the wrong department; to this, in this case, may be added the force of certain literary associations. There is nothing in the example that requires us to explain on the basis of phonetic resemblance, though it would not be impossible that it played some small part.

3. αὐλίζω

Tov sets out the facts and considerations correctly: 21

Jer. 31:9 (LXX 38:9) ἄνδρας αὐλίζων ἐπὶ διάβρυγας δόσων
I will bring them (back), causing them to lodge by channels of water

- and he goes on: 'however, if the LXX reflects a variant διάβρυγα, no homophony should be presupposed'. And this is quite right. But surely we can go somewhat further, and say that exactly this variant is reflected. αὐλίζω not only occurs, but is the most common of the renderings for the Hebrew לְבָנִי 'lodge, stay the night' in its various forms. The verb in its various forms occurs about 71 times, and Greek renderings include αὐλίζω (35 times), καταλύω and cognates (about 15 times) and κοιμῶ and the like (over 15 times). It seems therefore extremely probable that αὐλίζων in our verse comes from that source. This does not meant that it was a 'variant' in the sense that a text existed that was intended to be so, i.e. that διάβρυγα was written; all that is needed is that the LXX translators perceived the word as one having a nun as penultimate consonant, and - seeing that this was difficult and possibly even nonsensical - nevertheless faithfully and literally translated it and wrote it down. The

21 Tov, p. 225.
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word therefore has nothing to do with phonetic resemblance - and indeed the phonetic resemblance at the best could not be great, since the ending -zōn of the Greek is far from being very similar to the -kōm of the Hebrew.

4. αὐλῶν

This is another standard example of a word chosen in Greek because of its similarity to the Hebrew יֹּלֶם. The passage is Deut. 11:30:

| MT | נְלִים |
| LXX | τῆς ὀρυχί τῆς ὕψηλης |
| Later translators | αὐλῶνος καταφανοῦς |

The modern understanding of the Hebrew is that it is the name of a tree, and LXX takes it so. The other rendering, αὐλῶν, means 'valley' and is so used several times in the LXX, translating standard terms such as נֵלֶה and לֵך. As a rendering for the fairly familiar tree-name יֹלֶם it is very surprising; this has suggested to scholars that αὐλῶν was selected because of its similarity to Hebrew יֹלֶם, despite the fact that it produced a very discrepant meaning.

This can, however, be definitely disproved. Strange as it may seem to us, they thought that this word meant 'valley', and there is a wide range of evidence for this, notably the standard Targumic rendering יֵשְׁמ 'plain'. The treatment of the word was semantic and etymological. The situation at Ps. 42:2 shows this clearly:

| MT | יֵשְׁמ |
| Aqu. | οὗ τὸ αὐλῶν |
| 'Another' | οὗ τρόπον πεδίου |

22 Tov, p. 226; the example has long been quoted, e.g. H.B. Swete, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge 1900) 41.
I have gone into the details in an earlier article and they do not have to be repeated here. Obscure as the final explanation is, the rendering applies to words appearing to have the root "-y-l" under certain circumstances, and the meaning is taken as 'valley, plain', independently of phonetic similarity. Αὐλῶν therefore is certainly not a real case.

5. βρῶμα

βρῶμα and τρόφιμο are terms for food, rather rare, and understood to be specialized in the sense of food for the invalid. Wellhausen says that the rendering of these with βρῶμα is an instance of phonetic-resemblance translation. This seems straightforwardly impossible to accept. 

βρῶμα (βρῶσις) is a catch-all word for food, except for ἄρτος which is usually ἀρτὸς. There is no ground to suppose that phonetic resemblance played a part.

6. ἔχοςαρίτης

In II Sam. 6:19 David distributed to the people certain foods; each person received a bread roll, an ἄρτος and an ἔχοςαρίτης. For the second element, ἔχοςαρίτης, the LXX wrote ἔχοςαρίτης, a word used only here in the LXX. It must mean some kind of bread baked in the hearth (ἐχάρια). It has been suggested that the word was chosen for the rendering because of its phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew ἔχονι. 25

24 Wellhausen, p. 11 n.
25 Thackeray, p. 37; Caird, p. 84.
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What was an ἄρμον? It was probably not a bread roll, baked in the hearth, for if it was it would probably reduplicate the קָּנָה קָּנָּה already mentioned in the verse. Baumgartner (KBL 93b) thinks that it was a sort of date cake. St Jerome took it to be a meat preparation: assatura bubulae carne, doubtless following Jewish ideas of the sense of this word.

Here it seems likely that phonetic resemblance did have a place. The words had a reasonable degree of similarity. The meaning achieved by rendering with ἔσχαριτης was substantially different, and yet it was still a foodstuff and something that could be aligned in the same series. The Hebrew word was a very rare one, and probably no one had accurate knowledge of what it had in fact represented. The translator took a Greek word that sounded reasonably similar and meant some kind of foodstuff, sufficiently close in meaning to fit into the general context.

Yet even here other possibilities of explanation remain. The most likely is an etymological chain of reasoning. Thackeray (p. 37) already wondered if the translators saw a connection with πῦρ 'fire'. Would it be fanciful to suppose that they also saw a connection with παγι 'bake' in the letter δ, or one with πνεῦμ 'ashes' in the ρ, or indeed both? There would be an analogy in the later treatment of Deut. 33:2 ἄρμον. That our word was given etymological interpretations is clear from B. Pes. 36b, where R. Ḥanan b. Abba says that it was 'a sixth of a bullock', presumably analysing it as a compound of πῦρ and ρά.

7. ἔτάκη

This is another verb case, but of a different type.

Jer. 6:29 MT וַיֶּאֶשׁ עָלָיו LXX πονηρὰ τούτων οὖκ ἔτακη

26 Tov, p. 225.
The Hebrew verb means 'be removed', as with the removal of a ring, or the snapping of a thread or thong. The Greek verb means 'melt'. The Greek form does have a striking resemblance to the Hebrew if the initial n of the latter is ignored. However, there is another explanation. The translator saw this form, or read this form, as a form from the similar but semantically very different Hebrew verb הָנַל, also used in the niphal; its meaning is 'to be poured out' and sometimes particularly 'melt'. Perceiving the form in this way, he translated quite exactly and precisely with ἔπιθημι. Phonetic resemblance did not enter into the matter. τῆκω is one of the several renderings used for הָנַל and is found at Na. 1:6, Ezek. 24:11. Incidentally, there seems to be another such mistake in identification at Hab. 3:6, MT דֹּחַל הָנַל הָנַל, LXX ἔπεσα λείψεων, καὶ διετάκη ἔθνη. The verb of MT is הָנַל 'maketo start up' (?), and the translator has taken it as διετάκη 'melt'. In our passage, Jer. 6:29, the association with the verb 'melt' is made very easy and natural because the preceding context is about the smelting of ores or of metals in order to refine them; this is particularly clear in a version like NEB.

8. ἡπτάζω

The use of the verb ἡπτάζω is almost entirely a phenomenon of Isa. There are twelve cases in all, three of them in the one verse Isa. 8:9, and in eight of these the Hebrew is a form of הָנַל. Walters comments: 'This usage is obviously due to the Hebrew, and ἡπτάζω here is a homonym fashioned with regard to the Hebrew word with its similar sounds'. The usual glosses for הָנַל are 'be shattered, be dismayed' (BDB) and we have various nouns and adjectives meaning 'terror, dismay, ruin' and the like. The natural

27 Walters, pp. 185f., 256-61; the quotation is from p. 257. It is far from easy to follow what Walters is saying in this very complex excursus.
sense of ἴπποσικτήριον would be 'be overcome, defeated, shown to be inferior'. Though the discussion of Walters is not very clear, he seems to argue that the main meaning of ἴπποσικτήριον in the LXX is 'be frightened'. The implication seems to be that the main sense of ἴπποσικτήριον in Hebrew is fear rather than defeat; that ἴπποσικτήριον has been chosen as a rendering because of phonetic similarity; and that it has, at least in most cases, been understood in terms of fear as well.

But in the same excursus Walters begins with a comment from Ottley which might well lead in a very different direction. 28 Ottley had said that ἴπποσικτήριον was a 'stop-gap word': 'whenever the translator was in doubt about the proper meaning of a word ... he took refuge in one or more of these words without considering whether they gave the correct sense or any sense at all'. In other words, this may come close to the category of 'favourite words' which has been mentioned above. For, within the one book of Isaiah itself, if it is striking that ἴπποσικτήριον is used eight times for forms of ἴπποσικτήριον, it is equally striking that it is used for a very wide variety of other meanings. Thus we have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah 13:15</td>
<td>ἴπποσικτήριον</td>
<td>'will be stabbed through'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:1</td>
<td>ἴπποσικτήριον</td>
<td>'will melt'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:1</td>
<td>ἴπποσικτήριον</td>
<td>'will deal treacherously'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54:17</td>
<td>ἴπποσικτήριον</td>
<td>'will defeat in a lawsuit'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To these we may add the noun ἴπποσικτήριον for ὑπὸ 'serfdom' at 31:8. This has a similarity to 19:1 quoted above. With respect to this group of words, Walters seems to have been hasty in judging LXX ὡς δὲ φεογόνον for ἴπποσικτήριον at 10:18 to be 'a

wild guess'. Probably the translator associated or even counted as one (or as sometimes one) the roots שומ (to us 'melt') and שיב, שיבת (to us 'flee'); a form like שומ he took to be related to שיבת 'take flight'. So δειλίδοτε 'be cowardly' for שיב at 13:7. Words with n-s and words with n-s thus belonged together, and semantically one side might provide the development from 'melt' to 'become terrified' and hence 'be defeated', while the other side provided 'flee' and hence 'be defeated'. This tendency was strengthened by the fact that words from both groups appeared to stand together, as at 10:18 and 31:8. Thus ἠττᾶμαι, ἠτημα provided neatly for the semantic pattern, as the translator saw it.

But all these considerations make it less likely that ἠττᾶμαι was chosen because of its phonetic similarity to a Hebrew word. It is not impossible that this consideration played a part where מון is being rendered, but it seems less likely when the word is used for so many other Hebrew terms to which it had no resemblance, and when the semantic question of dealing with many passages where only a vague and general meaning was to be given is taken into consideration. The fact is that, on the basis of Greek meanings alone, ἠττᾶμαι was a very natural word for what the Isa. translator seems to have wanted his word to mean.

9. καρχαροῦμενος

This word is found only once, used by Aq. at II Sam. 6:16 to translate רכבר, David, according to the MT, is רכבר בguarded before the Lord. The Greek versions are:

LXX ἄροουμενον καὶ ἀνακρουοῦμενον
Aq. διατιμασοῦμενον καὶ καρχαροῦμενον
Symm. σκυρῶντα καὶ καρχαροῦντα

καρχαροῦμενος certainly has a considerable phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew רכבר. It is less easy, however, to be sure that this phonetic resemblance is the actual motivation of the rendering by Aq. One has to consider what
he may have had in mind. Any knowledge of Aqu. suggests that an etymological motivation is far more probable than one based on phonetic resemblance. Or perhaps he was simply trying to give what he understood as the meaning?

The Hebrew word itself is uncertain. Modern scholarship following Jewish tradition takes it to mean 'dancing', 'whirling' or the like. But there is evidence that the Greek translators took it to be a term for the making of some sort of noise, and this may perhaps be defended as the actual original sense: McCarter translates 'strumming' (on a sonorous instrument); following Ahlström, cf. v. 14.29 LXX's ἀνακρούμενος clearly refers to 'striking up' (music), and Symmachus's καγχάζων would seem to mean 'laughing'. For καρχαρός there is little evidence that is closely relevant: the basic sense of κάρχαρος is 'saw-like, jagged, with saw-like teeth' (LSJ), but it is also used as 'harsh' of sounds or language, and also in the sense 'rough, rude' of manners and habits (Plutarch, Moralia 468c). I have not been able to think of a Hebrew 'etymology' that could be the basis, and incline to think that Aqu. must either have meant 'making a harsh noise', in line with the other Greek translators, or else have meant 'behaving rudely'. If either of these was the meaning he intended, then it makes it less clear that phonetic resemblance was the motive for his choice.30 The case is an uncertain one and phonetic


30 One other case sometimes cited as from Aqu. I mention in the notes though I omit it from the text of this article: the reported rendering ὕδωρ 'water' for הַיָּם 'glory' at Lev. 23:40, mentioned in Pal. Sukkah 3.5 (53d); Tov, p. 226. It looks like a distorted transliteration, wrongly reported as Aqu.; Aqu. would certainly have used οἰκονομεῖα. As Field put it (Hexapla I, 208 n. 45) quis sanus crediderit that this was Aquila's actual reading?
resemblance is only one among several possible explanations.

10. λίς

This is not a LXX word but is found in other Greek versions, once in Ag. and once in Th. It is an old epic word for 'lion' and it is rather surprising to find it in documents of the Christian era. The equivalence λίς - Ṭην at Job 4:11 is very striking, and has long been explained as an instance of Aquila's choosing a Greek word because of its phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew. Ag. is indeed a later translator and in that sense separate from the LXX; but he remains very relevant for our discussion, because what Ag. did may well have been a development of what others had done earlier. The more phonetic resemblance was used by Ag., or by any other of the later versions, the more likely it is that it remains plausible for the LXX or parts of it.

That λίς might have been selected because of its phonetic resemblance to Ṭην is indeed very plausible, and it is one of the strongest cases that has ever been adduced. Yet there are two reasons for questioning its validity. Firstly, we have the other case at Hos. 5:14, where Th. has λίς for Ṭην. This immediately shows two things: firstly, that λίς, unusual a word as it may be, was current as part of the vocabulary of the later translators, and secondly that it was used for another word that was understood to mean 'lion' but had no phonetic resemblance at all. This at once suggests that its use by Ag. at Job 4:11 may have had no connection with phonetic resemblance either.

Hebrew had a plethora of 'lion' words, and the Job passage had five of them. Unless translators were to write λέων for all of them, they had to scrape together whatever words they could find, and in fact various translators put in tigers, panthers and the like in these passages, to say nothing of LXX's remarkable μυμηκρων 'ant-lion' (?) at Job 4:11. The Ṭην of Job 4:11 is the fourth 'lion' term in the series. We do not possess Aquila's rendering of the

[48]
other terms here, but we may be sure that for the first, הַעָרָא, he used λέων, for הָּעַטִּי probably λέοντα as in Hos. 5:14, for רָעָמָם doubtless σκύμνος. For שֵׁיִּג he simply needed another word, and he used λίς. The needs of translation practice explain the choice without any recourse to factors of phonetic resemblance.

This conclusion is confirmed by the use of λίς for הָּעַטִּי by Th. at Hos. 5:14. This again is a place with a plurality of 'lion' terms, and Th. uses λίς for the first of them, הָּעַטִּי, using λέων for the second, רָעָמָם: that he used λίς before λέων is interesting. λίς was a straightforward word for 'lion', perhaps specialized for one out of the several Hebrew terms. Though an archaic word, it was still in use in late poetry, the best-known case being in Theocritus 13:6, a source close to the time of origin of the LXX. The LXX itself, however, never used it: though the Hebrew שֵׁיִּג is a rare enough word (only Isa. 30:6, Prov. 30:30, Job 4:11), the LXX recognized it in all cases as a lion term, but never used λίς.

One cannot leave the subject without a moment's enjoyment of Symmachus's rendering at Job 4:11: for שֵׁיִּג he wrote ἀνωπόστατος λέων, literally 'a non-existent lion'. He translated the term twice, giving the straight semantic rendering λέων, but adding to it the etymological analysis as οὐ + ψη 'it is not'.

Phonetic resemblance nowhere entered into the matter.

11. μεγάλως

This looks at first sight like a convincing example.

Job 30:30 MT יִרְעֵף יַסְעֵף יָרֵג
LXX τὸ δὲ δὲρμα μου ἐξοκεῖται μεγάλως

Thackeray already interpreted this as a choice of a Greek word similar to the Hebrew יָרֵג 'from off me', though clearly differing vastly in meaning.\(^{31}\) Purely phonetically

\(^{31}\) Thackeray, p. 38.
it appears to be a good case.

A glance at γνωρίζειν, however, quickly shows that the Job translator may well have had a tendency to insert this adverb where it had little or no basis in the Hebrew. Apart from 4:14, where it stands for בֶּט, there are three or four other cases in the book, at none of which do Hatch and Redpath profess to know what Hebrew word, if any, is being rendered. A good example is Job 17:7:

MT בֶּט כָּל אֲדֹנֵי
LXX πεπολιθρικημα μεγάλως ύπο παντων

The Job translator has somehow read his Hebrew as 'I am greatly besieged by all'. The μεγάλως cannot be straightforwardly connected with any word obvious in the Hebrew. Something similar can be seen in Job 15:11, 24:12. Nowhere else does μεγάλως appear to relate to a Hebrew element that has phonetic resemblance. It is probable that μεγάλως at Job 30:30 is quite unconnected with any phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew. Other cases, outside Job, where it seems to be inserted without any real corresponding Hebrew include Zech. 11:2, Dan. LXX 4:16(19).

12. ὁρμος

At Ezek. 27:11, we hear that the men of Arvad among others were in the walls and towers of Tyre, and, it goes on:

MT ᾁπάται μονής ἐν ὑπὸ τῶν ὡρμίων
LXX τάς ἀράτεις αὐτῶν ἱππόμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν ὡρμίων σου κύκλῳ

MT is taken to mean 'they hung their shields upon your walls round about'. LXX is peculiar because of the form ὡρμίων. It has been suggested that, where the Hebrew has the familiar־יִעַן 'wall', the Greek is using ὁρμος in the sense of 'harbour' (the word can also mean a cord, chain, anything strung out like a necklace, wreath, chaplet etc.).

32 Thackeray, p. 38; Caird, p. 85.
'Harbour' would of course make good sense for Tyre. According to the argument, reliance on similarity of sound has produced an error in the meaning: the word which meant 'wall', Hebrew נַפִּי, has been reproduced in the form of Greek θυμός meaning 'harbour'.

Theoretically it looks possible but there seems to be no supporting evidence in the tradition of the Greek Bible. In fact there is evidence which points in a quite different direction. For Hebrew נַפִּי 'heat, passion, anger', which is most often rendered by δυνάς or ὁργή, there are two cases of rendering by δρομή 'impulse, drive'. One of these is in this same book, Ezekiel:

Ezek. 3:14 ἐν δρομῇ τοῦ πνεύματός μου
The other is Dan. 3:8: ἐν δρομῇ τῆς ισχύος αὐτοῦ
(Similarly ὁργή is used a few times, mainly to render נַפִּי).

It seems likely therefore that at 27:11 the Ezek. translator wrote ἐπὶ τῶν δρομῶν σου (accent different because of the feminine δρομή). He was not thinking of harbours but of impulses, drives. Naturally, this makes a very poor translation in terms of sense, especially when the same sentence has just contained ἐπὶ τῶν τειχῶν σου 'on your walls' a few words earlier. The translator was, however, not thinking so much of the general picture he was conveying: rather, he was working word by word, quite literally, and the most likely reason for him to have seen this meaning in his word is something in the spelling of his Hebrew Vorlage. The most likely suggestion is that he took the first waw of נַפִּי to be a yod. A yod in that position would definitely point away from נַפִּי 'wall'. It would not be a Masoretic spelling for נַפִּי 'heat, passion, anger', but it would be a possible post-biblical spelling. Alternatively, and perhaps better, there was a Vorlage נַפִּי or נַפִּי with defective spelling; defective spellings of נַפִּי are not uncommon and for exactly this suffixed form we have a doubly defective writing נַפִּי in the MT of Isa.
60:10. Possibly, once the translation was made, the word was read as Ἱρύμων 'harbours', which of course fits the context very well, and for that reason was not corrected. This account may seem strange and convoluted but the LXX has many examples of such renderings.

If this suggestion is correct, then the rendering is explained entirely on the basis of translation technique and the question of phonetic similarity does not arise.

13. ὥγις

-wsj is the normal rendering for מָג 'snare, trap' and has marked phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew word. The trouble is that it gives exactly the correct meaning and is much the most natural rendering in any case: what other word could they have used so naturally and effectively?

More or less all cases of מָג are rendered with ὥγις. On the other side it should be observed that, looking at it conversely, by no means all cases of ὥγις are renderings of מָג. HR list 49 cases of ὥγις as identifiable over against a Hebrew Vorlage, and more or less exactly half of these stand for a Hebrew word other than מָג: apart from minor terms that occur only once or twice, the chief cases to note are forms from בֵּן, which are rendered by ὥγις ten times, ἰππά (so rendered once), and πῆλ 'net' (so rendered eight times). Or, to put it in the other way, if one takes other main words in the same field, the most central is πῆλ, and it is rendered with ὥγις eight times, which is as

33 I am indebted to Mr Jeremy Hughes for useful suggestions about this and also about the meaning ranges of מָג and בֵּן (above, pp. 20-27).

34 Thackeray, p. 38; Caird, p. 81.
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high as the figure for any other rendering used for it (σκάνδαλον is also used eight times). There is only one group of books in which we have a one-to-one relationship, all cases of παγίς standing for ΠΟ and vice versa, and that is the Min. Proph. and Isa. (seven cases, including Isa. 42:22, which is otherwise in MT, and omitting the first case in Am. 3:5, which is absent from LXX). If we tabulate the three areas in which most cases of παγίς occur, we find proportions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>παγίς renders ΠΟ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παγίς renders other terms</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Ps. it is worth noticing that the use of παγίς for ΠΟ increases in consistency in the latter part of the book: up to Ps. 68, παγίς renders ΠΟ only once and other terms eleven times; from Ps. 68 on, it renders ΠΟ eight times and other terms only once.

There might, then, be some case for supposing that phonetic resemblance played a part in the vocabulary selection in respect of παγίς in the Min. Proph., in Isa. and in the latter part of Ps. It is more probable, however, that the word was used simply because it was the main and most natural Greek word, adequately translating the Hebrew, and phonetic resemblance was of no importance. The metaphorical character of the term, well seen in Hebrew where most snares and traps were religious in character, was of course already well enshrined in the past history of the term in Greek.
Wellhausen suggested that phonetic resemblance was the ground for the rendering τὴν τὴν παρατείνουσαν for
κ—κυρῆν at II Sam. 2:29. 35 Abner and his men travelled all
night and crossed the Jordan κυρῆν κυρῆν and they came
to Mahanaim (or: to the camp). For the phrase just quoted
the LXX has καὶ ἐπορεοῦσαν ἀλην τὴν παρατείνουσαν. The
Greek term has a certain, rather distant, phonetic
similarity to the Hebrew. Is it real?

The sense of ἀλην is uncertain. Traditionally it was
taken as a place or region: they 'went through all Bithron'
(KJV), following Vulgate *lustrata omni Bethoron*; the Targum
has 'all Bithron', and the Peshitto has the place-name
Geshur. A more modern interpretation takes it as an
expression of time: 'marching the whole forenoon' (RSV), or
'went on all the morning' (NEB).

The sense of παρατείνειν seems to be 'to extend,
continue alongside of', and the LXX usage seems to favour
the sense of place. There are half a dozen cases, reflecting
different Hebrew terms, and there is no clue that leads us
back specifically to ἀλην or the root ἀλημ. The most likely
usage is that of a mountain range or plateau that
continues along or extends beside some path or valley: for
instance, Num. 23:28, where the top of Peor is described as
ἐπὶ ἀλητέα κιβωτίων and this is put into Greek as τὸ
παρατείνον εἰς τὴν ἔρημον. The same thing is done by
‘another’ at Jud. 1:9, where for ἄλλην ἄλλην we have τὸ ὄρος
καὶ τὰ παρατείνοντα. There is ample contemporary
exemplification for such uses of παρατείνειν. It might be
possible to explain also in terms of 'the continuing (or
following)' day or night, but it seems less likely. Since

35 Wellhausen, p. 11 n.
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παρατείνειν is a rather frequent expression for 'extend along, continue alongside', it seems that there is no reason to accept the suggestion that it was chosen for phonetic similarity to יהלום.

15. ἐφημεῖν

In Gen. 42:1 Jacob learns that supplies of grain are to be had in Egypt. He addresses his sons:

MT אָהַל חַנָּן
'why do you look at one another?'

LXX ἵνα τῇ ἐφημεῖτε;
'why are you lazy, remiss, idle?'

He instructs them to act, and they take action.

This has often been quoted as a case of phonetic resemblance.36 The present writer puzzled over it a long time. It cannot be claimed that the Greek word has any close resemblance to the Hebrew: only two consonants are at all comparable, and they stand in the reverse order. Since ἐφημεῖν is used only here in the books of the Hebrew canon, we have little purchase on the question how this word would normally be used. It might be simply a rather free and vague translation, giving the general sense but ignoring the verbal details; but this seems less likely in this part of Gen.

A clue may be found in a verse of Ben Sira which is one of the few others to use ἐφημεῖν in Greek, and the only other one where we possess a Hebrew text. The Hebrew and the Greek do not fit at all exactly but some phrases are quite similar.

36 Caird, p. 86; Tov, p. 225.
Sir. 35:11

The Hebrew has the one command, נֹאֵם, while the Greek has two, μὴ στηρίγματι and μὴ σφυραγίζω; σφυραγίζω seems to mean 'lag behind'; its only other use in the LXX is of the priests who 'brought up therear' behind the ark, Jos. 6:9 (Hebrew הַנַּחַל). One cannot therefore be sure about the equivalences but the Sire passage gives some support to the likelihood that a form of the verb ῥαν 'delay' lies behind σφυραγίζω. In fact a corresponding emendation to the text of Gen. 42:1, רָחַבְתְּ-לָךְ, has been proposed. We do not have to assert that this was the true original text; but it is likely that the LXX either saw it so or construed it so. That there was uncertainty about this verb, and various ways of dealing with its problems, is shown by the Peshitto ṭהַדָּיו, which gives 'do not fear' and implies an analysis on the basis of Hebrew אֲרֹן. Neofiti supplements the text with additional matter. The theme of delay appears elsewhere in the Joseph story with the verb נֹאֵם at Gen. 43:10, while ῥαν 'delay' occurs at Gen. 34:19; in the former the Greek is βραδύω, in the latter χρονιζω, which is the commonest Greek rendering for this verb, occurring ten times.

To sum up, then, the LXX probably either had a text רָחַבְתְּ ( םאָבַת ?) or construed it in that manner. They rendered it with σφυραγίζω, which was an unusual rendering in the LXX but not wholly unparalleled. It may have added something of a more psychological nuance, but basically it was a perfectly adequate and accurate translation. Phonetic resemblance did not enter into the matter.
Doubts about homoeophony in the Septuagint

16. ὑσχίς

During the night the god Dagon fell on his face and his head and hands were broken off. Then, the text goes on, not much was left of him:

I Sam. 5:4b MT  
ἠγενόμενον ἐν ὑσχί 
'only Dagon was left upon him' 
LXX  
πλῆθυ ή ὑσχίς Δαγών ὑπελεύειαθ 
'only the spine of Dagon was left'

It was long ago suggested that ὑσχίς was a guess made on the basis of ρὶ: so for example Wellhausen.\(^{37}\) If so, then ὑσχίς was chosen because it had some phonetic resemblance to ρὶ and also gave some sort of sense in the context. If this explanation is right, it supports the view that phonetic-resemblance translation was easily resorted to.

There are, however, several objections to this account of the matter. For one thing, the ρὶ of the Hebrew is already accounted for by the πλῆθυ of the Greek. For another, it is impossible to believe that anyone who knew any Hebrew at all was puzzled by the common and familiar word ρὶ. Nor does ρὶ look in the slightest like a noun from which even the most confirmed guesser might divine a word like ὑσχίς. Nor, we may add, was ὑσχίς likely to be felt as very similar to ρὶ, since ῶ was generally represented by κ and not by χ, which stood for ῶ.

It is more probable that the text contained a word for 'back' or 'spine' which has fallen out in the MT. McCarter proposes that we should read: ῶ ὑσχίς ἐν ὑσχί 
'only his back was left upon him'.\(^{38}\) As soon as it is realized that a

\(^{37}\) Wellhausen, pp. 11n., 59; Thackeray, p. 38; Caird, p. 85.

\(^{38}\) McCarter, I Samuel, p. 119.
text-critical solution is likely, it becomes clear that there is no case of phonetic-resemblance translation here. The traditions of Targum and Peshitta, incidentally, also have expressions like 'only the body of Dagon was left', and these traditions should be taken seriously.

17. σκέληζω

σκέληζω is a case of an unusual kind. It occurs at Jer. 10:18:

MT  הָנֹּךְ קַלִּיָּתָן לְבָּשׁ בָּוָא ָוָא ֱוָא ִּיתְקָוָא ִיָּּתְקָוָא ִיָּּתְקָוָא ִיָּּתְקָוָא ִיָּּתְקָוָא
LXX  ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ σκέληζω τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν γῆν

The Hebrew sense is understood to be 'behold, I sling forth', and this is the normal sense of the verb יָלַך and its related nouns; the verb occurs four times and the nouns יָלַך and יָלַּנָּה (in this sense, as distinct from יָלַך 'curtain') seven times. All these, apart from Jer. 10:18, are more or less correctly recognized by the LXX. It has been suggested that the Greek word was chosen because of its phonetic resemblance.39

The first problem about this is that the phonetic resemblance is extremely slight. The sequence κ-λ could certainly form a resemblance but the effect of this is much spoiled by the preceding s in the Greek. On the whole, one must feel that the phonetic resemblance is so weak that some other explanation must be more probable.

The question that then immediately follows is; what was the sense intended by σκέληζω? Tov follows LSJ in giving this word, which it cites almost only from this very passage, the sense of 'trip up one's heels, upset'. It is not quite certain, however, that this, which is the sense of

39 Tov, p. 226.
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the compound verb ἀποσκελήσω, is also the sense of σκελήσω itself. Aquila uses it for ἤν η 'twist' at Job 8:3, and Theodotion uses it for ἤδ η 'twist' at Prov. 19:3; we also have σκελὴσω for ἤδ η in Aq. at Jer. 14:14. Patristic writers have σκλησιμα and σκελήσω in the sense of 'snare'. I suspect that there is either some etymological play behind the rendering at Jer. 10:18, or else that σκελήσω here has some unusual meaning that has not yet been properly identified. In any case the explanation through phonetic resemblance is much too weak to be accepted.

18. σχῆζα

In one chapter of the Bible, I Sam. 20, the story of Jonathan and David with the arrows, the Hebrew יַ֣ה or יַ֣ם is rendered with σχῆζα, repeatedly. Elsewhere the rendering is βῆλος (29 times) or βῆλις (six times). It has been suggested, that the rendering σχῆζα was motivated by phonetic resemblance to יַ֣ה, though Wellhausen himself declared against the likelihood of such an explanation. It is suggested that, although the Greek word means a 'lath, splinter' or 'piece of wood cut small', especially for firewood, it was used, because of phonetic resemblance, for the Hebrew word 'arrow', and this in all the nine or so cases in this chapter.

It is indeed odd that one single chapter in the entire Bible uses this rendering so often, while it is elsewhere unused. On the other hand, it cannot be said that the Greek σχῆζα looks or sounds very similar to the Hebrew יַ֣ה or יַ֣ם.

The fact is that σχῆζα, whether colloquially or in some other way, did in fact mean 'arrow' or virtually so, and is

40 Wellhausen, p. 11n.; Caïrd, pp. 85f.; Walters, pp. 194f.
used as such in the LXX itself: I Macc. 10:80, they surrounded the camp and ἔξετίναζαν τὰς σχῆςας εἰς τὸν λαόν 'released arrows into the people from morning till night'. It is possible that the term was like 'shaft' in English: referring originally to the lath or split piece of wood from which the arrow was made, it came to be used for the arrow itself. The term, though uncommon, is found also in the Greek Anthology (6.282) and in the inscription IG 2² 1629.996 σχῆςα εἰς ἀξελή καταπαλίων 'shafts for catapult bolts'. There is nothing to do with phonetic resemblance in the whole matter.

19. τρανός

This is a case of a different kind because the word in question is a verb. It has always seemed to the writer antecedently less likely that phonetic resemblance should have an effect in the case of verbs than in that of nouns, for the obvious reason that the Hebrew inflectional system, especially in the imperfects, must change the shape of words very greatly and make comparability with any one Greek word extremely remote. In this example phonetic resemblance exists only because the Hebrew word is feminine and in the imperfect; if it were masculine there would be no resemblance at all. It could, nevertheless, theoretically be that there was here a phonetic resemblance peculiar to this form and this instance only. The case is:

Isa. 35:6 MT דָּמוֹן וַיְשַׁלָּק ןָּהָה LXX καὶ τρανόν ἔσται γλῶσσα μογιλιάων

τρανός refers to the clarity of the speech. The problem with this is that it may be semantically quite correct. The common gloss for ןָּהָה in Hebrew is 'rejoice' and this is how Tov presents the sense of the Hebrew in our sentence: 'the tongue of the dumb shall rejoice'. ⁴¹ And this is how the LXX

⁴¹ Caird, p. 86; Tov, p. 225.
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has usually taken it: the common renderings are ἀγαλλιάζοντας, εὐφραίνειν. But lexicographers have, probably rightly, emphasized the acoustic quality of the cry, its loudness, clearness and articulateness, as the basic meaning. The clarity of voice achieved through divine influence appears elsewhere, e.g. Wisd. 10:21:

οἷς ἐσφόν ήνοιξεν στόμα κυψάν
καὶ γλώσσας νηπίων ἐθηκεν τρανός.

In a similar context a few pages earlier Isa. 32:4 tells how the tongue of the stammerers will learn הָיוּ עָזָה 'to speak clearly', and here our word is used by Sym., λαλεῖν τρανόν. It seems that the clarity of the speech of those divinely assisted to speak is a common topos. For this, τρανός is a very natural word. It was probably used independently of the precise form of the Hebrew, which can only very exceptionally have contained the initial letter τ. The phonetic resemblance is most probably coincidental.

20. τρυφή

τρυφή 'delicacy, luxury' is used at Prov. 4:9:

יווה נחש, סול🐜םו תרפו. It has also been listed as a word chosen for phonetic similarity to the Hebrew נחש. This, however, is difficult to believe. If the word has any phonetic similarity to a Hebrew word, it must be to נְחשׁ 'medicine' (in the Bible only at Ezek. 47:12). It is more probable that the Prov. translator is simply trying to convey the meaning of the Hebrew in more varied and less stereotyped language than is usual in the main part of the LXX. For נחש and נחשׁ the most-used renderings were rather uncertain or unsatisfactory, ססֶךְ, ססֶךְ אֶכְתִּית etc. was

42 Caird, p. 86.
rather common, but the great majority of uses for this particular word were in Isa. The other dominant renderings were καθαρσίς and καθαρμα; these terms were based on a usage of the verb ἔχω in the sense 'boast' which was numerically a rather minor meaning; and the nouns did not give a very clear impression of what was meant. At 16:31 Prov. uses the more customary locution στέφανος καθαρσίς for 'crown of glory', but here at 4:9 he uses a more original expression, just as we have στέφανος κάλλους at Isa. 62:3. The sense 'softness, delicacy, daintiness' doubtless went rather far in an unusual direction for the biblical text, but certainly gave as good an impression as the usual καθαρσίς. Crowns, after all, belonged to people who enjoyed some luxury. The whole locution is typical of the Prov. translator and does not involve phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew.

21. φακδς, καψάκης

φακδς is treated by Tov as a Semitic loan-word in Greek; but this seems unlikely. The original sense in Greek was 'lentil', and it is still so used in the LXX, rendering ὑποκή. In Greek it seems to have developed the sense of a bottle shaped like a lentil (LSJ) and is used especially of a hot-water bottle, both in the older medical writings and in papyri of the first century A.D. It is natural to take it that this sense, even if not common, was well enough known to be used in the LXX. Josephus uses it, though only when following the LXX; but even so he would hardly have used their diction if it was not intelligible to his readers.

In this sense, 'flask', it is used to render both יְנִּי and יְנִּיֶּי. This makes it a stronger case for phonetic

43 Thackeray, p. 38; Walters, pp. 195f.; Caird, p. 82; Tov, p. 221.
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similarity than most of the words we have discussed, for one obvious reason: it is used to translate two different words, both of which contain the syllable *pak* or *paḥ*. All three cases of Hebrew יִּגַּה are rendered by φακός, a striking consistency; also, among the seven cases of ἀνασά, all the three in I Sam. 26 are so rendered. It is reasonably likely that phonetic resemblance was a factor: from a number of possible terms for a flask or pitcher, φακός was chosen because of its likeness to the Hebrew. But, since the meaning is also correct, one cannot be sure: it may have been taken as simply a current word on its own merits.

One might also consider the possibility that καφακης, which is used to render all the other cases of ἀνασά, four in number and all in I Ki., was also thought to have some kind of similarity to that Hebrew word. Probably not, however: this word was much in use in Ptolemaic times, as the papyri show, and was used by the translators because it was a natural and contemporary term. The choice of it had nothing to do with the phonetic form of the Hebrew.

(d) Weak cases

We have thus reviewed a number of the more interesting or more convincing cases that have been adduced by scholars. Only rather seldom, and uncertainly, has it seemed that phonetic resemblance could be claimed as a probable motivation for vocabulary choice in the LXX. But with the loss of support from most of these cases which had at least appeared stronger, it becomes apparent that many other instances which have been propounded are extremely weak and hardly worth the trouble of serious discussion. Some are much too remote phonetically: thus one cannot take seriously the suggestion that οὐκοσουντίν for ἔσυ or for ἔσυ has anything to do with phonetic resemblance. 44 Some

44 Thackeray, p. 38.
others are really transliterations of the Hebrew word and
do not count: such have been taken as evidence because
transliterations and phonetic resemblance have been allowed
to confuse each other, up to the time of Tov's article:
thus צֵּמַה in Jud. 20:6 B text is a mere transliteration of
the Hebrew נֵצֵמ and has nothing to do with the Greek word
'ferment'; cf. also some texts at Ezek. 24:13. In other
cases the Greek is nothing but the normal word for the
meaning required and there is no reason to look for phonetic
resemblance. Δις is a normal word for 'goat', known from
Hellenistic Jewish papyri, and phonetic resemblance to Δις is
irrelevant. Υλος was not chosen because of phonetic
resemblance to הִלָּחֶם, but because it was the normal Greek
idiom for the same meaning. Similarly, διοκατωμα and such
terms were not used because of phonetic resemblance to ηγυ
- which resemblance would at best be very limited - but
because they were already the normal and natural Greek
terms for a sacrifice in which, as in the Hebrew sacrificial
rules, the animals were entirely consumed by fire. And
χωπος in a couple of places in Chron. is not chosen because
of phonetic resemblance to χωρεον 'vineyards', but because
χωπος meant 'fields' in which, as in these cases, vines
might be grown (I Chr. 27:27).

(e) Some cases of verbs

In any discussion of the idea that phonetic resemblance
was a major motive in choice of vocabulary, verbs form a
special case. For the Hebrew verb is affected in inflection
by prefixes and suffixes, and also by internal vowel changes
and shifts of pattern, that make it very difficult on the
surface to say that any Hebrew verb will 'resemble' any
Greek verb. Nevertheless a number of verb examples have been
put forward in the past discussions and have to be taken into

45 Caird, p. 84.
46 Caird, p. 86.
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consideration. Such examples are significant in another way: namely, that the verbs in question are in many cases used repeatedly or regularly, and in this respect differ from many of the suggestions reviewed above which are very sporadic or occasional. If the verb cases really display motivation through phonetic resemblance, then they are rather powerful evidence; if on the other hand they can be otherwise accounted for, then they show the weakness of the whole idea that phonetic resemblance was an important factor. We shall look briefly at the following verbs: ἄγαλλισθαι, ἄγαπᾶν, ἄπαθν, θαυμάζειν, καταλύειν, κυλόειν, παλαιόν.

First however we shall look at ἄγαπᾶν, since it well displays some of the major issues involved.

1. ἄγαπᾶν

It has been suggested that ἄγαπη has a phonetic resemblance to ἡγη, and this might be so, but it is probable that the basic equivalence here involved was established on the basis of the verb and not on that of the noun; but the phonetic similarity of the verb forms in Hebrew and in Greek is much less. What, for instance, is the similarity to any Greek form of the Hebrew יָּהַנָּה at Gen. 24:67, the second case of this word to occur in the Bible? The fact is that the Greek verb with stem ἄγα- never had any substantial phonetic similarity to the Hebrew stem יָּהַנ, and that once inflectional modifications are allowed for there is practically no similarity at all.

The idea that ἄγαπᾶν was selected and preferred because of its phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew יָּהַנ is, of course, in complete contradiction with another possibility, namely that ἄγαπᾶν was by the time of the LXX the most natural semantic equivalent for the same Hebrew. There are in fact many indications that ἄγαπᾶν was growing in importance in Hellenistic Greek. Josephus uses it far more than any other term for love; so, notoriously, does the N.T. The details need not be set out here again. 47 Suffice

47 See my article "Words for Love in Biblical Greek" (above, n. 8), and references to literature there.
it that we say: ἀγαπάω was probably preferred by the LXX for two reasons, firstly that it was by that time the most general and suitable term for love, divine and human, and secondly because it fitted the vast majority of the Hebrew contexts in which ḫnn occurred. The idea that it was selected because of phonetic resemblance to the Hebrew thus severely damages our perception of the lexical situation in which the LXX worked. It is probable that the LXX, by taking ἀγαπάω = ḫnn as a standard equivalence, made ἀγαπάω even more universal than it was in the normal language of the time; and hence the N.T., not surprisingly, reverted to something closer to the normal koine in using a higher proportion of φιλεῖν. But the basis for choice of ἀγαπάω was semantic and lexical rather than phonetic. Conversely, if we were to accept the phonetic-resemblance account of the selection of ἀγαπάω, it would only have the effect of obscuring the semantic development which had made this word the most natural for the needs of the LXX.

2. ἀγαλλίασθαι

The case of ἀγαλλίασθαι is of a different kind. As has already been indicated, the phonetic resemblance of this long Greek word to the Hebrew יִקְלוּ, the characteristic long ו vowel of which is present in the great majority of forms, is minimal. On the other hand, this verb is said to be a 'new formation in Hellenistic Greek, found only in the Bible and ecclesiastical writers',48 and if this is correct it is less natural to explain the use of it as deriving from common contemporary usage. It could be that the influence of Hebrew יִקְלוּ, even granted that the phonetic resemblance is slight, was a factor in favouring the choice of this word rather than some other among the Greek words with the sense 'rejoice'. In order to consider this we have

48 Bauer, ed. Arndt and Gingrich, p. 3.
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to look at the distribution of words for 'rejoice' in LXX usage. A glance is enough to indicate, for instance, the very limited use of the familiar χαρεῖν - only about 35 cases identifiable against the Hebrew. Similarly, the noun χαρά has only about eighteen. Much the commonest LXX term in the field is εὐφραίνειν and its noun εὐφροσύνη. On the Hebrew side much the most common term is נפש and its noun נפש. Thus נפש is rendered with εὐφραίνεσθαι about 100 times, with χαρεῖν about sixteen times. The noun נפש is similarly rendered in the overwhelming majority by εὐφροσύνη or εὐφραίνεσθαι, plus eight cases of χαρά and three each of χαμους and χαμοσύνη, and also three or four of ἀγαλλάζω.

However, on the other hand, is scarcely rendered by the εὐφραίνειν group at all: there are a handful of cases, three of εὐφραίνειν and these all in the Min. Proph. or Isa., one or two of εὐφροσύνη. The dominant rendering of הלי is ἀγαλλάζωσθαι (27 times or so), and the second most common is χαρεῖν (eight times, plus one or two noun forms). It is this correlation between הלי and ἀγαλλάζωσθαι that lends colour to the idea that phonetic resemblance has been the principle followed. But, unfortunately, this line of thinking cannot be carried very far. For ἀγαλλάζωσθαι is used also, and almost equally, to render another Hebrew root, מָלַח, which has no phonetic resemblance to it whatever. If we take the verb ἀγαλλάζωσθαι, the breakdown of the Hebrew terms which it is used to render is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>הלי</th>
<th>נפש</th>
<th>מלח etc.</th>
<th>שׁי</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The corresponding noun ἀγαλλάζωσθαι renders הלי only once; it is usually the rendering of נפש (eleven times) or of שׁי (four or five times). The other noun form ἀγαλλάζωσθαι stands for הלי only twice, for נפש and cognate forms twice, for forms from שׁי four or five times, and for נפש three or four times.
These facts make it practically impossible to suppose that the choice of \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \alpha i \) and cognates is in any way motivated by the phonetic resemblance to \( \gamma \eta \lambda \). This conclusion is confirmed when we look at the distribution of the terms among books. Apart from a very few sporadic exceptions, \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \alpha i \) appears in overwhelming majority in only two places: in the Ps. and in Isa. (over 50 and about ten cases respectively). \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \alpha i \) is likewise almost only used in Ps.; \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \mu a \) is mainly found in Isa., with a few also in Ps. Although the Psalms are much the largest user of \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \alpha i \), they use it to render \( \gamma \eta \lambda \) 19 times and to render other Hebrew terms 31 times: that is, even within the Ps. \( \gamma \eta \lambda \) is not the majority source from which \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \alpha i \) derives: indeed, it is actually exceeded by \( \pi \rho \lambda \) (22 times). Similarly, \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \alpha i \) is used almost only in Ps., and almost entirely for terms other than \( \gamma \eta \lambda \). \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \mu a \) occurs thrice in Ps. but never for \( \gamma \eta \lambda \). Thus in Ps., much the largest user of this entire group of words, the substantial majority of uses of \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda - \) is for Hebrew terms other than \( \gamma \eta \lambda \). This makes it practically unthinkable that phonetic resemblance to \( \gamma \eta \lambda \) has anything to do with the choice of the Greek word in this book.

The other major user of \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \alpha i \) and cognate nouns, Isa., shows a higher degree of correlation with \( \gamma \eta \lambda \) in this book, nine are rendered with words from the \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \alpha i \) group, three with \( \varepsilon \phi \rho \sigma \alpha \nu \sigma \mu a i \) and cognates, one with \( \pi \alpha \mu \iota \gamma \eta \gamma \sigma \iota \zeta \omega \), and one is not rendered at all. Moreover, as is well known, words for 'rejoicing' tend to occur in groups and parallelisms together: at Isa. 41:16 \( \beta \rho \zeta \pi \) is rendered with \( \varepsilon \phi \rho \sigma \alpha \nu \beta \sigma \sigma \theta \sigma \iota \) and the following \( \beta \rho \zeta \pi \) in the same line is rendered with \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \sigma \iota \zeta \alpha t \). According to HR's registration, which is approximately right, Isa. contains no less than nine cases where words like \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \alpha i \) and cognates are renderings of Hebrew words other than \( \gamma \eta \lambda \).

It seems impossible therefore to suppose that any of the major translators who used \( \gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \alpha i \) used it because they were motivated by the phonetic resemblance to \( \gamma \eta \lambda \). It would indeed be possible that such an idea did
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occur now and again, or existed in the mind of one of the translators who used the word very little in any case. But all the indications suggest that no special effort was made to correlate ἱα with ἀγαλλιάσομαι, and the most natural conclusion is that the phonetic resemblance was unnoticed and considered to be of no importance.

3. ἀπατᾶν

ἀπατᾶν is used fourteen times to render forms of the verb ἰα, and this has also been ascribed to phonetic resemblance. Lewis, p. 30. Leaving aside the qal, the sense of which is rather different, these fourteen form a large proportion of the total occurrences of this verb, in fact all of those in Ex., Jud., Sam., Ki., Chron., Ps. (Ps. 78 (LXX 77):36, a case omitted by Hatch and Redpath) and one of those in Job (Job 31:27, which is a qal in the Hebrew but is rendered as ἀπατᾶν; in any case this is a post-LXX insertion from Th.; the other case in Job, at 31:9, is rendered otherwise). The cases in Ezek., Hos. and Prov. are also otherwise rendered.

ἀπατᾶν does seem to have a fair degree of phonetic resemblance to ἰα, or would do so if it were not for the following factor, which has been implied above but not made express until now. It is the modern scholarly habit to cite a Hebrew verb by the perfect qal, thus ἰα in the third person; and this habit produces some considerable similarity to ἀπατᾶν. But the actual words the translators had to translate did not sound like this: they were niphals, piels, or puals, and typical forms were such as ἱα, ἱππος, ἰος. These sound a lot less like ἀπατᾶν.

It is possible that scholars who have suggested ἀπατᾶν as a case of phonetic resemblance have had another point in mind, which we may quote from LSJ: 'The compound ἐκαπατᾶν is more common, especially in Herodotus and Attic prose;

49 Caird, p. 80.
the simple verb is used in LXX Gen. 3:13 etc., but not by Polybius, and is rare in later Greek. It may have been thought (though I have not seen a reference to it) that the compound verb had been more generally used and that the LXX preferred the simple verb because it had greater phonetic similarity to the Hebrew.

This takes us back to a point already touched upon above, namely that no Greek compound verb can really be similar phonetically to a Hebrew verb. Theoretically, then, it would be conceivable that phonetic resemblance to נָשַׁל motivated in some degree the choice of ἁπατάω rather than ἔξαπατᾶν. The latter is found in the LXX, but rarely, for Hebrew 'נָשַׁל at Ex. 8:25, and also, where no Hebrew exists, at Sus. 56 θε' (LXX ἁπατᾶν). But, though these possibilities are theoretically conceivable, there is no real reason to believe that they motivated anyone. ἁπατάω is considerably used for other terms such as τράπι, ἄδι, ὑλᾶ and is used in all about fifteen times for terms other than נָשַׁל (I include the cases like Ps. 77(LXX 76):3, Prov. 24:15, Jer. 49:8 (LXX 30:2), all of which are rather remote or very remote renderings but nevertheless illustrate the use of ἁπατᾶν). Since the phonetic resemblance, as pointed out above, is not so great as it seems, it is probable that it had no effect upon the choice of terms for the translation.

With ἁπατᾶν it seemed good, however, to consider another aspect: the possibility of a semantic shift. One tends to think of ἁπατᾶν as 'deceive', but of נָשַׁל in Hebrew more as 'entice, seduce, mislead'. If there was a real difference of meaning, one might suppose that ἁπατᾶν had been selected because of its phonetic similarity to נָשַׁל although it did not mean quite the same thing. However, some investigation in relevant Greek authors suggested to the writer that there is no real difference here and that ἁπατᾶν and cognates overlap very well with the nuances of נָשַׁל. Thus the Josephus Lexicon offers us the following glosses:

ἁπατᾶω to deceive, outwit, defraud, cheat, lead astray, seduce, induce
ἁπατέων cheat, seducer, demagogue
ἐξαπατάω to deceive, defraud, trick, lead astray, cheat.
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It seems then that there is no substantial semantic difference; on the contrary, ἄπανταν and cognates provided very good semantic rendering for Ἁμ, and this makes it more unlikely that phonetic similarity played any part.

4. Θαυμάζειν

Θαυμάζειν for Hebrew ḫw cannot be taken as a serious case. The word is used for a wide variety of Hebrew terms and in fact renders Ἁμ only four times. Δεξιότατα 'to be surprised' is equally common as rendering of Ἁμ (perhaps four times). This was straightforwardly the normal and most obvious verb in Greek and phonetic resemblance did not enter into the matter.

5. καταλέξειν

καταλέξειν for Hebrew ḫv, ḩv also cannot be taken seriously. There are indeed fourteen cases or so; but the fact that it is a compound verb makes its phonetic resemblance low, and the basic and obvious fact that it is the central Greek term meaning 'stay the night' shows that the rendering is a semantic one in which phonetic similarity had no importance. In fact it is much outnumbered by quite different renderings of ḫv or ḩv, much the most common being αὐλίζειν, on which see already above. αὐλίζειν is used over 30 times, and κοιμάω and other related words for 'sleep' about seventeen or more. It is noticeable that the use of καταλέξειν is more or less confined to the earlier part of the Bible, all cases lying within the region Gen.-Kist, while αὐλίζειν begins in the B text of Jud. It would be theoretically possible, therefore, that a translator of the earlier books noticed and chose καταλέξειν because of its phonetic similarity to the Hebrew ḩv. But further investigation once again makes this unlikely. The most important user before Judges is Genesis, with nine cases of ḩv, plus two of the noun ḩv. Of these the first four (19:2,2; 24:23,25) and the last two (42:27, 43:21) are
rendered with कαταλείπω. At 26:17 कαταλείπω is used to render a quite different Hebrew word, נֶב. In all the other places (24:54, 28:11, 31:54, 32:14, 32:22) the rendering is κοπιοῦν. While it would be theoretically possible that the translator at the beginning of the book chose कαταλείπω to render because of phonetic resemblance and then abandoned that choice, it is simpler and more convincing to accept that phonetic resemblance played no part at all and the words were chosen because they were normal and natural in Greek.

6. क्लेअर

It has also been suggested that the rendering of נֶב, in Hebrew basically 'shut up, restrain, withhold' (BDB), by क्लेअर is a case of phonetic resemblance. This verb occurs seventeen times in all, fourteen in the qal and three in the niphal. Out of these eight cases are translated by क्लेअर and two others by अपक्लेअर. These two last are both in I Samuel, which book does not use the simple क्लेअर in rendering נֶב (though it uses it in rendering יָנָה).

There is indeed a reasonable degree of phonetic resemblance here, at least at first sight. In addition there are two factors which appear to strengthen the case. Firstly, one must consider whether there is not a degree of semantic shift in the use of क्लेअर for נֶב. The central meaning of the Hebrew term is understood to be 'shut up': BDB give the gloss 'shut up, restrain, withhold'. This has some similarity to, but seems not to coincide with, the sense of क्लेअर which is rather 'hinder, prevent'. It would be possible therefore to suppose that क्लेअर was chosen for its phonetic resemblance to נֶב, in spite of the fact that the use of it meant a slight shift of meaning: for instance in a case like Ezek. 31:15, where the Hebrew אֲנִי כֹּלְבֹּת means 'the great waters were held back' (NEB) or 'shut up', but the Greek καὶ ἐκάλυσεν πλῆθος ὕδατος suggests rather 'I hindered the multitude of water'.

50 Thackeray, p. 38; Caird, p. 81.
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More intensive study, however, makes this consideration seem less cogent. The majority of cases in which ἄνευ is translated by κωλύειν are cases that do come close to 'restrain, withhold' and do not have the more precise sense of 'shut up': so Gen. 23:6, where no one will 'withhold' the use of his tomb; Ex. 36:6, where Moses is asked to 'hinder' or 'prevent' or 'forbid' Eldad and Medad from prophesying, not to lock them up physically. Some other cases, like Ps. 40:10 (LXX 39:10) τὰ χείλη μου οὗ μὴ κωλύσω have a more peculiar air in Greek and suggest more of a semantic shift. With ἀποκωλύειν, I Sam. 6:10 is clearly to 'shut up' calves at home; on the other hand, 25:33 is clearly 'one who prevented me or kept me from entering into bloodguilt'.

A survey of all cases suggests that this is a matter of semantics and translation technique rather than of phonetic resemblance. A considerable proportion of cases of ἄνευ, and especially of those in the key early books of the Pent., really did mean 'hold back, prevent, hinder' and came very close to the normal sense of κωλύειν. The somewhat more strained usage in other cases arises because translators continued to use the common rendering, κωλύειν, even where the context made it somewhat peculiar. This is common experience with the LXX. Phonetic resemblance need not be invoked as explanation at all.

The second factor, and a rather surprising one, is that ἀποκωλύειν is twice used, in I Sam. 25:7, 15, to render the hiphil of the verb ἅλω, traditionally 'humiliate' but better 'molest' (NEB) or 'do harm'. This is a verb of substantially different meaning. This fact might therefore suggest that phonetic resemblance was indeed the key, and that ἅλω was rendered by (ἄπο-)κωλύειν because of that resemblance, just as ἄνευ was so rendered. This however is once again not a necessary inference. The connection is equally explicable on the basis of inner-Hebrew 'etymology': ἅλω was regarded, being in any case a rather rare term and unusual in its usage here, as belonging with ἄνευ and being in a sense 'the same word'. Moreover, yet a further circumstance helps us to explain these cases in a different way. I Sam. 25, the story of
David, Nabal and Abigail, is rich in κωλύειν and ἀποκωλύειν, using them five times in all, i.e. far more densely than any other passage in the Bible. But it used them in rendering a considerable variety of Hebrew expressions, thus:

v. 7 ἀποκωλύειν for סכר
v. 15 ἀποκωλύειν for סכר
v. 26 κωλύειν for עין
v. 33 ἀποκωλύειν for פָּלַח
v. 34 ἀποκωλύειν for עין

It must be considered, then, that (ἀπο-)κωλύειν was felt by the translator to be a happy key expression for the passage, and it is highly unlikely that he used it in order to mark similarity with the individual Hebrew words rendered.

The same is the case in other parts of the Bible: both κωλύειν and ἀποκωλύειν are used to render other verbs, such as עָכַל, בָּשָׁא, רַע, though not so frequently. עָכַל, for instance, is rendered by these Greek verbs six times.

Another argument against the phonetic resemblance explanation is that the common verb פָּלַח, much more frequent in usage than פְּלַח, is never rendered with κωλύειν or compounds, although there are a number of places where this would have been semantically not too remote.

It must be concluded that the use of (ἀπο-)κωλύειν to render פְּלַח or פָּלַח can be fully explained on grounds of semantics and translation technique; phonetic resemblance was of no importance. The word was, after all, the overwhelmingly natural term in Greek for anything close to 'hinder, prevent, withhold'. When the meaning came naturally in the specific field of 'lock up, imprison', the LXX commonly used terms like φυλάσσειν, κατακλείειν, e.g. Jer. 32 (LXX 39):2,3. The noun פָּלַח is always, and correctly, φυλακή.
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7. παλαιοῦσθαι

Finally, the use of παλαιοῦσθαι to render ἡλικία (and of παλαιός to render the adjective ἡλικία), is a very weak example. It was a standard Greek term, abundantly used for 'decay through lapse of time' (LSJ), and especially of garments and the like. Phonetic resemblance was irrelevant.

8. Summing-up

In this section we have examined seven verbs, and some others were considered earlier on: in section (b), κατασκηνοῦν; in section (c) 1. ἀπορεῖν, 3. αὐλᾶειν, 7. ἔτοκη, 8. ἔτισθαι, 9. καρχαροῦναι, 15. ἔθιμεῖπν, 17. σκελῆσιν. Also 19. τρανὸς is in effect a verb form, since the Hebrew rendered is a verb. Some of these examples never looked very convincing, but in a few of them there were distinct signs that they should be taken seriously. In no case have we found any good reason, after full examination, to believe that phonetic resemblance was an important factor. In almost all cases other influences provide a better explanation. That this should be so is not so very surprising, since we indicated at the beginning that it is very difficult for any normal Hebrew verb to 'resemble' a Greek word except perhaps in one or two accidental forms.
(f) Conclusion

The present writer did not set out with the purpose of disproving the existence of translations based on phonetic resemblance. Their existence has long been part of the scholarly tradition, and one tended to accept it, especially because of the various strong 'key examples' which seemed to be beyond dispute. And there was no reason why anyone should be predisposed to question or contradict this apparently well-established view. My own point of entry into the question was through the suggestion, put more strongly by George Caird than it had been before, that the selection of διψάνει as the word for love was motivated by phonetic resemblance, a view that, as it seemed to me, would have important semantic repercussions if it were correct. The important recent change in the status quaestionis was created by Tov's article of 1979, for it succeeded, it seems for the first time, in separating out the cases of phonetic resemblance from those of Semitic loan-words and of transliterations of the Hebrew. Previous studies had often lumped these together or had suffered from other category mistakes and confusions. But Tov's successful isolation of the cases of phonetic resemblance reveals something of the nakedness of the land in this area; it invites the scholar to ask how many of these cases are certain, and whether there is really a mass of such renderings from which the examples he cites are only a small selection. In my own study I began by [76]
accepting a much larger number of the traditionally-cited examples; but as my study proceeded the number became smaller and smaller. Unless a further body of examples can be produced, other than those already traditional, it seems to me that our results are strongly negative. Phonetic resemblance was only a very minor factor in vocabulary choice. Not a single one of the 'strong' examples was found to hold water. The loss of them has a 'domino effect', the weaker examples rapidly collapsing once the evidence of the stronger has gone. Not a single certain case of phonetic-resemblance translation has been found. The most probable has been ἐσχαρίτης, and even here a different motivation has been suggested and yet others might yet be discovered; the word is, after all, not so very similar to the Hebrew word rendered. Φακδ is also a reasonably probable case. These are typical of what may be found. Translation on the basis of phonetic resemblance is to be found in a small handful of cases and with rare or specialized words. On common and key vocabulary items it probably had no effect.