

Journal of Biblical Text Research. Vol. 33.

Published Semiannually by

The Institute for Biblical Text Research of the Korean Bible Society; October 2013

Table of Contents

• Paper •

- [Kor.] A Study on Tripartite Nominal Sentences in Biblical Hebrew
----- Sung-Dal Kwon / 7
- [Kor.] The Problem in the Korean Translation of “What shall I do to obtain eternal life?”
(Mt 19:16; Mk 10:17; Lk 18:18; 10:25) ----- Jeongsoo Park / 34
- [Kor.] Textual-Critical Observations on Recently Published Oxyrhynchus NT Papyri
: P119, P120, P121, and P122 ----- Kyoung Shik Min / 54
- [Kor.] Features of Bible translations in Mongolic languages in comparison with Korean Bible
translations ----- Youngcherl Lee / 77
- [Eng.] Translation: A Selected Survey of Contemporary Approaches as Related to Bible
Translation ----- Esteban Voth / 95
- [Eng.] A Presentation of 4QLXXNum in Comparison with the LXX and MT
----- Koot van Wyk / 114

• Translation Note •

- [Kor.] The New Suggestions for Translation about Revelation 1:14a & 21:3
----- Jae-Woog Bae / 139
- [Kor.] The Honorification of ‘the Glory of YHWH’ in Ezekiel -- Dong-Hyuk Kim / 147

• Translated Paper •

- [Kor.] “‘When did we see you ... ?’ Translating Rhetorical Questions”
----- Paul Ellingworth (Dal Lee, trans.) / 155

• Book Review •

- [Kor.] *Each According to Its Kind: Plants and Trees in the Bible* (Robert Koops, Reading:
United Bible Societies, 2012) ----- Hee Suk Kim / 168

<Abstract>

A Study on Tripartite Nominal Sentences in Biblical Hebrew

Prof. Sung-Dal Kwon

(Westminster Graduate School of Theology)

Tripartite nominal sentences in Biblical Hebrew refer to those verbless nominal sentences that include a third constituent (usually a 3rd person pronoun or a demonstrative) in addition to a subject and a predicate. In the realm of Biblical Hebrew linguistics, the past 100 years have seen constant research on nominal sentences, and especially there are still differences among views of tripartite nominal sentences. At the center of the controversy lies the question of what the identity and roles of the third element other than the subject and the predicate, that is to say the third person pronoun or the demonstrative (let's call this third element special pronoun) are in tripartite nominal sentences.

The first task of this study is to explicate whether the special pronoun in tripartite nominal sentences is a copula, and the second is to investigate what its identity and roles are if it is not a copula.

In order to grasp the identity and role of tripartite nominal sentences in Biblical Hebrew, this study attempts at systematic and critical research on the basis of precise and diverse statistical data (our data was based on 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 1 Chronicles, and 2 Chronicles). The results clarified that the special pronoun in tripartite nominal sentences cannot be a copula. This is because tripartite nominal sentences cannot be regarded as having the same properties as bipartite nominal sentences as the two are too different in many respects. It is also confirmed, as a result of this study, that views that regard the structure of tripartite nominal sentences as extraposition or 'casus pendens' are difficult to accept.

As a result of the investigation of the identity and roles of the special pronoun, i.e. the second task of this study, it is found to play two roles. Its first role is emphasis. Many of the researchers who mention emphasis regard the pronoun as emphasizing the subject, while only a few researchers say that it can emphasize the predicate as they take it to emphasize what is right in front of it. However, this study claims that the special pronoun emphasizes not only the subject and

predicate but also the entire sentence in a tripartite nominal sentence. In tripartite nominal sentences, word order is not regularly determined, but diversified in accordance with degrees of the definiteness of the subject and predicate, and hence plays the role of emphasizing the entire sentence.

The second role is balancing the subject and the predicate. Like weights of a scale, the special pronoun plays the role of lifting the entire sentence while balancing the subject and the predicate. That is to say, when the weights of the subject and the predicate are identical (their definiteness being the same), it lifts the two in the middle of them. On the other hand, when the weight of the subject is lighter than that of the predicate, it plays the role of lifting the two while helping the predicate with relatively weak definiteness.

<Abstract>

**The Problem in the Korean Translation of
“What shall I do to obtain eternal life?”
(Mt 19:16 Mk 10:17 Lk 18:18; 10:25)**

Prof. Jeongsoo Park (Sunkyu University)

Jesus' conversation with the rich man in the synoptic gospels could not be correctly understood and translated until one realizes the Jewish and Christian soteriological questions in the Hellenistic Judaism that was under debate. The question “what good thing must I do to *obtain/get* eternal life?” in Matthew 19:16 brings up a fundamental debate: for whom is such a question qualified? The questioner is a Jew. This is also the case of Jesus' conversation with a scribe in Luke 10:25-28. The premise of his question is not how he *becomes* God's chosen people (Israel), but how he lives as the people of God. God's promise to Israel is maintained and depends upon the observance of the commandments of the Torah. At the same time, however, the whole inheritance of eternal life remains at the final judgment also for Israel. Matthew 19:16 eliminates the term ‘inherit’ (‘κληρονομήσω’) in the question of the rich, young man, and substitutes it with ‘σχῶ’(have). Instead he adds that term to the eschatological statement on 19:29 given to Jesus' disciples who have left everything to follow him.

It means that early Christianity shared the heritage of Jewish soteriology from the perspective of so-called ‘covenantal nomism’, but just with a changed point of view in the understanding of eschatological salvation: God's promise is now given to the disciples of Jesus as delegates to Israel, and furthermore, its new prospect will be extended to the Gentiles. However, at the same time, it is clear that the Gentiles also can never forsake the commandments of the Torah (Mt 5:17-19) because they are also supposed to face the final judgement. The Jews and Gentiles seek the will of God revealed in the law and “should live by doing it”(τοῦτο ποίει καὶ ζήση. Lk 10:28). The first-century Judaism and Christianity were standing on this common ground.

Without missing such a complex theological meaning, it will be suggested that the current Korean translation “obtain/get the eternal life”(Mk 10:17; Lk 18:17; Mt 19:16; Lk 10:25) should be revised to “inherit the eternal life” in Mark and Luke as well as to “have the eternal life” in Matthew respectively.

<Abstract>

**Textual-Critical Observations on Recently Published Oxyrhynchus
NT Papyri : P119, P120, P121, and P122**

Prof. Kyoung Shik Min
(Yonsei University)

The purpose of this study is to investigate textual-critically some fragmentary NT papyri. The researches on NT papyri in the second half of the 20th century were restricted mainly to the so called “big papyri”, i.e. Chester Beatty and Bodmer Papyri (P45, P46, P47, P66, P72, P75), because we in those days developed no proper method to analyse fragments. At the turning of the century, fragmentary papyri began to gain interest in the NT scholarship, and resultingly, several researches on fragmentary NT Papyri have been published. Most of them, however, are limited to the level of general introductions, which could not make the fragments useful as individual textual-critical evidences.

On the basis of this context, we tried not only to study scribal habits, but also to inquire characteristics of each of their texts and their meaning as a group as well. Furthermore, we attempted to evaluate each individual fragmentary papyrus textual-critically, so that they may be useful evidences so much as the so called “big papyri”, not only to understand the history of the text, but also to reconstruct the so called “original” text.

This should be just an example study to explore the world of early fragmentary NT papyri, and is expected to stimulate further researches on this field.

<Abstract>

Features of Bible translations in Mongolic languages in comparison with Korean Bible translations

Mr. Youngcherl Lee

A dozen of new Bible translations in Mongolic languages have emerged in recent two decades, in tandem with the rise of Christian churches and believers among Mongolian tribes, from Kalmykia in the west through Buryatia and (outer) Mongolia to Inner Mongolia in the east. This study aims to explore the features of Mongolian Bible versions, particularly the two most popular versions: the MUBS version in Outer Mongolia and the MNT in Inner Mongolia, in comparison with Bible versions in Korean, a language which has been traditionally classified under the same Altaic group with Mongolian.

The controversy seems ebbing away in regard to the Mongolian term for God, now that “Burkhan (Бурхан)” has been chosen as the best word to describe Biblical God by the translators of most popular Bible versions as well as by majority of churches, whether in Outer or Inner Mongolia, Kalmykia or Buryatia. In contrast, none of the other alternatives has won a major support even in one of the four key regions where the Mongolic speakers dwell. The most popular version, using “Burkhan” for God, is also the version most literal in its translation style (like in Korea) compared with other versions following dynamic equivalence or paraphrased translation, both in Inner Mongolia and in Outer Mongolia.

Biblical key terms in the Mongolian versions are rather independent from foreign influences, compared with those in Korean or Japanese versions which had to import vast majority of the key terms from ‘hanzi’, the Chinese characters.

Mongolian Bible translations, compared with Korean counterparts, reflect not only cultural advantages arising from nomadic traditions akin to Hebrew nomadism, but also some grammatical advantages such as a rich stock of suffixes to express tenses and aspects as well as more freedom to use honorific second singular pronoun.

In recent years Mongolian translators are showing an unprecedented ardor in

the translation of Biblical poetry, to apply Mongolian rhythms (characterized in particular by alliteration), which penetrates deeply into Mongolian idioms and literature.

Despite the short experiences and the current shortage of translation experts as well as concerns over diminishing number of Mongolic-language speakers out of Mongolia, Mongolian Bible translations today seem to be gaining momentum in parallel with the waxing of Christianity at home and the surge of Mongol students learning Bible translation abroad, getting ready to make inroad into minor Mongolic-speaking tribes with no Scriptures yet in their own language.

Translation: A Selected Survey of Contemporary Approaches as Related to Bible Translation¹⁾

Esteban Voth*

1. Introduction

We begin by quoting Friedrich Schleiermacher: “That utterances are translated from one language to another is a fact we meet with everywhere, in the most diverse forms.”²⁾ We hold this to be true, though we would suggest strongly that translation occurs everywhere even within the same language. This is particularly true with Latin American Spanish, as spoken in the different countries of the continent. Words in the same language have different meanings in different countries and in different time periods. The reason for beginning with Schleiermacher’s statement is because today there are many that question the practice of translation and propose that translation is really an impossible task. As we consider a selection of the different approaches to translation that are used today, our undergirding hypothesis is that “translation” is indeed possible and that it takes place everywhere, at different levels, with diverse purposes. Some may consider that this is a naïve or somewhat of a utopian position. Nevertheless we hold on to a “belief” that communication does indeed take place and that translation is part and parcel of that communication.

At the outset, we also want to state a working hypothesis that can serve as background for understanding the different approaches that are used or posited with respect to the discipline of translation. “As we confront a translation we

* Head of Global Translation Advisors, United Bible Societies; evoth@biblesocieties.org.

1) This study was prepared as a lecture for a translation workshop organized by the Korean Bible Society. It was intended as an introductory survey for a group of 38 scholars who are now involved in their first Bible translation experience. The goal was to expose them to a few of the different approaches used today in Bible translation.

2) F. Schleiermacher, “On the Different Methods of Translating”, Susan Bernofsky, Trans., L. Venuti, ed., *The Translation Studies Reader* (London and New York: Routledge, 2004), 43.

must keep in mind the context of the source text, the context of the target text, and even more importantly, the distance between the two. For it is in that distance—in a Babel of linguistic, temporal and spatial displacements—where everything occurs: where texts and cultures are transmitted or lost, renegotiated, re-examined and reinvented. It is within this losing, renegotiating, re-examining and reinventing that this survey must be placed.”³⁾ It is our contention that the many different approaches and theories of translation constantly struggle with these elements and particularly the distance between them. As we strive to understand the different theories that are offered it will be helpful to remind ourselves of the working hypothesis stated above.

Translators who are actively involved in translation of any text are always “theorizing.” They may not be conscious of it, but they are constantly making choices, selecting from different but equally valid possibilities, rejecting others, etc. and all this happens on the basis of some kind of theory. Over the past forty years approximately, a lot of reflecting has been done on the theory and practice of translation. As a result a number of theories or approaches have emerged. Some are more philosophical and theoretical while others are more concrete and practical. However, as mentioned before, translation has always been done, with or without a developed theory of translation.

Still another issue that needs to be introduced before we delve into the different theories is the issue which we will call “sacred text.” Though attempts have been made to minimize the difference between “sacred text” and other texts, we suggest that the translation of “sacred text” carries with it a particular set of elements that cannot be ignored nor are they always the same as those elements present in the translation of other kinds of texts. We will address some of these elements as we discuss some of the more prevalent theories that begin to have an influence on how “sacred text” is translated. A preliminary issue that we will mention now at the outset is that those involved in the translation of “sacred texts” often times (always?) work on the basis and belief that there is a *stable* original from which one translates. This conscious or unconscious presupposition will be challenged in this essay.

3) S. Waisman, *Borges y la traducción* (Buenos Aires: Adriana Hidalgo, 2005), 9.

2. Equivalence

The notion of equivalence in translation has been around for a long time. In fact, one could suggest, albeit tentatively, that equivalence translation theory is present in one form or another in most of the subsequent contemporary theories of translation. The concept of equivalence has been qualified at different times in different ways. Perhaps one of the earliest suggestions was the one formulated by Eugene Nida in various publications which was called “Dynamic Equivalence.” Nida writes: “One way of defining a D-E translation is to describe it as “the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message. This type of definition contains three essential terms: (1) *equivalent*, which points toward the source-language message, (2) *natural*, which points toward the receptor language, and (3) *closest*, which binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation.”⁴⁾

A particular and very important goal of the Dynamic Equivalence theory is the producing in the receptor readers or hearers the same effect that the source text produced in the so-called original readers or hearers. This means that the response of the receptors to the translated text is essentially the same as that of the original receptors. In other words, equivalence can be understood as that concept that suggests that there is a relation of equal value between a source text and a target or receptor text. Therefore it becomes clear that the translation that follows this theory is one which privileges equivalence of response over equivalence of form.

Sometime later, Nida along with deWaard suggested a variation on the term dynamic equivalence and proposed that “Functional Equivalence” was a better nomenclature. This was due to some misunderstandings and misuse of the term dynamic equivalence. Functional equivalence was then set as over against formal equivalence. In the latter, a great emphasis is placed on the source text, and a translation should try to preserve as much of the original form as possible. This is also referred to as a more literal translation. However in functional equivalence, even though there is a marked concern with respect to understanding the form and culture of the source text, what is privileged is how the intended receptors will understand the text.⁵⁾ Nida is quite clear when he

4) E. A. Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating* (Leiden: Brill, 1964), 166.

5) E. A. Nida and Jan de Waard, *From One Language to Another. Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating* (Nashville: Nelson, 1986).

contends that: the conformance of a translation to the receptor language and culture as a whole is an essential ingredient in any stylistically acceptable rendering.⁶⁾ All of this suggests that according to this approach, equivalence can be achieved at any linguistic level. In fact, it also assumes that there is a pre-existing equivalence between cultures and/or languages before a translation ever takes place.

In a way, Schleiermacher anticipated this by arguing that translations could be understood as *foreignizing* or as *domesticating*. Though these were not his terms, his statement in this regard has become famous among those involved in translation. He suggested the following: “Either the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him; or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the writer toward him. These two paths are so very different from one another that one or the other must certainly be followed as strictly as possible, any attempt to combine them being certain to produce a highly unreliable result and to carry with it the danger that writer and reader might miss each other completely.”⁷⁾ A foreignizing translation would be one that follows the formal equivalence strategy whereby the translation attempts as much as possible to follow the words and form of the source text. A domesticating translation would be one that follows the functional equivalence strategy whereby the translation attempts to elicit in the target text the same effect that the source text had on its original hearers or readers. Indeed there are extreme cases of this, such as the semitic metaphor “lamb of God” becoming the “seal of God” in an Inuit culture or even more extreme “the piglet of God” in Papua New Guinea. Needless to say these are extreme examples that we are using to emphasize the dangers of taking any approach to the extreme. This then leads us to beg the question regarding Schleiermacher’s statement about not combining the approaches. It seems to us that inevitably in any translation and particularly a translation of a “sacred text” a combination of these two approaches will be used along with others as well. One can certainly have a preference of one over the other and use it as much as possible. However, it seems unadvisable to use one to the absolute exclusion of the other.

Eugene Nida was a genius in his own time and also a product of his time.

6) E. A. Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating* (Leiden: Brill, 1964).

7) F. Schleiermacher, “On the Different Methods of Translating”, 49.

When one evaluates his proposals and theories which are based on practical field experience one must always keep in mind the historical context in which he developed his suggestions. This however, does not exempt us from pointing out some problems that a strict adherence to a functional equivalence theory might have. Any criticisms we articulate are done with the utmost respect for the work and person of Eugene Nida. An initial question one can pose from a more contemporary standpoint is that of the nature of the source text in any translation endeavour. Functional equivalence seems to place a high priority on the source text. It is as if there is a superiority of the source text over the target text. The target text must constantly measure up to the source text. In other words the source text always has a privileged position over the target text. The translation then is seen as a somewhat diminished product because the “real” authority lies with the source text. This is very true of sacred text translation where there is a kind of holy respect for the “original,” which oftentimes does not exist. However it is evident that in the imagination of the sacred text translator there is an “original” somewhere that holds all authority. However, we suggest that in many senses there are no definitive texts, and therefore what we have as source texts are “drafts” or “versions”. And therefore the translations are not less than the source texts, and the translation process gains power and relevance as a human activity. We suggest that it is not necessary to consider a translation as inferior to the so-called original or source text. Thus one can challenge the supremacy of the source text in a translation event.

Another point of contention that can be raised is the whole notion of the “stability of the source text”. In the equivalence model of translation there is an underlying assumption that the source text is stable. This leads to a view that the source text is a definitive text, rather than a draft or a version. Modern theories of translation would very much question the idea of a fixed or definitive and thus a stable source text. One can even go so far as suggest that there is no such thing. All texts are mobile, unstable, unfixed and therefore are all ultimately “drafts.” On the other hand, one should not consider that the translations are by nature superior to the source text. If anything can be suggested it is that both source text and target text (or translation) are equally legitimate and would hold the same power and status.

The instability of texts is well illustrated by the reality of sacred biblical texts.

The fully developed discipline known as “textual criticism” demonstrates this over and over. As new manuscripts or portions of manuscripts are discovered one can clearly see that the sacred texts were never stable or definitive. The amount of variants that occur as one compares versions or drafts of the same text is evidence of this fluidity of texts called “original” or “source texts”. To this we can add the entire ancient tradition of translation of these texts into contemporary ancient languages such as Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, and others. These translations themselves betray the reality of the instability of source texts. This also suggests that knowing these original languages does not guarantee the possibility of knowing or translating a definitive text. In fact, not knowing the original languages of the sacred text opens up a variety of versions to the reader that enriches the experience with such texts.

Still another matter that needs to be qualified with respect to the functional equivalent model has to do with an assumption that we mentioned above. According to this model, there is a pre-existing equivalence between cultures and/or languages before a translation ever takes place. Stated in another way, this theory assumes that there can be a production of stable text in languages that have equal expressive capacity. This means that there is a symmetry amongst all languages and therefore equal responses can be elicited by the translation process. We suggest that this kind of “automatic” symmetry does not exist among all languages. Personal experience with “indigenous” non-western languages in the Americas, leads us to believe that not all languages have the same expressive capacity and therefore that in certain cases a dynamic, functional or natural equivalence is not attainable. By this we do not mean that communication is not possible. However, as Nida himself often stated, communication is always of a degree.

3. *Skopos* Theory of Translation

Skopos is a Greek word that can mean in broad terms “purpose,” but it can also be understood as “goal,” “intention,” “aim.” We will refer primarily to “purpose,” as the key idea behind this theory of translation.⁸⁾ This is another

8) There are two seminal works published in 1984 that must be considered under this topic: *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*, by Katharina Reiss and Hans Vermeer, and *Translatorisches Handeln, Theorie und Methode*, by Justa Holz-Mänttari.

approach that questions some of the assumptions embedded in the equivalence model, but also has “equivalence” characteristics within it. Therefore, even though it provides some corrective guidelines to the traditional equivalence approach, it also drinks from the fountain of equivalence at various stages.

To begin this discussion we can state at the outset that the priority in this model is set on the “purpose” of the translation, and in particular the communicative purpose of the translation. What is different or new with this approach is the assumption that the target side function can be different from the source text function. This means that any given source text can be translated in different ways which in turn results in target texts that function in different ways, though coming from the same source text. Perhaps herein lies the major difference between this model and the equivalence model. In *Skopos* or purpose theory, the target text function takes priority over, or becomes the dominant factor over the source text. Now this does not mean that in any given situation the source text function cannot be equivalent or the same as the target text function. In fact, in some cases they can coincide, as long as they are clearly stipulated from the beginning. However, this is not a requirement for a translation to take place. Now this approach has important consequences regarding the methodology to be used, particularly before beginning the translation.

One of the things that this theory emphasizes is the role of the client. In the case of a Bible translation there are different possibilities. The client could be the National Bible Society, a local church, an international church denomination, a Bible agency, a department of culture, or all of them together. The role of the client is critical for the client defines, determines and chooses what kind of translation shall be contracted. Along with this the client must define for the translator or translation team, the function that the target text is intended to perform. In some cases, the client may wish to maintain what is perceived to be the source text function. Whether this indeed is possible, is another question. However, since we have established that a particular text can be translated in different ways, it is entirely possible that the client requests that the target text perform a different function than the one perceived to be played by the source text. It is in this context where the issue of communication becomes critical. In the final analysis, the client must define clearly for the translators what indeed

needs to be communicated and in what manner. For once again, at the risk of being overly redundant, the ultimate criterion in this theory is what “purpose” is being sought.

This process whereby the client expresses the instructions to the translators has now been crystallized in what has been variously called a “translation brief,” a “commission,” a “job description,” or simply “client’s instructions.” This is a critical component of this theory because it is the client who defines the purpose of the translation. Though it is the translator who is the expert, he/she must submit that expertise to the desires and goals of the client.

This aspect of *Skopos* theory has become very important and foundational for modern Bible translation especially in the United Bible Societies context. In the case of each new potential translation project, the United Bible Societies encourages those who manage the translation project to develop a “translation brief” from the start, so that everybody involved (the team members, the Churches and other interested parties) can work with the same principles for the project.

For example, the purpose and intended audience of the translation are of course an important part of this brief. Questions such as: In what way will the new translation be different from translations that already exist? What are the expectations that need to be met? Will the translation be in fact a new translation or a revision? Will this new translation aim at a particular section of society (Church people; young people; specific education levels) or not? How will this affect the style and level of the target text? In other words, on which need will the translation focus? All of these elements are very critical and need to be established from the very beginning before any one verse of the sacred text is translated.

For purposes of illustration we will present an example of a translation brief. By no means do we present this as an absolute or perfect model. We offer it as a working tool that can be of benefit to a new Bible translation project.

Standard Georgian Translation Project (10-12-10)

Principles

1. Goal: Translation for general use in church and society with focus on educated people.

2. Translation base: *Biblia Hebraica* for the OT, UBS 4th Ed. GNT for the NT, LXX for the DC books.
3. Model translations: Patriarchal Text 1989, IBT/UBS 2001 Text, ancient Georgian translations.
4. Type of translation:
 - a. Basically Formal Equivalence
 - b. As much as possible idiomatic, literary Georgian.
 - c. Natural style (Hebrew/Greek literalisms to be avoided if not consistent with natural Georgian)
 - d. Consistency in key terminology, names, etc. (unlike existing Georgian translations)
 - e. Archaisms to be avoided
 - f. Represent faithfully the original historical and cultural context, historical facts and events should be expressed without distortion. Attempt to represent the original intent of the authors
5. In matters of exegesis, consultation of UBS Handbooks is highly recommended.
6. Footnotes are used :
 - a. For explanation of proper names when they allude to meanings of Hebrew/Greek words
 - b. When the meaning of Hebrew words is not clear
 - c. In the case of important textual variants (from ancient versions or manuscripts)
 - d. For explanation of unknown objects or ideas
7. Other helps for readers:
 - a. Cross-references
 - b. Glossary
 - c. Preface
 - d. Introductions to the Bible, Bible books
 - e. Index of names
8. Two editions: with and without DC books

Procedures

- Team members for drafting need to be selected
- Coordinator: needs to be chosen
- UBS Translation Consultant: needs to be assigned

Stages:

1. First draft in Paratext by one of the team members –based on assignments document–, starting from existing texts (issues raised by translator put in Paratext notes)
2. Review by other team members individually (suggestions for improvement entered as notes in Paratext)
3. Original drafter reviews comments from other team members
4. Team discussion with focus on issues not yet resolved
5. Consistency checking (both format and content) by coordinator with the help of the Paratext tools
6. Consultant checking (usually spot checking)
7. Preprocessing for typesetting

One can point out many positive aspects that come with this approach. Initially one can argue that knowing the purpose beforehand certainly helps the translator develop a blueprint of how the translation process should proceed. The translator does not need to guess as to what the target audience is expecting or needs. So, in a sense one can say that the translator is conditioned and governed by the purpose of the translation. Another virtue that can be named is the fact that the translator by being governed by the purpose, can feel free to use more than one approach in the translation particularly when it comes to different genres. The translator is not a slave to an equivalence approach nor to a formal more literal approach or to any other theory that is available and helpful. This means that the process involved can be much more trans-disciplinary and consequently much richer in the long run.

There are as well some questions or criticisms that need to be directed toward the *Skopos* theory. The British critic Peter Newmark⁹⁾ has raised the issue that what the translator is able to translate is “words,” not functions. In other words,

9) P. Newmark, *A Textbook of Translation* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1988).

one should nuance the almost exclusive emphasis on purpose or function that *Skopos* theory supports. This is important particularly when one translates an ancient text for which the intended purpose cannot easily be determined. Target function is indeed important to establish, but it need not be so exclusive.

Still another matter to be considered is that the source text has purposes, and these should be recognized and given their rightful place in the translation process. Despite placing a heavy emphasis on target function or purpose, the corrective here is to keep in tension the reality of source text function or purpose, as long as that can be discerned with relative accuracy or confidence.

Despite these and other critiques that can be directed toward *Skopos* theory of translation, one can acknowledge the important contributions that it has made to the translation enterprise by diminishing the exclusive and powerful position of the source text and giving the target text a more prominent position.

4. Translation as Rewriting¹⁰⁾

Translating means to adopt strategies that are from time to time different. This induced André Lefevere to speak explicitly of translation as manipulation and rewriting.¹¹⁾ To translate is to manipulate and rewrite because translation has a great deal in common with other kinds of interpretation and textual production, such as historiography, literary criticism, and editing. All these activities, in fact, have the goal of building an image of a text, of an author or of an entire literary culture and to project them in a different reception environment. The history of translation, and particularly the history of Bible translation, is precisely the history of a community in relation to others. In this sense, to rewrite is to rethink a text in relation to its own cultural coordinates.

In regard to this, it is important to see how the perception of literary property or even the very notion of faithfulness in translation has developed over time. It has been observed that this notion has changed significantly throughout the

10) This section is based completely on a lecture delivered by Dr. Stefano Arduini for the Nida School of Bible Translation, May 2013. Dr. Arduini is professor of linguistics at the University of Urbino, Italy. Used with permission.

11) A. Lefevere, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Frame* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992a).

course of history, in that a translation deemed faithful in a certain period is considered to be unfaithful in another. Another concept of great interest is *patronage* that is to say that the individuals, groups and institutions which influence, encourage but also censor rewriting in the literary sphere. Aspects such as these are very important because they enable us to understand that translation is never an innocent activity and that it depends strongly on the social and political context in which it takes place:

Translation is... rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society.¹²⁾

Translation is a kind of rewriting but it is not only that. In fact, if all translations are rewritings, not all rewritings are translations. For instance, a translated text speaks in the name of the original; while a critical essay about the V Canto of *Inferno* does not speak in the name of Dante. But there is another idea that circulates around this matter: a translation comes from a text or from a series of well-defined signs. This is a crucial point because it is the basis of the conditions of mediation and rewriting. These two characteristics would not exist were it not for a defined text which translation rewrites or which speaks in the name of it.

Generally it is quite difficult to find out the precise source of a discourse. For example, during a conversation the sentences are linked together, but what is said has a relation with a heterogeneous amount of signs and stimuli. This means that it would not be easy to know where our sentences come from.

A translator, on the contrary, could more easily answer this question, because he is almost always able to point to a passage on the page. But if we would ask him where an entire translation comes from, the answer would be definitely more complex. Let's think of a publisher who orders the translation of a Russian novel. The new novel, written by the translator, has clearly originated from the Russian one. Anyway, even in this clear example, we do not think either that the original novel contains all we need for producing the translation, nor that we can carry on translation of all that exists in the original text.

12) *Ibid.*, XI.

During rewriting, a translator must of necessity misuse some parts or functions of the Russian text; he has to use his global knowledge, his knowledge of the works of the same author and genre, of Russian literature, of cultural or material objects described in the novel, and so on. A new text will waste some old signs and will add new ones. This becomes quite true with respect to Bible translation where all the knowledge of the ancient culture(s) is critical to the entire translational enterprise.

There is a second aspect in this topic. Even if literary translation is an important area of translation, it doesn't represent the whole area. Nowadays, translators work on a wider range of media, material supports and types of texts, and their 'original' has become very complex. Materials that enter in a translation can be just a part of a wider text, the collection of a certain number of different texts or parts of them, etc.

The real case which we can consider as being very far from the translation of a novel is the electronic word, which no longer has the stability of the printed word. Electronic texts can constantly change; they are not the immediate result of the author and can rapidly spread but they can also rapidly disappear, as fire from dry wood.

These considerations require the definition of a new concept of text, not as a limited entity closed within objective limits, but as a node of an unlimited space and time net. Should we conclude that the idea that translations come from a defined original text is wrong? I think the answer is no. We should simply conclude that to consider the source text as a necessary pre-existent fact is just an illusion. Actually, translation itself defines the cluster of signs that will be its basis: in a certain sense the original text is the product of its translation.

5. Cultural Translation

We begin by stating what for some might be obvious: in translation "meaning" does not remain unaltered when traveling from one culture to another. In addition two more important basic points need to be stated at the outset. First of all we must admit that cultures are not stable. When we consider cultures and translations we work with the concept that cultures are quite

unstable due to many reasons. Secondly, we suggest that translations have the capability of changing cultures. This is not a new phenomenon that appeared as a result of “globalization,” though indeed globalization has had an effect on this process. The phenomenon is quite old and has been going on as long as translation has taken place.

Homi Bhabha¹³⁾ (1994), the Indian cultural theorist has rightly claimed that symbols in any given culture are not stable and that they are constantly being reformulated, reinterpreted and even translated. Cultures are always being redefined, reformulated, and in a very real sense being translated. Indeed we might suggest that some cultures such as the Greek culture have attempted to be more homogenous and to be separate from the whole Asian context. And yet even the Greeks cannot claim a sense of cultural purity for they also have influences from other narrations and other social practices. We agree with Stefano Arduini when he says: “Considerations of this nature help us to affirm that cultures do not have a stable nucleus and that therefore it is not even possible to retrieve their original and authentic values. On the contrary, cultures are unstable representations which question antagonistic relations which are in continuous transformation. Therefore, we are not faced with defined entities but the constant redefinition of boundaries and systems.” (Unpublished lecture delivered in May, 2013 at the Nida School of Bible Translation, Misano, Italy)

This reality has led to the idea of the hybridization of cultures (García Canclini, 2001). To speak of a hybrid culture is not to say that at some time the culture was pure or “original.” On the contrary, to speak of hybridization with respect to cultures is to affirm that cultures are the result of constant negotiations between cultures, interaction of ethnic identities, where cultural meanings are negotiated all the time. Thus, cultures are not closed, isolated entities, but are always subject to influences from the outside.

The instability of cultures as well as the reality of hybridization certainly has a relationship to the translator. It is the translator who stands in the “between space” of languages. The translator knows two languages, and thereby would of necessity know two cultures. Therefore, it follows that there is an effect that the translation has on any given culture by opening it up to another culture. In other words, translation has the possibility of creating hybridity. The heterogeneous

13) H. K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994).

cultural conditions in which translation takes place has been analyzed by the Tel Aviv school as represented particularly by Even-Zohar (1981; 1990) and G. Toury (1980; 1995) within the framework of *Polysystem Theory*.¹⁴⁾

When dealing with sacred text that was redacted over centuries in the ancient world of the Near East, one encounters this hybridity constantly. Texts have travelled geographically, temporally, linguistically and culturally. This reality that is so evident becomes even more complex when one “translates” this “hybrid” text or more precisely this “hybrid culture” into non-Western languages, where vocabulary, worldviews, cultures, and values, are so very different. Historical analysis and description shows that the introduction of the Biblical text into a culture that never had encountered a written text, or a semitic theological text, has modified, changed and influenced that indigenous culture. It is quite evident that the introduction of a literary sacred text into another culture can ultimately affect the hierarchy of values, beliefs, understanding of symbols and even long held traditions. In other words, experience tells us that what cultural translation theory attempts to articulate can be corroborated in practice. To what extent this change and influence is deemed positive or negative is certainly up for debate. What cannot be denied is that the translation of the sacred text has always and will always produce cultural change. This reality will continue to deepen and extend the process of hybridization both textually and culturally.

14) S. Arduini says: “The concept of polysystem is an attempt to define all the activities which are considered to be literary within a culture. In this sense, the polysystem is a system of heterogeneous systems which make up literature, literature being conceived as a system in movement with transformations and continuities. From this point of view, literature is not only considered in an abstract way but is also connected to the judgments of value which belong to a specific historical period. Furthermore, literature is never isolated and is never pure, because it always comes into contact with other literatures creating continuous interferences. These interferences cannot be eliminated in the contacts between cultures and are usually unilateral because literature is a source, it performs this role thanks to its prestige and the fact that the importing system needs to find models which it does not find in itself.” Unpublished lecture delivered in May, 2013 at the Nida School of Bible Translation, Misano, Italy. See I. Even-Zohar, *Polysystem Studies*, numero monografico di *Poetics Today* 11 (1990), 1, and G. Toury, *In Search of a Theory of Translation* (Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, Tel Aviv University, 1980; and *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995).

6. Final Reflections

Time does not allow us to cover many other theories, sub-theories and approaches to the task of translation. There are many more that could be addressed, and there is ample bibliography that can be studied.¹⁵⁾ However, as I reflect on the various theories or paradigms that continue to be offered and articulated in the field of Translation Studies and in the sub-field of Biblical Translation, I am more and more convinced that we do not need to be captured by only one of them. It is not necessary in my opinion to align oneself as a translator with just one of these approaches and try to apply it singlehandedly to the entire translation process. This is particularly true of sacred text translation. For in fact, the problem with most Bible translations is that in trying to apply a single theory of translation they both decrease the level of communication and flatten the depth of richness that is inherent in the sacred text. The different historical, cultural, linguistic, theological and literary contexts present in the biblical text, mitigate against the attempt to make them all sound the same and say the same. It seems to me that it is very important to avail oneself of the many contributions that have been made in the discipline of translation theories so as to produce translations that do not hide the richness embedded in the sacred text.

<Keywords>

translation studies, functional equivalence, skopos theory, translation as rewriting, cultural translation.

(투고 일자: 2013년 7월 31일, 심사 일자: 2013년 8월 20일, 게재 확정 일자: 2013년 8월 20일)

15) See *References* below.

<참고문헌>(References)

- Bhabha, Homi K., *The Location of Culture*, London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar, *Polysystem Studies*, numero monografico di *Poetics Today* 11 (1990).
- García Canclini, Néstor, *Culturas híbridas. Estrategias para entrar y salir de la modernidad*, Buenos Aires: Paidós, 2001.
- Holz-Mäntäri, J., *Translatorisches Handeln, Theorie und Methode*, Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica, 1984.
- Lefevere, André, *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint*, Assen-Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1975.
- Lefevere, André, *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Frame*, London and New York: Routledge, 1992a.
- Lefevere, André, *Translation, History and Culture. A Sourcebook*, London and New York: Routledge, 1992b.
- Newmark, Peter, *A Textbook of Translation*, New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.
- Nida, Eugene A., *Toward a Science of Translating*, Leiden: Brill, 1964.
- Nida, Eugene A., *Translating Meaning*, San Dimas, California: English Language Institute, 1982.
- Nida, Eugene A., *Contexts in Translating*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2002.
- Nida, Eugene A., *Fascinated by Languages*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2003.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Taber, Charles R. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Nida, Eugene A. and de Waard, Jan, *From One Language to Another. Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*, Nashville: Nelson, 1986.
- Nord, Christiane, *Translation as a Purposeful Activity*, Manchester: St. Jerome, 1997.
- Nord, Christiane, *Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis*, Amsterdam-New York: Rodopi, 2nd. revised edition, 2005.
- Nord, Christiane, Funktionsgerechtigkeit und Loyalität, I. Theorie, Methode und Didaktik des funktionalen Übersetzens, II. Die Übersetzung literarischer und religiöser Texte aus funktionaler Sicht, Berlin: Frank & Timme, 2010.
- Pym, Anthony, *Exploring Translation Theories*, London and New York: Routledge,

2010.

- Reiss, Katarina, *Translation Criticism, the Potentials and Limitations: Categories and Criteria for Translation Quality Assessment*, Manchester and New York: St. Jerome e American Bible Society, 2000.
- Reiss, Katarina, and Vermeer, Hans J., *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1984.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich, “On the Different Methods of Translating”, Susan Bernofsky, Trans., Venuti, Lawrence, (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Toury, Gideon, *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics; Tel Aviv University, 1980.
- Toury, Gideon, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995.
- Venuti, Lawrence, *The Translator’s Invisibility. A History of Translation*, London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Venuti, Lawrence, *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an Ethics of Difference*, London and New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Venuti, Lawrence, (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Venuti, Lawrence, *Translation Changes Everything*, London and New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Waisman, Sergio, *Borges y la traducción*, Buenos Aires: Adriana Hidalgo, 2005.

A Presentation of 4QLXXNum in Comparison with the LXX and MT

Koot van Wyk*

1. Introduction

Texts from Qumran received attention in publications and research since their discovery. The text under investigation here is no exception.¹⁾ There are some serious questions to consider in relation with this text: What can this Qumran text tell us about the relationship with the consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition? What can it tell us about its relationship with any of the Ancient Translations? What can it tell us about its relationship with the so-called LXX or

* Koot van Wyk is a Visiting Professor in the Department of Liberal Arts Education at Kyungpook National University Sangju Campus, South Korea and a Conjoint lecturer for Avondale College, Australia. He holds a DLitt et Phil in Comparative Semitic Linguistics from the University of South Africa (2004) and a ThD from Rikkyo University, Tokyo, Japan (2008). He is married to Sookyong Kim (Phd in New Testament, Andrews University, Michigan USA 2008). She has worked on the “Warrior Messiah” and her dissertation was published by Cambridge Scholars Publishing. He has studied Textual Criticism under Prof. dr. Johann Cook of Stellenbosch University, Cape, South Africa; Prof. dr. Johann Erbes of Andrews University, Michigan, USA; and Prof. dr. John Lübbe of the University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa. The impact of the secretary of William Foxwell Albright, Leonna Running of Andrews University, Michigan, USA and another student of Albright, Frederick Charles Fensham of Stellenbosch, Cape, should not be left unnoticed.

1) There are two major models suggested for the line-up of manuscripts from the Old Greek of the original LXX (OG) to Qumran Greek (4QLXXNum) to the Göttingen edition (G^{cd}) (N. Petersen 2009, 484-495). One can classify them as *I Skehan A* (1956/1957, 57); *II Skehan B* (1977, 39). The early Skehan analysis of 4QLXXNum shows that there existed the OG or 4QLXXNum which was subsequently reworked in later times to provide the G^{cd}. The later Skehan view modified and stated that the OG was indeed the oldest Greek text and was similar if not identical to the current G^{cd} but that 4QLXXNum (at a later period) was a stylistic revision and reworking of the Greek to conform with the consonantal text of the Masoretic Tradition. Supporters in the direction of Skehan’s A position in 1956/1957 were E. Ulrich (1990, 75-76); L. Greenspoon (1998, 109-110); and E. Tov (2001, 10; 2003, 106-110). Skehan’s B position was favored by J. Wevers 1982, 235 and N. Petersen (2009, 481 and 484 at paragraph 1.3).

Septuagint? And what can it tell us about the condition of the Septuagint in the pre-Christian era?

What scholars may not have realized, is that 4QLXXNum is able to tell us something about the conditions of the Hebrew Vorlage in the pre-Christian period related to the existence or not of one canonical perceived and applied text. Textual variety over millennia is no secret nor surprise. Close correlation of texts over millennia is a noteworthy surprise.

2. Approach and Purpose

The approach here is to recognize that the translators were doing their best to be true to what they perceived as their Vorlages. Therefore, the investigation in this research attempted to reconstruct the Vorlage for each translation (Qumran Greek or Late Roman Greek or Byzantine Greek) or each relevant manuscript in order to see whether a Semitic base was the origin of some or all of the variants.

This approach is quite different from that of studying the translation techniques, since the focus is not on the *translator* behind the translation but rather on the *copyist* of the Vorlage to the translation.

As far as *translation techniques* are concerned, this researcher is somewhat skeptical of the success of such an investigation since one is dealing with doubtful layers,²⁾ meaning *firstly* that copyists made errors: (1) wrong or

3) Modern textual criticism presents some ironies. One of them is that the popular current paradigm insists, on the one side that a stable Hebrew text did not exist for the Second Temple Period, to use the words of Tov, but then the same scholars and others insist that computers will be a good way of determining a literal or free translation of the Greek of the so-called LXX. If a person insists, that a compass is unstable how can one determine the literalness and free use of the compass by others? One cannot teach eclecticism and emphasize the value of the use of computers for determining the literalness and free use of the text for translation. What text? What makes it even more complex is J. Wevers' comment in the introduction to the Göttingen edition (G^{ed}) of the LXX of Genesis that he does not live under the illusion that he has constructed the original LXX "Der Herausgeber unterliegt nicht der Illusion, dass er durchgängig den ursprünglichen Septuaginta text wiederhergestellt habe." The original text does not exist (Frankel 1841, 4; Kahle 1915, 439 where Kahle also said "Die älteste Form dieser Übersetzung rekonstruieren zu wollen, ist eine Utopie..."). Thus, Septuagint or LXX is an elusive task, so how does the scholar with a computer try to establish a translation technique of a text that is not fixed but elusive comparing it to an original Hebrew that is due to the Arabist Wellhausen *et al* only concocted, reworked and added later? The above text (4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803) helps to establish one stable point regarding this dilemma, and that is why

different divisions of letters, words or paragraphs; (2) substituting letters or transposing them; (3) relying on memory instead of the text on his desk; (4) not always knowing what to do with supra-linear corrections or entries; (5) misconstrued illegible sections on his manuscript. *Secondly*, readers to the translators made errors in similar ways even if the copyists were perfect in their copying. *Thirdly*, translators made errors: (1) by mishearing; (2) confusing letters and sounds; (3) relying on memory; (4) transposing letters and words.

In this researcher's approach, variants in the versions are not due to a *free* translation of the consonantal text of the Masoretic text but rather to an error that entered the process of transmission through a copyist or by the process of reading by a reader or the process of translation from a translator who misread or misheard. One can identify these as five slips: *slip of the tongue*, *slip of the hand*, *slip of the memory*, *slip of the eye* and *slip of the ear*.³⁾

It is thus imperative to reconstruct the possible Vorlage to each manuscript and to understand the origin of a variant in that way by comparison with other reconstructions. Variants sometimes coincide in the same zone in the verse in the versions lending support to the idea that an illegible reading in a Semitic text commonly used by all of the scribes of the versions led to these variants. This was the approach particularly in this research.⁴⁾

this researcher is discussing this important piece of evidence. Paul Lippi, a doctoral student of E. Tov said orally in Jerusalem to this researcher in 1989 that E. Tov did not support the multiplicity of texts theory in the Second Temple Period for the Torah, only for the rest of the Old Testament books. Tov's view on 4QLXXNum is very similar to this researcher. This researcher is very thankful to all the Daniel fragments that Eugene Ulrich sent him from Notre Dame University in Indiana. Incidentally, and only in this case with 4QLXXNum, Ulrich and Tov findings are strongly supported also by this researcher. Different from these scholars, this researcher is opting for a one-standard text for the whole Old Testament, not only the Torah as Tov would have said, according to Paul Lippi.

3) Koot van Wyk, "Linguistic Slips: A Window to Ancient Methods of Bookmaking", *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 31 (2012), 158-175.

4) The importance of *translation techniques* in the Greek translations has been the subject of discussion by a number of scholars in the past (see S. Olofsson 1990; J. Barr; E. Tov; and A. Aejmelaeus 1993). Olofsson indicated that the traditional distinction between a *free* and *literal* translation is not easy to make and that the distinction is *subtle and complicated and there exist no criteria for dividing them* (Olofsson 1990, 12). Gehman showed that literal translation and a free translation sometimes even co-exist (Olofsson 1990, 13, footnote 110). The position taken by this research is this: if you do not know what the original Semitic underlying the translation look like, you are not able to judge whether it is literal or free. If you choose the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition as the given standard and presumably the closest approximation

3. Qumran Text from Cave 4⁵⁾

Although this researcher's view is also in favor of Skehan's A position, there are many points that cannot sufficiently answer the history of the text in the light of other considerations. My intention here is to first fix the standard textual form and then to opt for the Greek translation corresponding closest to the standard form, to explain why there was or was not a degenerative process in scribal practices following the original translation of the original Septuagint. This is done by looking at the scribal practices at the Library of Alexandria before Antiochus Epiphanes and after him (164 BCE) with the help of what one can know about the Early Greek works of Homer. The phenomena in Classical Greek scholarship during first two centuries before the Christian Era gives one then a bed in which to lay similar phenomena in the G^{ed}.

The puritanic intentions of the 70/72 Rabbis in 289 BCE in Alexandria and their high view of the inspiration of their Old Testament would have resulted in phenomena that N. Petersen listed, which he found in 4QLXXNum = 4Q121 = Rahlfs 803:

It may be concluded that a concern of this author was that his text be intelligible in the target language (Greek). This necessitated that some of the more egregious standard equivalents be abandoned. Despite this concern for clarity, the author still seems to have adhered closely to his base scriptural texts, and this resulted in a number of literalistic renderings. Furthermore, even when he abandoned a standard equivalent, his alternative translation, did not go far beyond the meaning implicit in the base text.⁶⁾

of the original, then any deviation from that standard can assist in the allocations of modes of literalism or differences between literal and free translations. The current populist trend in textcritical sciences cannot answer this question since it employs in essence the eclectic method. Someone who is applying eclecticism to textual analysis cannot determine the original text since that scholar is reconstructing the text by him/herself and by picking and choosing from a variety of textual traditions, the endproduct is not the original but the perceived original in the mind of the reconstructing modern scholar. To use an analogy: it is Wellhausen's Pentateuch not Moses' Pentateuch.

5) The text was presented by Skehan in *HTR* 69 (1976), 40-42 but can also be found in *DJD* 9 (1992). A reduplication is thus not necessary here.

6) N. Petersen, "An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran: 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev^a in the Light of Previous Studies", *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19:4 (2009), 494.

4. Variant list of 4QLXXNum = 4Q121 = Rahlfs 803

Certain items were listed by Petersen and discussed by various scholars at times, mentioned by him:

4.1. Numbers 3:40 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. I 2

[λεγων] αριθμησον [παν πρωτοτοκον αρσεν]/[των υι]ων Ισραηλ ...]] επισκεψαι παν πρωτοτοκον αρσεν των υιων Ισραηλ G^{ed}.

לְבַנֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל פָּקֵד כָּל-בְּכוֹר זָכָר לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל MT, SamP

4.2. Numbers 4:6 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. II 18

[α]ρτηρας] τους αναφορεις G^{ed}; בָּד MT. Equivalent αρτηρ / αναφορευς variants for בָּד Num 4:8, 11. Num 4:12 ε[π]αρτηρος] επι αναφορεις G^{ed}, עֲלֵה-מִטָּה MT

4.3. Numbers 4:7 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col.

υ[α]κινθι[νον];

4.4. Numbers 4:8 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col.

και τα σπ[ονδεια] (και τας π[...]).

4.5. Numbers 3:42 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. I 10

αυτωι] nothing G^{ed}; וְהָא MT.

4.6. Numbers 4:7 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. II 21

...ιμ]ατιον υ[α]κινθι 21 [νον και δωσουσιν επ αυτην τα τ[ρ]υβλι] Verb unaccounted for by G^{ed} but present in וְהָא MT.

4.7. Numbers 4:12 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. III 10

και θησουσιν] εμβαλουσιν G^{ed}; וְהָא MT.

4.8. Numbers 4:12 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. III 13

αρτηρος] αναφορεις G^{ed}; מִטָּה MT.

It is very important to note that internal evidence in 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 does not come with a tag, “this is the original Septuagint”. To look for such evidence and ignoring the general character of 4QLXXNum may not be an advanced step. What one can know about the history of the origin of the Septuagint and the number of scholars involved in its original translation, albeit considered by some scholars to be nothing but a myth, taken at face value seems to be a reliable state of affairs. The Jews saw the opportunity to provide society with a Greek translation in a prestigious Library like Alexandria, thus one can assume that great care was taken with this project.

To illustrate the care Jewish traditions took, one should consider the percentage of deviation in the copying of the book of Daniel for example. If one compares the proximity of 4QDan^a with Codex Aleppo realizing that more than a millennium is in between, then one has to conclude that in all likelihood, the form of the original Septuagint would be very literalistic.

One can mention the case of ἀριθμησον in Numbers 3:40 at Column I 2 of 4QLXXNum instead of ἐπισκεψαι in G^{ed} in Numbers 3:40 which was to avoid misunderstanding for the Greeks of the time of the original LXX with the word ἐπισκεψαι. This last word was probably loaded with a wider semantic range that could give a misunderstanding for the academic Greek audience which the Rabbis sought to delimit.⁷⁾ After all, it does not matter how many times the equivalent ἐπισκεψαι = 𐤒𐤐 appears in the later Byzantine preserved LXX (or G^{ed}), since it was a later modified degenerative text any way.

The explanation of Petersen that [α]ρτηρας was used as a desire “to more accurately communicate the Hebrew text’s 𐤒” as not a human agent but an instrument instead of the later G^{ed} form αναφορεως, which can be interpreted also as a human agent,⁸⁾ is well taken here. The Rabbis were careful and did not want to destroy the sanctity of the text.

5. Non-MT variants in 4QLXXNum/ 4Q121 = Rahlfs 803

A number of cases are considered by scholars to be evidence of variants with

7) Hinted also by N. Petersen, “An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran”, 494.

8) N. Petersen, “An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran”, 494.

the MT and more in line with the later G^{ed}. Especially the work of J. Wevers are mentioned in this regard.⁹⁾ The evidence seems meagre.

5.1. Numbers 4:6 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. II 18

Ø = zero αυτου] Ø = zero αυτου G^{ed}; בדיו MT. Actually, the argument is not fair here since the evidence is too limited to make a decision on this issue. We do not know for example if the Greek equivalent for “table” was another shorter Greek word/synonym and if there was on that basis enough space to fit in the word αυτου. The position of Wevers¹⁰⁾ is viable only if it can be supported with certainty that the text indeed reads the G^{ed} form but notices the reconstructions of the greater part of both lines and the meagre data.

5.2. The case in Numbers 4:8 in 803 is the same where Wevers suggested that 803 did not follow the MT in adding a pronominal at the end of the sentence. However, where is the end of the sentence in the fragment and what if shorter Greek words/synonyms were used in the next line that could have allowed for the so-called missing pronominal to be used in the beginning of the next line? The argument is *argumentum ex silentio* for the greater part from a scientific point of view.¹¹⁾

9) Ibid., 493 footnote 51.

10) John W. Wevers, “An Early Revision of the Septuagint of Numbers”, *Eretz Israel* 16 (1982), 235.

11) Another example of conclusions based on reconstructions or *argumentum ex silentio* is 4QpaleoExod^m which was extensively researched by J. Sanderson and others. It is also in *DJD* 9 plus plates until xlvi. The reconstruction of this text was done under the assumption that there are close resemblances with the Samaritan Pentateuch. In Exodus 7:18b it is not based upon 7:15-18 (Tov 1992, 98). Line 6 is a recasting of the order of the verses and follow phrases from 7:26. Line 9 is from 7:20, lines 10-11 is from 7:21. From lines 11-14 is 7:19. Some conclusions were based on reconstructions like Exodus 10:2b; 11:3b; 20:21b. Conclusions on scanty evidence is *DJD* 9, 114 at Exodus 27:19b where the so-called Samaritan Pentateuch agreement is based only on one word. Line 7 is from Exodus 27:18; line 8 is from Exodus 27:19; line 9 is in this researcher’s view, from Exodus 27:9. One can mention the scanty evidence of the combination of the three fragments on *DJD* 9, 101-102. The left margin of one of the three is smaller than the fragment of column I. Is there any proof that these three fragments are physically connected? Is there any evidence that they are connected to columns XX and XXII? A DNA test can probably confirm their connection? The so-called Samaritan Pentateuch connection in 4Q158 in *DJD* 5 (1968) is curious since it is a biblical paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus. With a paraphrase one may expect to find reliance on memory and planning well known in cognitive linguistics with characteristics: phrase order changes, words omitted and added and spelling confusions.

5.3. Wevers also mentioned that 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 added some words which were left out by the MT in Numbers 4:7 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. II 20 where 803 and G^{ed} used επ' αὐτην. One has to be very careful with this conclusion that both 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 and G^{ed} added what was not in the original Hebrew of the MT. Notice for example that the order of the translation of עליו with επ' αὐτην was moored from its later position and brought earlier in the sentence in G^{ed}. G^{ed} then cancelled the word ונתנו of the MT and fused it with יפרשו.

That does not mean that 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 did the same merely because we can hardly see επ' αὐτην and nothing more. We do not know if 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 honored both these verbs instead of fusing them like the later G^{ed} did. The suggestion of Wevers is again based on meagre data.

5.4. The last case mentioned by Petersen where Wevers suggested that 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 followed G^{ed} instead of the MT is in Numbers 4:8 = 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 col. II 28 where Wevers felt that both 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 and G^{ed} were using δι' αὐτης but as Petersen admitted, it was only in the restored or Wevers' reconstructed text of 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 that it appeared.¹²⁾ It is again *argumentum ex silentio* and cannot stand scientific verification.

6. Comparison of texts

This researcher will select a section from Numbers 4 of 4QLXXNum, Column iii, and align it with the consonantal text of the Masoretic text as opposed to the so-called Septuagint that survived through Christian hands of their era.

6.1. Selection from Column iii (4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803)

12) N. Petersen, "An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran", 493 footnote 51.

Numbers 4:13-15

Column iii lines 15-23

15. επαυτοιματιονολο]ΠΟΡΦΥΡ|ον¹⁴καιεπιθ
- 16.
- 17.
- 18.
19. ΚΑΙΤΑΠ|ονδειακαιπαντατασκευητουθυ
20. CIA|σ]ΤΗΡ|ιουκαιεπιβαλουσινεπαυτοκα
21. ΔΥΜΜΑΔ|ερματινονυακινθινονκαιδιεμ
22. βαλουσιντουςαρτηρασαυτου¹⁵καισυντε
23. λεσουσινΑαρωνκαι]ΟΙΥΙΟΙΑ|υ]ΤΟΥ|καλυ

It is necessary to retrovert Column iii lines 15-23 to compare this text to the reading of the consonantal form of the Masoretic Text.

6.2. Retroversion of a Selection of 4QLXXNum to Hebrew

Numbers 4:13-15

15. עליו בנר ארגמן ונת
16. תנו עליו את כל כליו
17. אשר ישרתו עליו בחם את ה
18. מהתת את המזלנת ואת היעים
19. ואת המזתקת כל כלי המז
20. בח ופרשו עליו כ
21. סוי עור תחש וש
22. מ ובדיו וכ
23. לה אהרן ובניו לכ

6.2.1 Comments:

1. The letters in relief are those of the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition. This is my reconstruction of the text and therefore it is in relief.

2. The letters in bold are those remnants from the manuscript that survived.

3. Texts are placed in this section consecutively in order to compare the correspondences and to see if there is any connection between them. Supra at point 6.1 is given a pericope from Numbers 4:13-15 of **4QLXXNum**, followed in 6.2 by the **consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition and in bold those characters that are on the fragment**. Below at 6.3 is the **Greek** of Rahlfs (1935) on the same.

6.3. Addition in Byzantine LXX Edition (G^{ed}) of Numbers 4:14

G^{ed}LXX Numbers 4:13-15

15. επαυτοιματιονολο]ΠΟΡΦΥΡ[ον¹⁴καιεπιθ
 16.
 17.
 18.
 19. ΚΑΙΤΟΝΚ[αλυπηρακαιπαντατασκευητουθυ
 20. CIA[σ]ΤΗΡΗ[ουκαιεπιβαλουσινεπαυτοκα
 21. ΛΥΜΜΑΔ[ερματινονυακινθινονκαιδιεμ
 22. βαλουσιντουςαρτηρασαυτουκαιλημψονται
 ιματιονπορφυρουνκαισυγκαλυψουσιντον
 λουτηρακαιτηνβασιναυτουεμβαλουσιναυτα
 ειςκαλυμμαδερματινονυακινθινονκαιεπι
 θησουσινεπιαναφορειςκαισυντε¹⁵καισυντε
 23. λεσουσινΑαρωνκαι]ΟΙΥΙΟΙΑ[υ]ΤΟΥ[καλυ

6.3.1 Comments:

1. In this selection from Column iii lines 15-23 is presented a section that survived from Numbers 4:14-15. It is not certain whether verse 14 actually started in line 15 since one has no evidence to substantiate Skehan's suggestion that it is.

2. There is a long section that has been added in the Christian period LXX edition at the end of verse 14 before the start of verse 15. See the sample above. This addition is definitely not in 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803.

3. It may be argued that the three lines open between lines 15-19 could have been the space for the long addition at the end of verse 14. If that was the case, it would be unusual, taking into consideration that nowhere else is there a tendency to follow the variants of the later LXX. See e.g. line 1 in Column I. In this case a comparison of Numbers 3:40 in Rahlfs and the Qumran fragment revealed different vocabulary:

4QLXXNum on 3:40:	⁴⁰	ΙΑΡΙΘΜΗCΟ[νπανπρωτοτοκοναρσεν
Rahlfs Numbers 3:40:	⁴⁰	ΙΕΠΙΣΚΕΨΑΙπανπρωτοτοκοναρσεν

Furthermore, if one reconstructs the Hebrew then it is clear that these three lines were filled up with the rest of verse 14 in the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition and that there is no space to add the long addition of the Christian period LXX.

4. This data poses a problem to the acceptance of the *later* LXX reworking as the *original* LXX. The inclination is to suggest that the original LXX reads a more literal translation of the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition but that in later centuries it became distorted and reworked due to Hellenism during the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and other factors like the degenerative quality of scholarship after Epiphanes. 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 would then be an example of a copy of the original LXX.¹³⁾

5. In those areas where this researcher do not agree with Skehan in his reconstruction the *letters in relief plus underlined* **ⲕⲠⲚ** are used to indicate that possibly the underlined word in relief was used in this way in 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803.

6. This fragment is very important in establishing the form of the Greek text in the early centuries. If one compares the number or ratio of correspondences between the Christian period LXX edition and Qumran fragments on the one hand and the number or ratio of correspondences of the Greek fragment 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 with the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition on the other, one has to conclude that 4QLXXNum/4Q121 = Rahlfs 803 displays a stronger affinity than does the Christian period LXX. It is worth reminding oneself what Tov concluded:

Although no text has been found in Qumran that is identical or almost identical with the presumed Hebrew source of [Septuagint], a few texts are

13) The phenomenon of condensation of texts could be for functional purposes or because the method of copying was by memory. There is also the phenomenon of abbreviation that was witnessed in the scholarship at the library of Alexandria or later for the Old Testament as witnessed by Justin the Martyr (ca. 150 CE) in his *Dialogue with Trypho* 68:71-73 and Origen in a letter to Africanus (ca. 230 CE) in *PG* 11:36-37 and 40-41. M. Fraser (1972) indicated that the Iliad texts that existed before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (167 BCE) are longer than those Iliad texts after his time (Fraser II 1972, 691 note 278). The phenomenon of epitomizing of texts in the ancient world was discussed by Francis Witty (1974, 111-112) and these works coincide with the origin of Qumran manuscripts and the Septuagint. Nothing is mentioned by E. Tov (1992) and others, about these important phenomena in the quality of scribal scholarship of the Second Temple Period.

very close to the [Septuagint] ...¹⁴⁾

The “*very close*” that Tov mentions has been placed under scrutiny in this research and the result is that there are *a few (if possible) points of contact* but not *very close*. Tov listed 4QSam^a here as an example¹⁵⁾ and that text was also re-evaluated by this researcher with, though, a few brief remarks.¹⁶⁾

Tov’s *New Description*¹⁷⁾ of the so-called *development of the biblical text*, stands under review in this research. The facts do not support *a variety of texts in*

14) E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 115.

15) One’s best efforts (whether using the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition or Cross who used the Greek text, presumably the Septuagint) cannot explain all open spaces in the fragment. It is my conclusion that 4QSam^a is not the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition nor the Greek text presumed to be the Septuagint, but a *para-biblical text* fulfilling a function that one cannot yet ascertain. The fact that there are points of contact between the later Greek versions and this Qumran fragment does not make it Septuagintal *per se*. There are too many details in the text that do not correspond. In the light of the obvious error Column 2 line 11 with the reading of ויפקר = אפאאא instead of כי פקר = אפאאא caused by misreading presumably Paleo-Hebrew letters, and the cases of triple readings (Column 2 lines 15-17) as well as the Targumistic additions (Column 2 lines 1, 3-4) and changes in order of the verses, it is accepted in this research that there was no Paleo-Hebrew Vorlage that compares with the Late Roman and Byzantine Greek versions. In this research it seems rather that the scribe misread and composed a *para-biblical text* due to his inability to read the Paleo-Hebrew of a text that is very similar to that of the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition. This position is *contra* Cross (1953) and Tov (1993) but more in line with Eybers (1960). The problems in the proper order of words may be due to slips of the memory as is the case with the triple reading in the last part of Column 2. The following brief remarks should suffice: 1. There is a *typographical error* in Cross’s transcription (1953) in Column 2 line 4. 2. This researcher’s main difficulty with Cross’s transcription is the open spaces that he left. See lines 15-17 in Column 1. 3. Cross used the LXX in order to reconstruct the text whereas in this researcher’s reconstruction the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition was used. 4. As far as the scribe of 4QSam^a is concerned, there is a scribal error or a mistake in Column 2 line 7. This error is supported by a clear photo and is identified as such by Cross and Eybers as well. Cross called it *a slip of the scribe* (Cross 1953, 22) and Eybers agreed that it was probably *a scribal error* (Eybers 1960, 6). There are more: Column 2 line 16; Column 2 line 17. 5. There are a number of additions in this fragment not shared by the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition (Column 2 line 1); Column 2 lines 3-4 (but in this researcher’s view rather 2 Samuel 2:13 was considered to belong to 2 Samuel 2:16 by the scribe). 6. Cross argues that the Qumran fragment is an earlier and older type of the Hebrew text and that any other variation from it is considered later or an addition (including the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition). See also Tov (1992, 273) who shares Cross’ views regarding this fragment. It is probably better to consider a further scrutinizing of Cross’ presentation for publication at another time.

16) Koot Van Wyk, “The Form and Function of 4QJudg(a) as a witness to degenerative scribal and copyist activity”, 16-17 Appendix D.

17) E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 187ff.

the second temple period,¹⁸⁾ but rather a number of reworkings and distortions of the main text during this period due to (1) functional use of the biblical text (parabiblical text). Other options also apply for the period was known for its (2) degenerative scholarship at Alexandria in Egypt since the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.¹⁹⁾

18) Ibid., 117 at 8.[2].

19) It is P. M. Fraser (1972) who studied in detail the degenerative scholarship of Homer's works at Alexandria during the time of Ptolemees is Fraser (P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Vol. I. Text; Vol. II. Notes [Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1972]). He said Zenodotus' treatment of the text (of Homer) seems to have been quite arbitrary at times: he omitted consecutive series of lines which he regarded as superfluous and at other points he fused two or more lines of which he disapproved on the ground of impropriety (which might cover various grounds of unsuitability but particularly included those lines which seemed to him to show insufficient respect to the gods) into single lines by omitting the supposed improprieties. It was to combat this that Aristarchus a century later introduced into the armoury of critical signs a special sign, the διπλη περιεστιγμενη to denote readings of Zenodotus of which he disapproved (Fraser I 1972, 451). Fraser mentioned that Apollonius (270-245 BCE Fraser; 240-230 BCE Parsons) attacked Zenodotus. The text of Zenodotus on the *Iliad* was the basis of the editions of Aristophanes (204/1-189/6 BCE Fraser; 195-180 BCE Parsons) and Aristarchus (175-145 BCE Fraser; 160-131 BCE Parsons). Fraser also mentioned that the codex of the *Iliad* Venetus A at Θ 284 reads: παρα Ζηνοδοτωι ουδε ην. ηθετειτο δε και παρα Αριστοφανει (My translation: "But from Zenodotus it was not. However, from Aristophanes it was also accepted"). (Citation of Greek from Fraser II 1972, 664 note 102). Aristophanes invented two critical signs, the αστερισκος and the κεραυνιον and Fraser said it appears probable that Aristophanes used the former to indicate that a colon or a poem should be shifted, the latter to mark a corrupt passage. He also apparently employed the sigma and antisigma to distinguish between duplicate lines (Fraser II 1972, 664 note 103). Aristophanes wrote a book *On Words suspected of not being used by the early Writers* (Fraser I 1972, 460). Aristarchus wrote many commentaries (Fraser I 1972, 461). Fraser said about his textual conservatism: Like many scholars after him, he fell at times a victim to his own special knowledge, and farthered on the text of other authors, particularly Pindar, many Homeric usages foreign to them (Fraser I 1972, 462, also II 1972, 668 note 141). Later Ammonius found it necessary to write a pamphlet with the title: *On the fact that there were not more than two editions of the recensions of the Iliad by Aristarchus* = περι του μη γεγονεναι πλειονας <των δυο> εκδοσεις της Αρισταρχειου διερθρωσεως τουτο φασκοντι. (see Fraser I 1972, 464 and II 1972, 671 note 157). For examples where Aristarchus improved the text of Homer when it seemed illogical to him (see Fraser I 1972, 464). Fraser said that Aristarchus tried to determine the true reading whenever possible. Application of this and other principles of criticism might lead either to emendation (μεταθεσις), or to preference for one reading over another, or, when longer passages were involved, to censure or even suppression of the entire passage (Fraser I 1972, 464-465). These examples of freedom to emend or omit or add to the traditional texts, on the basis of logic or other considerations, are part of the *modus operandi* of the scholars of Alexandria concurrent with the Qumran texts. Demetrius was a student of Aristarchus and he wrote two pamphlets *Against the Aristarchean Exegesis of Homer* and *Against Athetized Lines* (Fraser I 1972, 471). Didymus also wrote *On the Aristarchean Recension* (Fraser I 1972, 472). Didymus wrote:

7. Analyzing key words in Numbers 4:6-14 in the Hebrew

Key elements repeated in the pericope Numbers 4:6-14 analyzed

A	B ונתנו עליו Num 4:6a και επιθησουσιν	C ופרשו בנד Num 4:6b και επιβαλουσιν	D ושמו בדיו Num 4:6c και διεμβαλουσιν αναφορεις
		C יפרשו בנד Num 4:7a επιβαλουσιν	
	B ונתנו עליו Num 4:7b εν οις σπενδει	C ופרשו ... בנד Num 4:8a επιβαλουσιν	D ושמו את־בדיו Num 4:8c και διεμβαλουσιν...αναφορεις
A ולקחו בדיו Num 4:9a και λημψονται	B ונתנו אתה Num 4:10 και εμβαλουσιν		
	B ונתנו על Num 4:10b και επιθησουσιν	C יפרשו בנד Num 4:11a επικαλψουσιν	D ושמו את־בדיו Num 4:11c και διεμβαλουσιν...αναφορεις
A ולקחו Num 4:12a και λημψονται	B ונתנו Num 4:12b και εμβαλουσιν		
	B ונתנו על Num 4:12c και καλψουσιν	C ופרשו עליו בנד Num 4:13 επιθησουσιν	
	B ונתנו עליו Num 4:14a και επιθησουσιν	C ופרשו עליו Num 14:14b επιβαλουσιν	D ושמו בדיו Num 4:14c και διεμβαλουσιν...αναφορεις

“This is however, incorrect, for if we give preference to published writings over the lecture-notes, we should write according to Aristarchus Ζευσ μεμεγας.” = το δε ουκ εχει τακριβους γραφομεν κατα Αρισταρχον Ζευσ με μεγας (Fraser II 1972, 685 note 240 with a citation from the codex of the *Iliad* Venetus A at B 111). One should not conclude from this that Didymus had access to all works published centuries before him. Although he had access to Aristarchus’ publications, he did not have access to those of Zenodotus or other earlier works (see Fraser II 1972, 684 note 238 where he described the aspect of inaccessibility of originals to the scholars of Alexandria extensively). All these editorial reworkings, recastings or textual transformations of Homer’s works at Alexandria took place concurrent with the origin of the copies at Qumran. To assume that the Qumran texts are virgin texts, with each form representing a perfect copy of different traditions, is a simplification of a much more complex state of affairs.

Elaboration in G^{ed}

A	B	C	D
ולקחו בגשמו בריו	ונתנו עליו	ופרשו בגד	שמו בריו
Num 4:14d	Num 4:14e	Num 4:14f	Num 4:14g

It is evident from an analysis of some key words that are used in patterns in the pericope between vv. 6-14 that the Hebrew composer selected them in such a way that it forms a beautifully balanced and harmonized grid. If one places these selected reoccurring words in a nice grid or even give colors or numbers or letters to them, one can see the pattern. The later Byzantine Greek translation did not keep to this grid or pattern and it appears from an analysis of literal synonyms on a one to one basis, that the Greek translator was using a Hebrew text that was probably copied by memory since there are *slips of the memory* in that key elements of the grid appear in the wrong order in the sentences of the Greek text.

This is not the only problem, namely that the Greek translation was done with a faulty Hebrew Original but also the word in the Byzantine text that differs with 4QLXXNum is evidence that something was wrong with the later text that was not with the earlier one. We know that Justin the Martyr was complaining about the Greek texts in his day²⁰⁾ and also Origen wrote to Africanus²¹⁾ that they must flatter the Jews to give them better originals since the Greek translations used in the churches were problematic.

20) In his *Dialogue with Trypho* 68:71-73 Justin the Martyr in 160 CE raised the issue concerning the shortness of some biblical texts. He accused the Jews of removing many words and phrases from the Hebrew and Greek texts. He noted that the books of *Esdra*s and *Jeremiah* have been abbreviated by the Jews of his day in the Septuagint copies but that the longer texts can still be found in the Synagogues.

21) Origen in his letter to Africanus (see *PG* 11:36-37 and 40-41) explained in detail his text-critical activities. He said that in his studies he noticed that there were many plusses (additions) in the Greek copies that were currently used in their day in the churches. He quoted examples to show that some Greek copies differed even among themselves from the book of *Daniel*. The Greek is longer, sometimes up to 200 verses longer. The edifying passages in *Esther* is not found in Hebrew “our copies are very much fuller than the Hebrew”. In *Job* many passages were omitted by Greek copyists, between four to sixteen verses. In *Jeremiah*, Origen noticed cases of transposition and variation in the readings of the prophecies. The Greek of *Genesis* has a longer text and there is diversity in the Greek readings of *Exodus*. At this point Origen suggested that the Church should reject their copies and “put away the sacred books among them, and flatter the Jews, and persuade them to give [us] copies that are untampered with, free from forgery = ut nos puris, et qui nihil habeant figmenti, impertiant” (*PG* 11:40-41).

Let's look at some evidence of *slips of the memory* for the Hebrew Vorlage of the Greek of the Byzantine period: instead of reading και επιθησουςιν in LXXNumbers 4:10a, the text is reading και εμβαλουςιν which is the substitution of ונתנו עליו for ושופר. There is the same phenomenon in LXXNumbers 4:12b and 12c and in 4:13. Due to persecutions and bookburning practices and library thefts,²²⁾ Jews had only access sometimes to a Roman Public library where the Hebrew texts were kept.²³⁾ The only way to copy it was to read it and memorize it, walk out and write it down. This was the origin of the *slips of the memory*. If it was dictated to someone else to scribble down, some more errors crept in and if the handwriting was very bad, deciphering problems could have originated due to *slips of the hand*. The ancient practices of bookmaking has been studied by a number of scholars in the past.

The key elements in the sense of order of the grid give us the ruler to test the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXXNum text, namely how close the later translator kept to the grid. The translator attempted to be as literal as possible but the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXXNum read the elements in a different order at times.

This raises the eyebrows for the LXXNum text since the advantage of 4QLXXNum is that it kept to the vocabulary of the MTNum diagonally opposed to LXXNum which deviated from both 4QLXXNum and MTNum. Having a text (4QLXXNum) like the MT more than a millennium later aligned so closely

22) Parsons says that under the reign of Eumenes II of Pergamon, “for the second time the Hellenic world was ransacked for manuscripts...Where the originals were now more difficult to find and sometimes unprocurable, copies were made for the princely bibliotheke of the famous Mysion city” (Parsons 1952, 24-25). Cassius Dio reported the censorship of books of Cremutius Cordus in the days of Tiberius (before 37 CE) and wrote that his daughter Marcia as well as others had hidden some copies (see Cassius Dio LVII 24.4 in Cramer 1945, 195). Tacitus reported bookburning actions in Rome “the fathers ordered the books to be burned . . . but some copies survived, hidden at the time, but afterwards published” (Tacitus *Annals* 35 in Cramer 1945, 196). Johnson and Harris mentioned that in 303 CE “the Emperor Diocletian made a concerted effort to destroy all Christian libraries, and many perished, but the one at Caesarea survived” (Johnson and Harris 1976, 66). See also Fraser II (1972, 48; 100; 147) for the appetite for books at the Alexandria library and Pergamene library. Ptolemaic kings ordered to take books from ships, copy them, keep the originals and hand back the copies to the ships (Fraser I [1972], 325). Such a culture encouraged books to be hidden.

23) “Although books in the Roman public libraries did not circulate outside the building as a general rule, it is apparent from several classical references that influential people could on occasion borrow them for home use” (Johnson and Harris 1998, 68). The rule was at the Athenian library in 100 CE, “no book shall be taken out, since we have sworn an oath to that effect” (ibid).

as opposed to LXXNum texts that are problematic, highlights the two sets of scribal phenomena: one careful and precise; the other of a degenerative kind.

It is thus legitimate to bring the two sets of scribal phenomena of Classical Works like Homer at the Library of Alexandria, one set before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and the other set after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and place it side by side with the nature and form of the LXX since its inception. The same degenerative phenomena are also found at Alexandria: elaborations, confluents, substitutions, omissions. On such basis this researcher is arguing that 4QLXXNum is a form that predates Antiochus Epiphanes and that the LXXNum is a form that was the result of degenerative scholarship. It was already done for Homer by scholars in the past.

8. The addition in LXXNum14d-g

There is a large addition in LXXNum 4:14 and the way this addition was composed is very similar to the parabiblical functional text 4QFlorilegium.²⁴⁾ In the case of 4QFlorilegium, citations from 2 Samuel 7:10-14 and 1 Chronicles 17:9-13 were placed in lines 1-3, 7-11 of that text. In lines 1 and 2, there are excerpts from 2 Samuel 7:10; in line 3 of Exodus 15:17; in line 4 of Exodus 15:18; in line 7 of 2 Samuel 7:11; in line 8 of 2 Chronicles 17:11; in line 10 of 2 Samuel 7:13-14; in line 12 of Amos 9:11; in line 14 of Psalm 1:1; in line 15 of Isaiah 8:11; in line 16 of Ezechiel 37:23; and in line 18 of Psalm 2:1 with *peshet*. “It was as if he moved from one to the other during the citation and selected those constituents that he wanted”.²⁵⁾ “The method of excerpting is thus a cut-and-paste procedure with syntactical and explanatory additions”.²⁶⁾

In LXXNum 4:14, the presumable “composer” excerpted words and phrases from Numbers 4:9; 4:13; 4:14; Leviticus 8:11; and Numbers 4:6. This addition is also *parabiblical* in LXXNum 4:14. It was placed in this order in the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXXNum 4:14 text and served some purpose that is not clear right now. This researcher has already mentioned that it was not the first error

24) 4QFlorilegium (174) can be found in J. Allegro DJD 5 (1968), 53 and plate XIX.

25) Koot Van Wyk, “The Form and Function of 4QJudg(a) as a witness to degenerative scribal and copyist activity”, 17, Appendix D.

26) Ibid.

this scribe or the scribe of his Vorlage committed. Supra was mentioned the order of elements problem in the pericope.

9. Conclusions

It appears that 4QLXXNum is the survival of a pre-Antiochus Epiphanes text-form of the Septuagint (pre-164 BCE) which was more literal and in line with the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition than the Greek text-form that survived in post-Epiphanes times through Christian hands. Since 4QLXXNum is aligning so well with the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition (a period of nearly 1148 years) the stability of these two texts calls for a canon form to have existed almost identical to the consonantal text of the Masoretic tradition from which the literal translation was made.

It implies that this form existed already at Qumran. Any deviation from this standard is later and due to degenerative scholarship. Wevers is correct, he did not reconstruct the original Septuagint of Genesis for the Göttingen edition. He reconstructed the post-Epiphanes degenerative product and what was preserved through Christian hands, and not the original, of which 4QLXXNum is an example.

<Keywords>

textual criticism, textual analysis, Septuagint, 4QLXXNum, slips.

(투고 일자: 2013년 7월 30일, 심사 일자: 2013년 8월 20일, 게재 확정 일자: 2013년 10월 15일)

<참고문헌>(References)

- Aejmelaeus, A., "What can we know about the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?", *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99:1 (1987), 58-89.
- Aejmelaeus, A., "Septuagintal Translation Techniques - A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account", G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, eds., LXX: Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings, *Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992, 381-402.
- Aejmelaeus, A., *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1993.
- Allegro, J. M., Qumran Cave 4. *DJD* 5. 4Q158-4Q186, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Barr, J., *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Barrera, J. T., "Espías contra consejeros en la Revuelta de Absalon (II Sam., XV, 34-36): Historia de la Recension como Método", *Revue Biblique* 86 (1979), 524-543.
- Barrera, J. T., "El estudio de 4Q Sam^a: Implicaciones exegéticas e históricas", *Estudios Bíblicos* 39:1 (1981), 5-18.
- Barrera, J. T., "Textual Variants in 4QJudg^a and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges (1)", *Revue de Qumran* 14:54 (1989), 229-245.
- Barrera, J. T., "Edition Préliminaire de 4QChroniques", *Revue de Qumran* 60:15 (1992), 523-529.
- Barrera, J. T., "Light from 4QJudg^a and 4QKgs on the Text of Judges and Kings", D. Dimant and U. Rappaport, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty years of Research*, Jerusalem: The Magnus Press, 1992b, 315-324.
- Barrera, J. T., "Crítica textual de 1 Re 22,35. Aportación de una nueva lectura de la Vetus Latina", *Sefarad* 52:1 (1992c), 235-243.
- Bodine, W. R., "The Greek Text of Judges. Recensional Developments", *Harvard Semitic Monographs* 23, Chico: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Bogaert, P.-M., "Les deux redactions conservees (LXX et MT) d'Ezechiel 7", J. Lust, ed., *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation*, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1986, 21-47.
- Bond, Z., *Slips of the Ear: Errors in the Perception of Casual Conversation*, California: Academic Press, 1999.
- Cook, J., "The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis", *Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 23, Atlanta Georgia:

- Scholars Press, 1987, 91-125.
- Cook, J., "On the Relationship between 11QPs^a and the Septuagint on the Basis of the Computerized Data Base (CAQP)", *Congress of the international Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992, 107-130.
- Cross, F. M., "A Note on Deuteronomy 33:26. With D. N. Freedman", *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 108 (1947), 6f.
- Cross, F. M., "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint", *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 132 (1953), 15-26.
- Cross, F. M., "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text", *Israel Exploration Journal* 16 (1966), 81-85.
- De Boer, P., *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I-XVI. A Contribution to the Study of the Books of Samuel*, Amsterdam: Paris, 1938.
- Driver, S. R., *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, with an Introduction on Hebrew Paleography and the Ancient Versions*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Ehrlich, A. B., *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel. Textkritisches, Sachliches und Sachliches. 3 Bd: Josua, Richter, I und II Samuelis*, 1910, 67-161.
- Elliger, K. and Rudolph, W., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1984.
- Erbes, J., *The Peshitta and the Versions. A Study of the Peshitta Variants in Joshua 1-5 in Relation to Their Equivalents in the Ancient Versions. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Studia Semitica Upsaliensa 16*, Stockholm, Sweden: Elanders Gotab, 1999.
- Eshel, E., "4QDeut - A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing", *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 62 (1991), 117- 154.
- Eybers, I. H., "Notes on the Texts of Samuel found in Qumran Cave 4. Studies on the Books of Samuel", *Papers read at 3rd Meeting of Die O.T. Werkgemeenskap in Suid-Afrika*, Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1960, 1-17.
- Eybers, I. H., *Historical Evidence on the Canon of the Old Testament with special reference to the Qumran sect*, Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms International, 1965.
- Field, F., *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive Veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta. Post Flaminium*

Nobilium, Drusium, et Montefalconium, adhibita etiam versione Syro Hexaplari, concinnavit, emendavit, et multis partibus auxit Fridericus Field. Prolegomena, Genesis-Esther, Oxford: Clarendon. Reprint Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1875, 1964.

Frankel, Z., *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, Leipzig: Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel, 1841.

Fraser, P. M., *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Vol. I: Text; Vol. II: Notes, Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1972.

Frensdorff, S., *Das Buch Ochlach W'ochlah (Massora)*, New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1972.

Goshen Gottstein, M., *The Aleppo Codex*, The Hebrew University Bible Project, Jerusalem, 1976.

Goshen Gottstein, M., "The Development of the Hebrew Text of the Bible: Theories and Practice of Textual Criticism", *Vetus Testamentum* 42:2 (1992), 204-213.

Grabbe, L., "The Translation-Technique of the Greek Minor Versions: Translations or Revisions?", G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, eds., LXX: *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings, Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992, 505-556.

Hammershaib, E., "On the Method, Applied in the Copying of Manuscript in Qumran", *Vetus Testamentum* 9 (1959), 415-418.

Hanhart, R., "The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences", G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, eds., LXX: *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings, Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 33, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1992, 339-379.

Hatch, E. and Redpath, H. A., *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1897-1906. Reproduced Graz 1954.

Johnson, E. D. and Harris, M. H., *History of the Libraries in the Western World*, 3rd edition, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc. Methuchen. 1976.

Kahle, P., "Untersuchungen zurr Geschichte des Pentateuchtextes", *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 88 (1915), 399-439.

Kallai, Z., "Samuel in Qumran. Expansion of a Historiographical Pattern (4QSam^a)", *Revue Biblique* 103:4 (1996), 581-591.

Klostermann, A., *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*, Nördlingen: C. H. Beck, 1887.

Lee, J. A. L., *LXX: A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*,

- Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Lippi, P., "The use of the computerized data base for the study of Septuagint revisions", *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 17 (1984), 48-62.
- Lippi, P., "Recovered: a lost portion of the book of Samuel", *Ministry* 64:3 (1991), 20-21.
- Lübbe, J. C., "Describing the Translation Process of 11QtgJob: A Question of Method", *Revue de Qumran* 13 nos. 49-52 (1989), 583-593.
- Lübbe, J. C., "Certain Implications of the Scribal Process of 4QSam^c", *Revue de Qumran* 14:54 (1989b), 255-265.
- Macleod, R. M., *The Library of Alexandria: Centre of Learning in the Ancient World*. London, 2000.
- Martin, Malachi., *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Volumes I-II. In *Bibliothèque du Muséon*. Volume 45, Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1958.
- Olofsson, S., *God Is My Rock. A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Int, 1990.
- Olofsson, S., *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Int, 1990b.
- Orlinsky, H., "On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 13:2: 81-91, 1941.
- Parsons, E., *The Alexandrian Library, Glory of the Hellenistic World: Its Rise, Antiquities and Destructions*, London: Cleaver-hume Press, 1952.
- Penna, A., "La Volgata e il Manoscritto 1QIs^a", *Biblica* 38 (1957), 381-395.
- Petersen, N., "An Analysis of Two Early LXX Manuscripts from Qumran: 4QLXXNum and 4QLXXLev^a in the Light of Previous Studies", *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19:4 (2009), 481-510.
- Poullisse, N., "Slips of the tongue: speech errors in first and second language production", *Studies in Bilingualism* 20, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999.
- Qimron, E. and Strugnell, J., "Qumran Cave 4 V. Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah, in Consultation with Y. Sussmann and with Contributions by Y. Sussmann and A. Yardeni", *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* 10, 1994.
- Rabin, Ch., "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint", *Textus* 6 (1968), 1-26.
- Rahlf's, A., *Septuaginta-Studien I-III*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.

- Rahlfs, A., *Septuaginta*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
- Rofé, A., “The Acts of Nahash according to 4QSam^a”, *Israel Exploration Journal* 32:2-3 (1982), 129-133.
- Rofé, A., “The Nomistic Correction in Biblical Manuscripts and Its Occurrence in 4QSam^a”, *Revue de Qumran* 14:54 (1989b), 247-254.
- Running, L. G., “A study of the relationship of the Syriac version to the Massoretic Hebrew, Targum Jonathan, and Septuagint texts in Jeremiah 18”, A. Kort and S. Morschauer, eds., In *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry*, 227-235, Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1985.
- Schniedewind, W. M., “Notes and Observations. Textual Criticism and Theological Interpretation: The Pro-Temple Tendenz in the Greek Text of Samuel-Kings”, *Harvard Theological Review* 1 (1994), 107-116.
- Skehan, P. W., “4QLXXNum: A Pre-Christian Reworking of the Septuagint”, *Harvard Theological Review* 70 (1977), 123-152.
- Skehan, P. W., Ulrich, E. and Sanderson, J. E., “Qumran Cave 4 IV. Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts, with a Contribution of P. J. Parson”, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* 9, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
- Smith, H. P., *Samuel. International Critical Commentary*, New York, 1899. Reproduced Edinburgh 1969.
- Stipp, H-J., “Das Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik in neuen alttestamentlichen Veröffentlichungen”, *Biblische Zeitschrift* nf 34:1 (1990), 16-37.
- Thackeray, H. St. J., *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1906-1940.
- Thenius, O., *Die Bücher Samuels. Kurzgefasster exegetisches Handbuch zum A.T.* Leipzig, 1842, 2nd edition 1864.
- Tov, E., “L’incidence de la Critique Textuelle sur la Critique Littéraire dans le Livre de Jérémie”, *Revue Biblique* 79 (1972), 189-100.
- Tov, E., “The Relationship between the Textual Witnesses of the O.T. in the Light of the Scrolls from the Judaean Desert”, *Beth Miqra* 77 (1979), 161-170.
- Tov, E., *The Text-Critical use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Jerusalem: Simor, 1981.
- Tov, E., “Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues”, E. Tov, ed., *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel*, Jerusalem: Simor, 1981, 45-67.
- Tov, E., “A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls”, *Hebrew Union*

College Annual 53 (1982), 11-27.

- Tov, E., "The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation", *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 31 (1986), 321-339.
- Tov, E., "Recensional differences between the MT and the LXX of Ezekiel", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovaniensis* 62:1 (1986b), 89-101.
- Tov, E., "Some sequence differences between the MT and LXX and their ramifications from the literary criticism of the Bible", *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 13 (1987), 151-160.
- Tov, E., *The Nature and Study of Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present. VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* - Jerusalem, C. E. Cox, ed., Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1987b, 337-359.
- Tov, E., *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8hevXIIgr)*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Tov, E., *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Tov, E., "Three Manuscripts (Abbreviated Texts?) of Canticles from Qumran Cave 4", *Journal of Jewish Studies* 46:1-2 (1995), 88-111.
- Ulrich, E., "The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus", *Harvard Semitic Monographs* 19, Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Van der Kooij, A., "De tekst van Samuel en het tekstkritisch onderzoek", *Nederlands Theologische Tijdschrift* 36:3 (1982), 177-204.
- Van Wyk, Koot, "The Form and Function of 4QJudg(a) as a witness to degenerative scribal and copyist activity", *Doctoral Dissertation for the University of South Africa*, Pretoria: Unpublished, 2004.
- Van Wyk, Koot, "Textual Criticism under Scrutiny: Xerox Problems since Epiphanes", *Korean Journal of Christian Studies* 75 (2011), 5-19.
- Van Wyk, Koot, "Linguistic Slips: A Window to Ancient Methods of Bookmaking", *Journal of Biblical Text Research* 31 (2012), 158-175.
- Walters, S. D., "Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1", *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107:3 (1988), 385-412.
- Wellhausen, J., *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag, 1871.
- Wevers, John W., "An Early Revision of the Septuagint of Numbers", *Eretz Israel* 16, Orlinsky Volume (1982), 235-239.
- Witty, F. J., "Reference Books in Antiquity", *Journal of Library History* 9 (1974), 101-119.

<Abstract>

Book Review - *Each According to Its Kind:*

Plants and Trees in the Bible

(Robert Koops, Reading: United Bible Societies, 2012)

Prof. Hee Suk Kim

(Chongshin Theological Seminary)

This monograph, *Each According to Its Kind: Plants and Trees in the Bible* (EAIK hereafter) was published by the United Bible Societies as a part of its series, *Helps For Translators*. In EAIK's introduction, the basic issues for reading its main portion are dealt with, in relation with understanding how the plants and trees are classified, and how names of biblical plants/trees are translated in accordance with the interrelationship between the ancient world of Israel and the modern world in which we live. The second part, the major portion of EAIK, explains the plants/trees, which are divided into six categories: wild trees and shrubs; domestic trees and shrubs; food plants (grown and gathered); incense and ointment; plants for everyday use; and flowers, thorns, and weeds. Each category provides a good number of plant/tree names, which are explained in terms of biblical references, discussion, description, special significance, and translation issues. Simply put, EAIK explores what a name has meant in the ANE context, what it means in the Bible, and what it could mean in our contemporary context. The third part presents selected bibliography, glossary, and a series of indices such as general index, plant name index, scientific plant name index, and geographical name index, scripture references, and biblical language index. Beyond doubt, EAIK is an invaluable resource for Bible translators as well as for the serious readers of the Bible. It helps us to better understand the world of plants and trees presented in the Bible. For Korean readers, EAIK should be utilized with an understanding that it has been written from a viewpoint of Western cultures and languages. Accordingly, when used with an attempt that pays attention to the cultural and linguistic differences between Korea and the Western world, EAIK will surely be an asset to enhance our understanding of the Scripture. This writer urgently recommends that EAIK will be translated into Korean and be used by the Bible translators and the members of the church.