

Table of Contents

• Paper •

[Kor.] Literary Criticism and the Bible Translation: Lamentations as an Example -----	Yeong-Mee Lee / 7
[Kor.] Exploring the basic Texts of Korean Old Version (1911) --	Hwan-Jin Yi / 31
[Kor.] The Ending of the Gospel of Mark and the final GAP ----	Young-in Kim / 56
[Kor.] On the Study of Luke 6:24-26 for Q Reconstruction -----	Inhee Park / 71
[Kor.] A Cultural Historical Study of Worship and Rituals in Hebrews and Revelation of The Complete New Testament in Korean (1911) -----	Ky-Chun So / 94
[Kor.] Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ θεοῦ by Paul?: A syntactic and semantic Study on Gal 6:16 -----	Eung-Bong Lee / 113
[Kor.] Translation of Three Inferential Conjunctions in Hebrews -----	Chang-Wook Jung / 132
[Kor.] An Exegetical Consideration of the Korean Translation of Philippians 2:10 -----	Chung-Hyeon Cho / 148
[Eng.] What Old Greek Translators Did When They Did Not Know a Hebrew Form -----	Alpheaus Graham Zobule / 165
[Eng.] A Reconsideration of the Testimony of Two or Three Witnesses in the Damascus Document 9:16-10:3 -----	Keun-Jo Ahn / 183
[Eng.] Some Grammatical Features of the Samaritan Pentateuch Hebrew: Comparative Study with the Tiberian Hebrew -----	Hyun-Joon Choi / 206
• Book Review •	
[Kor.] <i>The Works of Their Hands: Man-made Things in the Bible</i> (Ray Pritz, New York: United Bible Societies, 2009) -----	Jun-Hyun Kim / 228
[Kor.] <i>Politeness and Addressee Honorifics in Bible Translation</i> (Ji-Youn Cho, UBS Monograph Series, No. 11; Oxford: Marston Books Service, 2009) -----	Jayhoon Yang / 246

<abstract>

Literary Criticism and the Bible Translation: Lamentations as an Example

Prof. Yeong-Mee Lee
(Hanshin University)

The present study explores the necessity of an literary functional or inter-textual equivalent translation of biblical texts by examining Korean translations of the book of Lamentation. The overall study shows that literary criticism contributes to transform the fuller meaning of the original text itself into the translated text, as the criticism aims to delve the original meaning of the final text as a whole.

Literary criticism that concerns the structure of the unit and rhetorical devices finds the structural feature of the book of Lamentations as Acrostic poem and lament. No Korean translation reflects the feature of acrostic poem nor highlight the nuance of lament in its translation. This study thus suggests to adopt the four syllable metrical rhythm of Korean traditional poem or pan-so-ri to refresh the fact that Lamentations might have been used in the worship setting. The study also suggest to show the representative rhetorical devices of the book of Lamentations which include personification of the city, Jerusalem, and the abundant use of figurative languages. Among Korean translations, the *New Korean Revised Version* (1998) revives the meaning and intention of the personification. Through the literary device, the poet wants to empathize the agony of the destruction of the city.

In addition, the study on the translation of 5:21-22 finds that different hermeneutical position yields different translation, beyond the issue of grammar. Also it realizes that the literary context and the use of the same words in other biblical texts help to translate figurative languages of which equivalent words are not found in the receptor language.

<Abstract>

Exploring the basic Texts of Korean Old Version (1911)

Prof. Hwan-Jin Yi

(Methodist Theological University)

The purpose of this article is to explore what the basic texts of the Korean Old Version (1911) might be. Scholars think that they are presumably Chinese Bibles such as the Delegates' Version (1854) or a certain Chinese Bible followed by the Union Version in Mandarin (1919).

Through the textual analysis of some verses taken from the books of Psalms (85:10-13), Proverbs (1:1-7), and Job (1:20-2:3), we realize that the Korean Old Version mainly follows the Revised Version in English (1881) by about 53% and Bridgman and Culbertson's Version in Chinese (1864) by about 47%. But at the same time, the Korean Old Version borrowed some of terms and expressions from Schereschewsky's Old Testament in Mandarin (1875) and his Easy Wenli Bible (1902).

More specifically with the book of Psalms, the Korean Old Version shares two and half verses with Bridgman and Culbertson's Version while it shares one and half verses with the Revised Version. As for the book of Proverbs, the Korean Old Version shares three verses with Bridgman and Culbertson's Version, while it shares four verses with the English Revised Version. As for the book of Job, the Korean Old Version shares two verses with Bridgman and Culbertson's Version while the Korean Old Version shares three verses with the English Revised Version.

Therefore, we assume that Koreans first translated Bridgman and Culbertson's Version into Korean and then missionaries corrected the Korean translations using the English Revised Version. Why then, did the Korean translators take Bridgman and Culbertson's Version as their Vorlage? It is probable that the translation committee of the Korean Old Version accepted James C. Hapburn's advice, who was a chief editor and translator of the first Japanese Bible with a broad experience in Bible translation. The Korean translation of the Old Testament Studies (1893) by G. H. Jones also had Bridgman and Culbertson's Version as its Vorlage. It seems that by the turning era of the last century, Bridgman and Culbertson's Version has been regarded as a faithful Bible to the original text. As a matter of fact, it faithfully reflects the King James Version in many respects. The reason why missionaries took the English Revised Version as their primary source is that it was a faithful heir of the King James Version so that they believed it to reflect the original language fully.

<Abstract>

The Ending of the Gospel of Mark and the final ΓΑΡ

Dr. Young-in Kim
(Hana Bible Institute)

The second gospel ends abruptly at 16:8 in riddled words: ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ without disciples' encounter with the resurrected Jesus. This has become problematic for Christian readers because of the ellipsis about the rehabilitation and the reunion of the resurrected Jesus and his disciples, and because it is quite different from the main frame of other synoptic gospels. So it turned out that we have some 1,700 codices which have various endings in relation to the Gospel of Mark.

Although textual critics would have commonly asserted that Mark 16:8 is the original intentioned ending, it is often assumed that the last leaf of a copy book was worn out or torn off because of the puzzling ending in Mk 16:8. For this reason, New Testament scholars like Eta Linnemann and Walter Schmithals attempted to reconstruct Mark's original ending, but their points of view are quite different from each other: (1) the ending was lost, but it was preserved in Mk 16:15-20 (LE: Long Ending) and Mt 28:18-20 - E. Linnemann (2) Mk 16:8 is the original ending of Mark, but the right position of conclusion is not in its place; it was changed and is now in Mk 3:13-19 and Mk 9:2-8 - W. Schmithals. The difference of both positions is based on whether they can accept the result of textual critics. Therefore, one attempts to find out the original ending of the second gospel outside the text of Mark while the other attempts to do so within the text.

Recently a new discussion about the final γάρ has developed in this context. In the past, the main question was this - what is the literary role and function of the final γάρ. So they inquired after whether a sentence or book can end with γάρ. Actually after the study of van der Horst, it was proved that not only a sentence but also a book can end in γάρ. However, the new perspective of the final γάρ involves the use of the TLG-Data Base which includes all of the extant Greek texts from pre-600 to 1453 C.E. According to the statistical results from the TLG, N. Clayton Croy showed that the final γάρ also has a narrative function which demands additional information, which serves as the evidence that Mk 16:8 is not the original ending of Mark. Unfortunately, Kelly R. found some counter-examples in the TLG. Finally, in order to understand the complex issues about the ending of Mark, it is necessary to accept the result of textual critic and also to approach with a new hermeneutics.

<Abstract>

On the Study of Luke 6:24-26 for Q Reconstruction

Dr. Inhee Park
(Ewha Womans University)

Recently, Q has been emerging as the most influential document for the history of Jesus and the earliest Christianity. After the reconstruction of Q was accomplished by IQP as well as by the individual scholar, Q is insisted among Q experts as being “a gospel” not just a saying collection. Though Q is a hypothetical document, the argument for its existence is supported by the theoretic evidences such as the verbatim agreement and the common sequence found in both Luke and Matthew. It is in fact a reconstructed completion of around 240 verses which include various literary forms such as small narrative, parable, prophetic sayings, dialogue, and debate. Before the reconstructed Q became available, it was rarely treated as a text.

Despite the marvellous achievement in the reconstructing field, there is, however, no final form of Q. Generally, Q has been reconstructed by the agreements on the double tradition of Luke and Matthew, and by following the Lukan order on the basis of the results of the 160 years' history of Q. But there are still unsettled questions such as the Markan doublet or Luke and Matthew Sondergut that should have influenced the extent of Q, whether by reducing or extending it.

Specifically, the Lukan Sondergut 6:24-26 has been constantly debated as to whether it comes from Q. Even though it is not in the double tradition, there are some evidences to support its derivation from Q. First, it shows the characteristic of the Q with the peculiar literary form of woe. Second, the 6:24-26 is linked with other woes of Q (Q 11:42-52) and share the similarity in both content and form. Third, those two evidences establish a literal and theological unity for the whole text. Revealing the resistance against the injustice of the Jerusalem rulers, their scribal retainers, and the pharisees, those woes shape the ethos of the oppressed in 1 C., Galilee which corresponds with the social context where the Q had been produced. Accordingly, Luke 6:24-26 is suggested to be included the Q reconstruction in its own right.

<Abstract>

A Cultural Historical Study of Worship and Rituals in Hebrews and Revelation of The Complete New Testament in Korean (1911)

Prof. Ky-Chun So

(Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary)

The Complete New Testament in Korean published in 1911 was the first Scripture by the British and Foreign Bible Society Korean Agency, which established a committee for Bible translation and had three volumes of the Old Testament and one volume of the New Testament translated into Korean. This paper focused on studying some cultural historical heritages of early Korean churches based on the New Testament, specifically through the books of Hebrews and Revelation. Despite the publication of Ross's translation, the Complete New Testament in Korean is highly recognized as a cultural and historical heritage because it was the first Korean translation of the Bible by the Korean Bible Society. This paper studied some agricultural heritages and cultures involving marriage, Chinese characters, military, and nature in order to study ancestral worship and rituals of Hebrews and Revelation in various ways in which early Korean churches experienced all over the life styles and many church members of them deeply sympathized due to they are speaking in Korean. This paper also studied records of early Korean churches helping to lead many Koreans accept the Complete New Testament in Korean without any negative feeling. Since then, Koreans live together as a race, and established the foundation of Christianity in Korea in order to reach a biblical world view. Finally, this paper studied some areas contributed by the Complete New Testament in Korean to increasing the number of house churches because it was interested in uniquely Korean feelings, and was theologically expressed in ways that would be more closely perceived by the Korean people.

- Richardson, P., *Israel in the Apostolic Church*, SNTS MS 10, Cambridge, 1969.
- Robinson, D. W. B., "Distinction between Jewish and Gentile Believers in Galatians", *ABR* 13 (1965), 29-48.
- Rohde, J., *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, ThHKNT IX, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1989.
- Schrenk, G., "Der Segenwunsch nach der Kampepistel", *Judaica* 6 (1950), 81-94.
- Schlier, H., *Der Brief an die Galater*, KEK, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Uhlig, S., *Das Äthiopische Henochbuch*, JSRZ V/6, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1984.

<Abstract>

Translation of Three Inferential Conjunctions in Hebrews

Prof. Chang-Wook Jung
(Chongshin University)

Six inferential conjunctions occur in Hebrews and the three of them are most frequently used; οὖν, διό, ὅθεν. The first particle is employed most generally in the NT, four hundred and ninety-nine times, while the second and the third conjunctions fifty-three times and fifteen times respectively. Their frequency is peculiar in Hebrews as the first conjunction οὖν takes place in twelve places whereas the second and the third particles διό and ὅθεν in nine and six places respectively. The occurrence of the first particle οὖν is less than that of the sum of the second and the thirds particles. The following question thus arises: Why are the three inferential conjunctions adopted in this way? Does each of them display characteristics different from each other? Otherwise, are they adopted as such simply in order to avoid the monotony of using only one conjunction? How are they understood and translated by translators of Korean Bibles and English Bibles?

This study demonstrates that each of the conjunctions involves a subtle nuance, which has to be expressed in the process of translation. The conjunctions are ignored in some instances of Korean and English versions, which should be corrected. The conjunctions have to be translated more variously and more accurately without being omitted. This effort will make the meaning of the text clear.

<Abstract>

An Exegetical Consideration of the Korean Translation of Philippians 2:10

Prof. Chung-Hyeon Cho
(Nam Seoul University)

The purpose of this article is to propose an alternative interpretation on Paul's triadic adjective expression, ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων (Phil 2:10), which has been taken as masculine in the tradition of the Korean protestant Bible-translation.

For this, first of all, the whole poetic passage of Philippians 2:6-11 is placed within a broad context of 1:27-2:18, which is regarded as Paul's first exhortative section. In this section, Paul is concerned with the two problems that Philippian church faces, that is, external persecution and internal disunity. Because these two problems are interwoven throughout the epistle, they are not treated separately by Paul. Therefore, Philippians 2:6-11, which is the center of the whole exhortative section, cannot be grasped simply by a limited category of ethical humiliation. Rather, this passage is to be understood in terms of God's sovereign lordship.

There are several good reasons to take Paul's triadic phrase as masculine. Initially, the point of Paul's triadic expression is to stress not classification or some specific cosmology, but the universality of the following proclamation. In other words, Paul uses the triadic phrase to describe the whole creation, whether animate or inanimate, as joining in the heavenly worship. Secondly, the verbal links between Philippians 2:6-11 and 3:20-21 support the position of taking the phrase as neutral. The phrase πᾶν γόνυ κάμψη κτλ (2:10-11) corresponds to τοῦ δύνασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα (3:21). Thirdly, the theme 'All things are subject to God' is also found elsewhere in Pauline writings. In 1 Corinthians 15:27-28 and Ephesians 1:22, for example, Paul uses this theme on the basis of Psalm 8:6. Lastly, the Philippians threefold division of the universe reflects the OT view of the totality of God's creation.

In conclusion, Paul introduces this problematic phrase into Philippians 2:10 to emphasize the totality of God's creation. Paul's triadic expression envisages all creatures, no matter what they may be, as joining in confession that Jesus Christ is the Lord. Therefore, the phrase should be translated into Korean without losing such a contextual orientation.

What Old Greek Translators Did When They Did Not Know a Hebrew Form

Alpheaus Graham Zobule*

1. Introduction

Many scholars have demonstrated that Old Greek (©)¹⁾ translators did not always understand their Hebrew text.²⁾ In translating, however, translators cannot leave a difficult or unknown form undealt with. The © translators had to represent a difficult or unknown form in some way in order to come up with a rendering that is linguistically and semantically tolerable in the textual segment in which it occurs. This article discusses the common translation practices that © translators employed when dealing with difficult or unknown Hebrew forms.

2. Translation Evidence that a Translator Does Not Know a Hebrew Form

* United Bible Societies Translation Consultant.

- 1) For a treatment of the different ways the term “Septuagint” is used, see Leonard Greenspoon, “The Use and Abuse of the Term ‘LXX’ and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship”, *BIOCS* 20 (1987), 21-29. I use the term “Old Greek” (©) to refer to the original Greek translation or, more accurately, translations of the books comprising the Jewish scriptures that were included in the canonical “Old Testament” of the early church and I understand the term Septuagint (LXX) to refer more generally to include other non-canonical books as well.
- 2) Emanuel Tov, “Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?”, Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox, eds., *De Septuaginta: Studies in honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday* (Mississauga: Benden Publications, 1984), 53-70; Richard Ottley, *A Handbook to the Septuagint* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1919), 114-116; Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (New York: KTAV, 1902 [reprint 1968]), 329-330.

Two translation evidences often indicate that a Hebrew form is more likely a difficult or unknown form to a © translator. First, a Hebrew form is more likely a difficult or unknown form if the Hebrew form is a rare one and its © renderings are incorrect.³⁾ For instance, the place name קִיר “Kir” in Amo 1:5 is incorrectly rendered ἐπίκλητος “the called” by the © translator. The Hebrew קִיר “Kir” is more likely a difficult or unknown form to the © translator as further evidenced by the fact that when it occurs again in Amo 9:7, the same translator incorrectly renders it as βόθρος “pit.” The fact that a Hebrew form is a difficult one is often reflected by an incorrect rendering in one or more ancient versions, namely, the Latin Vulgate, Syriac Peshitta, and Aramaic Targumim. In the case of קִיר “Kir,” it is correctly represented by the Peshitta *qjr* in Amo 1:5, but it is incorrectly represented by Targum Jonathan קִירִיני and by Vulgate *Cyrene*. The incorrect renderings of קִיר “Kir” in other places confirm that the Hebrew form is a difficult one to many ancient translators.⁴⁾

Second, a Hebrew form is more likely a difficult form to the © translator if all occurrences of the same Hebrew form are incorrectly rendered in the same translation unit. A translation unit is a book or group of books translated by the same translator. For instance, taking the Minor Prophets as a translation unit,⁵⁾ the fact that all occurrences of the Hebrew סֹפֶפֶה “whirlwind” in the Minor Prophets are incorrectly rendered as καταστροφή “overthrow, destruction” (Hos 8:7) and συντέλεια “end, completion” (Amo 1:14; Nah 1:3) in the © Minor

3) It is neither claimed here (1) that every rare Hebrew form is unknown to a © translator, nor is it claimed (2) that every rendering of every rare Hebrew form is incorrect. Rather, the claim is that if a Hebrew form is a rare one and its rendering/s is/are incorrect, then the Hebrew form is more likely a difficult or unknown form to the translator.

4) Outside Amos, the proper name קִיר “Kir” occurs only two other times in the Hebrew Bible (2Ki 16:9; Isa 22:6). In 2Ki 16:9, the Peshitta correctly represents it with *qjr*, while Vulgate and Targum incorrectly represent it with *Cyrene* and קִירִיני respectively (cf. ἡ κυρηνηνιδε for קִירִי). In Isa 22:6, Peshitta, Vulgate and Targum Jonathan all associate it with its other homonym קִיר “wall,” hence, the Peshitta has שֹׁר “the wall,” the Vulgate *parietem* “the wall” and Targum Jonathan שֹׁר “wall.” The © translators eliminate it from the translation in 2Ki (4 Kgdms) 16:9, and possibly replaces it with συναγωγή “assembly” in Isa 22:6.

5) H. St. John Thackeray, “The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books”, *JTS* 4 (1903), 578-585; see also, Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*. Vol. 1: *An Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1909), 11-12.

Prophets is translation evidence that the Hebrew is a difficult form to the © Minor Prophets translator. That סִוּפָה “whirlwind” is a difficult form to the © Minor Prophets translator but not to © translators of a different translation unit is obvious from the fact that all its occurrences in the Minor Prophets are rendered incorrectly and all its occurrences outside of the Minor Prophets are rendered correctly.⁶⁾

It needs to be stated that not all incorrect renderings of a Hebrew form indicate the translator’s ignorance. An incorrect rendering of a known Hebrew form may result from a translator’s secondary attempt to make overall sense of a textual segment that contains a difficult form. In such a case, there is often translation evidence in the same translation unit that the © translator knows the Hebrew form that has been rendered incorrectly.⁷⁾ For instance, in Amo 3:12, one sees the incorrect renderings of מִטָּה “bed, couch” as φυλῆς “tribe” and עֲרֹשׁ “couch, divan” as ἱερεῖς “priests.” These incorrect renderings, however, do not indicate that the translator is mistaken or ignorant of the two Hebrew forms. Translation evidences in © Amos indicate that the translator knows both Hebrew forms as evidenced by the correct renderings of עֲרֹשׁ “couch, divan” as στρωμνή “bed, couch” (Amo 6:4), and of מִטָּה “bed, couch” as κλίνη “bed” (Amo 6:4). Rather, the difficult form in Amo 3:12 is קִמְשָׁךְ “silk?” which the translator attempts to make sense of by transliterating it as the place name Δαμασκῶ “Damascus.” The incorrect renderings of מִטָּה “bed, couch” as φυλῆς “tribe” and עֲרֹשׁ “couch, divan” as ἱερεῖς “priests” are secondary adjustments

6) Outside of the Minor Prophets, the word is properly represented by words in a similar semantic range: λαίλαψ “whirlwind, hurricane” (Job 21:18), γνόφος “darkness” (Job 27:20), δίνη “whirlwind” (Job 37:9), ὀργή “wrath” (Psa 83[82]:16) and καταιγίς “hurricane, storm” (Pro 1:27; 10:25; Isa 5:28; 17:13; 21:1; 29:6; 66:15; Jer 4:13).

7) For a theoretical discussion on such secondary adjustments that, on the surface, suggest that a © translator may be ignorant of a Hebrew form that has been rendered incorrectly, see Alpheus Graham Zobule, “A Critical Analysis of the Old Greek (©) Translation of Amos 1-5: Testing the ‘Semantic Situations and Paths’ (SSP) Model”, Ph.D. dissertation (Union Theological Seminary and Presbyterian School of Christian Education, 2008)”, 83-85.

made to accommodate the incorrect representation of the difficult form דְּמִשְׁק “silk?” as Δαμασκῶ “Damascus.”⁸⁾

3. How A © Translator Deals With A Difficult or Unknown Hebrew Form

A © translator resorts to the following translation practices when he deals with a difficult or unknown Hebrew form: conjecture and conjectural variation, transliteration, replacement, etymological rendering, form-association rendering, segmentation, and elimination.⁹⁾

3.1. Conjecture and Conjectural Variation

Conjecture and conjectural variation are the translation practices of guessing the meaning of an unknown form based on grammar, syntax, and context. These two translation practices are commonly employed and are not unexpected. For instance, in Amo 1:4, the translator is ignorant of אֲרָמְנוֹת “citadels.”¹⁰⁾ The translator conjectures its rendering as θεμέλια “foundations,” a conjecture that fits well in the syntax, and it makes good sense in the context. The various © representations of the 32 occurrences of the Hebrew form אֲרָמֹן are a good example of conjectural variation.¹¹⁾ Outside of the Minor Prophets, © translators

8) Alpheus G. Zobule, “A Critical Analysis of the Old Greek (©) of Amos 3:12 in Light of Ancient Translation Practices”, Kenneth A. McElhanon and Ger Reesink, eds., *A Mosaic of languages and cultures: studies celebrating the career of Karl J. Franklin* (Dallas: SIL International, 2010), 447-454. SIL e-Books, 19. [Dallas]: SIL International. <http://www.sil.org/silepubs/abstract.asp?id=52554>.

9) To avoid the impression that I am manufacturing my evidences, I will cite, as much as possible, examples that come from studies done by other scholars. As will become clear, however, in many cases I have re-interpreted their data.

10) William Rainey Harper, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1905), 22; Tov, “Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?”, 57; Robert P. Blake, “Khanmeti Palimpsest Fragments of the Old Georgian Version of Jeremiah”, *HTR* 25 (1932), 254-256; Percy J. Heawood, “אֲרָמֹן and אֲרָם”, *JTS* 13 (1911-12), 66-73; G. B. Caird, “Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint”, *JTS* 19 (1968), 460-61.

11) Tov, “Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?”, 56-58.

vary their conjectures as follows: βασίλειον “palace” (Pro 18:19), ἄμφοδα “block of houses surrounded by streets; streets” (Jer 17:27; 30:33[49:27]), ναός “temple” (Jer 30[37]:18), οἶκος “house” (Isa 32:14), ἐναντίον “opposite, facing” (2Ki [4 Kgdm] 15:25), πόλις “city” (Isa 34:13), ἄντρον “cave” (1Ki [3 Kgdm] 16:18), βάρις “large, house” (2Ch 36:19; Psa 48[47]:4, 14; Lam 2:5, 7), πυργόβαρις “citadel, fortress” (Psa 122[121]:7), θεμέλιον “foundation” (Isa 25:2; Jer 6:5), τοίχος “wall” (Isa 23:13), and γῆ “land” (Jer 9:20). The © Minor Prophets translator varies his conjecture of the Hebrew form אַרְמֹן between the nouns θεμέλιον “foundation” (Hos 8:14; Amo 1:4, 7, 10, 12, 14; 2:2, 5) and χώρα “land, country” (Amo 3:9[2x], 10, 11; Mic 5:4).

3.2 Transliteration

Transliteration is the practice of transcribing a source language form in the receptor language. Transliterating a difficult or unknown Hebrew form by © translators is a phenomenon that has been long recognized by scholars.¹²⁾ In Jdg 8:7 the © translator is ignorant of the rare form הַבְּרִקְנִים “thorny growth,” and so transliterates it as βαρκοννιμ.¹³⁾ When the rare form occurs again in Jdg 8:16, the translator also transliterates it but as βαρακηνιμ. In Gen 15:2, the translator is ignorant of מַשְׁקָה “acquisition, possession,” a hapax legomenon, which occurs in the phrase בְּרִית־מַשְׁקָה, and so transliterates it, hence, the rendering υἱὸς Μαασεκ.¹⁴⁾ In Amo 3:12, the translator is ignorant of רְמֹשֶׁק “silk?,” a hapax legomenon, and so he transliterates it as the proper name Δαμμασκιῶ “Damascus.”¹⁵⁾ A transliteration in and of itself does not indicate the © translator’s ignorance of the underlying Hebrew form. A translator may transliterate other forms such as

12) Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, 32; Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 324-325; Michael Paul Vernon Barrett, “A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies and Techniques of the Septuagint”, Ph.D. dissertation (Bob Jones University, 1977), 107, 144-147; Tov, “Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?”, 55-56; Tov, “Loan-words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint”, *Biblica* 60 (1979), 233-235; Tov, “Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament”, *Textus* 8 (1973), 86-92.

13) Tov, “Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?”, 55.

14) Harry M. Orlinsky, “The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators”, *HUCA* 46 (1975), 104-105.

15) Zobule, “A Critical Analysis of the Old Greek (©) of Amos 3:12 in Light of Ancient Translation Practices”, 477-545.

proper nouns and technical terms (religious terms, measures, weights, etc.) for which the receptor language has no equivalent, and loan-words also appear as transliterations.¹⁶⁾ Transliteration, as a way of dealing with unknown forms, applies only to content words or words that are expected to be translated but are instead transliterated.

3.3. Replacement

Replacement is the practice of replacing a source language form with a receptor language form that is semantically unrelated to it.¹⁷⁾ The translator may replace a source language form that is unknown to him with a known but semantically unrelated receptor language form. For instance, since the obscure and rare form הַרְשָׁא “mountain slopes?” (NIV) or “flaming fire?” (RSV) in Deu 33:2 is an unknown form to the © translator, he replaces it with a semantically unrelated form $\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota$ “angels.”¹⁸⁾ In Isa 28:19, the translator is ignorant of הַצִּיָּד “trembling,” and so replaces the phrase הַצִּיָּד וְרָק “only trembling” with $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ πονηρά “bad expectation.”¹⁹⁾ In Jer 18:20, the translator replaces the

16) Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, 32-36; Barrett, “A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies and Techniques”, 107; Tov, “Loan-words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint”, 217-218, 227-233.

17) Szpek calls this a “contextual translation, substitution that most often has no semantic connection with the original source language” (Heidi M. Szpek, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job: A Model for Evaluating a Text with Documentation from the Peshitta to Job*, SBL Dissertation Series 137 [Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1992], 171). I reserve the term “substitution” for a translation practice that involves substituting a known form, not an unknown form, with another known form. See Zobule, “A Critical Analysis of the Old Greek (©) Translation of Amos 1-5”, 76-77.

18) James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 302-303. The noun הַרְשָׁא is also a difficult form to Aquila, Symmachus, Vulgate, Targum Onkelos, and Peshitta. In order to make sense of the textual segment, Peshitta eliminates it from the translation, while other ancient translators segment it as הַרְשָׁא , hence, Aquila $\pi\acute{\iota}\rho$ $\delta\acute{o}\gamma\mu\alpha$, Symmachus $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$, Vulgate *ignea lex* and Targum Onkelos $\text{אִישׁהָא אֲרִיָּהָא}$. In Deu, a similar form הַרְשָׁא “foundation” occurs in the phrase $\text{הַרְשָׁא הַפְּסָגָה}$ (Deu 3:17; 4:49). Ignorant of this Hebrew form, the © Deu translator transliterates it as Ασηδωθ . In Jos 10:40; 12:3, 8; 13:20, the same Hebrew form is also transliterated as Ασηδωθ .

19) Tov, “Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?”, 59.

unknown form שוּחָה “pit” in כָּרוּ שוּחָה לְנַפְשִׁי “they dug a pit for my soul” with ῥήματα “words.”²⁰⁾ In Amo 2:8, עֲנֻשִׁים “fined” is replaced by συκοφαντιῶν “false accusation.” Since the translation practice of replacement involves a Greek form that is semantically unrelated to the Hebrew form it replaces, the resultant Greek translation is incorrect.

3.4 Etymological Rendering

Etymological rendering is the practice of deriving the meaning of a form from its original root/s or from its cognate in a cognate language. In an etymological rendering, the meaning that the translator uses is traceable to a root or cognate of a cognate language, and the form that the translator seeks to represent and the meaning of the root that the translator uses must be shown to be semantically related. For instance, granted that the noun צְלִמּוֹת is related to an original expression צֶל מָוֶת “shadow of death,” then the © translators employ true etymological rendering when they segment and render צְלִמּוֹת as σκιά θανάτου.²¹⁾ The two cognate languages, namely, the languages of the Peshitta and Targum, also represent separately the two components of צְלִמּוֹת.²²⁾ One may admit as another example of etymological rendering תְּהַבְּלוֹת which is rendered κυβέρνησις “generalship?” (Pro 1:5; 11:14; 12:5; 24:6; Job 37:12), if תְּהַבְּלוֹת is indeed etymologically related to הַבֵּל “steersman, captain” (Eze 27:8, 27, 28) which is rendered κυβερνήτης. The representation of the noun in the

20) Ibid., 59. The fact that שוּחָה “pit” is a difficult form to the © Jer translator is again evident from its incorrect renderings in Jer 2:6 as ἀβάτω “untrodden, impassable” and in Jer 18:22 as λόγον “word.” Note that the Hebrew form is correctly rendered by the © Pro translator in Pro 22:14 as βόθρος “pit” and in Pro 23:27 as τετρημένος “bored.”

21) Barr, *The Typology of Literalism*, 302.

22) The noun צְלִמּוֹת occurs 18 times and it is represented as follows in ©: σκιά θανάτου (Job 3:5; 12:22; 24:17, 17; 28:3; Psa 23[22]:4; 44[43]:20; 107[106]:10, 14; Isa 9:1; Jer 13:16; Amo 5:8), γνοφεράν (Job 10:21), σκιά (Job 16:16), ἕδου (Job 38:17), ἀκάρπω (Jer 2:6), οὐκ ἔστιν φέγγος (Job 10:22), and left unrendered (Job 34:22). The Peshitta segments every occurrence of צְלִמּוֹת as *ʿllj mwt* “shadows of death.” The Targum Jonathan represents צְלִמּוֹת with מוּחָה מוּחָה “shades of death” in all but its occurrences in Jer 13:16 and Amo 5:8 where it represents it with הַשׁוּךְ and קַבֵּל respectively. The Vulgate represents it with *umbra mortis* “shades of death” in all but in a few places (Job 10:21; 16:16; 24:17b; 38:17; Jer 2:6; Amo 5:8) where it uses a word that means “dark” or “death.”

difficult expression רַחֲמָיו “his allies” (Amo 1:11) with the noun μήτρα “womb,” which is the usual representation of רֶחֶם “womb,” is another example of etymological rendering.

3.5 Form-association Rendering

Form-association rendering is the practice of representing the meaning of a form with the meaning of another similar but semantically unrelated form.²³⁾ The translator may employ a form-association rendering when he does not know the meaning of a difficult or unknown Hebrew form. This translation phenomenon is a very common one, but it has been incorrectly labeled as “etymological” rendering or exegesis by Tov, Barr, and others.²⁴⁾ The words “etymology” or “etymological” are inadequate descriptive terms for such a phenomenon because the two forms that the translator associates are similar only in form but are not etymologically related in any way. The term “form-association” is the best descriptive term for such translation phenomenon. For instance, the © translator is ignorant of the meaning of the rare form הַמִּשְׁפָּתִים “campfires?” or “sheepfolds?” of Jdg 5:16, and so he associates מִשְׁפָּתִים with the similar but semantically unrelated form שְׁפָתוֹת “lips” and renders מִשְׁפָּתִים as χεῖλέων “lips” (Jdg 5:15 [MS A]).²⁵⁾ In Isa 28:17, the © translator is ignorant

23) I borrow David Weissert’s term *form-association* to refer to the translation phenomenon of associating one form with a similar but semantically unrelated form. David Weissert, “Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques-A Case Study of חלל-חיל-חול”, *Textus* 8 (1974), 31-44. Weissert says, “In problematic cases the derivation or reduction of certain verb-forms was accomplished by the method of *analogy* or *form-association*” (Ibid., 36). Weissert applies the terms *analogy* or *form-association* only to certain verb forms. My use of the term *form-association* is not restricted to verbs.

24) Emanuel Tov, “Excursus: Etymological Exegesis”, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged (Jerusalem: Simor Ltd, 1997), 172-180; Tov, “Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?”, 67-69; Barr, “*The Typology of Literalism*”, 318-322; Barrett, “A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies and Techniques”, 184.

25) Tov, “Did The Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?”, 69; Tov, “Excursus: Etymological Exegesis”, 173. The unknown form מִשְׁפָּתִים occurs in the phrase בֵּין הַמִּשְׁפָּתִים here and in Gen 49:14, where the © Genesis translator also finds מִשְׁפָּתִים an unknown form and so replaces it with a semantically unrelated form κλήρος (“portion, lot”), hence, the rendering ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν κλήρων.

of the form מְשַׁקֵּל “leveling instrument, level” and so associates it with a similar but semantically unrelated form מִשְׁקָל “weight” and renders it σταθμούς “weight.”²⁶⁾ In Isa 1:25, the © translator is ignorant of בַּר “lye, potash” and so associates it with a similar but semantically unrelated form בָּרַר “to purify” or בַּר “pure” and renders it as καθαρόν “clean, pure.”²⁷⁾ In Amo 7:1, the translator associates אַחֲרֵי־מַתְּמָה “after-growth, after-math” with the similar but semantically unrelated form יִלְקֵי “locust,” hence the rendering βροῦχος “locust.”²⁸⁾

Two general observations may be noted regarding the application of a form-association rendering. First, the number or order of the consonants in the difficult or unknown form does not have to match those of the consonants of the similar but semantically unrelated form with which the translator associates. All the translator looks for is for at least two consonants to be similar or the same. In

26) Barrett, “A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies and Techniques”, 184. Barrett associates מְשַׁקֵּל “leveling instrument, level” with שָׁקָל “measures” but it is more likely that the translator associates מְשַׁקֵּל with מִשְׁקָל “weight.” Of the 88 times that the noun שָׁקָל occurs, it is primarily rendered by δίδραχμον (e.g., Gen 23:15, 16; Exo 21:32) or σίκλος (e.g., Exo 30:24; 39:1,1); it is rendered by σταθμός only once (Lev 27:3) and by στάθμιον only 2 times (Eze 45:12; Amo 8:5). The form מִשְׁקָל “weight,” however, is primarily rendered by σταθμός (e.g., Gen 43:21; Lev 26:26; Jdg 8:26; 1Sa [1 Kgdm] 17:5; 2Sa [2 Kgdm] 12:30; 21:16; 1Ki 7:47 [3 Kgdm 7:32]; 10:14; 25:16; 1Ch 20:2; 22:3, 14; 28:14, 16, 17, 18; 2Ch 9:13; Eze [2 Es] 8:30, 34; Job 28:25; Jer 52:20; Eze 4:16) and twice by στάθμιον “weight, small stone” (Lev. 19:35; Eze 5:1). The form מְשַׁקֵּל occurs in another place only in 2Ki (4 Kgdm) 21:13 and there the translator also takes a similar form-association rendering by rendering it as τὸ στάθμιον “weight, small stone.”

27) Barr, *The Typology of Literalism*, 321. An observation of how the other versions deal with this difficult form indicates the following. The Vulgate and Peshitta also follow a similar form-association rendering and render the form בָּרַר in Isa 1:25 as *ad purum* and *dkjw* respectively. Aquila also does a form-association rendering but uses a Greek form that is slightly different semantically, namely, ἐκλεκτός “select, choice.” For the occurrence of the form בַּר “lye, potash” in Job 9:30, © does another form-association rendering but turns it into an adjective representing the phrase בָּרַר כַּפָּי with χερσὶν καθααίς “pure hands,” the Vulgate as well as the Peshitta make form-association renderings and represent בָּרַר with *mundissimae* “shining clean” and *bdkjw*’ “with purity” respectively while the Targum Job replaces it with באהלא “with aloe.”

28) Note that the © Minor Prophets translator has rendered יִלְקֵי “locust” as βροῦχος “locust” elsewhere (Joe 1:4; 2:25; Nah 3:15, 16).

Isa 1:25, the translator associates a two-consonant form בר “lye, potash” with a three-consonant form ברר “pure,” hence, the rendering καθαρόν “clean.” In Isa 14:12, the © translator associates the unknown form חולש “the one who crushes, defeat” with its transposed form שולח “the one who sends,” hence, the rendering ὁ ἀποστέλλων “the one who sends.”²⁹⁾ In Mic 6:14, the © translator associates the unknown form ריקנות “emptiness?,” a hapax legomenon, with the verb יחשך “it will darken” and renders it as σκοτάσει “you shall darken.”³⁰⁾ In 2Ch 3:10, the © translator associates the unknown five-consonant form צעצעים “things formed, images” with the two-consonant form עץ “tree” and represents it with ξύλων “trees.”³¹⁾ Second, the translator may look for a similar but semantically unrelated form in a cognate language. For the © translator this language is usually Aramaic.³²⁾ In Hab 3:16, the © translator associates the rare

29) Barrett, “A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies and Techniques”, 184.

30) Takamitsu Muraoka, “Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography”, Claude E. Cox, ed., *VII Congress of the IOSCS, Leuven 1989*, SCS 31 (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1991), 210.

31) Tov, “Excursus: Etymological Exegesis”, 174.

32) Theoretically the © translator could also associate an unknown form with a similar but semantically unrelated form in the receptor language, namely, Greek. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, 36-38, has pointed to possible examples. However, one must be careful not to accept uncritically all the examples that Thackeray gives. Many of the examples that Thackeray gives do not involve difficult forms and would properly classify as homophonic associations, but they are “forced” homophonic associations that have no phonetic resemblance to their Hebrew equivalents. Other scholars have also suggested that homophony is a translation technique employed by Septuagint translators (Charles T. Fritsch, “Homophony in the Septuagint”, *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* [1973], I [Jerusalem 1977], 115-120; G. B. Caird, “Homoeophony in the Septuagint”, Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs, eds., *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976], 74-88; Tov, “Loan-words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint”, 223-227), but Barr has appropriately cast doubts on such a suggestion (James Barr, “Doubts about Homoeophony in the Septuagint”, *Textus* 12 [1985], 1-77). Barr has observed that “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” (77). However, such a phenomenon is theoretically possible and may also involve known words when an unknown word occurs in the same textual segment. In the phrase וּבְדִמְשֵׁק עֵרֶשׁ (Amo 3:12), the translator transliterates the unknown form דְּמִשְׁק as Δαμασκῶ. Having done that, he now cannot render the known form עֵרֶשׁ “bed”

form צָלַל, from צָלַל “to tingle, quiver,” with the similar but semantically unrelated Aramaic form צַלִי “to pray,” hence, the rendering προσευχῆς “prayer.”³³⁾ In Psa 60 (59): 10; 108(107):10, the © translator associates the rare noun רְחִצִי “my washbasin” with the similar but semantically unrelated Aramaic form רְחִץ “to trust” and renders רְחִצִי as τῆς ἐλπίδος μου “my hope.”³⁴⁾

3.6. Segmentation

Segmentation is the practice of segmenting a source language form below the word level and then representing the different constituents of the form as meaningful forms in a receptor language. The translator may segment and represent constituents of difficult or unknown forms. One or all of the segments may turn out to be meaningful forms but otherwise the translator may also apply form-association rendering on the other segments. In Amo 4:10, the © translator segments the rare form בְּאֵשׁ “stench” as בְּ אֵשׁ “in fire” and represents it by ἐν πυρὶ “in fire.” In Amo 1:14, the translator segments סוּפָה “whirlwind” as ה 3fs suffix and סוּף “end, completion”, hence the rendering συντελείας αὐτῆς “her end.” In Nah 1:12, in the expression אִם־שְׁלָמִים וְכֵן רַבִּים “though they are safe and are many” the © translator is ignorant of שְׁלָמִים and so segments אִם־שְׁלָמִים as אַמְשַׁל מִים, and leaving aside the initial א on אַמְשַׁל and וְכֵן in the phrase, he comes up with a meaningful phrase מִשַׁל מִים רַבִּים, which he then renders as κατάρχων ὑδάτων πολλῶν “rules over many waters.”

The translation practice of segmenting a Hebrew form was practiced not just by © translators but by other ancient translators as well. In Isa 18:1, Aquila

correctly without having a linguistically intolerable phrasal segment and so he associates עֲרֹשׁ with ἱερεῖς “priests” and represents it by ἱερεῖς. This could be called a homophonic association but it is better called just a similar form-association rendering resulting in a transliteration.

33) Tov, “Excursus: Etymological Exegesis”, 179.

34) Ibid.; Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 30 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990), 7. Other examples of form-association rendering may be gleaned from Tov, “Excursus: Etymological Exegesis”, 179-180; Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version*, 28-30; Ottley, *A Handbook to the Septuagint*, 114-115; Muraoka, “Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography”, 205-222. For a discussion on the possible influence of late Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic on the © translators, see also J. Joosten, “On the LXX Translators’ Knowledge of Hebrew”, Bernard Taylor, ed., *X Congress of the IOSCS, Oslo, 1998*, SCS 45 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2001), 165-179.

segments צלצל “whirring” as צל צל and represents it by σκιά σκιά’ “dark, dark.”³⁵⁾ In Exo 32:25, Aquila segments the hapax legomenon שִׁמְצָה as שִׁם צה “name of ?” Note that the segment שִׁם “name” is a meaningful form, but the segment צה is not, so Aquila further associates צה with a similar but semantically unrelated form צִאָה “filth,” and represents שִׁמְצָה by εἰς ὄνομα ῥύπου.³⁶⁾ In Deu 33:2, Aquila segments the rare noun אֶשְׁרָה “mountain slopes?” or “flaming fire?” as אֶשׁ אֶרֶב “fire of the law” and represents it by πῦρ δόγμα; and the same form is also segmented by Symmachus and represented by πυρινὸς νόμος.³⁷⁾ (As has been discussed under the translation practice of replacement, the © translator replaces the difficult אֶשְׁרָה with ἄγγελοι “angels.”)

3.7. Elimination

Elimination is the practice of removing the receptor language equivalent of a source language unknown form from the translation. In this translation practice the translator eliminates any representation of the unknown form from the translation if, by doing so, it does not create an unresolvable semantic situation in his translation. The translator may make other adjustments that prevent the rendering of the textual segment from becoming linguistically and semantically intolerable. In 2Ki (4 Kgdms) 4:35 in וַיִּגְהַר עָלָיו וַיִּזְוֹרֶר הַנֶּעַר עַד־שִׁבְעַ פְּעָמִים “and he stretched upon him, and the child sneezed seven times,” the translator is ignorant of זרר “to sneeze,” a hapax legomenon,³⁸⁾ so he eliminates וַיִּזְוֹרֶר from the translation and then slightly reorganizes the syntax to arrive at καὶ συνέκαμψεν ἐπὶ τὸ παιδάριον ἕως ἑπτάκις “and he bowed himself upon the child seven times.” In the segment וַהֲיוּ לְאֵלֶּהָ לְשִׁמָּה וְלִקְלָלָהּ וְלַחֲרָפָה (Jer 44 [51]:12) “and they shall become a cursing, horror, a curse, and a disgrace,” the

35) Barr, *The Typology of Literalism*, 300. The Targum Jonathan ספינן “ships” and the © πλοίων “ships” probably render the Hebrew form correctly. The Peshitta translator associates it with the similar but semantically unrelated Syriac form *ʾll*’ “shade, shadow,” while the Vulgate *cymbalum* “cymbal; sound” associates צלצל with a similar but semantically unrelated form צלצלים “cymbal.”

36) *Ibid.*, 300.

37) *Ibid.*, 302.

38) Barrett, “A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies and Techniques”, 147. Another example that Barrett gives is the verb צנך in Isa 22:18, a verb which occurs another time only in Lev 16:4 (*Ibid.*, 184-185).

Jer β translator is ignorant of אָלָה “curse” and so he eliminates it from the translation, hence, the resultant rendering of the expression is καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ὀνειδισμὸν καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν καὶ εἰς κατάραν “and they shall be for a reproach, destruction, and a curse.”³⁹⁾ For the other occurrence of אָלָה in Jer 42(49):18, the translator replaces it with another semantically unrelated form, namely, ἄβρατον “untrodden, impassable.” The noun לְקַשׁ “after-growth, after-math” occurs only twice and both of them are in Amo 7:1.⁴⁰⁾ Ignorant of the noun, the translator eliminates its first occurrence from the translation, and associates the second occurrence with the similar but semantically unrelated form לְקַשׁ “locust,” hence, the rendering βροῦχος “locust.” To accommodate this incorrect rendering, he associates אַחַר “after” with אֶחָד “one” and גִּוִּי “mowing” with גֹּג “Gog” so that וְהָיָה לְקַשׁ אַחַר גִּוִּי הַמֶּלֶךְ “and behold it was the latter growth after the king’s mowings” is now represented by καὶ ἰδοὺ βροῦχος εἰς Γωγ ὁ βασιλεύς “and behold, one caterpillar, king Gog.”⁴¹⁾

4. Conclusion

Scholars have long recognized that © translators did not always know their Hebrew text. Modern day translators often betray their ignorance of a Hebrew with a footnote like “*Hebrew is uncertain*,” but © translators are not known to have employed footnotes in their translation. As translators, however, ©

39) Takamitsu Muraoka, “Literary Device in the Septuagint”, *Textus* 8 (1973), 26. Muraoka assumes Thackeray’s two-translator theory for Jer. However, even if one does not assume Thackeray’s theory, the translator also seems to have eliminated it from the translation in Jer 23:10, which would be in Jer α according to Thackeray’s theory. The form also occurs in Jer 29:18, but the entire verse has no corresponding Greek text.

40) The verb לְקַשׁ “to take the aftermath” (Job 24:6) which is a hapax legomenon is also an unknown form to the © Job translator. The translator replaces it with ἠργάσαντο “they worked,” a verb which, though semantically unrelated to the unknown form, still makes sense in the textual segment. See Homer Heater, Jr., *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 11 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982), 78-79, 138.

41) The Hebrew אַחַר (rendered μετὰ ταῦτα in Hos 3:5) is not a difficult form to the © Minor Prophets translator. The noun גִּוִּי occurs only in Amo 7:1 in the Minor Prophets, and quite possibly another difficult form to the © Minor Prophets translator.

translators had to deal with difficult or unknown forms, for leaving a difficult or unknown Hebrew form undealt with would create more difficulties in the translation. The basic question faced by the © translators in such a situation is how to represent meaningfully the difficult or unknown Hebrew form. This gave rise to the translation practices discussed above. In employing these translation practices, the primary aim of the © translators is to come up with a rendering that is semantically and linguistically tolerable, not necessarily correct, in the textual segment in which the difficult or unknown Hebrew form occurs. For each of the examples of the difficult or unknown Hebrew forms discussed above, a comparison of the meaning of the Hebrew form and its © representation reveals that both mean different things, and if accuracy in translation is measured by how closely a © translation renders the meaning of the Hebrew form, then the © rendering may be said to be incorrect or wrong. However, since the Hebrew form is difficult or unknown to the © translators, translation accuracy is out of the question and instead the foremost aim in the mind of the © translators is to give a © representation that is meaningful in and of itself and also meaningful in the textual segment in which the difficult or unknown Hebrew form occurs.

(투고 일자: 2010. 8. 19, 심사 일자: 2010 9. 5, 게재 확정 일자: 2010. 10. 6)

<Keywords>

Old Greek, translation practice, unknown Hebrew forms, conjecture, conjectural variation, transliteration, replacement, etymological rendering, form-association rendering, segmentation, and elimination.

<Refereneecs>

- Barr, James, "Doubts about Homoeophony in the Septuagint", *Textus* 12 (1985), 1-77.
- Barr, James, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, no. 15., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Barrett, Michael Paul Vernon., "A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies and Techniques of the Septuagint", Ph.D. dissertation, Bob Jones University, 1977.
- Blake, Robert P., "Khanmeti Palimpsest Fragments of the Old Georgian Version of Jeremiah", *Harvard Theological Review* 25 (1932), 254-255.
- Caird, G. B., "Homoeophony in the Septuagint", Robert Hamerton-Kelley and Robin Scroggs, eds., *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976, 74-88.
- Caird, G. B., "Towards A Lexicon of the Septuagint", *The Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968), 453-75.
- Fritsch, Charles T., "Homophony in the Septuagint", *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (1973), I (Jerusalem 1977), 115-120.
- Greenspoon, Leonard., "The Use and Abuse of the Term 'LXX' and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship", *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 20 (1987), 21-29.
- Harper, William Rainey., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Amos and Hosea*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- Heater, Homer, Jr., *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, no. 11, Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982.
- Heawood, Percy J., "ארמון and ארם", *The Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1911-12), 66-73.
- Joosten, J., "On the LXX Translators' Knowledge of Hebrew", Bernard Taylor, ed., *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 51, 165-179, Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 2001.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu, "Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography", Claude E. Cox, ed., *VII Congress of the International Organization of*

- Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 31, 205-222. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu., “Literary Device in the Septuagint”, *Textus* 8 (1973), 20-30.
- Olofsson, Staffan., *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 30, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990.
- Orlinsky, Harry M., “The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators”, *Hebrew Union College Annual* 46 (1975), 89-114.
- Ottley, Richard R., *A Handbook to the Septuagint*, New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1919.
- Swete, Henry Barclay., *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1989.
- Szpek, H. M., *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job: A Model for Evaluating a Text with Documentation from the Peshitta to Job*, David L. Petersen and PHEME PERKINS, eds., SBL Dissertation Series, no 137. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Thackeray, Henry. St. John., *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, Vol. 1, Introduction, Orthography and Accidence, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- Thackeray, Henry. St. John., “The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books”, *Journal of Theological Studies* 4 (1903), 578-85.
- Tov, Emanuel., “Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?”, Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox, eds., *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honor of John William Wevers on his Sixty-fifth Birthday*, 53-70, Mississauga, Ontario: Benden, 1984.
- Tov, Emanuel., “Loan-words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint”, *Biblica* 60 (1979), 216-236.
- Tov, Emanuel., *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged, Jerusalem: Simor, 1997.
- Tov, Emanuel., “Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament”, *Textus* 8 (1973), 78-92.
- Weissert, David., “Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques- A Case Study of חלל-חיל-חול”, *Textus* 8 (1974), 31-44.

Zobule, Alpheus G., “A Critical Analysis of the Old Greek (©) Translation of Amos 1-5: Testing the ‘Semantic Situations and Paths’ (SSP) Model”, Ph.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary and Presbyterian School of Christian Education, 2008.

Zobule, Alpheus G., “A Critical Analysis of the Old Greek (©) of Amos 3:12 in Light of Ancient Translation Practices”, Kenneth A. McElhanon and Ger Reesink, eds., *A Mosaic of languages and cultures: studies celebrating the career of Karl J. Franklin*, 477-545. Dallas: SIL International, 2010. SIL e-Books, 19. [Dallas]: SIL International. <http://www.sil.org/silepubs/abstract.asp?id=52554>.

A Reconsideration of the Testimony of Two or Three Witnesses in the Damascus Document 9:16-10:3

Keun-Jo Ahn*

1. Introduction

The Damascus Document (CD) 9:16-10:3, contrary to the current discussions of some scholars, does not extend beyond the scope of the biblical law (Torah) in its regulation on the number of witnesses required in a capital case while the CD does reflect “sectually explicit”¹⁾ law due to circumstances of the Qumran sect. Through this paper I will raise one major and two minor problems: (1) the CD 9:16-10:3, a judicial law of the sect remains within the territory of the Hebrew Bible; (2) Yet, it reveals some characteristics of sectarian law caused by particular situations; (3) Any approach to relate some of the New Testament passages to this witnesses code of the Qumran sect would fail without cautious investigations on the rationale and circumstances of the regulations.

This paper consists of three parts: 1. discussion of the key scholars on the passage under question; 2. reconsideration of the passage with textual critical notes; 3. result and significance. The first part explores general outline of the CD and the translations and arguments of scholars on the CD 9:16-10:3. They will be mainly Jacob Neusner, Bernard S. Jackson and Lawrence H. Schiffman. The second part unfolds my own translation and understanding of the passage with critical comments on the discussions of the three aforementioned scholars. Finally, the result of the reconsideration explains the status of the CD 9:16-10:3 in relationship with the Hebrew Bible. We will reach to the conclusion that the

* A Professor at Hoseo University, Old Testament.

1) I have borrowed this term from the article of Carol A. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran”, William Henry Propp, Baruch Halpern and David Noel Freedman, eds., *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167-187.

CD text lies in the tradition of the Torah, which signifies that both the CD and biblical laws maintain the same position in the regulation of witnesses in a capital case.

2. An Original Development in *Halakhic* Exposition?

2.1. Structure of the Damascus Document

The CD is divided into two sections: Admonition (cols. 1-8 & 19-20 of the Cairo manuscripts) and Laws (cols. 15-16²⁾ & 9-14). In the Admonition, the author addresses his “sons” (2:14) on the themes of the sect’s teaching, many of which appear also in the Community Rule. His aim is to encourage the sectarians to remain faithful. He demonstrates how loyalty is rewarded and the apostasy chastised in the history of Israel.³⁾ The laws in the CD cover, among other topics, the purity of priests and sacrifices, diseases, marriage, agriculture, tithes, relations with non-Jews, entry into the covenant community and oaths involved, life within the community, sabbath, and communal organization.⁴⁾

Even though the CD appears to be composed of two different genres, it is basically a legal text. It was Dupont-Sommer who pointed out a close link between the two sections, the Admonition and the Law. Contrary to Rabin who discusses “two entirely different writings which the scribe of Manuscript A happened to copy out in the same book”, Dupont-Sommer argues that the first part is a sort of introduction to the second. “In reality, the whole purpose of the Exhortation is to advise the members of the sect to obey its ordinances.”⁵⁾ Baumgarten confirms the fact that the Admonition plays a role as essentially an

2) “It becomes obvious, as Milik has indicated, that cols. 15-16 belong before col. 9”: Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, “Damascus Document (CD): Introduction”, James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation Vol.2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 4.

3) Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scroll in English* (New York: Penguin Books, 1998), 126.

4) James C. Vanderkam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 126.

5) A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. tr. by Geza Vermes (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961), 117.

introduction to a corpus of Torah interpretation and sectarian rulings.⁶⁾ Vermes also categorizes the CD along with the Community Rule (1QS), the Temple Scroll (11QT), and 4QMMT under the list of “the Rules” in his book.⁷⁾

Before we begin to dig into our particular code of the testimony laws, general features of the CD are in order. First, the statutes in the CD are intended for the group members who live in the towns and villages while the Community Rule is for the people who have exiled themselves to remote Qumran. The author’s mention of “camps” (7:6), “take wives and beget sons” (7:7), “the camp” (10:23), “the assembly of the towns of Israel” (12:19), and “the assembly of the camps” (12:23) indicate a normal communal lifestyle.⁸⁾ Second, by contrast to the Temple Scroll that is a supplement to Torah, the laws in the CD are not directly revealed statutes. The use of exegesis, though sporadic, sets the laws of the CD apart from the divine revelation.⁹⁾ Instead, these laws are based on the interpretation of the scriptural words. Third, the law in the CD is primarily of composite in nature. It is a compilation, a digest, a collection of decisions which may date from different periods.¹⁰⁾ Accordingly, the legal codes expose accumulations representing the whole spectrum of Qumran exegesis and legislation.¹¹⁾ Yet, more recent scholars claim that the CD is a more coherent composition, even if it has been assembled from smaller units.¹²⁾

2.2. Ambiguities of the CD 9:16-10:3

The CD 9:16-10:3 is a law concerning the number of witnesses in executing a capital case and a property case. This passage is an exposition of the Torah,

6) Joseph M. Baumgarten, “The Laws of the *Damascus Document* in Current Research”, Magen Broshi, ed., *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 55.

7) Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scroll*, 125-156.

8) James C. Vanderkam & Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002), 216.

9) Joseph M. Baumgarten, “The Laws of the *Damascus Document*”, 55-56.

10) A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings*, 142.

11) Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, “Damascus Document (CD): Introduction”, 6.

12) P. R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the Damascus Document* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982), 50; John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010), 13.

especially, Deuteronomy 17:6 and 19:15. Both biblical passages clarify that two or three witnesses are required to sustain a charge and that one witness is not enough to convict any crime. However, the regulation in the CD 9:16-10:3 is not unequivocal in several points.

First of all, two different renderings are possible in the decision of the number of witnesses demanded to complete a capital case. Some translators read two witnesses but others, three. Second, another problem in translating the text is a confusion between אַחַד and אַחַר . Qimron discusses that those appearances in lines 19-21 are unclear.¹³⁾ Specifically, line 21 would make a significant change of the meaning by taking one of the two options.¹⁴⁾ Third, the CD law accepts the validity of a single witness, which the biblical law rejects (Deut. 17:6; 19:15). Does this mean that the sect has departed from the traditional teaching of the Torah? It could not be the case because the Damascus Document is full of biblical languages and also because part of its purpose is to present the sect as the true heir of the biblical Israel.¹⁵⁾ Then, how should the contradiction be resolved? Finally, there are two different judicial functionaries in our text: מבקר and שופטים . The מבקר is depicted as a main judiciary in lines 9:16-22.¹⁶⁾ However, שופטים suddenly takes the place of מבקר in the very next line (9:23-10:1). The relationship between the two is not clearly delineated in the text.

The vagueness of the text has attracted many scholars into a close investigation of the text. Among them, Jacob Neusner, Bernard S. Jackson, and Lawrence H. Schiffman have made considerable contributions. I will explore how the three experts understand the text and respond to the four problems raised above.

2.3. Extension of the Biblical Law

Neusner has looked into alternative translations of many other scholars and

13) Elisha Qimron, "The Text of CDC", *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, 26-27.

14) In lines 19 and 20, אַחַד rather than אַחַר is agreed preferable by most translators (Levine, Rabin, Vermes, Charlesworth, Garcia-Martinez, Yadin, Jackson, Schiffman and so forth; cf. Charles). Yet, for line 21, scholars show disagreement.

15) Philip R. Davies, George J. Brooke and Phillip R. Callaway, *The Complete World of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Thames & Hudson Ltd., 2002), 18.

16) In particular, lines 16-20 show that the capital case appears to be complete (שלם משפטו) under the control of מבקר .

ended up with “three” witnesses in the completion of a case.¹⁷⁾ He summarizes his examination as follows: “Levine and Charles require *three* such testimonies; so too Levi demands ‘une troisieme fois’; and Vermes, following Ginzberg, suffices with two successive incidents.”¹⁸⁾ It shows us that the number of witness causes disagreement among translators.

However, what Neusner emphasizes in his research is not to determine the number of the witnesses but to observe the peculiar way in which the CD deals with a single witness. He has pinpointed the problem the biblical law also has in relation to the testimony of two witnesses. The case of a crime committed before only one witness cannot be prosecuted since the law sets it aside as an anomaly.¹⁹⁾ It is the anomaly that the CD 9:16-22 is concerned with. What is remarkable is that the rules of evidence in the CD supply a better solution when the Pharisaic-rabbinic law is proven as being unable to solve the case of the single witness. The CD suggests a combination of single witnesses.²⁰⁾

Neusner criticizes Ginzberg who has insisted that there are parallel laws of the single witnesses between rabbinic traditions and the CD. According to the CD, it is possible to combine the testimony of witnesses to two separate, but similar, crimes into a single action.²¹⁾ However, Ginzberg’s “parallels” fail to demonstrate any of those combination of separate successive commissions. Neusner asserts that the law of testimony in the CD does not exhibit “substantial agreement” with that of the rabbinic traditions. Furthermore, Neusner claims that the CD works on the basis of quite contrary principles.²²⁾ This argument is supported by Schiffman who argues, “...in regard to the law of testimony, the framers of the legislation recorded in the *Zadokite Fragments* reached substantially different conclusions from those of tannaim.”²³⁾

17) Jacob Neusner, “‘By the Testimony of Two Witnesses’ in the Damascus Document IX,17-22 and in Pharisaic-Rabbinic Law”, *Revue de Qumran* 30 (1973), 199, 216.

18) *Ibid.*, 202.

19) *Ibid.*, 197.

20) This concept of combining separate offences in CD is first introduced by Baruch A. Levine, “Damascus Document IX,17-22: A New Translation and Comments”, *Revue de Qumran* 30 (1973), 195-196.

21) Jacob Neusner, “By the Testimony”, 204.

22) *Ibid.*, 204.

23) Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code* (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1983), 81. Also, refer his another book, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the*

Since the main interest is in the comparison of the CD with rabbinic traditions concerning the witness law, Neusner does not present a detailed study on the text itself, even without his own translation. However, we can infer that Neusner would choose אָחַר in line 21 (between אָחַר and אָחַר). So the translation goes: *if there are two each testifying to a different matter* for he would read the sentence that begins from line 20 as a continuing provision on the combination of single “separate” witnesses for the capital crime. On the other hand, in the case of selecting אָחַר, it reads: *if there are two who testify about one matter*, it would not be the anomaly (“a crime before only one witness”), which was the starting point of Neusner’s discussion, but would be a usual scriptural case of two witnesses.

Yet, there remain two problems unanswered in Neusner’s investigation. Why did the author of the CD accept the single witness as valid in the sect’s judicial procedure while the sages in the rabbinic tradition pronounce to be illegitimate? What about the function of מְבַקֵּר in relation to שׁוֹפְטִים? These are two questions with which Jackson and Schiffman struggle in the following.

Jackson has carried out a careful inquiry on the text, CD 9:16-23,²⁴ in which he divides it into four parts:

- A A special evidentiary procedure whereby a capital case may be rendered “complete” (lines 16-20)
- B A non-capital sanction to be imposed in a capital case on the evidences of two witnesses (lines 20-22)
- C A statement of the sufficiency of two witnesses in a case concerning property (lines 22-23)
- D The same non-capital sanction as in B to be imposed in a case concerning property on the evidence of one witness (line 23)

Among these parts, A and B (lines 16-22) deal with capital offences, while C and D (lines 22-23) concern property matters.

Lost Library of Qumran (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 284. Related volume, Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), 9. However, a counter argument of N. L. Rabinovitch, “Damascus Document IX,17-22 and Rabbinic Parallels”, *Revue de Qumran* 33 (1977), 113-116; Neusner’s response is in “Damascus Document IX,17-22 and Irrelevant Parallels”, *Revue de Qumran* 35 (1978), 441-444.

24) Bernard S. Jackson, “*Testes Singulares* in Early Jewish Law and the New Testament”, *Essays in Jewish and Comparative Legal History* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 172-201.

Jackson rightly defines that the principal problem affecting the legal significance of the passage is the question whether two or three separate offences are required before the case may be regarded as complete.²⁵⁾ According to Jackson, the main linguistic issue is whether ושב והודיע למבקר (*and he also reports it to the Inspector*) in line 19 is to be construed as part of the clause commencing עד עשותו (until he does it) in the previous line. If the phrase is a part of the sentence, the requisite number would be two. Otherwise, it would be three. Jackson's decision is three because the construction of the phrase as part of the עד clause involves a major difficulty of illogicality or tautology.²⁶⁾

Also, Jackson considers the problem of the obscurity in line 21. Even though he admits the intelligibility of each reading (אָהָר and אָהָר), he judges that אָהָר does not appear to be what the scribe intended.²⁷⁾ He disputes the view of Schiffman who prefers אָהָר and concludes the section B (lines 20-22) as referring to “two simultaneous witnesses”. Instead, Jackson argues that B continues the theme A (three *testes singulares*²⁸⁾ required for capital case) with a further diminution of the weight of the evidence. Thus, it does not talk about two “simultaneous” witnesses but two *testes sigulare*.²⁹⁾ The relationship of A with B is, in Jackson's view, straightforward: if there are three *testes singulares* in a capital case, his judgment is complete; but if there are only two, the sanction is less-separation from the purity (הטהרה).

Jackson's translation of the sentence in question is as follows: *But if they (the witnesses) are two, and they (each) testify to a different case, the man shall only be separated from the purity...*

Now, a problem arises from this reading: what does דבר אהר (*a different case*) mean? Jackson explains it as “a different type of case”. He intends to stress that where the evidence consists of single witnesses offences (*testes singulares*), those separate offences must form part of a single class of action.³⁰⁾ It signifies that each witness testifies to **a separate offence**. Like Neusner, Jackson calls his

25) Bernard S. Jackson, “*Testes Singulares*”, 173.

26) *Ibid.*, 173.

27) *Ibid.*, 177.

28) Jackson uses this term for single witnesses to a separate (but similar) offence.

29) Bernard S. Jackson, “Damascus Document IX,16-23 and Parallels”, *Revue de Qumran* 35 (1978), 446.

30) Bernard S. Jackson, “*Testes Singulares*”, 177.

attention to the combination of single witnesses.

He also affirms the sufficiency of single witness as an incredible contemplation of the CD draftsman³¹⁾ as Neusner has alluded. Jackson observes that such a minimum evidence that requires only one was not unknown elsewhere.³²⁾ However, Jackson does not discuss about the circumstances of the CD law that renders the provision of single witnesses. Yet, he does make helpful comments on the function of מבקר.

In this regard, Jackson's discussion was affected by Rabinovitch who had mentioned about the capital jurisdiction of the mysterious רשות (*authority*).³³⁾ Rabinovitch argues, "there was an 'authority' other than regular court which was empowered to punish habitual murderers even if their crimes were witnessed by only one witness."³⁴⁾ He attempts to find a correspondence between the מבקר in the CD and the רשות. Jackson, however, contends that there is no indication that the CD elevates the מבקר into an authority with greater power than the regular court of the community.³⁵⁾ He concludes that the מבקר plays no role greater than that of clerk who takes the depositions of witnesses as the evidence becomes available. It is שופטים who exercises capital jurisdiction (10:1). The separate sections of the rule of שופטים and that of מבקר in 10:4-10 and 13:7-14:2 respectively, explain their different functions. Accordingly, for Jackson, מבקר appears as a prosecutor who collects evidences to convict a culprit while שופטים performs the role of judge who executes a final sentence.

Schiffman raises two significant questions in reading three witnesses for the conviction of capital crimes: (1) Why is it that the Qumran sect required three witnesses in capital cases where the Pharisaic-rabbinic law accepts two?; (2) Why does the sect allow the combination of testimony to separate occurrences of the same offense as a basis for conviction?³⁶⁾

The two questions indicate that Schiffman digs into a point that has been missed by Neusner and Jackson: how does the Qumran sect concede the validity of one witness which is not indicated in biblical law?

31) Ibid., 177.

32) Bernard S. Jackson, "Damascus Document IX,16-23", 446.

33) N. L. Rabinovitch, "Damascus Document IX,17-22", 115-116.

34) Ibid., 116.

35) Bernard S. Jackson, "Damascus Document IX,16-23", 449.

36) Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Qumran Law of Testimony", *Revue de Qumran* 32 (1975), 605.

Schiffman reconstructs the exegetical process of the CD which attaches a distinct meaning to each number mentioned in the Hebrew Bible. Regarding the law of sabbath limits, for example, the CD 10:21 states, “Let him not walk about outside of his city more than a thousand cubits.” In contrast, the CD 11:5-6 reads, “Let no man walk after an animal to pasture it outside of his city except two thousand cubits.” Schiffman argues that although these laws look contradictory, they are the result of sectarian *midrash halakhah*.³⁷⁾ The sect cited the description of the boundaries of the Levitical cities in Numbers 35:2-5 and used this definition of the city limits. Since the scripture states both numbers, a thousand and two thousand cubits, the sect seems to have concluded that there were two sabbath limits, that of one thousand cubits beyond which a man could not walk, and the other, of two thousand cubits, beyond which he could not go if pasturing his animals.³⁸⁾

Schiffman argues that the sect maintained both provisions in groups of numbers - each had to have its own significance. In relation to the law of testimony, the same principle was employed. If the Torah enjoined conviction by two or three witnesses, one could safely assume that the intention was for capital crimes to require three witnesses and for monetary matters to require only two.³⁹⁾ Thus, the sect’s requirement of three witnesses in capital cases where Rabbinic law accepted two may be traced to a different exegetical approach to the pertinent biblical material.⁴⁰⁾

The result of his reading of our text is clear: from the commands of Deuteronomy 17:6-7 and 19:15 regarding “two or three witnesses”, the CD law of testimony requires two witnesses for financial matters but three for capital cases.⁴¹⁾ This explains why Schiffman prefers רָאָה to רָאָה in line 21 as we have already noticed above in Jackson’s debate. Schiffman’s translation of the sentence reads: *If, however, there are [only] two witnesses who testify concerning one [and the same] matter, the person may only be removed from the*

37) Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Qumran Law”, 606; Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Sectarian Law”, 74.

38) Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Qumran Law”, 607.

39) *Ibid.*, 607.

40) Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Sectarian Law”, 75.

41) Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Relationship of the Zadokite Fragments to the Temple Scroll”, Joseph Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick, eds., *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 140.

Purity.⁴²⁾ He emphasizes that two simultaneous witnesses to one crime are not sufficient for capital conviction.

Schiffman does not directly investigate the relationship between מבקר and שופטים. However, his study of the law of reproof in the CD 9:2-8 displays significant answers to the question. He claims that the sect required a formal procedure of reproof for a violation before the offence could serve as the basis of trial and conviction. This process necessitated that witnesses to any offence censure the culprit formally in the presence of witnesses.⁴³⁾ It was the מבקר who officially recorded this reproof and supplied the basis for conviction if other single witnesses should later report the same offence. According to Schiffman, מבקר is an administrative official of the sect in the tribunal process who makes it possible to bring the violator to the court.⁴⁴⁾ Like Jackson, Schiffman also understands the מבקר as a clerk or a prosecutor at most, but not שופטים who have a prime jurisdiction.

The three scholars we have explored agree to the rendering of three witnesses in capital cases. Also, Jackson and Schiffman reveal a common opinion in their understanding of the relationship between מבקר and שופטים while they translate lines 20-21 discordantly due to their different judgment in reading either אָמַד or אָמַר. Most of all, they identically highlight the combination of single witnesses in the CD as original extension beyond the biblical law. However, they have disregarded the problem of the contradictory aspect of this *halakhic* exposition to the Torah. Schiffman tries to explain why the sect introduced the combination of single witnesses. Yet he does not pay his attention to the incongruity.⁴⁵⁾

3. Endorsement of the Evidence of Only One Witness in Biblical Law

3.1. An Alternative Understanding of the CD 9:16-10:3

42) Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Qumran Law", 603.

43) Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Sectarian Law", 78.

44) *Ibid.*, 95.

45) In his "Sectarian Law", 77-78, Schiffman does point out the contradictory regulation of the fatal case of the CD to the *Temple Scroll* but no concern about the difference from the scripture is made.

16 כל דבר אשר ימעל
17 איש בתורה וראה רעהו והוא אחד אם דבר מות הוא וידיעהו
18 לעיניו בהוכיח למבקר והמבקר יכתבהו בידו עד עשותו
19 עוד לפני אחד ושב והודיע למבקר אם ישוב וניתפּש לפני
20 אחד שלם משפטו ואם שנים הם והם מעידים על
21 דבר אחר והובדל האיש מן הטהרה לבד אם נאמנים
22 הם וביום ראות האיש ידיעה למבקר ועל ההון יקבלו שני
23 עידי נאמנים ועל אחד להבדיל הטהרה ואל יקובל
10:1 עוד לשופטים להמית על פיהו אשר לא מלאו ימיו לעבור
2 על הפקודים ירא את אל אל יאמן איש על רעהו
3 לעד עובר דבר מן המצוה ביד רמה עד זכו לשוב

- 16 Anything that a man acts faithlessly
17 against the Torah and his fellow sees it, (if) he is alone, and if
it is a matter of death he shall report it
18 to *mevaqqr* reproving in his (the offender's) presence. And the
mevaqqr records it by his own hand until he does it
19 again before one and he shall report it again to the *mevaqqr*. If
he is caught again before
20 one, his judgment is complete. If they are two but they testify about
21 different things, the man shall be excluded only from the Purity,
providing they are trustworthy
22 and on the day that each saw the man each report to the *mevaqqr*.
And concerning property they shall receive two
23 trustworthy witnesses; upon one witness, to exclude for the Purity.
No witness shall be accepted
10:1 by judges to sentence death upon his testimony unless he has fulfilled
his days to pass
2 among those who are appointed and is fearful of God. No man shall
be trustworthy against his fellow
3 as a witness who transgresses any word of the commandment deliberately
until he becomes pure to return.

Our text is largely divided into three: (1) regulation of testimony in capital case (9:16-22); (2) regulation of testimony in property case (9:22-23); (3) regulation of trustworthy witness (9:23-10:3). Again, the first part consists of two sections: 1. capital case with one witness (9:16-20), and 2. capital case with two conflicting witnesses (9:20-22).

In the first part (9:16-22), the key words to understand the structure of the text are **והוא אחד** and **ואם שנים הם**. The author undertakes the testimony provision of a capital crime with two options: one is the case of **one witness** and the other one is **two witnesses**. Both cases are insufficient for conviction of a capital crime. Yet, three consecutive single witnesses would complete the case, while two different testimonies⁴⁶⁾ should drive the offender out of the Purity.⁴⁷⁾ The second part elucidates that two witnesses suffice whether simultaneous or sequential in monetary case.⁴⁸⁾ Only one witness in this property case directly signifies the separation. The third portion is straightforward concerning the requirements of trustworthy witness upon which judges would pass the sentence of death.

3.2. A Treatment for Ambiguities

We have noticed the vagueness of our text. Four issues were elaborated: 1. In a capital case, what is the number of witnesses, two or three?; 2. For the translation of the first part of the CD 9:21, should it be **אחד** or **אחד**?; 3. Why did the sect accept one witness that is contradictory to the scriptural law?; 4. What is the relationship between **מבקר** and **שופטים**?

As I have presented in my translation above, the text claims three single witnesses in capital case. On this point, I agree with all three scholars above. In addition, I accept Jackson's reading of **אחד** instead of **אחד** but on a different basis. Yet, I am not convinced with the understanding of the relationship between **מבקר** and **שופטים** discussed by Jackson and Schiffman. Most of all, I strongly disagree with their unanimous contention on the combination of single witnesses as an original extension of the sect beyond the biblical law. I would argue that the witness regulation in the CD still stays within the bounds of the biblical law. If my argument proves cogent, the problem of the discrepant state of the *halakhic* exposition in contrast to the Torah will be disposed.

46) "Different testimonies" (**דבר אחד**) could mean either two sequential isolated witnesses (the offender commits two crimes) or two discordant testimonies of simultaneous witness (the offender makes one violation). At this point we cannot determine which one is the case.

47) Both Schiffman and Garcia Martinez appropriately explains the message of exclusion from the Purity (**הטהרה**; pure food) in the sect as demotion to the status of a first year novice: Schiffman, "Sectarian Law", 165; Florentino Garcia Martinez & Julio Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Wilfred G. E. Watson, tran. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), 224, 231.

48) James H. Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 45.

First of all, I prefer the reading of אָחַר to אָחֵד with a perspective different from that of Jackson. He disputes the view of Schiffman who selects אָחֵד and reads the case of two witnesses as “two simultaneous witnesses.” Jackson suggests that lines 9:20-22 indicates a further diminution of the weight of the evidence with his reading of אָחַר.⁴⁹⁾ To determine a capital violation three *testes singulares* are required but there are only two. That is why non-capital sanction, the separation, is introduced. For me, however, lines 9:20-22 simply depicts the situation of two witnesses with different testimonies by contrast to the condition of only one witness. The lines are not necessarily related to the two sequential separate witnesses. So preoccupied with the concept of *testes singulares*, Jackson overlooks the basic meaning of the text.

Second, Jackson and Schiffman render מִבְּקֵר as a judicial clerk or an administrative official ranked lower than שׁוֹפְטִים concerning the relationship between מִבְּקֵר and שׁוֹפְטִים. This interpretation seems to be true from a casual reading of the text. Yet, two problems prevent us from accepting this initial reading. Firstly, if we examine the process of a capital case in lines 9:16-20, we might be puzzled by its sudden conclusion: “...his judgment is complete (שלם משפט)”. In what way is the case complete? The text clarifies that the tribunal procedure of the capital case is performed only by the authority of מִבְּקֵר. We have to note that, the same text, a few lines below introduces שׁוֹפְטִים as an executioner of the death sentence (line 10:1). Then, why the execution of שׁוֹפְטִים does not follow immediately after the שלם משפט? It indicates the independent authority of מִבְּקֵר in the legal course. The regulation of one witness in capital case would stop unfulfilled at an unexpected point for Jackson and Schiffman who maintain the final administrative judgment of שׁוֹפְטִים. If מִבְּקֵר was no more than a judicial clerk, the provision of line 9:20 should have proceeded to the completion of the case by שׁוֹפְטִים.

Next point is concerned with the job description of the מִבְּקֵר in 13:7-14:2 of the CD. It reveals that his position is more than just a judicial secretary in the sect.⁵⁰⁾ Specifically, 13:9 regulates his duty as a father and shepherd for the

49) Bernard S. Jackson, “Damascus Document IX,16-23”, 446.

50) Regarding the leadership position of מִבְּקֵר, different depictions of the CD from the text of IQS are discussed by Moshe Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 19-21. Weinfeld judges that the CD pictures מִבְּקֵר as a spiritual leader.

community: *He shall love them as a father loves his children, and shall carry them in all their distress like a shepherd his sheep* (Vermes' version). Also, in lines 13:12-13, his authority in the decision of membership prevails over anyone of the camp: *No member of the camp shall have authority to admit a man to the Congregation against the decision of the מבקר of the camp* (Vermes). Of course, Schiffman has already mentioned about the role of the מבקר as a spiritual leader of the sectarian settlement as well as a legal administrative official.⁵¹⁾ Yet, he does not see any parallel function of the מבקר as שופטים in the judicial procedure.

My argument is that if the מבקר played a key role in the camp ranging from its organizational concerns to spiritual matters, why didn't he take the judicial authority as well? With regard to the relationship with שופטים, we find that the מבקר functions exactly the same as the שופטים in collecting relief supplies of the camp in the CD 14:12-13: *They shall place the earnings of at least two days out of every month into the hands of the מבקר and the שופטים*. . . Here, at least, the מבקר is not inferior to the שופטים in practicing his authority.

Now, I have reached the point that is critical in my criticism to the discussion of the previous scholars. I have maintained that the testimony law of the CD 9:16-10:3 is not a novel development of the sect. Instead, it keeps the tradition of the Torah.

The scholars' misunderstanding of the text originates from their lack of discretion in grasping the various stages of the scriptural law expressed in Deut. 17:2-8. At least, four steps are taken toward the completion of a capital case:

- I. Initial Exposure: “. . .and if it is reported to you or you hear of it” (NRSV) 17:4a
- II. Collection of Evidence: “you make a thorough inquiry” 17:4b
- III. Conviction: “and the charge is proved true that such an abhorrent thing has occurred in Israel” 17:4c
- IV. Execution: “then you shall bring out to your gates that man or that woman who has committed this crime and you shall stone the man or the woman to death. **On the evidence of two or three witnesses the death sentence shall be executed; a person must not be put to death on the evidence of only one witness**” 17:5-6

51) Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Sectarian Law”, 95.

As we see, the law of “two or three witnesses” is applied at the final stage of the procedure, “Execution”. As a matter of fact, each of the four stages could not be carried out without the testimony of witnesses.⁵²⁾ The concern of the law maker here is to secure the minimum number of witnesses, two, at the level of execution. It means that only one witness can be accepted as valid in earlier stages. Without consideration of the stages in legal process, Neusner unduly judged that the law isolates the case of a crime committed before only one witness as an anomaly.

What stage of the process does our text, especially the CD 9:16-20 belong to? It is definitely not the stage of execution. It is the beginning of the legal process, the stages of “Initial Exposure” and “Collection of Evidence”. If this is true, the consideration of the single witnesses and their combination are not idiosyncratic elements of the CD law because the biblical law would allow the legality of a series of single witnesses in those stages of gathering information about the violation.

Those scholars who tried to understand our text fails to discriminate the application of the testimony provided for the conviction of a crime. What the author of the legal code is concerned about is a proper process of collecting evidences: three consecutive single witnesses are enough to make the case public. In other words, the case gets ready (שלם)⁵³⁾ to go for the next stage.

Ignoring the different stages in the judicial procedure of the biblical law lead scholars to also overlook in their discussion about the connection of the CD 9:16-23 to the New Testament. For example, Jackson debates that Paul adapts the unusual procedure of our text to his purpose of emphasizing his third visitation in 2 Cor 13:1-2.⁵⁴⁾ He proposes that the New Testament exegesis appears to have been one of the channels through which the institution of *testes singulares* was transmitted from the CD. However, the author of the CD law does not suggest that he should convict and then punish his offenders since it is

52) Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), 117.

53) Here we find a solution to the problem left unsolved previously. That is the unexpected stop of the regulation in the process of capital case (CD 9:20). Now, the reason for sudden finishing is understandable because the completion of “his judgment” (שלם משפט) is not the final phase of the case but beginning of it; meaning only the end of the first two stages of exposure and collection of evidences. The reticence of the following procedure is natural since the next one (the stages of conviction and execution) is well known from the biblical law (Deut 17:4c-6).

54) Bernard S. Jackson, “*Testes Singulares*”, 180, 193-201.

his *third* visit. Paul is simply saying that when he arrives in Corinth, he will (if needed) execute judgment since he has given more than ample warnings of possible future action.⁵⁵⁾

Therefore, all the discussions of the scholars on the combination of single witnesses as an original development in *halakhic* exposition are rejected. The consideration of one witness as valid in the CD law is not contradictory but in the same tradition of the biblical law.⁵⁶⁾

3.3. Sectually Explicit Law

Although I have claimed that the CD law in 9:16-10:3 remains in the boundary of the biblical law, it does reflect sectarian characteristics owing to the particular circumstances of the sect for it tries to explicate all the numbers of two and three witnesses in Deut 17:6-7. As Schiffman has observed, the sect gives attention to each number and its significances.⁵⁷⁾ The Damascus Document itself pronounces the capital punishment to be completed by three witnesses, yet the law takes consideration of two separate testimonies on “different things”. It indicates that the number of three witnesses for capital punishment could be reduced to two witnesses. In sectarian communities, two witnesses are not enough for capital punishment. Yet, the two witnesses as well as three execute the capital sentence in biblical law. In spite of the difference in required number, we witness the sect's endeavor to interpret the biblical stipulation of the “two or three witnesses”.

Baumgarten states that the bulk of the CD laws is not formulated in polemical fashion.⁵⁸⁾ This comment is applicable to the testimony of law in our text. Newsom points out the problem of “sectually explicit” literature from Qumran caves is that it is often not sectually explicit enough.⁵⁹⁾ However, she demands an integrated investigation of the text from the questions of content/rhetoric, of authorship, and of use.

55) Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (Waco: Word, 1986), 470.

56) Deut 19:16-21 shows that only one witness causes to bring a public court. Again, the only one witness is not being applied to the stage of execution but that of thorough inquiry toward final conviction. The previous verse 19:15 is applied to the stages of conviction and execution.

57) Lawrence H. Schiffman, “The Qumran Law”, 607

58) Joseph M. Baumgarten, “The Laws of the *Damascus Document*”, 56.

59) Carol A. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature”, 185.

It would be out of the scope of my paper to expound those questions here. However, the overall “sectually explicit” elements are in order. First, the appearance of specific terminology such as מבקר and הטהרה indicates the sectarian origin of this law. Second, this fact is strengthened by the exclusive regulation of “trustworthy witness”. The witness should be one of the members of the community. Even among the members, the trustworthy witnesses should only be those who are enrolled into the Congregation and qualified for the Purity(הטהרה). Third, the testimony stipulation in the CD 9:16-10:3 as a whole is a piece of communal legislation,⁶⁰⁾ rather than *halakhic* exposition, in which the sectarian life attempts to follow its peculiar way throughout the satellite communities.⁶¹⁾

4. Conclusion

A heated controversy around the number of witness in the CD 9:16-10:3 and its acceptance of only one witness, which is seemingly contradictory to the Torah, have brought me into a scrutiny on the text in debate. Moreover, I have found a more serious issue that the Qumran sect appears to have departed from the tradition of Torah when a prominent scholar like Schiffman concludes that the sect developed its original exegesis and regarded single witness as valid in dealing with capital crimes. This is definitely not the case of the Torah to which the sect is always eager to return (CD 15:12). It impels me to enter into a dialogue with the experts in this regard and to face the text of the CD directly.

The presupposition of the three scholars above (Neusner, Jackson, and Schiffman) that a peculiar way of exegesis of the sect governs the text has directed them into a conclusion: the original development of *halakhic* exposition in the CD 9:16-23. However, I have refuted such conclusion, arguing that the testimony law in the CD still holds the tradition of the biblical law: both the CD and the biblical law maintain the number of witnesses in the execution of a capital case as two or three. Discreet understanding of the various stages of the

60) Charlotte Hempel, *The Law of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition and Redaction* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 99.

61) Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 274.

scriptural law expressed in Deu 17:2-8 gives us a clue to understanding the validity of single witness. In the stage of investigating a criminal charge, the evidence of only one witness along with that of two or three witnesses is effective in both biblical and CD law. The rendering of $\eta\eta\aleph$ instead of $\eta\eta\aleph$ in line 21 and consideration of the sectarian circumstances of the CD production have contributed to reinforcing my discussion.

(투고 일자: 2010. 8. 19, 심사 일자: 2010 9. 5, 게재 확정 일자: 2010. 10. 6)

<Keywords>

CD 9:16-10:3, Damascus Document, Testimony of Witnesses, Deuteronomy 17:4-6, Qumran Sect.

<참고문헌>(References)

- Baumgarten, Joseph M., “The Laws of the *Damascus Document* in Current Research”, Magen Broshi, ed., *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1992, 51-62.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., *Studies in Qumran Law*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., & Schwartz, Daniel R., “Damascus Document (CD): Introduction”, James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation Vol.2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994, 4-58.
- Collins, John J., *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2010.
- Davies, Philip. R., *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the Damascus Document*, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982.
- Davies, Philip. R. & Brooke, George J. & Callaway, Phillip R., *The Complete World of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, London: Thames & Hudson Ltd., 2002.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, Geza Vermes, trans., Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.
- Hempel, Charlotte., *The Law of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition and Redaction*, Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Jackson, Bernard S., “Damascus Document IX,16-23 and Parallels”, *Revue de Qumran* 35 (1978), 445-450.
- Jackson, Bernard S., “*Testes Singulares* in Early Jewish Law and the New Testament”, *Essays in Jewish and Comparative Legal History*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975, 172-201.
- Levine, Baruch A., “Damascus Document IX,17-22: A New Translation and Comments”, *Revue de Qumran* 30 (1973), 195-196.
- Martin, Ralph P., *2 Corinthians*, Waco: Word, 1986.
- Martinez, Florentino Garcia & Barrera, Julio Trebelle, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Wilfred G. E. Watson, trans., Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993.
- Neusner, Jacob, “Damascus Document IX,17-22 and Irrelevant Parallels”, *Revue de Qumran* 35 (1978), 441-444.
- Neusner, Jacob, “‘By the Testimony of Two Witnesses’ in the Damascus

- Document IX,17-22 and in Pharisaic-Rabbinic Law”, *Revue de Qumran* 30 (1973), 197-218.
- Newsom, Carol A., “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran”, William Henry Propp, Baruch Halpern and David Noel Freedman, Winona Lake, eds., *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpretation*, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990, 167-187.
- Qimron, Elisha., “The Text of CDC”, Magen Broshi, ed., *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1992, 9-50.
- Rabinovitch, N. L., “Damascus Document IX,17-22 and Rabbinic Parallels”, *Revue de Qumran* 33 (1977), 113-116.
- Rad, Gerhard von, *Deuteronomy*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., “The Relationship of the Zadokite Fragments to the Temple Scroll”, Joseph Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick, eds., *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery*, Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*, Philadelphia and Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code*, Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., “The Qumran Law of Testimony”, *Revue de Qumran* 32 (1975), 603-612.
- Shanks, Hershel, *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeology Review*, New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Stone, Michael E. & Chazon, Esther G., ed., *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Vanderkam, James C., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Vanderkam, James C. & Flint, Peter, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*, New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002.
- Vermes, Geza, *The Complete Dead Sea Scroll in English*, New York: Penguin

Books, 1998.

Weinfeld, Moshe, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Some Grammatical Features of the Samaritan Pentateuch Hebrew: Comparative Study with the Tiberian Hebrew¹⁾

Hyun-Joon Choi*

1. Preliminary

It was customary to believe that the Samaritans originated from inter-racial marriages of (a mixture of) people who were living in Samaria and other peoples at the time of the Assyrian conquest of Samaria. However, there are a number of theories about the origins of the Samaritans, all of which have in common a tradition which asserts that the cult of Yahweh was originally widespread throughout the land of Israel. Even if this is true, the origin and early history of the Samaritans are quite problematic because their sources are far removed from the events, and because the non-Samaritan sources are told (tell) to be hostile.

The biblical account in 2Ki 17 had long been the decisive source for the formulation of historical accounts of Samaritan origins. Reconsideration of this passage, however, has led to more attention being paid to the Chronicles of the Samaritans themselves. The fullest Samaritan version of its own history became available since the Chronicle (ספר הימים) was published.

Samaritans are related to Judaism in that they accept the Torah as its holy book. They consider themselves to be true followers of the ancient Israelite religious line. The Samaritan tradition maintains that its Torah dates to the time of Moses and that it was copied by Abisha ben Phineas shortly after the

* A Fulltime Lecturer at Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary, Old Testament.

1) In the present paper, I employed the following abbreviations that are frequently used in biblical Hebrew studies: BH=Biblical Hebrew / DSS=Dead Sea Scrolls / MT=Masoretic Text / SA=Samaritan Aramaic / SH=Samaritan Hebrew / SA=Samaritan Aramaic / SP=Samaritan Pentateuch.

Israelites entered the land of Canaan. However, modern literary analysis and criticism do not support this position. In fact, there are two main versions of the Torah: the Jewish version and the Samaritan version, and their contents are almost the same, which can mean that both are derived from the same original.

The Samaritan Pentateuch(SP) is the Samaritan version of the first five books of the Hebrew Bible, which comprise the entire canon of the Samaritan community. Following this, the Samaritans separated themselves and restricted their canon to the first five books of Moses using their own alphabet. In this way the manuscripts they handed down remained independent of the history which led to the massoretic text which is a matter of great interest for textual criticism. A manuscript of the SP was found at Damascus in 1616. It is a popular copy of the original text and contains some 6000 variants. It is possible that the Samaritan Pentateuch came into the hands of the Samaritans as an inheritance from the ten tribes whom they succeeded. However, it is much more probable to conclude that it was introduced by Manasseh at the time of the foundation of the Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerazim (Josephus Ant. 11.8. 2, 4). The Samaritans rejected all the Old Testament except the Pentateuch, and they claimed to have an older copy than the Jews and that they observe the precepts better.

The SP, like that of the Jews, has a fixed pronunciation of the Torah, which is transmitted very carefully by oral teaching from generation to generation. An extant work from the end of the 10th-11th century by the poet Taviya ibn Dartah, so called 'A Canon on the Rules of Reading', deals with the accents used in reading the text of the Pentateuch. The treatise was composed in Arabic, but the Aramaic names of the accents and the Aramaic verse at its close testify to the antiquity of the sources from which it was gleaned.

The purpose of this paper is to learn some characteristic features of the Samaritan Hebrew. Compared to the Tiberian Hebrew, the Samaritan Hebrew has distinctive phonological features, such as gutturals, absence of shewa. Sometimes, the fact that the homonyms with gutturals, which have identical

sounds but different meanings, leads us to difficulties to distinguish between the two words. For instance, רַעַב / רָחַב, we do not know what the word means by the pronunciation (Gen 12:10 *rāb*/ Exo 26:8 *rāb*), but we may only know by the context. The Tiberian tradition, the Babylonian²⁾ and the so-called the Palestinian³⁾ vocalization systems, do not distinguish between vowel quantities, but rather between vowel qualities. The vowel quantity may be surmised and interpreted on the basis of comparative grammatical considerations. The Samaritan vocalization system does not distinguish between vowel quantities either, and so the grammarians did not discuss them, but what their vocalization system undoubtedly aims at expressing is their reading tradition, and this is absolutely uniform and stable in the performance of every modern Samaritan. When the grammarians ascribed seven symbols to the vowels (*u, o, ā, a, e, ə, i*)⁴⁾, they unquestionably included *u* and *o* as single entities. These two vowels did not require separate symbols, since they were mutually exclusive. It is the quantitative difference between *u/o* which shows that vowel quantity was not marked in any way. Therefore, it may be claimed that they were familiar with six vowels.

2. Case Studies

In this section, I will bring up some cases that present the traits of the Samaritan tradition. For convenience, I will group some forms together of which the linguistic characters are analogous.

2) The Babylonian vocalization system is well described in I. Yevin, *מסורת הלשון העברית המשקפת*, בניקוד הבבלי, 2 vol. (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1985), 364f.

3) E. J. Revell, *Hebrew Texts with Palestinian Vocalization* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970), 99-121.

4) It is hard to distinguish the vowels *ā* and *a*. The difference between the vowels *ā* and *a* in SH is the location where the vowel is produced. The vowel *ā* is produced in the lower front part in the mouth and the vowel *a* is produced in the lower rear part in the mouth.

2.1. *guwwəm* (Num 34:24 גוּׁם) / *ṣābuwwəm* (Gen 14:8 צְבוּׁם)
**gūwyim > guwwəm / *ṣawyim > ṣābuwwəm*

In TH, the combination of semi-consonants ʾ and ʿ often lost its consonantal character. Frequently, they merge with a preceding vowel, and the vowels cause them to become a diphthong. When the consonant which is an ascending diphthong comes first, the syllable would be simple like other syllables, whereas the combination would be contracted to a simple vowel (*uw > u*, *iy > i*, etc.) if it comes second. The diphthong persists only when the consonantal elements are geminated. When the vowels are not geminated, then the diphthong contracts into a vowel. If the diphthong should be maintained, it splits into two syllables or geminates its consonantal element, as in the word *yayyən* (for the expected **yām*).⁵⁾ The diphthong of SH tradition, which originally contains long vowel, tends to split into two syllables. For instance, the diphthongs *ūy* and *ōy* become *uwwi*, and *īw* becomes *iyyu*. In the cases above, the diphthong *ūy* became *uwwi*.

In SH, such as the case we have here, the vowels *i*, *u* and another vowel ʾ (derived from gutturals אהח״ע) is substituted by a geminated glide. The vowel *y* after *i* is geminated to *iyy*, and the vowel *w* after *u* is geminated to *uww*, such as *miyyā dām* (Lev 27:28, מִיַּיָּא דָּאֵם), *miyyūlām* (Gen 6:4, מִיַּיֻּלָּאֵם), *ēluwwəm* (< **ēlūim*) (Deu 4:7 הַיִּם הָאֵלֶּיךָ).⁶⁾

2.2. *sādəm* (Deu 32:32 סָדֵם) / *arrefāəm* (Gen 50:2 אֲרֵפְאֵם)

2.2.1. *sādəm* (סָדֵם)

This case shows that the form of SH has a vowel while the equivalent form of TH has shewa. In general, the sign shewa indicates the absence of a vowel,

5) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *עברית וארמית נוסח שומרון על פי תעודות שבכתב ועדות שבעל פה*, 5 vol. (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1957-77), 46-47.

6) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *ibid.*, 26.

however, in TH, there are two types of shewa: the term shewa refers to an ultra-short vowel, which is vocalic or mobile shewa (שווא נע), while the absence of a vowel is termed shewa quiescence (שווא נר). For shewa mobile, it once appeared as a vowel, but in certain times, its vowel was deleted as a consequence of stress shift.⁷⁾

A comparison of SH with TH, BH reveals a decisive difference between them. In other words, the absence of shewa in SH (and in SA as well) is distinctive. Corresponding to the TH shewa, one finds a vowel in SH, as a rule a long vowel in an open syllable and a short one in a closed syllable. Furthermore, SH sometimes possesses a vowel corresponding to the shewa quiescence. For in TH, shewa is a secondary vowel, derived from a full vowel (usually from an originally short vowel) in accordance with the rules of syllabic stress.

It is assumed that the shewa existed at an early stage. It seems that the Hebrew reflected in the Samaritan Hebrew would apparently be of a time prior to what is revealed in the Tiberian Hebrew (and in the biblical Hebrew for that matter), since it is not possible to demonstrate that the Samaritan Hebrew had shewa at an earlier stage⁸⁾. Moreover, the phenomenon considerably antedates the period of Arabic speech among the language of DSS as Ben-Ḥayyim claimed⁹⁾. Yet, it is still difficult to conclude whether the phenomenon of shewa disappearance is earlier or later due to the insufficient phonetic information in the Samaritan Hebrew.

7) P. Joüon & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Roma: Biblical Institute Press, 1996), 50.

8) Cf. J.H. Perterman, *Versuch einer Hebräischen Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der Heutigen Samaritaner* (Leipzig, 1868), 10; T. Nöldeke, "Über Aussprache des Hebräischen bei den Samaritanern", *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gessel. D. Wissenschaften* 23 (1868), 485-5-4. Peterman held an opinion that the absence of shewa in Samaritan Hebrew is original while Nöldeke thought it is late phenomenon.

9) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *עברית וארמית נוסח שומרון על פי תעודות שבכתב ועדות שבעל פה* (Jerusalem: The Academia of the Hebrew Language, 1957-1957), 46-47.

2.2.2. arrefāʾem (Deu 3:13 רָפְאִים)

This case reflects three distinctive characters of SH: a) auxiliary vowel (see, 2.3), b) unfamiliarity with shewa (see 2.2.1), and c) the masculine suffix *-em*. Concerning the masculine suffix *-em*, the vowels *i* and *e*, the distinction between them is not maintained in closed post-tonic syllables, where they both appear as the vowel *ə*; the rule is that a noun or a verb containing an *i* or *e* vowel in any other circumstances shows a shift of that vowel to *ə* in a closed post-tonic syllable, e.g., *bit* (Gen 35:1 בֵּית); *abbət* (Ex 12:4 הַבֵּית); *ger* (Num 9:14 גֵּר); *aggər* (Exo 23:9 הַגֵּר). In addition, words containing the vowel *i* in stressed syllables show a shift of that vowel to *e* when the relevant syllable is no longer stressed, e.g. *dabbər* (Gen 18:19 דָּבַר; cf. Exo 12:32 *dabbertimma*).

2.3. ēmirra (Gen19:24 עִמְרָה)

In TH, the three compound shewas stand especially under the four guttural letters instead of a shewa mobile, since these letters by their nature require a more definite vowel than the indeterminate shewa mobile. Thus, a guttural at the beginning of a syllable, where the shewa is necessarily vocal, can never have mere shewa quiescence. In this stage, a new vowel appears where there was no vowel at all. This auxiliary vowel appears in order to expedite the articulation of the word. This phenomenon is frequent in TH when the first consonant of the cluster is a guttural sound. This phenomenon is applied to SH as well.

In SH, generally, the guttural *ʿ* shifts to *ɛ*, such as *ʿēbīda* (Exo 1:14 עִבְדָּה), *idna* (Gen 18:12 עִדְנָה). When the word opens with historical *ḥ* or *ʿ*, it frequently maintains before the vowels *ā*, *ā*, *ā* *a*, such as *ʿaz* (Gen 49:3 עָז), *ʿamməš* (Exo 26:9 עֲמֹשׁ), etc.¹⁰⁾ There are however few cases, which begin with historical *ʿ* or *ḥ*, that

10) M. Florentine, “הבחנות בין משמעויות שונות וסימוגן באמצעים פונולוגיים בעברית בשומרוני”, A. Dotan and A. Tal, eds., *רובישטיין – הלשון העברית – מחקרים בלשון העברית* (Tel Aviv: University of Tel Aviv Press, 2005), 114-115. The gutturals *ʿ* and *ḥ* in the beginning of the cases Florentine

do not have pronounced ν , e.g. $\overset{\circ}{a}šən$ (Exo 28:30 אֲשֶׁן), $\overset{\circ}{a}d\overset{\circ}{a}š$ (Gen 29:14 אֲדָשׁ), $\overset{\circ}{a}r\overset{\circ}{a}b$ (Deu 13:16 אֲרָב), etc. It is very difficult to explain these exceptions, and to determine the phonological rules. However, as for the case we have here, the ν first consonant is not a historical (in Arabic $\dot{\text{ع}}$), and thus the ν is not remained.

In addition, the ח , which is derived from ע''חחא and ν , which is derived from ע''ח disappear after the prepositions אֶל and לְ , and after waw copulative. And the ν survives after the definite article הַ and in Hifil verbs, such as *baš* (Num 13:33 בָּשׁ), *waf* (Lev 26:39 וָפ), *wad* (Gen 19:4 וָד), etc.

2.4. afšēbī (Gen 14:5 אֲפִשְׁבִּי)

This case reflects the following facts: a) The vowel appears before the consonant when the word comes with the prepositions אֶל , לְ , and מִן (as participle), e.g. *abyom* (Lev 5:24 אֲבִיּוֹם). But the rule cannot be applied to every similar case. Sometimes the vowel appears after the consonant, e.g. *bāmūšī* (Num 12:8 בָּמֹשֶׁי). It is determined according to the formation of the word, yet we may learn some rules concerning this matter. When the preposition אֶל occurs before ב , מ , or פ , the vowel always follows the vowel of the consonant. And a word, which followed by אֶל or לְ , and has an initial guttural consonant, the אֶל or לְ has no vowel at all, e.g. *bisdāk* (<*biʾisdāk; Exo 15:13 בִּסְדָּק), *bišba* (<*biʾišba; Exo 31:18 בִּישְׁבַּע).

b) The second issue in this case is the pronunciation of בדו״ת . There were two types of pronunciation for these consonants, which are hard and soft, whereas today בדו״ת are always hard and the פ is always soft (Arabic influence). This rule does not contradict the fact that an original plosive פ can be produced like the ב (plosive). It may testify to the fact that the plosive פ is no longer in existence. It should also be mentioned that the fricative pronunciation of ר which is identical with fricative pronunciation of ב /v/, has not been lost. And the semi-

presented are being unmatched with the cases that are presented by Ben-Hayyim. It seems that Florentine has transliterated those forms mistakenly.

consonant ו occurs today under limited, defined conditions. The case we have here (*afšēbi*) implies that the present remains of the early conditions are the shift of fricative ב to fricative פ in the preposition ב, i.e., **av* > *af*. For instance, *afqā^o rāt* (Lev 19:20 בִּקְרַת), *afšilā* (Num 6:19 בְּשִׁלָּה), etc.

2.5. םidma (Gen 14:2 אֲדָמָה)

Concerning the case of םidma here, the ם of the proper noun in local connotation (occurred 3 times in the Samaritan Pentateuch) regarded as a part of the root. The vowel of the ם in nouns in the SH is usually *a* or *i*. The difference does not parallel between ם with pataḥ and ם with segol in the TH (the vowel *i* is more common). In nouns written with ם in the SH, the vowel *a* is prevalent, although the vowel *i* can also be found as the case here.

In the TH, the distinction between the feminine ending ם and the same ending indicating direction toward an aim is marked by the placement of stress. When the ending is accented, it is a feminine marker, and when it is not accented, it indicates He-locale. However, this distinction is not applied to the SH, since the stress is on penultimate syllable in the SH. Thus, one can deny the comprehension of the Samaritans on the function of -a ending.¹¹⁾

2.6. wtē'dāl (Gen 14:9 וְתִדְעַל)

*tid^{ac}al > wtē'dāl

The biblical stress on the Jewish tradition is precisely given only in the TH. In the TH, the stress mostly tends towards the end of the word (the ultimate stress, and less frequently comes on penultimate stress), whereas the SH has the stress mostly on the penultimate syllable (and less frequently on the ultimate syllable).

11) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, עאניש, 5 vol., 274. Like an instance *lila* לילה which is cognate by Arabic لَيْلَة, the Samaritans may understand it as a feminine noun in morphological point of view. One can conclude only on the basis of syntax.

The case we have here belongs to the latter group of the SH, since its stress is on the ultimate syllable. When we see all the words, which are stressed on the penultimate syllable in the SH, most of the forms have gutturals in the second or third radical. In some types of nouns, mostly feminine forms, e.g. *rēbūt* (Num 15:5 רֶבִיעִית, *qārāttu* (Lev 13:42 קָרַחַת), etc., it is evident that the stress on the ultimate syllable results from the reduction of the last two syllables into one through the elimination of the consonant separating their vowels at an early stage of development. Ben-Ḥayyim has claimed that the Samaritan Hebrew had stresses on the ultimate syllable in the early stage since the ultimate syllable was derived from diphthong of the two last syllables, then it was contracted to a single syllable.¹²⁾ According to him, it would seem that in the earlier stage, the forms (the ultimate stress results from the reduction of two syllables to one, such as **tūlāʾāt*, *ēlāʾāt*, **bāliyiʿl*) were originally stressed on their penultimate syllables. If we grant Ben-Ḥayyim's assumption, one can explain that the position of the stress in the SH results from stress recession from the ultimate to the penultimate syllable.¹³⁾

Blau remarked that the large number of explanations and the constant need for new solutions testify to the uncertainty surrounding the question of the development of the stress in the TH.¹⁴⁾ Bauer (& Leander)¹⁵⁾ and Bergsträsser¹⁶⁾

12) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *עצמני*, 5 vol., 219.

13) This explanation is based on these assumptions: a) existence of shewa in the stage prior to the SH, and its various transformations and consequences in the SH; b) the splitting of the diphthongs clearly demonstrating that the basic form of the split had ultimate stress (*nāṭīy* > *nāṭūwī* טוּי); c) a shift of vowels in the inflection of verbs known in the TH as involving stress (Philippi's law).

14) J. Blau, "Notes on Changes in Accent in Early Hebrew", S. Abramson and A. Mirsky, eds., *ספר חיים שירמן* (Jerusalem: Schocken. Institute for Jewish Research of the JTSA, 1970), 27.

15) H. Bauer & P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testamentes* (Halle, 1922), 275f.

16) G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1918), 116.

each assume two early stages preceding that of the TH; similarly, they each assume that one of these two stages is identical with the stress in literary Arabic. However, the very assumption of a stage equivalent to the stress in literary Arabic seems not plausible, since the Arabic stress has no phonological significance and that no distinctions are made on the basis of this stress, whereas in the TH, the very opposite is the case - vowel quantity being insignificant in TH, but stress decisive. They differ from one another in that Bauer & Leander make considerable use of the force of analogy to explain away features which would seem to contradict their basic assumptions, whereas Bergsträsser prefers a consistent phonological reconstruction, thus creating an extremely complex structure focused around morphological distinctions: nouns and suffixed verbs take one form of stress, whereas unsuffixed verbs and construct nominal forms take other kinds.

2.7. wyā[◌]i (Gen 1:19 יְהִי) / wyiṣṣā (Lev 14:3 נִצַּח)

2.7.1. wyā[◌]i (יְהִי) (Shortened Imperfect Qal)

In the TH, there are six verbal forms: perfect, converted perfect, imperfect, converted imperfect, jussive, and cohortative. These cases here (shortened imperfect Qal) have their individual character and syntactic, semantic distinctions. However, the system does not exist in every verb class and every stem. A waw preceding a measurable verbal form may have various semantic values. Probably, the Samaritans were not unaware, then that the reversal of the perfect and imperfect tenses of their own time appears in the SP mostly in forms with the conjunctive waw. In the SH, as in the second column of Origen's Hexapla, there was no morphological distinction between waw consecutive and waw conjunctive. The regulation of penultimate stress caused the forms to be

identical such as וַיִּלְךְ / וַיִּלְךְ, thus in the SH, there is no difference between waw consecutive and waw conjunctive.¹⁷⁾

The Hebrew reflected in the Samaritan tradition of recitation of the Pentateuch has its origins in the language of the late Second Temple period and the first generations thereafter.¹⁸⁾ As far as we ascertain from other sources, the converted perfect, the converted imperfect, and the lengthened and shortened forms of imperfect (cohortative and jussive) were not used in the living language of the time, and it can reasonably be assumed that awareness of these forms had disappeared even among educated speakers. Where no morphological difference remained, the Samaritans, reading the Pentateuch, understood the biblical forms in accord with the usage of their own day. Thus, the Samaritan grammarians stated that “in a minority of cases, the perfect forms indicate future occasion” (e.g. *barriktāni*, Gen 32:27 בַּרְכָּתָנִי), and the perfect with waw “normally indicates past time” (such as *yēkassiyāmu* Ex 15:5 יִכְסִימוּ), and as for imperfect with waw, “the waw shifts the meaning from the future to the past”.¹⁹⁾

Phonological processes originally caused distinct forms to be conflated in the TH. Thus, in place of the forms *yaqtulu*, *yaqtula*, and *yaqtul*, Hebrew has the single form יִפְעַל, which must bear all shades of meaning and usage of the Arabic forms. Additional phonological processes acted in the SH in later generations, bringing about further unification of forms that has been distinct in the TH. For instance, the rule that a long *ī* vowel becomes *e* (ə) in a closed, unaccented syllable caused the loss of the morphological distinction between such forms as וַיִּקְרֵיב and וַיִּקְרַב in the TH: both become *wyaqrəb* when the stress moves back to the penult in the SH. One sometimes finds *šere* in place of *hireq* in the TH as

17) M. Florentine, *ibid.*, 118.

18) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *שׂאנ״ש*, 5 vol., 170.

19) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, *שׂאנ״ש*, 1 vol., 67.

well such as Ex 19:3 וַתִּגַּד (cf. SH *wtagged*), although the TH distinguishes between imperfect and converted imperfect.

2.7.2. wyiṣṣā (ויצא)

In וי, the converted imperfect can be distinguished from the regular imperfect by vowel pattern, e.g., *wālād* (Gen 19:37 וַתֵּלֶד) / *tēlād* (Lev 12:5 תֵּלֶד), etc. The forms with preformative *y* can be explained as the perfect with the addition of the conjugation *y*. But this understanding of the verbs is inappropriate to the imperfect with *u*, *o* or *o* as the preformative vowel, such as *wāšābu* (Deu 1:45, 46 וַתֵּשְׁבוּ) or *wāminna* (Gen 30:38 וַיִּחְמְנָה). Thus, we can state with certainty that the preformative vowel *ā* is derived from an ancient *a* vowel, as in the Ugaritic verb *ʿard*. Furthermore, the imperfect preformative vowel *e* (*šere* in TH) can be explained only as the product of assimilation to the vowel of the second radical.²⁰⁾ Originally, forms with *a* and forms with *i* > *e* coexisted at random in Hebrew; the Samaritan tradition utilized the two possibilities to create a semantic distinction. In some verbs, such as *šab*, the converted imperfect differs from the regular imperfect not only in the vowels, but in the consonants as well: *wāšāb* = TH וַתֵּשֶׁב (cf. *tiššāb*, Lev 12:4 תֵּשֶׁב). But this rule does not apply to the case of the verb *יצא* we have here, where we find *wyiṣṣā* (Gen 19:14 וַיִּצְא): *yīṣṣā* (Deu 24:5 יִצְא); *wyiṣṣāu* (Deu 21:2 וַיִּצְאוּ), etc.

2.8. qarnəm (Gen 14:5 קרנים)

*qarnayim > *qarnēm > qarnəm

There are three forms of grammatical number: singular, dual, and plural. The singular bears no particular number marker. Secondly, the dual form is marked by the suffix *-ayim* added generally to the singular form (e.g. Lev 11:42 רַגְלַיִם,

20) Z. Ben-Hayyim, *עצמי*, 5 vol., 173.

Exo 25:23 אֲמָתִים, etc.), although on occasion it occurs with the base form of the plural (e.g. Jer 52:7 חוֹמוֹתַיִם, Eze 27:5 לוֹחוֹתַיִם, etc.). The masculine plural carries the suffix ים- and the feminine plural וֹת-, although it must be recalled that the וֹת- suffix is frequently used for masculine nouns as well (e.g. Jdg 3:2 דוֹרוֹת, 1Sa 12:17 קוֹלוֹת, Exo 34:7 אֲבוֹת, etc.), and that ים- is also used as the plural marker for feminine nouns (e.g. Gen 5:6 שָׁנִים, Neh 9:28 עֲתִים, Exo 29:2 חֲטִים, etc.). And this phenomenon is also attested in the DSS.²¹⁾

The dual form of the SH is usually only a matter of morphology, and no longer delivers the semantic function of expressing duality. However, it seems implausible to me that it can be the same function that was expressing duality in biblical Hebrew or early stage Hebrew.

Furthermore, we found many dual nouns that are expressing the pair of body e.g. Lev 11:42 רְגָלַיִם, Gen 34:21 גְּדֵיִם, Job 41:12 מְחִירָיו*(מְחִירָיִם), Exo 25:20 כְּנָפַיִם, Deu 28:65 עֵינַיִם, etc, although sometimes the dual forms express a number of objects bigger than two such as Lev 11:23 אַרְבַּע רְגָלַיִם. It alludes that the semantic function of the suffix fell into disuse. The orthography of the SP spelling does not differ in this respect from the Jewish Pentateuch, but the Samaritan pronunciation reflects a stage of Hebrew that has taken a further step toward the elimination of the dual form.

The dual and plural suffixes *-ayim* and *-īm* have been contracted from diphthong, and both become *-am* or *-īm* where there is ultimate stress. The medieval Samaritan grammarians have remarked that it is indicated by insert of

21) This phenomenon is attested also in the DSS. E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta Georgia: Scholars Press, 1986), 67. He remarked that, in the DSS, the masculine plural suffix ים- appears in the place of feminine plural nouns such as שָׁנִים. More frequently, the feminine plural suffix וֹת- appeared in the place of masculine plural nouns, such as מְגִדְלוֹת / מְגִדְלִים (which is already attested in BH). In the post-biblical Hebrew, the difference of the suffixes וֹת-/ים- became only a matter of style.

a soft letter between the yod of the plural and the letter preceding it.²²⁾ Here, one might question whether in the SH the origin of dual suffix is attached to the noun only in its singular form or whether it also attaches to the plural form. I think that the answer cannot be given decisively.

As a general rule, the SH was not familiar with shewa, thus in dual forms the vowel comes in the first and second radicals. However, as for the case we have here, there is no vowel between the first and second radicals. The form קַרְנִים in the toponym Jdg 14:5 עֲשֶׂתְרוֹת קַרְנִים is pronounced *qarnəm*, with no vowel between ר and נ. And it is well known that names tend to preserve their earlier form. Especially in this case, it happened before the invention of shewa mobile.

2.9. ׀at (Gen 1:1 אַת)

The case we have here is a preposition of monosyllable. This case leads us to question whether Philippi's law is applied in the SH.

The shift of vowel *i* to *a* in a closed, stressed syllable is known as Philippi's law in Hebrew. It has been highly disputed among the Semitic linguists. Many other scholars have been endeavoring to determine the law in phonological and morphological perspectives.²³⁾ When we deal with this regulation, we are required to examine other Semitic languages as well. According to Philippi's

22) Z. Ben-Hayyim, *אֲנִיִּשׁ*, 1, 5 vols., 180. The Samaritan grammarians, the high priests Elieser, Pinḥas, and Yoseph have explained: “להוציא את השם הפרטי. ריבוי. כל שם עצם יש לו ריבוי וזוגי, להוציא את השם הפרטי. ריבוי ... כל שם עצם יש לו ריבוי וזוגי, להוציא את השם הפרטי. ריבוי. ריבוי, כגון אלפים, שנתים ... הזכר (מובע) על ידי תוספת יו"ד הריבוי, כגון אלפים, שנתים ...” which is translated as “every noun has dual and plural form except pronoun. The masculine plural is expressed by addition yod...”

23) There are plenty of articles on Philippi's law, but main discussions are made in the following articles: J. Blau, “On Pausal Lengthening, Pausal Stress Shift, Philippi's Law and Rule Ordering in Biblical Hebrew”, *Hebrew Annual Review* 5 (1981), 1-13; F. R. Blake, “The Apparent Interchange between *a* and *i* in Hebrew”, *JNES* 9 (1950), 152-158; E. Qimron, “חילופי צירי / פתח בעברית המקראית”, *Leshonenu*, 50 (1985), 77-102; E. Qimron, “הוספות למאמר 'חילופי צירי / פתח בעברית מקראית'”, *Leshonenu*, 50 (1985), 247-249. Especially Qimron's work is notable since he gives us not only general perspective on the law but makes new suggestions on the law. Moreover, he presents comparative analysis of different Hebrew traditions.

law, generally the vowel *i* behaves in several different ways: a) it remains in a closed, unstressed syllable.²⁴⁾ b) it becomes *şere* in a closed, stressed syllable; in an open syllable neighboring to the stressed syllable; or in an open, stressed syllable.²⁵⁾ c) it becomes *pataḥ* in a closed, stressed syllable, and in pause, it becomes *qameṣ*.²⁶⁾ d) Finally, it becomes *shewa* in an open syllable adjacent to the stressed syllable.²⁷⁾

P. Joüon (& T. Muraoka) claimed that while the vowel *i* in all closed and stressed syllables becomes *a* according to the Babylonian tradition²⁸⁾, in the Tiberian tradition, the vowel *i* shifts to *a* only when the vowel is in the first closed and stressed syllable.²⁹⁾ However, for E. Qimron, Philippi's law occurs in both syllables (penultimate syllable and ultimate syllable) not just in the verb system (mainly) of the Tiberian and Babylonian tradition,³⁰⁾ but also in nouns and pronouns. If Qimron's assumption is correct, there were two types of *şere*; one is long and the other is short. The long *şere* can remain while short *şere* shifts to *pataḥ*.

Sometimes we found *segol* in the Hexapla³¹⁾ where *pataḥ* is found in Piel and Hifil of other Hebrew traditions such as the Tiberian and Babylonian traditions. In other words, the Hexapla was not familiar with the tradition that has a phonological interchange *i/a*. It seems that it is not a chronological issue rather a

24) For instance, לָבִי, בָּתוּ, יָתֵן, etc.

25) For instance, יָשָׁב, גָּב, צָלַע, לָבַב, יָתֵנוּ, יָדָבֵר, etc.

26) For instance, בָּת, חֲפָצָת, etc.

27) For instance, חֲמֹר, יָשָׁבוּ, יָדָבֵרוּ, etc.

28) In Babylonian sign “” stands for *pataḥ* and *segol*.

29) P. Joüon & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1994), § 29 c-d.

30) E. Qimron, חֲמֹר, 87, 96. He remarked that there is greater number of cases with *pataḥ* in the Babylonian tradition against cases with *şere* in the Tiberian tradition. Cf. F. R. Blake, *ibid*, 77.

31) Although it is in on-going dispute, it is worth to mention that we also found *segol* in the Septuagint, Hyronimus's Latin version against *pataḥ* of the Tiberian tradition.

dialectal question. It is plausible that the reason for the unmatched vowels between the Hexapla and other Tiberian tradition is that Origen's Hexapla only exhibits the Hebrew tradition that was not familiar with Philippi's law.³²⁾ Therefore, Qimron claimed that the vowel interchange *i/a* reflects a simple morph-phonemic variation than forms of different origins.³³⁾ Moreover, in the DSS, it seems that Philippi's law did not occur since short vowels *e* and *a* were not applied as *matres lectionis*.

Concerning Philippi's law in the SH, Ben-Ḥayyim claimed that the vowel *i* in the SH can remain, or shift to *e*, *a*, *ā*, but can never change to *shewa*.³⁴⁾ For him, Philippi's law has been applied in the Samaritan Hebrew except one single case, *qen* (Deu 22:6 קַן) / *qinnāk* (Num 24:21 קִנָּא).³⁵⁾ However, his assumption is not convincing, since he did not bring enough examples to prove the existence of the law. Furthermore, he disregarded the cases to which the rule did not apply. (was disregarded from the cases that the rule did not apply.) Even if Ben-

32) E. Qimron, חילוף, 88-89. He presents three reasons which have been claimed by scholars: a) the rule is early, however the analogy that compares the pausals and the normals has occurred in different ways in different traditions. Thus, in the Babylonian tradition, there are increased normal forms with the vowel *a*, while the vowel *e* was increased in the Hexapla transliteration, the Samaritan Hebrew, and the Palestinian tradition. b) Maybe, the rule (*i>a*) has occurred after Origen's Hexapla so that we cannot discern any trace of the rule in the Hexapla transliteration. However, as E. Qimron claimed, this assumption does not make sense well since Origen would not have known the Hebrew form if the rule has occurred later than the Hebrew that was already not spoken. c) Rather, this assumption would seem to be plausible, truly if it is a dialectal issue. Probably, it is presenting the dialectal differences among the ancient Hebrew traditions. Origen's Hexapla transliteration is reflecting the dialect in which the rule does not occur.

33) E. Qimron, חילוף, 99.

34) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, שעניי, 5 vol., 57.

35) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, שעניי, 5 vol., 79; F.R. Blake, *ibid.*, 81-82. Ben Ḥayyim has found only one case of exception that Philippi's law did not occur in the Tiberian tradition, but Blake found more exceptional cases including verbal forms. He remarked that the vowel *i* before consonant in the final syllable of the word is preserved, e.g. *ʾēm* < *ʾimm* (Exo 2:8 אֵם); *qēn* < *qinn* (Deu 22:6 קַן); *sēl* < *sill* (Gen 19:8 סֵל), etc.

Ḥayyim has presented cases as evidence, most of them are with one syllable of ultimate stress to which the law cannot be applied. Thus, we can not grant the existence of Philippi's law in the SH.

2.10. šinniyār (Gen 10:10 שִׁנְיָאֵר) / ʾālāsār (Gen 14:1 אֱלֶאֶסָר)

/ʿāšu (Exo 1:17 אֲשֻׁ)

These are cases leading us to study the behavior sibilants in the Samaritan Hebrew. It is generally accepted that the distinction between $\psi(\š)$ and $\psi(\ś)$ in the Tiberian tradition originates from the use of the letter *s* for two sounds in ancient Hebrew. Ben-Ḥayyim assumed that the two sounds were independent consonants ($\š$, $\ś$), i.e., each was a separate phoneme, judged by both comparative grammar and Hebrew phonological considerations.³⁶⁾ However, the studies in Semitic languages in general makes it apparent (is apparent to a fact) that in the Hebrew alphabet $\ś$ is the only phoneme marked polyphonically rather than by a special letter, and that the Hebrew alphabet stems from a language in which $\š$ and $\ś$ have merged, presumably to $\š$. And comparison with other Semitic languages clearly demonstrates the genuine character of the differentiation between $\š$ and $\ś$ in Hebrew, respectably, unlike the SH (both as $\š$)³⁷⁾, and establishes the separate existence of $\ś$, which is different from the Proto-Semitic $\ś$ and *s*. Since the Hebrew did not append new letters to the accepted alphabet, rather they used $\š$ polyphonically, for both $\š$ and $\ś$. Therefore, ψ , the letter marking $\š$ was chosen to present $\ś$.³⁸⁾

Concerning letters ψ and ν , it seems less plausible that the shift of ψ to ν in Aramaic led some scholars to consider Aramaic as the source of the

36) Z. Ben-Ḥayyim, שִׁנְיָאֵר, 5 vol., 23.

37) The consonantal shift $\ś > \š$ cause the forms to be identical, e.g. $\šāma/\šāmā$ שָׂמַע / שָׂמָה.

38) G. Bergsträsser, *ibid.*, 48.

development in Hebrew.³⁹⁾ Unlike Aramaic, in the SH, the sound ψ became \check{s} , and never found such a change from \acute{s} to s (samekh).⁴⁰⁾ The interchange between \acute{s} and s can be found in the pronunciation of the Hebrew in various Jewish communities.⁴¹⁾ However, in the SH, there is only a single sound \check{s} corresponding to the letter ψ . The Samaritans carefully distinguished between \check{s} ($< \acute{s}$) of the SH and s ($< \acute{s}$) of the SA. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the shift of $\acute{s} > \check{s}$ had already existed before it became under the influence of Aramaic for the sound \acute{s} had survived until the SA speech became dominant.

Additionally, it seems probable that in Qumran Hebrew, there were no more than two voiceless non-emphatic sibilants: \check{s} and s . The orthography does not reflect the phonetic values accurately because ψ is used for \check{s} and s (whose origin is Proto-Semitic \acute{s}) and ϑ is used for s (whose origin is Proto-Semitic s and only rarely \acute{s}).

3. Conclusion

When we evaluate the type of Hebrew in the contemporary Samaritan reading of the Pentateuch, we are required to ask the following question: To what extent is the contemporary SH an authentic reflection of the language when it was a living reality? In the process of describing and discussing the development of the SH under various grammatical explanations, we learned several distinctive facts (although I could not bring up all the grammatical issues of the SH): a) the shewa does not exist in this dialect, which takes important role in the Jewish Hebrew grammar. There is no vestige of this in the Samaritan grammar, b) there is only one ψ , pronounced \check{s} like the same letter in the Tiberian tradition, c) the

39) E. Ben Yehuda, *Thesaurus Totius Hebraeitis et Veteris et Recentioris* (Jerusalem, 1908-1959), 14 vol., 6777.

40) Z. Ben-Hayyim, “ישנם גם חדשים מן צפוני מדבר יהודה”, *Leshonenu* 42 (1978), 285.

41) “Hebrew Grammar”, *Encyclopedia Judaica* (New York, 1971), cols. 85-86.

guttural sounds behave in a special way. Verbs with these consonants are considered defective verbs. There is a difference between \aleph and η on the one hand, and η and γ on the other. The former being described as defective guttural letters, and the latter as sound guttural letters.

In addition, this study can contribute to a better translation of the Hebrew Bible. Translating the Hebrew Bible involves various grammatical considerations. Generally, the grammatical considerations take place based on the masoretic text, which is relatively a late development. However, we should remember that there are other Hebrew traditions of the OT, which are earlier than the Masora, such as the Babylonian, the Samaritan, and Origen's Hexaplaric traditions. Translating or interpreting the Hebrew Bible, we should take those different Hebrew traditions into consideration. Comparing different traditions, I believe, can contribute to discovering the significant grammatical differences that diversify the semantic aspects of the Hebrew Bible.

(투고 일자: 2010. 7. 30, 심사 일자: 2010. 9. 13, 게재 확정 일자: 2010. 9. 13)

<Keywords>

Samaritan Hebrew, Tiberian Hebrew, Babylonian Hebrew, Samaritan Pentateuch, Vocalization System.

<References>

- Bauer H. & P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testamentes*, Halle, 1922.
- Ben-Ḥayyim, Z., *עברית וארמית נוסח שומרון על פי תעודות שבכתב ועדות שבעל פה*, 5 Vols., Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1957-1977.
- Ben-Ḥayyim, Z., “ישנם גם חדשים מן צפוני מדבר יהודה”, *Leshonenu* 42 (1978), 278-293.
- Ben-Ḥayyim, Z., “בשולי ״חוק פיליפי״”, *Leshonenu* 53 (1987), 113-120.
- Ben Yehuda, E., *Thesaurus Totius Hebraitis et Veteris et Recentioris*, Jerusalem, 1908-1959.
- Bergsträsser, G., *Hebräische Grammatik*, 2 Vols., Leipzig, 1918-1929.
- Blake, F. R., “The Apparent Interchange between *a* and *i* in Hebrew”, *JNES* 9 (1950), 152-158.
- Blau, J., “On Pausal Lengthening, Pausal Stress Shift, Philippi’s Law and Rule Ordering in Biblical Hebrew”, *Hebrew Annual Review* 5 (1981), 1-13.
- Blau, J., “Notes on Changes in Accent in Early Hebrew”, S. Abramson and A. Mirsky, eds., *ספר חיים שירמן*, Jerusalem, 1970, 27-38.
- Florentine, M., “הבחנות בין משמעויות שונות וסימונן באמצעים פונולוגים בעברית בשומרוני”, A. Dotan and A. Tal, eds., *ספר זיכרון לאליעזר מחקרים בלשון העברית - רובינשטיין*, Tel Aviv: University of Tel Aviv, 1995, 107-116.
- Joüon P., & Muraoka, S. J. T., *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, 2 Vols., Roma: Biblical Institute Press, 1991.
- Qimron, E., “חילופי צירי / פתח בעברית מקראית”, *Leshonenu* 50 (1985), 77-102.
- Qimron, E., “הוספות למאמר ״חילופי צירי / פתח בעברית מקראית״”, *Leshonenu* 50 (1985), 247-249.
- Qimron, E., “חילופי צירי / פתח ו״חוק פיליפי״”, *Leshonenu* 56 (1991), 111-115.
- Qimron, E., *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Atlanta Georgia: Scholars Press, 1986.

Revell, E. J., *Hebrew Texts with Palestinian Vocalization*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.

Yevin, I., *מסורת הלשון העברית המשקפת בניקוד הבבלי*, 2 Vols., Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 1985.

<Abstract>

The Works of Their Hands: Man-made Things in the Bible

(Ray Pritz, New York: United Bible Societies, 2009)

Jun-Hyun Kim
(Luther University/Seminary)

More than five hundreds articles, which humans invented, appear in the Bible. The words used to refer to these inventions has proved challenging when translators have tried to come up with appropriate equivalents in their mother languages. The author, Ray Pritz, claims that the reason is: “raw materials vary widely, physical conditions may dictate different solutions to a common problem, and technology can differ greatly from one region to another and from one era to another.” A word which was in use in the time of Bible may no longer be in use in the present day or may require a long explanation. Such cases cause problems for the translators.

Trying to solve these difficulties is the central motif for this book. This is also indicated by the subtitle, “HELPS FOR TRANSLATORS” however this book is not like other books which have only one subject. Unfortunately, the author has to deal with more than five hundred articles so the form of this book is more like a dictionary, but has many features dissimilar to a dictionary. If it was a dictionary, than the book may have a different shape so that words were listed in alphabetical order or simply provide a definition of a word etc. But Ray Pritz categorizes the human-made articles into ten groups: 1. Occupations, 2. Warfare, 3. Buildings and Structures, 4. Religion, 5. Household, 6. Clothing, 7. Music, 8. Transportation, 9. Food and Drink, 10. Personal. Each group is a chapter in the book. Depending on the different types, each chapter is divided into smaller, more detailed groups. Thus, this book is classified into about 430 lists. Each article usually has 4 sections which are “References”, “Description”, “Usage”, and “Translation”. In some cases “Description” and “Usage” are combined. The author has consulted 30 different Bible versions in English, German, Italian, French, and Spanish.

Most articles have either an illustration or a picture which helps to explain the

objects. The pictures are taken from archaeological excavations. “Translation” sections are the most important part of the book and would be the most useful help for the translators because Ray Pritz gives a guide or a suggestion about the real meaning of the word in the Bible and how translators stay true to the meaning when transferred into their own languages. There are three suggestions: first, “borrow a word from a regional or trade language”. Second, “expand the translation somewhat to describe the object or its function”. Third, replace a word “when objects are used figuratively”. These suggestions are not the only solutions for the translation itself, but will be a useful guide for translators.

The Bible was written in Hebrew and Greek so it has to be translated into regional languages. From this perspective, this book is very helpful and useful to those who have a knowledge of the Bible at only a surface level; and are not so familiar with the history of Israel; and are not acquainted with Hebrew and Greek. Knowing the precise meaning of a word in the Bible is very important because it will directly influence the process of exegesis. If someone misunderstood a word and kept using that word incorrectly, then it may pose a challenge to the mores of Christian faith. Because of this, when translating a word, a scholar has to keep at once the biblical meaning and also be concerned about the interest of modern regional readers. It is a great task and yet also a huge burden. Especially, in the Korean context, the task is even more difficult because many Korean words come from Koreanized-Chinese characters. These words have been used over many generations. Most Koreans do not recognize this fact. It will be a big challenge for translators. Thus, translators who will translate this book need to be concerned not only to translate but also to do so in a way that adequately explains a word’s meaning and function in the Korean context.

<Abstract>

**Book Review- *Politeness and Addressee Honorifics*
*in Bible Translation***

(Ji-Youn Cho, UBS Monograph Series, No. 11;
Oxford: Marston Books Service, 2009)

Prof. Jayhoon Yang
(Hyupsung University)

The act of translation is not a simple word exchange process from one language to another but quite a complicated hermeneutic work which lots of cultural, ideological, linguistic theoretical and pragmatic elements are involved. This book presents a theoretical framework that gives an insight of this question to the reader. It deals with the question of addressee honorifics (AH) in Bible translation; how do we translate the Greek Bible that has no AH into another language where AH play quite an important role. It aims at providing a theoretical framework to solve this problem in Bible translation.

This monograph consists of six chapters with an introduction and appendix. It begins with the complicated AH system in Korean language. It surveys the trend of the AH system in diachronic manner by examining the honorific of the second person pronoun (HSPP) and honorific verb ending (HVE) in Korean language. It suggests six HVE forms of P, Y, O, T, N, E according to the formality and deference degree from the highest to lowest. It also presents various kinds of HSPP in the same way to the HSPP. It states that the interlocutors are influenced by five elements such as age, relative status, gender, degree of familiarity and formality of situation, all of which are closely inter-related to each other.

This book introduces and reviews some theories of politeness scholars such as Brown, Gilman, Lakoff, Levinson and Leech, and suggests five elements of politeness evaluation which are crucial in selecting the AH: situation of the dialogue, social factors of the interlocutors, cultural expectations, the speaker's assumptions about the addressee and paralinguistic politeness. The next chapter surveys some translation theories such as literal translation, dynamic

equivalence, and skopos theory. This monograph supports the skopos theory by criticizing that the former theories are more or less neglecting the audiences' area in translation process, and that the skopos theory is the most suitable for the AH translation as it acknowledges the receptor's situations.

The following two chapters are dealing with the translation of Sanhedrin scene in Mark's gospel as a sample of applying the AH translation frame suggested above. It firstly critically surveys the history of translation of this passage in the Korean Bibles from Ross' *Corean New Testament* of 1887 to the *Revised New Korean Standard Version* of 2001. It then examines this passage very closely through the AH framework and suggests a new translation.