic condition is also perhaps adequately fulfilled: 'altar' is not identical with the meaning of Hebrew נַעֲבוּ, but it is sufficiently close to provide a reasonable rendering. To the list given above we may with reasonable probability add one further example: Jer. 49:2 (LXX 30:18), MT נַעֲבוֹן but LXX בָּהֲמֹס אוֹרֵג: the LXX either had a Vorlage יהלוע or else, having a text like MT, read it or construed it as if it was יהלוע.

It is noticeable that all cases are in the Prophets (but none in Ezekiel, who has seven cases of נַעֲבוּ and who mentions altars fairly frequently). In effect the rendering we are discussing is found only in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea and Amos. It is a practice used by a rather small minority of books.
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The terminology of altars in the Greek Bible is a complicated matter. The common word for an altar is ἡραντ, and the overwhelmingly commoner rendering for this is θυσιαστήριον. Only certain groupings with the rendering βωμός for ἡραντ are found, and these tend to concern altars that are foreign, peculiar or potentially dangerous in some way. The command to destroy Canaanite altars is expressed with βωμός, Ex. 34:13, Deut. 7:5, 12:3; II Chron. 31:1 describes how illegitimate altars (βωμοῦ) were destroyed by Hezekiah (ἡραντ = ἡψηλᾶ in the same context). All the (rather numerous) references to altars in the passages about Balaam's sacrifices and about the altar constructed in Transjordania by the two and a half tribes dwelling there (Num. 23 and Jos. 22) use βωμός - whether as a sign of disapprobation, or because a different translator is working at this point, it is difficult to say, but probably the former. This is particularly clear in Jos. 22, where the Transjordanian altar is a βωμός but the true altar of the Lord is a θυσιαστήριον: cf. especially Jos. 22:19. After this, however, when it transpires that the Transjordanian tribes were not after all building an altar for sacrifice but a copy as a memorial and witness, then βωμός disappears from the diction. In all these cases the Hebrew is ἡραντ. One passage which is in LXX but not in MT uses βωμός, of the true priestly service, Num. 3:10; this is isolated in all the Torah and the historical books. We may recall that the New
Testament similarly uses ὀμός only for the Athenian altar seen by St Paul (Acts 17:23), and otherwise always θυσιαστήριον.

It is simple enough if we begin from the altar, and from נמי which is a simple and clear word: everyone knew what a מזבח was. With מזבח this was not the case. No one knew exactly what a מזבח was. The term was polysemic, and fell into two great natural divisions. One is seen when, for example, God is said to 'tread on the מזבח of the earth' (so Am. 4:13). The other is seen in the many places where a מזבח is a ritual or cultic centre. In many of these, sinister ritual goings-on take place, and there is continual insistence that such מזבח must be destroyed. Yet even then not all cultic places that are called מזבח are necessarily bad, for an exemplary person like Samuel is found to be frequenting one (I Sam. 9:12ff.) - at least so in the Hebrew, but the LXX may have evaded the difficulty by simply transliterating the word or treating it as a place-name: Samuel went up to Bama, had a sacrifice in Bama, and came down from Bama. In any case David and Solomon also sacrificed in such places (I Ki. 3:1-4). Thus, on the basis of the Hebrew text itself, there was some vagueness and ambiguity about a מזבח. Moreover, though we started out by using the term 'altar', a מזבח, even when it was clearly a ritual centre, was not always exactly an altar: it can be argued that it was an artificial mound or platform serving as an altar or having an altar built upon it. Scholars have thought of a funeral mound as the original
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sense in Isa. 53:9 (probably יִּהֲַכָּר; LQIsa 3וְהַֽמֵּבָּר; reanalysed by MT יִּהֲַכָּר as 'in his death').

This, however, was the case on the Greek side also. 

βωμός was used firstly for a 'raised platform, stand, base'; then, mostly, 'altar with a base'; and, later, 'tomb, cairn' (LSJ). Thus the spread of senses for Greek βωμός was highly similar to that of Hebrew יָמָן. Indeed some have thought that they were basically the same word, an old Mediterranean culture-term which had been inherited by both languages in some way. This item of linguistic history, if true, was certainly not known to the LXX. But the fact remained that βωμός had a very similar range of meaning to יָמָן.

Nevertheless the central and dominant meaning that will have attached to βωμός must be 'altar'.

If we are dealing with altars, however, we may wish to distinguish terminologically between good altars and bad. At least in some books, as has been seen, βωμός tends to be used for doubtful or illegitimate altars, but that does not mean that θυσιαστήριον is always a legitimate one: for instance, the altar set up by Jeroboam at Bethel is a θυσιαστήριον (I Ki. 13, repeatedly); so also an altar to Baal, θυσιαστήριον, I Ki. 16:32. It is at least possible, however, that the choice of vocabulary might be related, in some books if not in others, to the question of the legitimacy of the altar.

Now in the Prophets we have remarkable differences between books. First and most surprising, the Greek Jer. has
no cases of θυσιαστήριον at all! This book actually has little about altars, and such verses as do contain the term in MT are lacking from the LXX with the one exception of Jer. 11:13 (one of the two cases in that verse), where we have βωμός. This is a Baal altar. Of the six places where Jer. has ἡ γῆ, three are ritual places of a disapproved kind (7:31 Tophet; 32:35 (LXX 39:35) for Baal to burn children; 48:35 (LXX 31:35) for Moabite gods), and all these three have βωμός. 17:3 is lacking from the LXX. 19:5, again of ἡ γῆ for Baal to burn children, has υψηλά, in general the commonest biblical term for ἡ γῆ; 26:18 (LXX 33:18) refers to the 'mountain of the house' coming to be ὕψος ἡ γῆ and is translated as ἀλόγος δρωμοῦ. To put it simply, all occurrences in Jer. which concerned a ritual centre were translated with βωμός except for the one at 19:5 which has υψηλά, and all were religiously disapproved. Much the most natural explanation is that for the Jer. translator a ἡ γῆ, when it was not simply a mountain or a cosmic area, was precisely an altar. It was a place where things were burned in worship. For this his normal word was the normal Greek, i.e. βωμός. He may or may not also have preferred this word because he thought it disapproving in tone.

In Isa. 36:7 had one ἡ γῆ and two cases of ἡ γῆ but these seem to have been lacking from the original LXX. Leaving these aside, there are four cases of ἡ γῆ which are rendered with θυσιαστήριον and all of these are theologically
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favourable contexts: 6:6, 19:19, 56:7, 60:7. There are two cases of ἡμι in unfavourable contexts, 17:8 and 27:9, and both of these have βωμὸς. Where the Hebrew is הֵמָּה, only two cases refer to cultic centres, 15:2 of Moabite worship, 16:12 again of Moab, and these have βωμὸς. In Isaiah, whether by accident or by design, there is a clear division: a favoured altar is θυσιαστήριον, but an unfavoured cultic centre is βωμὸς whether the Hebrew is הֵמָּה or הֵמָּה.

In the Minor Prophets it is more difficult to see where the line of difference lies, and perhaps most likely there is none. These books mention altars fairly often, and the normal term is θυσιαστήριον. It is used even when divine action against the altars is referred to, e.g. Hos. 10:2, Am. 3:14. Nevertheless all these are at least Israelite altars. In these books הֵמָּה is used six times; three are cosmic, Am. 4:13, Mic. 1:3, Hab. 3:19; of the two which refer to cultic centres, both seem to be in contexts of particularly severe stricture and warning of destruction, Hos. 10:8 and Am. 7:9, and these have βωμὸς. In these books

14 At Mic. 1:5 MT has הֵמָּה but LXX has ἱμαρία; either the Greek was translated from a different text, or the translator abandoned literality at this point and assimilated the word to the context, where we have the preceding ἄσβεστα to render יָסָר; in any case it drops out of our discussion of the terms for altars and the like.
we may have something that comes closer to a simple stereotyping policy, i.e. the principle that Ἱλά, where referring to a cultic centre, is βωμός, while Ἱλά is ἱεράς. In other words, further semantic differentiation would not be entered into. If that should be so, these books are more likely than others to have been influenced by phonetic similarity. But the number of examples is too small to enable us to be sure.

Ezekiel, as already mentioned, has a number of cases of Ἱλά, but none are rendered with βωμός.

To sum up, the position may be imagined as follows. Sometimes Ἱλά was a cosmic mountain or the like. Most cases, however, were some kind of cultic centre, generally disapproved of theologically. One way of dealing with this was to use a rather neutral term like τὰ ὕψαλα 'the high places', which caught something of both meanings since it was known that the cultic centre had something high about it, and which also left it vague and unexpressed whether the entity was approved or disapproved: 'high places' was as comfortably ambiguous then as it has been in English ever since. But if one wanted to specify more exactly what this Ἱλά was, there were different opinions. It might be regarded as an idol (τῶν ἱερῶν Ezek. 16:16); a stronger school of opinion thought that it might be a pillar (στήλη Lev. 26:30, Num. 21:28, 22:41, 33:52); but the most satisfying thought was that it was an altar. Although, as we have seen, βωμός in Greek is
not exactly an altar and may be a base or platform for an altar, and though this may have assisted in the selection of βωμός as a suitable equivalent, we may be sure that where βωμός is actually used in the LXX it probably means the actual altar: this is shown by the quite numerous cases (about 23) where it is used to render מזבח. In fact βωμός is used far more often to render מזבח than it is used to render מזבח.

Much the majority of cases of מזבח, though not absolutely all, had something disapproved or foreign about them. There was also a tendency to use βωμός for foreign altars, though this again was not universal. But these factors are already enough to provide a rationale for the use of βωμός to render מזבח. It remains possible that the phonetic resemblance played a part, but it is hard to show that it did so, for the semantic explanation is sufficient to account for the patterns of usage actually found. And the fact remains that this rendering is restricted to seven or eight cases within the Prophets; and, when the Prophets themselves use βωμός thrice to stand for מזבח, all this counts against it. Phonetic resemblance can be ignored.
4. σκηνή, κατασκηνοῦν etc.

The resemblance between σκηνή, σκῆνωμα and the root of ἱσχύμ 'tabernacle' has doubtless come to the notice of many scholars, and similarly the resemblance between κατασκηνοῦμ and the verb σω. If this is a true case of a vocabulary choice motivated by phonetic resemblance, it is important, because these terms, unlike most of those which we have cited, are common and frequent terms occurring in many sources and running through much of the Bible. Moreover, the idea can have far-reaching exegetical effects. Thus Hoskyns and Davey, commenting on St John, translate the passage 1:14 καὶ ἐσκῆνομεν ἐν ἡμῖν as And dwelt (tabernacled) among us (in our midst) and go on to refer to the allusion to nomadic life contained in the word tabernacled. The reference is to God's dwelling in the Old Testament Tabernacle. And, they go on:

The more immediate reference is perhaps to the Palestinian use of the verb shakan (abide in, inhabit) - a word containing the same consonants as the Greek verb σκηνοῦμ (tabernacle) - to denote the presence of God in the Temple and in the midst of the Jewish people.\(^{15}\)
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It is safe to say that exegetical ideas of this kind have been quite widely influential. They will certainly be supported if it is found that the LXX in this word-group were motivated by this phonetic resemblance.

Let us then look at the distribution of the Greek forms concerned. Renderings of מָשְׁךָ and מַשְׁךָ with σκηνή, σκηνωμα and compounds are quite numerous, amounting to about 150 cases in all, and it is not surprising if phonetic resemblance has been thought of as the basis for this equivalence. We shall consider first the noun מָשְׁךָ and then the verbs.

For מָשְׁךָ the LXX rendering is σκηνή in 93 cases and σκηνωμα in 17; other renderings are negligible in frequency. But against this we have to set another fact: these equivalences, frequent as they appear at first sight, are in fact a minority use for these Greek words. For they are used to a far greater extent as renderings of the familiar לֹזֵן, the standard word 'tent'. Rough figures are: σκηνή renders לֹזֵן in about 240 cases and renders מָשְׁךָ in 93; σκηνωμα renders לֹזֵן in 46 cases and מָשְׁךָ in seventeen. But לֹזֵן has of course no phonetic similarity at all to these Greek words. The dominant use of σκηνή, σκηνωμα was to give, and to give quite correctly, the semantic expression 'tent', and not to provide a term having phonetic similarity with the Hebrew. Once we realize this, it ceases to be probable that the Greek σκηνή or σκηνωμα, even where they do render a form from the root לֹזֵן such as מָשְׁךָ, was an imitation of the sound
of that Hebrew word. On the contrary, it was a semantic expression, intended to express the meaning 'tent'. Although theoretically נִפָרֻר might be understood to mean 'dwelling-place' in general, in the vast majority of biblical cases it meant not any dwelling-place, such as a normal house, but a tent, and in particular the tabernacle in which God was understood to have dwelt, a moveable tent-like structure; and even where it might in reality be a fixed stone building the terminology was often interpretable as being derived from the sense 'tent' and was thus translatable with that term. Thus the fact is that σκήνη in the Greek Bible varies back and forth very rapidly between renderings of בָּצָן and renderings of נִפָרֻר, to which one must add renderings of נֶפֶשׁ in certain places; and the same is true of σκήνωσιμα.

Thus, in passages where there is a possibility that either an בָּצָן or a נִפָרֻר is being talked about, it is commonly impossible, starting from the Greek rendering σκήνη or σκήνωσιμα, to know which is the matter referred to. Nowhere is this more difficult than in the account of the construction of the tabernacle, as we call it, in Exodus, for there it is said that an בָּצָן, a tent, should be made as an outer cover over the משכן (Ex. 26:7). Thus there was both an outer and an inner tent. Each of these, or both of them taken together, could count as a σκήνη. In a number of places we have in Hebrew the composite expression בָּצָן + משכן such as משכן האל הרע (Ex. 40:2) and the Greek renders with ἡ σκήνη
Doubts about homoeophony in the Septuagint

τοῦ μαρτυρίου, compressing as it were the two terms for 'tent' and 'dwelling' into one. It is clear that the translators were not much concerned to assist their readers to discern when the Hebrew was לֹא and when it was יִנָּה. All this makes it increasingly doubtful that the renderings σκήνη and σκήνωμα were expected to represent an impression of the sound of the Hebrew לֹא. Much more often they rendered לֹא.

Let us then turn to the verbs of the same group. Here the central fact is the place of κατασκηνῶν as the majority rendering of לֹא (45 times), while other main renderings are σκηνῶ (registered as four, but see below), and, more important, κατοικῶ and other cognates of οἶκῳ (over 20 times) and καταλύω (a few). The prominence of κατασκηνῶν as a major verb 'dwell' in the Greek O.T. seems striking. But there are strong reasons against supposing that this frequency resulted from the phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew original. If one were to imitate the Hebrew לֹא with a Greek word, one would surely choose σκηνῶ rather than κατασκηνῶ, for the latter does not have much resemblance to any Hebrew word, while σκηνῶ could be said to resemble לֹא.

16 Among words for 'dwell', of course, κατοικέω is a far more frequent term, most commonly standing for לֹא.
quite well. But σκηνῶ is found very seldom indeed, in fact only at three places in the B text of Jud. (where A has κατασκηνῶ or κατοικῶ) and one in III Kingdoms 8:12 (and this a Hexaplaric addition).

Moreover, although κατασκηνῶ itself is more numerous in rendering לְשׁ than any other word, it remains rather thinly distributed in certain important sections such as the Pent. There are, for instance, no cases in Gen., Ex. and Lev. (where לְשׁ gal occurs thirteen times), and Gen. clearly prefers κατοικῶ and uses it in every one of its seven cases of לְשׁ. The major single locus for κατασκηνῶ is in fact in Ps. (eighteen cases out of a total of about 23 of לְשׁ).

There is also a considerable group in the Min. Proph., Jer. and Ezek.; Isa., by contrast, a large user of לְשׁ, has none at all and Job only two. Another point to be noticed is that κατασκηνῶ could be a transitive verb, meaning 'to make someone dwell (in a place)', which fits with the piel and hiphil forms of לְשׁ; a proportion of the cases numbered above belong to this category, as in 'make my name to dwell' etc.

To sum up this point, then, if phonetic resemblance had been a major factor, we might have expected σκηνῶ rather than κατασκηνῶ, but it is in fact seldom found. On the other hand, κατασκηνῶ, though the most numerous single term, is unevenly distributed and a number of significant books never used it at all and clearly had no interest in such degree of phonetic resemblance as it offered. It could
nevertheless be, in theory, that phonetic resemblance did form the motivation for some books, such as Psalms or the Minor Prophets.

Against this, however, there is a semantic argument which seems to be decisive. We mentioned above the idea that there is an association between the root לֹעֵש and the nomadic ideal of a mobile life in tents. The flaw in this notion is the fact that לֹעֵש does not mean 'live in tents' or 'live nomadically'. It is a term of permanence except where specially indicated otherwise. The Tabernacle was indeed a tent and a movable one, but that was not the meaning of its designation לֹעֵש: it was called לֹעֵש because God dwelt there all the time. Hence the term is also used of God's continual abode in Zion. If κατασκηνώω meant 'live in tents, live in a nomadic manner', and if it was also meant to communicate something of the atmosphere of the Hebrew לֹעֵש through its sound, it rather misrepresented it in fact.

The key to this lies in the Greek meanings. It is clear that κατασκηνώ and its compounds had in Hellenistic times shifted their sense from the older and particular sense 'camp, dwell in tents' to the more general meaning 'settle, live, dwell', and this had probably taken place before LXX times. Substantial evidence is known from Xenophon and the papyri, and the shift is very obvious in the N.T. Thus the LXX used κατασκηνώ because it meant 'settle, dwell' and in this represented correctly the meaning of the Hebrew לֹעֵש. It
was not intended by them to convey the atmosphere of camping and nomadism except when that was specified through the addition of a phrase like 'in tents' (and I am not sure that there are any actual cases of this). Those scholars who have seen (κατα) σκηνῶν as a term alluding to the nomadic life have, paradoxically, depended upon the classical meanings rather than upon those that the LXX intended. If the έσκηνωσεν of John 1:14 is intended to allude to the biblical past as communicated through LXX usage, then it was probably not an allusion to the tabernacle, and the traditional rendering 'dwelt among us' (KJV, RSV etc.) is more correct than the artificial 'tabernacled among us' suggested in modern times.

In my opinion the entire group of words σκηνή, σκήνωμα, κατασκηνόω and the rest suggests a semantic explanation rather than one in terms of phonetic resemblance. The ἔσχατον was rendered as σκηνή because it was in fact a tent, although this rendering thoroughly mixed it up with the common word for tent, σκηνή. It is most unlikely that phonetic resemblance was a factor. In the verbs, κατασκηνόω was used because it already meant 'dwell' and well represented the meaning of the Hebrew קֶץ, as did κατοικέω and other terms. Moreover, there may have been a chain of 'etymological' associations. But this does not mean a recall of the form of the Hebrew. Rather, in Septuagintal 'etymology', where two terms are seen as related in the Hebrew, something may be
done to use two terms that are related in the Greek. For this the nodal point was the acceptance of σκηνή 'tent' as the normal rendering of לֶשֶׁנַּן. The verb לֶשֶׁנַּן was then correspondingly rendered as κατασκηνών by some translators some of the time. This kind of etymological chain did not necessarily and did not normally involve phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew: it was a matter of cognate resemblance within the Greek that was supposed to mirror the cognate relationships within the Hebrew. The best-known instances, like the chain of πτκρός-words reflecting רֶם, or the chain of ἐκλεκτός-words reflecting רָע, have no kind of phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew at all. It is possible - I do not think more - that this sort of etymological notion had some influence upon the choice of κατασκηνών. There is certainly a stronger case for it than for the idea of phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew. The entire usage of the σκηνή word-group can be accounted for without the need for an appeal to phonetic resemblance. One objection may be quickly mentioned: some say that the basis of word-formation lay in the verbs, so that the etymological process would have moved from the verb to the noun. Not so: the idea of the primacy of the verb is a modern idea. The thought of the translators will much more probably have taken departure from the most prominent word in the group, and this without doubt was σκηνή 'tent'.
(c) Other examples alphabetically

1. ἀπορία, ἀπορέω

It has been suggested that phonetic resemblance lies behind the rendering ἀπορία ἀπορεῖται ἢ γῆ for the Hebrew יָשָׁב הַנַּעַר רָפֵע at Isa. 24:19.\textsuperscript{17} The syllable por is common to the texts in both languages, and the repetition of the syllable in both makes it more conspicuous. The verse, seen in a larger perspective, contains three sayings about the earth, in parallel form, with the three verbs ἀπορεῖ, ἀρραβώνει, ἀπορεῖται. The LXX contained only the first two (as it seems) in Greek. For the forms with Hebrew ἀπορεῖ it gives τοράζη τοράζηται ἢ γῆ and for those with ἀρραβών it gives ἀπορεῖ ἀπορεῖται ἢ γῆ.

In the Prophets, statements of this kind about strange and destructive happenings to the earth were not uncommon. But the words used were often in strange forms and unclear in meaning. The first verb, ἀπορεῖ, might be 'break asunder', but it might be something more like 'spoil, corrupt'; and the second, ἀρραβών, does not necessarily mean 'rend asunder' (as Tov puts it), it might be something more like 'stir, toss' (Lisowsky), or the translator might have thought of the other ῥή as in ῥή which means 'frustrate, make ineffectual (a plan, a covenant etc.)'. At the place which comes nearest to the cosmic usage of Isa. 24:19, namely Ps. 74:13, we have a startlingly different understanding:

Ps. 74:13 MT שָׁנָה סַפֵּר יָם יְהֹוָֽה
'Thou didst divide the sea by thy might' (RSV)

Ps. 73:13 LXX σὺ ἔκρατας ἐν τῇ συνάμμετα τῷ νῆν δόλασαν
'Thou didst strengthen the sea by thy might'

Here are some other examples:

Isa. 24:3 יָשָׁב הַנַּעַר רָפֵע
'The earth is emptied out'
do. LXX φθόρα φθόρεται ἢ γῆ
'The earth will be completely destroyed'

\textsuperscript{17} Tov, p. 225.
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In Nah. 2:3, however, the same verb is rendered with ἐκτίνισσω 'shake out'.

To the translators, then, there was often much obscurity in the wording of these prophecies of cosmic trouble. Uncertain of the exact sense of the (often difficult) wording, translators tended to use 'favourite words'. These can be blanket terms which are used for a wide variety of Hebrew expressions. Among the most notable of them, for this kind of passage, are ταράσσω and σαλεύω; and the first of these is the verb used in the first clause of our verse. ταράσσω is used for a large variety of Hebrew terms: Hatch and Redpath (HR) list forty-six. Isa. uses it eleven times, and never twice for the same Hebrew word. In these circumstances we should not expect any high degree of precision or of deliberateness about the correspondence between the Greek and the Hebrew words.

It is likely, moreover, that the same is true of ἀπορία and ἀπορέω. There is probably no single term in Hebrew to which either of these would be the natural and normal equivalence. The verb is used seven times, and every time for a different Hebrew word; the noun eight times, and again for a different Hebrew word every time. The Hebrew originals range over a wide field including cloudiness, fainting, darkness, disease and restriction or difficulty. The same seems to be true of ἀπορία ἀπορηθήσεται here. Tov's rendering 'and the earth shall be completely perplexed' is probably the best indication of what the translator had in mind. From his point of view, this was a very good indication of what the text must be saying. 'Perplexity' was one of the stock ingredients of the Day of the Lord (ημέρα Isa. 22:5).

It still remains possible that the existence of the common syllable por had some influence upon the choice of the Greek vocabulary. But there seems to be nothing which requires us to assume this. The choice of vocabulary by the LXX can be accounted for entirely on the basis of considerations of semantics and translation technique.

It has been suggested several times that the translation of מני by ἄρμονία is an example of phonetic-resemblance rendering.\(^{19}\) The passage in question is:

**Ezek. 23:42 MT**

חַלְמַתךָ פּוּךְ לְעָרֹב֔וֹ דוֹקִינוֹ

**LXX**

φωνὴν ἄρμονίας ἀνεκροδοντο

The suggestion is that מני itself meant 'noisy crowd' (Caird, p. 84) or 'multitude' (Tov, p. 224) but that the translation, motivated by the phonetic resemblance, saw this as similar to ἄρμονία and therefore as meaning 'music'.

There is indeed some similarity between the sound of מני and that of ἄρμονία 'music', but not very much. But the real weakness of the explanation through phonetic resemblance is that מני sometimes mean 'music' or something of the kind. This was well known to the LXX translators, for instance:

**Am. 5:23**

הָרַעְתֶּךָ פּוּךְ לְעָרֹב֔וֹ חַלְמַתְךָ

And even more was this the case with the verb מני, in which the making of sound was a very normal and frequent meaning, thus:

**Jer. 48:36**

(בר 31:36) מְשַׁפֵּר אָמָלָה בֹּקֶרָה֖ (twice) מִבְּשֵׁלָה

**Isa. 16:11**

מִיָּהּ קְיָדָהְךָ חַלְמַתְךָ_<

The Ezek. translator knew the two main areas of meaning for מני: (1) multitude, and (2) sound. He was remarkably poor, on the other hand, at seeing which was appropriate at which place. At 23:42 it seems to us that 'multitude' is more appropriate, but he wrote ἄρμονία, doubtless influenced by the preceding ἔρι: at 26:13, where it is quite clear, even by his own translation, that the context is musical, he writes πληθῶς 'multitude': τὸ πληθῶς (מְנַהֲג) τῶν μουσικῶν σου - possibly influenced by the πληθῶς he has written just above for another word (26:10).

\(^{19}\) Thackeray, p. 37; Caird, p. 84; Tov, p. 224.

[38]
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Another contextual factor is that the translator failed to identify the word יֵשׁ which follows יָלְתָה at 23:42; he took it as the plural perfect of some verb, perhaps יָשַׁע 'to draw out', or יֵשׁ 'join', and he construed this as 'to strike up' a musical instrument. Another passage that uses this terminology is

II Sam. 6:14 καὶ λαυδὶ ἀνεκρούσεν ὄργανοις ἐρμοσμένοις ἔναπτον κυρίου

-cf. also v.5 ἐν ὄργανοις ἐρμοσμένοις and v. 16.

Kyle McCarter on the basis of Qumran fragments thinks that the Hebrew here was יֵשׁ לְלוּל. These associations are significant because they may explain why the translator used the rare word ἀρμονία, nowhere else found in the sense 'music' in the LXX. The tradition was interested in the manufacture or 'fitting together' of instruments; in the (apocryphal) Ps. 151, which we now know to have been familiar in late biblical times, David says

Ps. 151:2 οἱ χεῖρες μου ἐποίησαν ὄργανον οἱ ὀρκοτυλοὶ μου ἐρμοσμένος ψαλτήριον

(which is only one Hebrew verb for the two of the Greek text; it is יֵשָׁב). If the Ezek. translator was aware of this, it could have suggested to him the word ἀρμονία, here to be used in the sense 'music'. He also, incidentally, is the only writer to have used the word elsewhere, at Ezek. 37:7, where each bone is brought together πρὸς τὴν ἀρμονίαν αὐτοῦ, 'to its joint' or 'to its fitting-point' (Hebrew יָשַׁב).

The rendering ἀρμονία, then, can be basically explained through the familiar experience that, where a word has more than one department of meaning, translators sometimes choose

---