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ABSTRACT

This study undertakes to demonstrate and assess the essentially hermeneutical nature of the differences between the MT and the LXX of the books of Haggai and Malachi.

In Chapter 1 I introduce the study and explain that virtually all of the past major treatments of the LXX of the Minor Prophets were essentially atomistic in nature and made no effort to treat the Greek text as a coherent, unified literary and theological work with its own independent integrity. I argue that the nature of the LXX of these books and the function of the LXX in history both constitute compelling reasons to treat the text as something other than a more or less defective witness toward a reconstructed Hebrew Vorlage which might be useful in the text-criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament.

In Chapter 2 I undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the kethib/Qere variants, the Sebirin, the Tiggune Sopherim and the variants attested directly or indirectly in the manuscripts discovered in the Dead Sea region as these might bear upon the Hebrew text of the Minor Prophets. I conclude that there is no evidence of systematic conformity to a proto-septuagintal text-type and that the textual evidence suggests a stream-like history with a constant intermixing of texts.

In Chapters 3 and 4 I provide a detailed textual commentary on Haggai and Malachi. In this commentary, I typically address the relation of the LXX's Vorlage to the MT, the meaning of the Vorlage, the meaning of the MT, the translator's understanding of the meaning of his Vorlage, the reasons the translator translated as he did and the significance of his Greek language without any concern for the motives or confusion which might be behind the Greek.

In Chapter 5 I conclude the study with an argument that the LXX of the Minor Prophets illustrates that an ancient translation could be both highly literal and yet reflect a high degree of hermeneutical intentionality by the translator. This possibility certainly complicates the matter of assessing the literalness of ancient translations. Furthermore, I offer an assessment of some of the central hermeneutical principles which influenced the translator in his re-shaping of the biblical text. I also argue that this study constitutes further evidence that much of the ancient interpretation of the Old Testament and many of the ancient versions of that text regularly employed palaeographically tendentious citation or translation and that a widespread program of paronomasia such as is in evidence in the LXX of the Minor Prophets can utterly confound text-criticism if incautiously defined.
To Doni
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

How This Study Came About.

This study is the result of a lengthy and complicated evolution. For initially, my examination of the Septuagint of the books of Haggai and Malachi was merely what might be regarded as text-critical preliminaries toward the real study which was intended to be a careful analysis of the Hebrew text of the books in question with certain particular interests in the matters of the compositional history and eschatology of the books. But I found myself unable to leave the "preliminary" study behind. I found the issues of the Greek text to be so complicated and so fascinating that it was impossible for me to shift my focus from that text.

What I initially observed was that in spite of the very impressive and prodigious creativity of many fine scholars who had made almost innumerable suggestions about how the differences between the MT and the LXX should be regarded as the result of differences between the Vorlage of the LXX and the MT, when the suggested differing Vorlage was examined closely, it was usually anything but convincing. Typically, upon investigation the proposed Vorlage was discovered to be contrary to expected Hebrew idiom and to imply a Greek rendering at odds with the standard renderings found in the Minor Prophets. And of course there was that problem of understanding how a text which needed as much alteration as implied in the sea of proposed emendations could have even been comprehensible, much less relatively smooth and straightforward.¹

Furthermore, the more I looked at the differences between LXX and MT, the more the differences looked other than random or isolated. They had
the appearance of forming a substantially coherent structure of thought. In fact, early in my examination of the books I began to suspect that I was coming to know a little something about the translator and his own thinking. This came as quite a shock. I had never before imagined that such an encounter might occur. My previous training and experience in the LXX had inclined me toward the view that the books of the LXX were more or less defective witnesses to be used in the reconstruction of an ancient form of the Hebrew Old Testament which might on occasion be quite useful in correcting the MT where it had experienced corruption of one sort or another. But early in my analysis of the books I perceived that such a high percentage of the differences between LXX and MT appeared to represent the intentional alterations made by the translator, that it would be necessary to modify my previous view of the textual relations between the LXX and MT. I undertook the study of the LXX of Haggai and Malachi expecting to alter slightly my general text-critical predisposition. I could have never imagined the extent of the challenge to my general view of textual realities which I would ultimately encounter in the LXX of the Minor Prophets.

The Need for the Study.

There have been quite a number of substantial text-critical tomes on the LXX of the Minor Prophets in recent scholarly history. And I have profited greatly from them. They are, in order of publication:


Of course there are also a great many lesser works, many of which are quite important. But the substantial treatments of the LXX of the Minor Prophets are the works mentioned. I have particularly profited from Stekhoven and Dingermann. My dependence on their work will be clear throughout. But what is clearly the case about all of these works is that none of them makes any pretense of treating the Greek text as a coherent literary work. None of these works could be regarded as an exegesis of the Greek text. This is the primary need which I seek to address in this study. Any help which might be gleaned along the way with respect to the text-criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament would of course be valued, yet it is my central purpose to elucidate the Greek text itself.

Of course the detailed exegesis of a work in translation, particularly when a text closely related to the translation's Vorlage is extant, deserves some defense. One aspect of that defense is the issue of how the translation functioned in history. In this case, clearly the translation was treated as a distinct literary work with its own theological integrity. So Claude Cox states,

The LXX as a collection of Scripture circulated in Egypt, Palestine, and beyond; Philo and Josephus use and comment upon it; early Christian writers like Paul quote from it liberally in New Testament writings. To cite only one relevant example of such quotation, it is LXX Job to whom James refers when he says to his readers, "You have heard of the steadfastness (hupomone) of Job." (5:11).
This is true and important. And yet, the most fundamental defense of the idea of doing exegesis on the LXX itself is a proper view of its nature. And to elaborate on that subject at this point would be premature. Thus we shall suspend the completion of the justification of our approach until the conclusion, at which point we can draw upon the detailed treatment of the subject matter to inform our view about such a fundamental question as the essential nature of the LXX of Haggai and Malachi.

The Approach of the Study.

We must arrive at some general opinion about the probabilities that the differences between the LXX and MT correspond to the LXX's connection with a putative proto-septuagintal text-type. Toward this end, in Chapter 2 we will do a comprehensive evaluation of the Kethib/Qere variants, the Sebirin, the Tiqqune Sopherim and the variants attested directly or indirectly in the manuscripts discovered in the Dead Sea region. Furthermore, we will assess the relative significance of the LXX's agreement with any Hebrew texts which differ from the MT and address the question of whether or not there is evidence of systematic conformity to a proto-septuagintal text-type.

Chapters 3 and 4 certainly constitute the heart of the study. This is our detailed textual commentary on Haggai and Malachi. In this commentary, we will typically address the relation of the LXX's Vorlage to the MT, the meaning of the Vorlage, the meaning of the MT, the translator's understanding of the meaning of his Vorlage, the reasons the translator translated as he did and the significance of his Greek text as read by readers only interested in the most natural meanings of the Greek language without any concern for the motives or confusion which might be behind the Greek. Clearly this exegetical work is multi-faceted. Nevertheless, it will always be the case that our central orientation to
the text will be the Greek of the books under investigation.

We will conclude our study in chapter 5 with a consideration of some of the central hermeneutical principles which influence the translator in his re-shaping of the biblical text. And finally we will discuss his essential *modus operandi*. In this final chapter, we will conclude our defense of the legitimacy and importance of the inquiry.
Notes

1Verhoef's statement on the matter is sound. He states, My fifteen-year experience in Bible translation has strengthened the conviction that the majority of proposed alterations to the text (cf., e.g., BHK/S) are really unnecessary. This conclusion also applies to the text of Haggai (and Malachi). Mitchell's list of additions, omissions, and errors, for example, is impressive, but most of the items are arbitrary (e.g., in 1:2,3,4,6,9,10,11,12,15; 2:2,5,7,15-16, 17,18,19,22,23). In the commentary we have pointed out that the "defectiveness" of the text need not be interpreted as corruption, but rather as the result—as Harrison puts it—of "stylistic clumsiness."

In most cases the meaning of the text is clear.


2Joseph Ziegler is the editor of the Göttingen edition of the Minor Prophets, Duodecim prophetae. 3rd ed. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum. Vol 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1984. Unless otherwise specified, this edition is used as representing the closest approximation to the Old Greek of the Minor Prophets. Outside the Minor Prophets, unless otherwise specified, we will be using Rahlfs handy text. I will on occasion question some of Ziegler's text-critical decisions, nevertheless, in general we are on a sure footing with his text. It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss the difficulties attendant to creating an eclectic text which purports to represent the Old Greek (LXX) from the various LXX manuscripts. However, I am aware that if the ancient scribes exercised a very high degree of authorial intentionality in their copying of their texts, then it necessarily follows that attempts to reconstruct the Old Greek by genealogical stemmata will be to some extent confounded. I have pointed out several instances of such tendentious alterations by the scribes.

This study would not have been possible without virtually unlimited access to the Ibycus computer of New College, Edinburgh. Particularly extensive use was made of the Packard Humanities Institute CD Rom #1 (particularly the CCAT Biblical Materials from the University of Pennsylvania). Dr. David Mealand of New College, Edinburgh, the resident
Ibycus expert, was particularly helpful and generous with his time.

All septuagintal study must be pursued with a constant awareness of the very real possibility that the Greek translation represents a translation of a Hebrew Vorlage quite different from the present MT. In determining the relative probability that the Vorlage might have indeed been different from the MT there are two principal approaches to the question. First is the consideration of the evidence of the existence of real Hebrew variants. Second is the assessment of the general character of the translation and the likeliness that any differences between the LXX and the MT are best understood as attributable to the translation process. Although clearly these two considerations are quite closely related to one another, inasmuch as we will give careful consideration to the matter of translation technique throughout the textual commentary, at this point we will only consider the evidence which might suggest the existence of real Hebrew variants. We will consider the evidence of ancient textual plurality at the level of the Hebrew text by means of a comprehensive examination of the Kethib/Qere variants, the Sebirin, the Tiqqune Sopherim and the variants attested directly or indirectly in the manuscripts discovered in the Dead Sea region.1

Kethib/Qere

Hosea

4.6 יִנְהַר וְיָשָׁר יְהוָה According to Olshausen (Heb. Gram. p. 179),
the anomalous form נדנדה is only a copyist's error for נדנדה; but Ewald (§247, e) regards it as an Aramaean pausal form. The suggestion in BHS that the K might be a corruption from an original (LXX = κατω από ψηφιών) is very unconvincing. Rather, the Greek looks to be a rather unexceptional assimilation toward the precise wording of the second half of the verse--καὶ εἴπελθει αναγκασθείς θεοῦ σου, κατω εἰπανομεί περὶ σου. It should be noted that the word-order of the Hebrew of the second clause (where the emphatic personal pronoun does in fact occur) is not such that would correspond closely to the "original" Vorlage of the LXX suggested in BHS.

6.10 K נדנדה Q נדנדה This is one of 20 instances where the K has the nominal pattern based on the Aramaic Pa'il form while the Q has the form derived from the Qal Passive--Pa'ul. The LXX has a predictable rendering--ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ εἶδον φρικώμενον. (ל). 4

8.12 K נדנדה Q נדנדה אבנה The Qere simply indicates that a vowel reduction would be expected in view of the shift of the accent which is occasioned by the makkeph (ל). 4

K נדנדה Q נדנדה רב In this instance, there are two different words at stake. The K represents a variant form of the word נדנדה, which means "myriad or numberless" while the Q represents the plural construct of the word נדנדה, which means "multitude or abundance." The editors of BHS wrongly commend the suggestion of Wellhausen to read the text as
The Greek of the LXX is καταγραφῶ αυτῷ πληθὸς καὶ τα νομίμα αυτου. If the final 1 of the unpointed Vorlage of the LXX were misread as the conjunction, then surely there would be no reason to imagine anything other than the K reading. But as Gelston notes, the readings of Symmachus and the Peshitta support the Q. Symmachus has εγραψα αυτῳ πληθη νομων μου.

9.16 K בולו Q בולו These negatives are so similar in usage that it would be very unlikely that any difference could be perceived in translation. (Cf. GKC §152 t).

10.10 K שלחותו ציינתה Q שלחותו ציינתה The Q reading of 'their iniquities" is supported by the LXX (εν ταῖς δυσιν αδικίαις αυτῶν), the Vulgate, the Targums and the Peshitta. It is difficult to imagine what the K might mean and the absence of the dual form in reference to two eyes is quite unexpected.

11.8 K בבלו קובאנסו Q בבלו קובאנסו LXX has ως Σεβωμ. Gordis explains, "The orthography of בבלו ציינתה and with two Yods, or the spelling ציינתה ציינתה, makes an error easily possible, which the Q seeks to prevent by writing the more normal and hence less equivocal form on the margin."

13.2 K בולו Q בולו As Gordis states, "To avert the possibility of their being read Kames He, i. e., as feminine suffixes, the Q writes the later and clearer form, with Vav, on the margin, as a guide to the reader in the absence of vocalization." The LXX has συντετελεσμενα which has every appearance of being a mistranslation of the K.
Joel

4.1 K אֶתְכְּרֵב Q אֶתְכְּרֵב LXX εἰστηρεψεν. The Greek verb renders both the Qal and the Hiphil of שׁוֹדֵב so often that there is no possibility of determining which Hebrew form was in the Vorlage of the LXX. What is no doubt behind the Q is the fact that there is no clear-cut example of שׁוֹדֵב as a Qal transitive except in the expression which occurs here—טַנְחוֹת שָׁבַע. KB (pp. 953-4) even speculates that there are two roots behind the Hebrew שׁוֹדֵב, and that the second one only occurs in the phrase in question. This seems a bit unlikely. William L. Holladay offers a fine survey of suggested explanations of the clause.

Amos

8.4 K וֹנֵב כָּל הָעָלָמִים Q וֹנֵב כָּל הָעָלָמִים Plural constructs of כלה וֹנֵב and רָבָה וֹנֵב respectively. No clear difference in meaning or of renderings in the LXX.

8.8 K הָנֵבָה וֹנֵב Q הָנֵבָה וֹנֵב The forms are the 3FS Niphal Perfect of בָּשָׂה and בָּשָׂה respectively. The LXX has καταβησταῖ which follows the Q. That K is corrupt is clearly suggested in the parallelism of 9.5 where one finds the expected form בָּשָׂה. Symmachus evidently reads the Q with his καταβησταῖ. Theodotion might read the K with his more vivid καταποντισθησταῖ. [Note that καταποντισθῇ often renders בָּלָה (Pi. "to drink") in the LXX.]

9.6 K מַעַלַתוֹנַי Q מַעַלַתוֹנַי This is a common case of the Q wanting to ensure that the expected יָבִא associated with personal suffixes connected to nouns in the plural is not deleted. Its omission is very common.
LXX has ἀναβασίν αὐτοῦ. Symmachus has τὰ ὑπέρων αὐτοῦ. It is precarious with Gordis to imagine that the LXX is misreading the Q because of its singular ἀναβασίν.

Obadiah

11 K שְׁנָתִים Q שְׁנָתִים The LXX has πυλάς αὐτοῦ. The K can either represent the singular noun or the plural written defectively. See GKC §91 K. However, it is certainly impossible to imagine that the rendering of the LXX proves that its Vorlage had the plural form. Both the Hebrew word שְׁנָתִים and the Greek word πυλάς are collective singulars. Thus in the MP alone, one observes that שְׁנָתִים occurs 12 times and that only in the Q of Obadiah 11 and in Zech. 8.16 is the Hebrew word plural. Yet the Greek rendering of the word is typically plural (singular only in Mi. 1.9; 2.13; Zeph. 1.10; & Zech. 14.10). And it is perhaps noteworthy that שְׁנָתִים occurs in Ob. 13 in the singular where it is predictably rendered with a Greek plural.

Micah

1.3 K ובמותי Q ובמותות K is plene.

1.8 K ישילים Q ישילים Variant spelling of same word.12

1.10 K ויהשלמנת Q ויהשלמנת The first person sing. Perfect of the K makes absolutely no sense in the context. It is necessary with LXX, P and Vulgate to read with the imperative. But the person of the imperative needs to be plural. The history of the obvious corruption was שְׁנָתִים כָּלַל וּלְכָלַל.
3.2 K Ṭub ḳin LXX τὰ πονηρὰ. The LXX renders both Hebrew words with the Greek word.

Nahum
1.3 K יְנָבָלוֹן Q יְנָבָלוֹן. The Q merely preserves the anticipated reduction in view of the following Makkeph הָדוֹר.

2.1 K לְצָבְרוֹנָה Q לְצָבְרוֹנָה. Same as 1.3.

K בֵּלֵל Q בֵּלֵל. The LXX has συντελεσται which is an obvious mistranslation of the K. Compare Hosea 13.2.

2.6 K בָּהֲלוֹתָם Q בָּהֲלוֹתָם. LXX has εν τῇ πορείᾳ συντων (Q).
Alexandrinus represents the K with its plural ταῖς πορείαις.

3.3 K וְנֶפֶשְׁלָה Q וְנֶפֶשְׁלָה. LXX καὶ ασθενησοσέαν. Because the Greek word regularly renders the Hebrew verb both in the Qal and in the Niphal, there is really no way to know what the Vorlage of the LXX was. The future tense of the Greek does not prove that it was translating the K for the Perfect + 1 might be in grammatical sequence with the first verb of the paragraph ימי (in verse 1) and thus might derive its temporal force from this Imperfect.

Habakkuk
1.9 K בֵּלֵל Q בֵּלֵל. LXX mistranslates the K with συντελεια. Symmachus renders the Q with παντα.
1.15 K  קָלָה בָּלָה Q  הַמְּקַלָּה LXX mistranslates the K with συντελεῖαν.

3.4 K  צַלְחַה Q  צַלְחָה Once again simply a difference in the form of the 3MS suffix. Cf. Hos. 13.2.

3.14 K  פֶּרֶזִּי Q  פֶּרֶזָּי LXX has διηναςτῶν. Inasmuch as the K merely represents the defective writing of the suffix on a plural noun, there is no way of knowing what the Vorlage of the LXX was.

Zephaniah
2.7 K  שְׁבִיטָה Q  שְׁבִיתָה A simple non-semantic phonological difference. As Gordis observes, "When a 'u' form of the verb is used, the Q has an i form of the noun שְׁבִיתָה שְׁבִיתָה. In other words, the Q, but not the K, manifests a distaste for two i sounds or u sounds in succession." 14

Haggai
1.8 K  כָּפַבָּה רֶסֶכָּר Q  כָּפַבָּה רֶסֶכָּר The cohortative final ה is at stake. The reading of the LXX כָּפַבָּה רֶסֶכָּר could of course represent either Hebrew reading.

Zechariah
1.4 K  פֶּמְשָׁלָלֵבָה Q  פֶּמְשָׁלֵלֶבָה It is very difficult to know how to point either form. The K form is not known elsewhere. It likely represents an early scribal error of assimilation toward the well-known form פֶּמְשָׁלָלֵבָה. If that be correct then it is not unlikely that we also have the scribal error of haplography at work. Thus the history of the forms would be:

The LXX has καὶ απὸ τῶν εἰσιδρικτημάτων τῶν συνηθῶν. It is precarious with Gordis to
speculate on the Vorlage of the LXX as this point. The frequency with which the LXX uses εὐφροσύνη to render both מצלל and is such that there is no possibility of determining the Vorlage here. Neither is the καὶ σπο adequate proof that the Vorlage had a double מ. If the form only had one מ then the double-duty of the מ of מפירות מידע ועזרים would quite naturally be inferred by the translator.

1.16 K לְךָ וְלָקוּד Q לְךִי וְלָקוּדוֹ LXX has καὶ μετερον. KQ represent different forms of the same word.

2.8 K אלהי Q אלהי

4.2 K אֲלֹים Q אֲלֹים LXX has καὶ εἶπεν. Alexandrinus has καὶ εἶπεν. The difficult (impossible ?) reading of the K is surely the result of a scribe accidentally looking back to the preceding אֲלֹים at the beginning of the verse. The Q is supported by manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza, the Latin Vulgate, the Targums and the Syriac Peshitta.

11.2 K הבצורים Q בגזרו The Q is impossible. The LXX has καὶ παλαισµον µετάφρασις. This 1st person plural verb might suggest a Vorlage of נבצורה.

11.5 K וַעֲנַשׁוּ Q וַעֲנַשׁוּ The Q is impossible. The LXX has καὶ παλαισµον µετάφρασις. This 1st person plural verb might suggest a Vorlage of נבצורה.

14.2 K נַפַל Q נַפַל The K is the Niphal of נַפַל and means "the women will be ravished." The Q is the Niphal of נַפַל (Qal—to lie down)
and is simply a euphemism for the same. See Gordis p. 86 for a complete list of KQ variants based on this motive of guiding the reader to avoid reading something too coarse or obscene. The LXX has αἱ γυναικεῖς μολυνθησόνται. There is no other instance where the LXX renders either שבול or שבע with this Greek word. So it is possible that the translators have created a euphemism of their own. There is no reason to imagine that the Vorlage was anything other than the K.

14.6 K יָקִּיבָּה, Q יָקִיבָּה The K is the Qal Imperf. of קִיבָּה and means to congeal or thicken. The Q is simply the noun meaning frost. The LXX with its καὶ ψυχή καὶ παγός is very difficult. It is tempting to read instead ψυχός καὶ παγός. However, the manuscript evidence and difficulty of the reading are overwhelmingly impressive. ψυχή (or -ής) is supported by W*, B, S*, Y*, Q*, 198, 233*, 393*, 534*, 544, 919, the Sahidic Version and the reading of Basilius Neopatrensis. The reading of the LXX might constitute support for the Q if only because it has a noun.

_Hosea_

4.8 K לְפָשֵׁה יִּתְּנָה LXX τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν It is not uncommon in Hebrew for the singular pronominal suffix to refer distributively to a plural. If that were the case with לְפָשֵׁה then the LXX might have simply smoothed out the language toward reasonable Greek idiom. However, it is also fairly likely that there occurred an ancient scribal error of dittography. The sequence of readings thus would have been לְפָשֵׁה רְדוֹתא "לְפָשֵׁה רְדוֹתא."
7.12 K עַזְרָאֵלִים לֵיתָן LXX καθως (?) See BDB p. 83 (_DIALOGUE_ID:8e).

9.2 K הַב לָשׁוֹן LXX αὐτοῦς (S)

12.9 K אָמְרָתָהוּ LXX καὶ εἰπεν (K—although the collective noun אֱפֹרִים can easily take a plural verb.)

**Amos**

5.19 K מַצְרִי LXX εκ προσώπου (K)

9.9 K אָרְזָה LXX επί την γῆν (?)

**Jonah**

1.14 K אָנָשִׁים LXX εν τροπον (?)

**Micah**

7.12 K יִבְנוּיָה לֵיתָן LXX constitutes a substantial rereading of the passage. Whereas the Hebrew is (ותָּלִיךְ וּבַיָּנוֹן) [and unto you it (they) shall come], the Greek καὶ αἱ πολεῖς σου ηζουσιν is reading the text as though it were וּבַיָּנוֹן. Thus the plural verb cannot be decisive in determining the Vorlage since it is required by the explicitly plural subject. The subject of the Hebrew is indeterminate.

**Haggai**

1.12 K אָנָשִׁים LXX καθοτι (?)
Zechariah

6.7 K οἱ ἀπορεῖ καὶ εἰπε (K)

10.7 K οἱ ἔσονται (K? Cf. Hos. 12.9.)

14.8 K ---(?)

Tikkune Sopherim

Hosea

4.7 is held to be a correction of . The LXX has την δοξαν αυτων εις ατμιαν θησομαι, clearly agreeing with MT.

Habakkuk

1.12 is held to be a correction of . The LXX has καὶ οὐ μὴ αποθανωμεν, supporting the MT.

Zechariah

2.12 is held to be a correction of . The LXX has απομενος της κορης του οφθαλμου αυτου, agreeing with MT.

Malachi

1.13 is held to be a correction of . The LXX has καὶ εξεφυσησατε αυτα. The reading supports the MT for the plural αυτα is simply the result of the fact that the antecedent is ταυτα.
The Variants Found or Implied in the Dead Sea Scrolls

There are three principal ways in which the texts discovered in the region of the Dead Sea might be of interest in our assessment of variants within the Hebrew tradition of the Minor Prophets. First is the important Hebrew scroll of the Minor Prophets discovered in a cave of Wadi Murabba'at (M88). Second are the citations from the MP in the Damascus Document. And finally and most important are the Pesharim of the books within the collection. We shall examine every instance where the LXX might be in agreement with manuscripts from the Dead Sea region against the MT. Then we shall assess the magnitude and significance of the agreement in view of the overall number of variants.

Murabba'at

Obadiah 17 MT מִלְמוּרֵיתְיוֹת מְמוּרֵיתְיוֹת M88 מִלְמוּרֵיתְיוֹת LXX τοὺς κατακληρονομησάντας αὐτοὺς The MT represents the plural (+ suffix) form of the noun מִלְמוּרֵיתְיוֹת ("possession"). M88 represents the Hiphil participle ("those possessing"). The only other occurrence of the Hebrew word is in Isa. 14.23

The renderings of the closely related feminine noun מַלְמֶשָׁה are:

Ex. 6.8 ενκλημο
Deut. 33.4 κληρονομιαν
Ezek. 11.15 εἰς κληρονομιαν
25.4 εἰς κληρονομιαν
25.10 εἰς κληρονομιαν
33.24 εἰς κατασχεσιν
36.2 εἰς κατασχεσιν
36.3 εἰς κατασχεσιν
36.5 εἰς κατασχεσιν

While it does seem that the translator of Ezekiel and Deuteronomy know
the feminine word מ nº נ is not clear that the masculine מ nº נ was known. Furthermore, it is worth noticing that the Hiphil of מ nº נ occurs 60+ times and yet is rendered with the Greek κατακλημονμενον only one time (Judg. 11.24). The only other occurrence of the Hiphil of מ nº נ in the MP is in Zech. 9.4 where the Greek is κατακλημονμενον. In these circumstances, it is very difficult to speculate on the Vorlage of the LXX.

Micah 2:11 MT ליאו אב M88 ו LXX αὐτοῖς (=M88) Although the LXX read the word as אב, the word of the MT can either be spelled ליאו or ליאו so that the reading of the LXX only reflects a judgment about the vocalisation.

Nahum 1:5 MT נרHEMA ליח LXX τα ἀρη (=M88 ?)

Zephaniah 3:15 MT ἀναίρετον M88 אב LXX εὐθύρων σου (=M88 ?)

The Damascus Document

1.13-14 (Hos. 4.16) MT נרHEMA מדרות מחרשך LXX οτι ως δαμαλις παροιστορησα παροιστηρησεν Ἰσραηλ (=MT)

19.15-16 (Hos. 5.10) MT ריה מחרר תודיה במעיונים גбал תליםות אשמך כמיות CD ריה מחרר תודיה במעיונים גбал תליםות אשמך כמיות נבדות LXX כמיות נבדות The confusion between מחרר and מחרר is common and not noteworthy. The LXX with its το ορμημα μου does reflect the pronominal suffix of MT's
16.15 (Mi. 7.2) MT נָלְשָׁת אֶת רִגְעָה מִי נָלְשָׁת אֶת רִגְעָה CD עַל מִי נָלְשָׁת LXX εκαστός τον πλησίον αυτοῦ (=CD) Although πλησίον does seem to render the Hebrew נָלְשָׁת in Gen. 26.31, Lev. 25.14, and Deut. 19.19, elsewhere in the MP it renders לֵא. One could perhaps suspect that CD and LXX were assimilating toward 7.5 where the MT is נָלְשָׁת האֶת רִגְעָה, however at this point LXX has μη καταπιστευετε εν φιλοις.

9.5 (Na. 1.2) MT κόπος μαθα ὑπερο αὐνας οὐαν ζαλιβιος CD κόπος μαθα ὑπερο αὐνας οὐαν ζαλιβιος LXX εὐδικών κυρίον τοὺς ὑπεναντίους αὐτοῦ καὶ εξαιρῶν αὐτοὺς τοὺς εὐθείοις αὐτοῦ (=MT)

19.7-9 (Zech. 13.7) MT λέγει κυρίος CD λέγει κυρίος LXX λέγει κυρίος παντοκράτωρ (=MT)

6.13-14 (Mal. 1.10) MT μὴ βιώσης λόγος ἀληθείας οἱ σκότοι νύμμω καὶ Σκύπεας CD μὴ βιώσης λόγος ἀληθείας οἱ σκότοι νύμμω καὶ Σκύπεας LXX διότι καὶ εν υἷν συγκλείσθησονται θυραι, καὶ οὐκ αναψετε το θυσίατηριον μου δώρεαν: Because the translator has altered the rhetorical force of the first clause, it is impossible to speculate about the presence or absence of the ἀλήθεια or conjunction; however it is quite likely that his vorlage did not have the pronominal suffix of λόγος.

The Pesharim
Hosea
2.11 MT מִקְלְכָּמָתָה לָבֹּלָעָּטֲהָתָה TIIDDt' 4Q166 LXX τοῦ μη καλυπτεῖν There is syntactical ambiguity in the function of the ל. The MT surely means “I will snatch away my wool and my flax given to cover her nakedness.” In this construction the purpose clause is dependent on the assumed given. The text of 4Q166 and the LXX find the purpose clause to follow directly from the verb לֹא יָכְלָא (I will snatch away ... in order to or with the result that ...). When read this way the Greek negative or the privative לֹא is required for the proper sense. Cf. BDB p. 583 *7 b (o) and GKC §119 y.

2.13 MT מִקְלְכָּמָתָה 4Q166 LXX καὶ πασᾶς τὰς πανηγυρεῖς αὐτῆς The MT is surely a distributive singular. Thus the fact that the LXX with πανηγυρεῖς is plural is not the slightest evidence of real textual correspondence between the reading of 4Q166 and LXX.

6.9 MT נֶחֱטָה 4Q163 POrTD LXX καὶ η λαχυς σου The MT represents the Piel infinitive construct of נָחֲת (See GKC §75 ee). 4Q163 has the imperfect of the same verb. Vegas Montaner argues that the reading of the LXX suggests an original Vorlage of נָחֲתֵּל. This suggestion has the merits of: 1. Acknowledging the typical rendering of λαχυς for לָבֹּל, and 2. Explaining the σου as a rendering of the pronominal suffix לָבֹּל. However, it is subject to criticism inasmuch as 4Q163 lacks the conjunction. The reconstruction requires a confusion of ל for ל. It requires the plene form of the ל (a spelling which only occurs 1 time in the MT—Dan. 11.6) and of the suffix. And it implies a Hebrew text which was unintelligible. For it is surely difficult to imagine how כְּן קְלוֹנָתָה could be translated. Thus, it is quite precarious to associate the LXX and 4Q163 at this point.
Amos 1:3 MT --- 5Q4 (ἡ εὐθύνη τοῦ τάφρος) LXX τας εν γάστρι ἐχομασ A shared
plus like this certainly looks like an instance of genealogical relation
between texts. However, assimilation toward verse 13 (ῥάφει τὰς
ev γάστρι ἐχομασ τῶν Γαλααθιτῶν) is not at all unlikely.

Micah 1:3 MT יֲמֵי 1Q14 (יַמֵּי) LXX יֵעַת וַה Vegas Montaner
assesses the situation very nicely:

En Profetas Menores ge aparece sin artículo cuando sigue un
sustantivo. En posición final, como aquí, lo normal es la presencia del
artículo, pero está también atestiguado simplemente ges (Hab 2,8,17;
Zac 9,10, lo que daría fuerza a esta variante. Sin embargo, adviértase
que la expresión btn(w)ty rs (Dt 32,13; Is 58,14; Am 4,13; Miq 1,3)
nunca lleva artículo y, no obstante, en los cuatro casos G traduce tēs
ges, lo que indudablemente convierte el apoyo de G a Q aquí en
prácticamente irrelevante. 19

Nahum

2.14 MT רְכֵּבָה 4Q169 (רְכֵּבָה) LXX πληθος σου The MT reads, "I will
burn her chariots (רְכֵּבָה--collective singular). Virtually the whole line
is missing from 4Q169 so that one finds the hypothetical reconstruction
לְצָאַהְוַה רְכֵּבָה. As clearly stated in a note on
p. 41 the word רְכֵּבָה is "reconstructed from the peser in 1.10." The
Targums read "your chariots" [although Sperber's Ms c has "its ("her")
chariot(s)"] 20 Gelston is probably correct in his view that the Peshitta's
agreement with LXX should probably be regarded as dependence. 21

3.1 MT יֵסָמֶךְ 4Q169 שְׂפַלַּתַּתָּם The MT represents the
Hiphil of one root מָשָׁה, while 4Q169 (and the rendering of LXX) represent the Qal of a second root מָשָׁה. The passive of the Greek likely represents merely a bit of smoothing by the translator.

3.8 MT הָיָה 4Q169 וְהָיָה LXX קαὶ ἐστὶ (+ αὐτῆς—W, A, and Theodoret)

3.8 MT καὶ υἱὸς 4Q169 Πλησίον LXX καὶ υἱὸς (Πλησίον) The Greek conjunction in и of itself could never be substantial proof of the existence of the conjunction in its Vorlage. The real difference pertains strictly to the pointing of מין.

3.11 MT וְהָיָה 4Q169 וְהָיָה LXX καὶ εστὶ

Habakkuk

1.4 MT המֶשֶׁס LXX το χρύσα

1.5 MT בָּרֹנֶים 1QpH [ברונימ] LXX αἱ καταφρονηταὶ It is very likely that the Vorlage of the LXX was ברונים. Cf. 2.5 αἰ νεῖκος βέβαιρος / ο δὲ κατοικονομοῦσα κατοικονομοῦσα καὶ καταφρονητῆς

1.6 MT בָּרֹנֶים 1QpH --- LXX ὁρμησώσαι This is probably just a free rendering of בָּרֹנֶים

1.15 MT יבָא לָיָה 1QpH LXX καὶ εἰλικρίνειν αυτὸν
2.2 MT ἁπλὰ 1QpH οἱ αὐτοῖς LXX ἀναγίνωσκον

2.5 MT ἡδίν 1QpH ἡδίν LXX Ziegler accepts the conjecture of Rahlfs that κατοικεμένος (the conceited one) should be read instead as κατοικεμένος (the drunken one). Brownlee, on the other hand, commends the suggestion of Houtsma that the reading of 1QpH might be reflected in the κατοικεμένος which is so widely supported in the Greek manuscripts. As he states, "The noun would be either ἱαμών or ἱαμόν, in either case a noun of the qattel form like ἱαμᾶ or ἱαμόν."22 In 1885 Houtsma argued that the Greek κατοικεμένος derived "from the verbal root ἱαμώ or ἱαμό, which appears as a hapax legomenon in Deut. 1:41." However, it must be noted that the verbal form in question is generally judged to derive from an Arabic root meaning "to be light." Cf. BDB p. 223 and KB p. 228.23

2.5 MT ἤπειρον 1QpH ήπειρον LXX καὶ κατάφρονητης It is possible that the Greek reading results from a misreading of 1QpH as ἤπειρον.

2.6 MT 1QpH ἄλλοι LXX παραβολὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ

2.6 MT ἄλλοι 1QpH ήπειρον LXX καὶ εὑρέσθη The MT refers to the collective singular of verse 5 while 1QpH and LXX probably represent an attempt to smooth out the text so that the verb reflects the plural of the subject ἅλλοι.
2.16 MT יִתְנָה לֵין מִי הַכֹּלֶה הַוַּיִּים LUXX καὶ διασαλευθήτι It appears that the MT has undergone an accidental metathesis (a suggestion made long ago by David Kimchi). The reading of 1QP H is superior on internal and external grounds. The context with its mention of drinking and drunkenness surely supports the word "stagger." Cf. the cognate noun in Zech. 12.2 ("cup of staggering"). Furthermore, the reading is supported by the Peshitta, Aquila and the Vulgate. However, it must be noted that the Pesher on the verse appears to imply a knowledge of the reading of the MT. ["Interpreted, this concerns the Priest whose ignominy was greater than his glory. For he did not circumcise the foreskin [יחל] of his heart, and he walked in the ways of drunkenness that he might quench his thirst." transl. of Vermes] See Horgan p. 50.

2.17 MT יִתְנָה לֵין מִי הַכֹּלֶה HXX πτὸςεῖ σε

In plate LX column 12, there is difficulty in determining whether the first letter is ה or י. The column begins יִתְנָה לֵין מִי הַכֹּלֶה, and clearly the first letter is the same length as the twelfth and yet distinctly shorter than the eighth. Since the eighth letter must be י rather than ה, it is very difficult to decide with certainty on the first letter. In the transcription found in The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. I The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary (The American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven 1950), it is transcribed by Brownlee with the י. However, Talmon and others have preferred to read it as ה. The LXX is perhaps understandable if the final ה of the MT
were read as "א" (אָסָּר) and if the "א" has slipped into the word at some point later than the Vorlage of the LXX. But it would certainly be precarious to try to correlate the Greek with either Hebrew. The Hebrew is too uncertain.

2.19 MT רֵאֶמ לֹא אֵין לֹא q PH 109 (M L X X o λέγων Vegas Montaner's presentation of 1QpH is quite bold here. The dot under the נ implies that it is possible to make it out, yet with difficulty. In fact, the vast majority of the נ is missing and only a tiny point of the next letter is visible. Thus Brownlee transcribed the text [ ]ת. It is possible that the proposed restoration is too short. The Greek definite article might well be expected merely on stylistic grounds.

Conclusion

Kethib/Qere

That the LXX of the Minor Prophets sometimes demonstrates a correlation with (perhaps dependence on) a textual tradition which differs from the K of the MT cannot be doubted. But neither should the statistical significance of this correlation be exaggerated. Of the 36 Kethib/Qere differences in the MP, in only four instances (Hos. 10.10, Amos 8.8, Na. 2.6 and Zech. 4.2) is it likely that the LXX reflects a clear correlation with the Q against the K. This represents a mere 11.11% correlation. It is possible, although unlikely, that there is a similar correlation between LXX and Q in Mi. 1.10 and Zech. 14.6. If that correlation be granted, one would have the greatest conceivable correlation of 16.66%. While it is true that a great many of these K/Q
variants are such that the Greek would not be different if the Variage were one form or the other, there is some probability that in such ambiguous instances the LXX should be regarded as reflecting the K of MT. This probability derives from the fact that in Hos. 13.2, Na. 2.1, Hab. 1.9 and Hab. 1.15 the LXX demonstrates through its mistranslation an unambiguous dependence on K against Q.

Sebiri

The situation with respect to the Sebiri is very similar. At the very most, it might be argued that the LXX corresponds to the Sebiri in 3 out of 13 instances (Ho. 4.8, Ho. 9.2 and Mi. 7.12). This represents a 23.08% correlation. However, this is very misleading. For it is very likely that the LXX does not in a single instance represent true genealogical dependence on the Sebiri. This is true because in Ho. 4.8 it is simply a matter of a distributive singular being rendered by a plural. In Ho. 9.2 a collective singular is rendered by the plural. And in Mi. 7.12 the plural verb of the Greek is necessitated by an obvious misreading of the preceding word A/uzil as A/uzil (ai polies sou).

Murabbe'at

Of the four variants attested by M88 which might be regarded as corresponding to the reading of the LXX, we found only one which in any way looked as though it would suggest that there might be a genealogical relation. This is Mi. 2.11. The Greek ouevoos must reflect a text like that of M88 Sheva'ei. But inasmuch as the Hebrew word found in the MT can either be spelled no or n, it is very probable that the ancient text had the plene form n which was simply vocalized differently by the
translator of MP. The article of Nahum 1.5 might easily have been added by the translator and the plural of Zeph. 3.15 is a predictable rendering of a distributive singular.26

The Damascus Document

The Damascus Document includes six citations from the MP. In only one of these (Mi. 7.2) does the LXX correspond to the variant of the CD. And it is quite possible that both CD and LXX are assimilating toward Mi. 7.5 where one does find the word יָפָר.

The Pesharim

Because of the quantity of variant readings attested either directly or indirectly by the Pesharim, we have examined only those instances where the scrolls and the Septuagint might be regarded as reflecting a common variant reading from the MT.27 Without a doubt, several of the passages represent substantial and suggestive correlations between the Pesharim and LXX. These passages are of great interest and great importance. And yet it is also true that a number of these passages are variant in rather uninteresting ways (word order, presence of an article, presence of a conjunction, plural or distributive singular). In such circumstances it is precarious to imagine any genealogical relation between the Pesharim and LXX. But whatever one might decide about the probabilities of genealogical relation in any given passage mentioned, the overall impression which the data makes is very clear. Vegas Montaner’s conclusion of the matter is sound. As he states:

Aunque queda fuera del ámbito de este trabajo, diremos de pasada que, salvo en pasajes muy concretos (por ejemplo, Nah 3,8; Hab 2,5-6 --en menor grado--), no hemos detectado que el texto de Q siga a G contra H de forma nítida y sistemática. Nos encontramos más bien con lecturas aisladas en este sentido. Aunque es necesario un estudio
Vegas Montaner has rather eloquently questioned the adequacy of the local text-type theory with respect to the evidence which pertains to the Minor Prophets. While it would be unsound to extend his critique to the whole of the Hebrew Bible, it is certainly fair to note that his conclusions are in close agreement with what is being concluded by several prominent scrolls experts about other areas of the Hebrew Bible. There seems to be an ever-widening consensus among the scholars of the scrolls that the highly schematic view of the evidence implicit in the local text-type theory is fundamentally inadequate. Emanuel Tov offers a more general critique of that theory in his important article entitled "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism." He states:

The greatest surprise of the Qumran discoveries derives from texts not particularly close to any of the three sources mentioned, MT, LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch, but maintaining an independent status. Such texts may contain many agreements with MT, but at the same time they also significantly disagree with that source. The same applies to their relation with the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch. More importantly, they hold a significant number of readings not shared with the three sources. They are thus independent. This was realized only recently, when it was recognized that the textual variety in Qumran can no longer be described according to the pattern of the tripartite division of the textual witnesses customary before 1947. According to the old-fashioned concepts with which most scholars still work, all the Qumran texts can somehow be fitted into that tripartite picture of the MT, LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch in the case of the Pentateuch and under a different name in the other books of the Bible. However, it has now been recognized that several texts do not
fit within any such framework, and must consequently be taken as sources additional to those known before.29

But beyond claiming that many of the scrolls must be regarded as independent, Tov also claims that a number of scrolls which have been described by earlier scholars as conforming to this or that text-type in fact do not.30 And he objects to the fundamental logic of the theory. As he states:

This variety is usually described in terms of proximity to texts known before the Qumran discoveries. This way of describing the Qumran texts is a mere convention derived from the accident that for several centuries scholars knew the mediaeval copies of MT, the Samaritan Pentateuch and LXX, but no earlier texts. Because of this somewhat unusual situation, the data are usually delineated in reverse order, so to speak.31 (Italics mine.)

The significance of Tov's point can hardly be exaggerated. For as Kurt Aland states with reference to a similar problem in New Testament text-criticism, "The affinitites of early manuscripts should not be described in terms of later manuscripts, but rather the reverse (a father does not inherit his son's traits, but a son his father's)."32 Thus it is surely sound to concur with Fishbane concerning the present state of knowledge of the relevance of the scrolls to the text-criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament. He concludes:

The complexity of these materials do not lend themselves to neat groupings of text families corresponding to such later text-types as 'Masoretic', 'Samaritan', and 'Septuagint'. There are, too [sic] be sure, observable correspondences between these types and the Qumran evidence; but the multiple alignments make any final categorization premature at this stage.33

And it is probably best with Vegas Montaner to view the general textual situation as one of a "gran fluctuación textual, con frecuentes intercambios entre los textos." And such a picture of the dynamic movement of the tradition and the constant intermixing of texts renders
any type of formal genealogical reconstruction futile. For as Zuntz stated,

The reason for the modern hesitations with regard even to *recensio* is in those troublesome facts with which Griesbach had already wrestled. The modern term for them is 'contamination'. The classical method of *recensio* groups the evidence and works back from its recent to its most ancient forms by the observation of common errors. This method is strictly applicable where the tradition is split into definitely separated lines of descent. Where these lines are blurred by cross-influences, *recensio* in the technical sense of the word becomes impossible, for it cannot, *ex hypothesi*, confidently be decided whether common errors are due to the interaction between various branches or to common descent.\textsuperscript{34}
We will not consider the variants within the medieval manuscripts collected by Benjamin Kennicott or J. B. de Rossi. The opinion of E. F. C. Rosenmüller in regards to Kennicott's collection is rather standard wisdom now: "This whole congeries of variants, assembled at such an expense of time and money, leads only to one simple conclusion: that all the extant codices are very late in relation to the original...that they contain a wealth of scribal errors but a dearth of significant and useful readings, and that correspondingly little if any help may be anticipated from them for the corrupted passages in the Hebrew text." (Handbuch der Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese I, 1797, p. 247) cited by Ernst Würthwein in The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica, 4th ed. trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ., 1979), p. 39 f.n. 69. A modern confirmation of Rosenmüller's judgment is to be found in the monumental article of Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition," Biblica 48 (1967), pp. 243-90. J. A. Sanders in his brilliant survey article, "Text and Canon: Concepts and Method" Journal of Biblical Literature 98/1 (1979), pp. 5-29 assesses the importance of Goshen-Gottstein's article in this way, "In 1967 Goshen-Gottstein published a pivotal study in which he argued that the medieval manuscripts collated by Kennicott and de Rossi, and so often cited by text critics to support textual emendations, were essentially derivative of the massoretic tradition, often times reflecting late ancient and medieval midrashic interpretations of scripture, and had little value for reconstructing pre-massoretic text forms. The challenge of Goshen-Gottstein's essay was directed at the very concept of text criticism as understood in biblical criticism until recently."


Gordis, pp. 113-114.


7. Gordis, pp. 94-5.

8. Ibid., pp. 92-4, cf. p. 56.


10. Ibid., pp. 110-114.

11. See especially the note of B. Davidson, The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons Limited, 1956), p. 12 (Section IV *1). “This is most frequent in suffixes of the 3 pers. sing. masc., ו, which is very often, and in all the copies alike, written ו, but the Keri almost always substitutes the common form ו.”

12. Gordis suggests a different root. He states: “We prefer the K as a Shaphel formation of יֵילָל (always וּיֵילָל) in the meaning ‘wailing’. We shall then have perfect parallelism, for each stich will express the idea of mourning: a) מֵי־יֵילָל b) מֵי־יֵילָל c) מֵי־יֵילָל d) מֵי־יֵילָל.” (p. 103 f.n. *273). However, this suggestion makes it difficult to translate the clear doublet (with apparent synonymity) of the clause גָּלַעְתָּו אַלְלָא. And surely the stripping is a symbolic expression of mourning so that the stich in question is not lacking in the idea.

Gordis (p. 185, f.n. 290) suspects a "precative perfect" and commends the "illuminating" discussion of Driver. In fact, Driver concludes his discussion by saying, "But the fact is that the evidence for this signification of the pf. is so precarious, the passages adduced in proof of it admitting of a ready explanation by other means, that it will be safer to reject it altogether." S. R. Driver, A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew (3rd ed., 1892), p. 25-6. GKC §106 n f.n. 2 states, 'Neither this passage, however, nor the use of the perfect in Arabic to express a wish or imprecation, justifies us in assuming the existence of a precative perfect in Hebrew.'


See the fine discussion in GKC §145 m (p. 464).

This very significant scroll is dated from the second century A.D. and came to light in 1955 (cf. Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies, rev. ed., 1961; reprint, (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980), pp. 18-19). Cross states, "The MS, found by bedu, purportedly comes from a fifth Murabba'at cave perhaps a kilometer or slightly less west of the four investigated in 1952. As we shall see, the text of the Murabba'at manuscript of the Twelve Prophets, like that of the more fragmentary biblical material, is virtually identical with the Masoretic consonantal tradition." (p. 19, f.n. 23). The text is published as part of Discoveries in the Judean Desert II: Les Grottes de Murabba'at par P. Benoît, O.P., J.T. Milik, et R. De Vaux, O.P. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961), pp. 181-205.

This aspect of our study is greatly helped by the comprehensive study of Luis Vegas Montaner, "Aportación al aparato crítico de la Biblia

19 Vegas Montaner, p. 172.


23 For a different view which places great weight on the rabbinic tradition and the renderings of the versions, see Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, trans. John T. Willis, Geoffrey W. Bromiley and David E. Greene, Vol. III (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1978), pp. 364-368, article by E. Kutsch. "If we are not to assume that the versions—and Rashi—were merely guessing in their interpretation of הֵמַנ hophel, we can only conclude that the root הֵמַנ found in Dt. 1:41 begins to correspond in meaning to the Heb. and Jewish Aram. root זֶמַן. If so, the versions with their various renderings have grasped different portions of the range of meanings represented by הֵמַנ. Like זֶמַן, then, הֵמַנ means 'be ready'; the hophel means 'be ready, make oneself ready, set about.' This gives rise to the meaning 'incite each other' (Syr.), 'hasten (to do something)' (Saadia and others).

If we do not have to consider such meanings as 'be easy, be light' for the root הֵמַנ, the emendations suggested for Job 30:24 and Hab. 2:5 are likewise unnecessary." (p. 366).

24 See Brownlee (pp. 79-81) and Maurya P. Horgan, Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books, The Catholic Biblical Quarterly: Monograph Series, 6 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of
America, 1979), pp. 50-1 for a good survey of the debate.

25Brownlee, states on pp. 87-88:
It is uncertain what one should read at xii, 15 for MT 2:19 רֹמֶר. Rost restores [ְוַנְאֵמֶר]. Elliger restores [הַנְאֵמֶר]. Habermann supposed a
dittograph here, and restored [הַנְאֵמֶר]. Elliger's restoration is
orthographically better than Rost's and fills the space a bit better.
Habermann's reading which does even better in filling the space had
been entertained by the present writer previously. If one counts the
spaces according to the line above, he finds room for six letters and a
space before הַלֶּךָ (the next word). Elliger's restoration would be two
spaces short. Habermann's restoration would be one letter too many,
but not impossible, as one may see by calculating according to the
second line above, where one more letter appears within the same
space. One may also measure ייִרְדוּ at the end of xii, 14, and then allow
יִרְדוּ to xi, 5 (with mostly the same letters) together with the
preceding and following spaces to indicate the room required for
יִרְדוּ to see that this is sufficient for Habermann's restoration. One
could also restore [וַנְאֵמֶר].

26Of course the article of Nahum 1.5 (םגה = M88 and ααρη =
LXX) could easily have dropped out by haplography. This accidental
omission would have been extremely likely if the letters of the partial
acrostic of Nah. 2-8 were actually written at the beginning of the lines of
some of the ancient Hebrew manuscripts מְגוֹה מְגוֹה » מְגוֹה מְגוֹה.

27As we indicated earlier, this aspect of our study is dependent on
the very important article by Vegas Montaner. Although our basic source
is Vegas Montaner's table * V. Mar Muerto = LXX (p. 158), we have at times
supplemented his list.

28Vegas Montaner, p. 179.


30Ibid. p. 19, f.n. 91. He states:
Other Hebrew texts were described as 'Septuagintal' as well, but in
our view the evidence is too scanty: 2QDeutC (see DJD III [Oxford
1962] 61); 4QExa* (see F. M. Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran and

Similarly in his important article "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls" [HUCA 53 (1982), pp. 11-27], he states, "I am not saying that none of the Qumran scrolls displays a close relationship with the LXX or Sam. Pent., but the greater part of the scrolls that hitherto have been described as 'Septuagintal' or proto-Samaritan' are, in fact, individualistic and independent." (pp. 20-1).

31 Tov, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts" p. 28. Similarly, Tov argued in "A Modern Textual Outlook..." that, "The very use of the term 'text-type' thus elevated three individual sources to the status of the main representatives of imaginary larger groups of sources." (p. 12)


The methods and terms traditionally used by textual critics to define the textual character of these fragments has tended rather to confuse than to clarify matters. Typical is the appendix to Bruce M. Metzgers *The Text of the New Testament*, pp. 247-256, with its "Check-list of the Greek Papyri of the New Testament." In describing p 32, for example, it states: 'agrees with N, also with F and G' (p. 250). What does this mean? About A.D. 200, when p 32 was being written, N of the fourth century did not yet exist, nor yet F or G, both of the ninth century. Of p 47 it states: 'agrees with A, C, and N' (p. 252). Here as in so many other instances the relationships which do exist are described in reverse (for p 47 they are demonstrably wrong: it is allied to N, but not to A or to C, which are of a different text type). Besides, the affinites of early manuscripts should not be described in terms of later manuscripts, but rather the reverse (a father does not inherit his son's traits, but a son his father's). Descriptions in such terms as 'mixed text,' 'partly Alexandrian, partly Western (pre-Caesarean) text,' etc., to describe manuscripts of a period when these groups had not yet developed and could hardly be 'mixed' contribute nothing to clear thinking.


I would suggest the following qualifications of the traditional theory: (1) The term 'recension' (introduced by Semler) conveys an incorrect idea of the tradition. There was neither an Eastern nor a Western recension. With it the idea of a genealogical descent of manuscripts must go. Every manuscript, of course, has ancestors and, very often, also descendants; but we cannot identify them (except in the case of a few groups of late manuscripts). The tradition ought to be visualized, rather, as a broad stream, of which the extant manuscripts and other witnesses yield occasional, rare samples (this may seem to be no more than an irrelevant change of metaphor, but therewith it becomes possible to account for facts otherwise unaccountable). (p. 254)

He goes on to state:

It is not, as in the case of some classical authors, a matter of one, or a few, manuscripts slumbering in some remote library, rarely read and still more rarely copied. The tradition of The Book is part and parcel of the life of Christianity. It comprises all the manuscripts existing at any given moment throughout the world, with the notes and corrections added to them, the quotations drawn, the versions made from them. You try to visualize the welter of communities small and great everywhere; each of them, and many individual members, have their copies; they use, compare, exchange, copy, and gloss them; and this living process goes on for centuries--a broad stream of living tradition, changing continually and, at any one moment, wide and varied beyond imagination. And against this rather overpowering notion of what the tradition really was, you put the comparatively tiny number of old manuscripts and other surviving evidence. Is it surprising that these survivals cannot be brought into a strictly rational relation? On the contrary: it would be surprising if they could. (pp. 255-256)

Although Zuntz was addressing the issue of the text of the epistles of the New Testament, he has in my opinion described to perfection the stream-like character of the textual history of the sacred texts of both Christians and Jews.
1 En tw deuterw etei epi Darieou tov basilewv en tw mwni tw ekto mia tov mwnos egeveto logos kuriou en cheiri Aghaiou tov profhtov legwv Eipon pros Zorobabel tov tov Salatiyl ek phylhs Iouda kai pros Ioushon tov tov Iosedez tov ierean tov megan legwv
2 Tade legei kuriou pantokratow legwv O laos outos legousin Our kei o kairos tou oikodomhsetai tov ouron kuriou.

Translation: 1 In the second year of Darius the king, in the sixth month, on the first day of the month, the word of the Lord came by the hand of Haggai the prophet, saying, Speak to Zorobabel the son of Salathiel, from the tribe of Judah, and to Joshua the son of Josedek, the high priest, saying, 2 Thus says the Lord Almighty, saying, This people say— The time to build the house of the Lord has not come.

Ev tw deuterw etei epi Darieou tov basilewv

The Syro-Hexapla represents ev nimeras (as in 2: 1,10). No preposition is present in 26 (Rome, 10th C.) or the Bohairic Version. However, this use of ev is very well attested. Under section 1.2. (with the Genitive), BAGD states, “of time (Hom.) in the time of, under (kings or other rulers).” Mayser, commenting on the occurrence of this expression in the Egyptian papyri, states: “Der temporale Gebrauch von ev tivos zur Angebe der Zeit, in oder während der etwas geschieht, beschränkt sich auf die Datierung nach Regierungsjahren der Könige bzw. nach Amtsjahren der eponymen Priester und Beamten…” He provides very many examples of the so-called “Königsdaten.” The same expression and rendering are found in 2: 10,14 and in Zech. 1: 1,7 and 7: 1.
A rigid literalism might have involved explicitly representing the word “day” and repeating the εν to represent the second Hebrew preposition. Of course the dative adequately expresses the meaning and is in fact representing the more normal Hebrew idiom. The word “day” is regularly omitted where it is quite easily understood from the context. The usual expression occurs in 2:1 εν τοιτ ου και εικαδι του μηνος and in 2:20 εν τοιτ ου και εικαδι του μηνος. The translator might have been influenced by these two passages. The other occurrence of the Hebrew temporal expression with the word “day” in this book is in 1:15 where once again the translator leaves out the word. (εν τη τετραδι και εικαδι του μηνος)

c bitcoins logos kou to en xeirai o uphian ou prophi tou leon

Thackeray notes: Hebrew is fond of what may be called physiognomical expressions, that is to say phrases referring to parts of the human body, ear, eye, face, hand, mouth etc.: in particular, many expressions are seldom found without some such adjunct. This accounts for a wide use of αφθαλμος, προσκωπον, στομα, χειρ etc., in the LXX: many of the LXX phrases are, however, passable, if unidiomatic, Greek expressions: the Hebrew has merely given them a wider circulation.

Moulton concurs, “We have a further set of “Hebraisms” in the compound prepositions which are freely made with προσκοπον, χειρ and στομα... Even here the Semitism is still on the familiar lines: a phrase which is possible in native Greek is extended widely beyond its idiommatic limits because it translates exactly a common Hebrew locution.”

Raija Sollamo in her very thorough study, Renderings of Hebrew
Semiprepositions in the Septuagint, distinguishes two fundamental senses in the ±430 occurrences of יִמְשָׁל in the MT: 1) יִמְשָׁל loci (which is seldom concrete and local and typically metaphorical)—±300x, and 2) יִמְשָׁל instrumenti (which means “by the hand of, by, through”) —±120x. With respect to the contemporary Koine outside the LXX she states:

In the contemporary extra-Septuagintal Koine and as early as Classical Greek many similar phrases with χειρι appear, such as εἰς (ταὶς) χειρας, εν (ταὶς) χεραιν, εν χειρι, δια χειρων or χειρος, ὑπο χειρα, the sense being local or metaphorically local, at times even temporal (ὑπο χειρα). But these expressions with χειρ are not used instrumentally in earlier or contemporary ‘secular’ Greek.

But BAGD lists a few possible secular uses of the idiom, one of which might well be contemporary with the later books of the LXX. “The OT (but cf. Diod. S. 3, 65, 3 ταὶς των γυναικων χεραι = by the women; Ael. Aristid. 45 p. 70 D.; μετα της χειρας των δικαιων; Philostrat., Vi. Apoll. 6, 29; Nicetas Eugen. 7, 165 χειρι βαρβαρων) has a tendency to speak of a person’s activity as the work of his hand...” The passage from Diodorus Siculus (1 BC) could be considered contemporary with the translation of the later books. The passage in question reads:

ενωτε γαρ τη της θειας φυσεως υπεροχη χρωμενον τιμωρεθαι των σαβεων ποτε μεν αυτοις εμβαλλοντα μανιαν ποτε δε ταις των γυναικων χεραι ξωντας διαμελιζοντα. [For sometimes using the eminence of the divine nature, he punished the ungodly, either striking them with madness or dismembering them, while living, by the hands of (or through) the women.]

Symmachus, not surprisingly, smooths out the Greek to the more idiomatic δι Αγγαίου.

Cyril of Alexandria, not realizing the Greek was merely a rather slavish rendering of a common Hebrew expression of instrumentality finds an emphatic reference to Haggai’s ministerial service in the language:

γενεται τοινυν ο λογος εν χειρι Αγγαίου· το δε εν χειρι
Moreover, the word came by the hand of Haggai—you will observe the 'by the hand of' in place of 'administering', which is to say ministering the words from God and performing the prophetic service.]

λεγων Ειπων προς Ζωραβελ τον του Σαλαβιηλ εκ φυλης Ιουδα και προς Ισθου τον του Ιωσεθεκ τον ιερα τον μεγαν λεγων

The participle λεγων introduces a slightly different reading from that in the MT. The Hebrew reads, "The word of Yahweh came by the hand of Haggai the prophet to Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel, governor of Judah, and to Joshua the son of Jehozadak the high priest, saying..." The Greek, on the other hand, reads, "The word of the Lord came by the hand of the prophet Haggai, saying, "Speak to Zerubb..." One's first inclination might be to suspect a Vorlage which differs from the MT in this section. Such a view is perhaps supported by the fact that in the Minor Prophets הם נל" is consistently rendered by the pleonastic Greek participle. (Am. 2:12; 3:1; 7:10; 8:5; Jon. 1:1; 3:1; 3:7; Mi. 3:11; Hag. 1:2,3,13; 2:1,2,10,11,20,21).

But there is some evidence that the translator of the Minor Prophets exercised a bit of liberty in the translation of direct discourse. In Hosea 6:1 one finds the septuagintal plus, Εν θλιψιν αυτων οφθησαν προς με, λεγοντες... Jonah 3:8 inserts an extra λεγοντες. Zechariah 2:4(8) has an extra participle in לָנִי נָפַךְ = και εἶπε προς αυτον λεγον. What one is likely observing in this verse of Haggai is probably nothing more than that rather common policy of the LXX translators to make explicit what was merely left implicit in the Hebrew text. As Wevers notes in his provocative little article, "Translation and Canonicity: A study in the Narrative Portions of the Greek Exodus": "If one is producing the word of God one would expect an attempt at accuracy much greater than for some secular work... This kind of pedantic exactness is often reflected when
that which is implicit in the text is rendered explicit in LXX." 12

The δη (which typically renders מָשָׁה) is included in Rahlfs and is supported from A, Q, W, 49, 449, 770*. It is however omitted from the other main textual witnesses and might represent assimilation toward that rather fixed idiom as it occurs in 1: 5; 2: 2, 11, 15, and 18.

The obvious and fascinating difference between the LXX and the MT lies in the fact that in the Hebrew, Zerubbabel is referred to as "the governor of Judah" while the Greek has instead "from the tribe of Judah" (cf. 1:14; 2: 2, 21. 1: 12 has the Greek plus ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰουδα). This is a very difficult difference to assess with any certainty at all. The Greek of the LXX is what would be expected if it were a translation of מָשָׁה. In fact, in every occurrence of מָשָׁה in the Minor Prophets, it is apparently rendered by the Greek word φυλή (Am. 3:1,2; Mic. 2: 3; Nah. 3:4; Zech. 12: 12,13,14; 14: 17,18). Thus one might be inclined to conclude that the LXX has simply translated a different Vorlage. However, if it has been shown that there is good reason to believe that the Vorlage of the LXX and the MT were very close to one another in general, and if we do not imagine a different Hebrew text behind the Greek of 1: 12 where one finds the Greek plus--ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰουδα where the Hebrew has the unqualified ברכִּבִּלה בּוֹרֶשְׁלָמִיָּלוֹן, then we might take the plus of verse 12 as a hint that the LXX translator intends some type of emphasis in his translation. A simple misreading by the translator is unlikely to have been repeated three other times. And the translator's knowledge of the Hebrew word is clear from the typical rendering of Mal. 1: 8 ἡγούμενον (the only other occurrence of מָשָׁה in the Minor Prophets outside of Haggai).

So it is with some considerable justification that one considers possible
motivations and intentional emphases behind the differing texts. If intentionality is involved here, there are only two likely explanations: either the translator is hesitant to refer to Zerubbabel as "the governor of Judah" or he is particularly interested to stress that he is "from the tribe of Judah." Wolff is probably correct in his judgment that "The fact that Zerubbabel came from the tribe of Judah (cf. I Chron. 2:3ff.; 3:17ff.) would seem to be more important for Gk than his official position in the Persian empire."¹³ That interest in Zerubbabel's tribal connections is only intelligible in terms of its messianic implications. Thus, this rendering is one of several evidences that the post-exilic community (of which the LXX translators are representatives) responded to the failed prophecies concerning Zerubbabel with a profound theological courage and confidence in the sure purposes of Yahweh. Rather than minimizing the prophetic statements which we might view to be a source of embarrassment and frustration to the ancient recipient, in fact the LXX translators enhanced and accentuated the messianic language in reference to both Zerubbabel and Joshua. Von Rad is quite right to challenge the modern reader, "Is it not possible that a prediction which was defined as "visionary" at the time of its delivery afterwards became absorbed in the great complex of prophetic tradition, because like other such predictions it was applied, after the failure of its first objective, to a future act of God?"¹⁴

The rendering of the introductory prophetic formula מִי תָּדָא הַקָּדוֹשׁ הַמָּלָאךְ is absolutely consistent in the Minor Prophets. It is always rendered תָּדָא לֵגֶהֶי...וּדָאָס אִיִּפֶנֶנ never occurs. The only variations concern the divine title and these are also quite consistent. The occurrences of תָּדָא לֵגֶהֶי in the Minor Prophets are (the superscription indicates the form of
The rendering of divine titles is quite consistent:

1. קֵּ֣עַ֗ר = Kupios
2. ἄρτι ὁ ὄνομά του = Kupios o Theos
3. Κύριος = Κύριος o Θεός
4. Διανεμεῖ = Kupios o Θεός o παντοκράτωρ

Amos 5:3 ta de λέγει κύριος L1,36, 86, 407, 233, 538 Bo Aeth Cyr. Th. + ὁ θεός Ο, 130 Hi(vid.) + κύριος (W) and Rahlfs text. The Hebrew is מִּיִּ֣י נְאַּלַץ. Amos 7:11 is quite unlike all the other occurrences of the phrase in the MP for the prophet is the subject of the verb. בֵּֽי־רְבָּהָ אֱלֹהִים

*Hag. 1:6 Alexandrinus has διότι ταύτες λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ. Most of the Greek manuscripts have no such formula at all. There is of course no comparable formula in the MT.

Interestingly, the only place where ταύτα λέγει represents anything but ᾽ονά ἐστιν ὁ θεός is Hg. 1:9 where the Hebrew has בְּאֵֽרְפָּּל.

Więc ήταν ο καπος του οικοδομησα τον οικον κυριου.

לָּא שָׁנָה לְרֵבָּהָ וּלְרֵבָּה יָהָוֶה הָלַּחַנְו.

Winton Thomas argues that the MT is corrupt and that the first תֵּלֶא should either be deleted or be vocalized נֵלֶא "now". He also repoints the infinitive to a perfect "has come". BHS notes that the Peshitta agrees with the LXX in reading with a perfect. It also suggests that the נְקֵּי supports the change to נֵלֶא with the נ apocopated. Ackroyd, noting the widespread belief that the MT is corrupt, objects:

Yet the use of the root בָּז come in, with reference to religious ceremonial (cf. e.g. Ps. 95.6) and the evidence of an almost poetic rhythm in the oracles of Haggai suggest that the excision of the phrase may destroy the full effect of the comment: 'It is neither a time for religious celebration, nor a time for rebuilding.'
Rudolph states, "Wörtlich: "Es ist nicht die Zeit des Kommens, die Zeit (des Hauses Jahwes, gebaut zu werden)". This literal reading is quite correct and perhaps suggests something a bit more concrete than is often observed. It is most likely that the Hebrew is referring to the glorious epiphany of Yahweh which was expected to follow shortly upon the exiles' return from exile. If this be the correct interpretation of the verse, then the nominal force of the infinitive is quite integral to the meaning.

A very similar nominal infinitive is found in Malachi 3:2: (From verse 1)

Behold, I send My messenger, and he will prepare the way before Me. And the Lord, whom you seek, will suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, in whom you delight. Behold, He is coming, says the Lord of hosts. But who can endure the day of his coming? And who can stand when He appears?

The LXX reads the Niphal infinitive as an active infinitive. Stekhoven lists Mi. 4:10; Jl. 1:12; Hab. 1:5 and this passage as cases where the LXX of the MP has an active verb in place of the expected passive.

Mi. 4:10 [you shall be delivered]/ ρυσεται σε [He will deliver you]

Jl. 1:12 [joy is withered from the sons of men]/ ἡγοσχιναν χαραν αι των ανθρωπων [the sons of men have disgraced joy]

Hab. 1:5 [if it should be told]/ εαν τις εκδηνηται [if anyone should tell] The translators might have read אַף as a Piel.

These cases, plus the greater number of cases where the active has been rendered by the passive (see discussion of Hag. 1.9), indicate that the
translators of the MP were quite free about the voice of the verbs. It
would be unwise then to assume a different Hebrew Vorlage. The Niphal
of נָשָׁה in the MP only occurs in: Perfect—Mal. 3.15; Infinit.—Hag. 1.2;
Zech. 8.9; Imperfect—Zech. 1.16. In all of these passages (except Haggai),
the Greek is passive.

The interrogative ¥ is indicated by the patah. This particle is nicely
rendered by the Greek ει. In Haggai, ει introduces an interrogative clause
(always representing the ¥) in: Hag. 1.4;2.13(12),14(13),20(19),20(19).

The Greek does not represent the emphatic personal pronoun דַּעַן. On the
function of the pronoun in the Hebrew, GKC notes, "Not infrequently the
separate pronoun serves to give strong emphasis to a suffix of the same
person which precedes (or sometimes even to one which follows),
whether the suffix be attached to a verb (as accusative) or to a noun or
preposition (as genitive).”20 An examination of the sampling of passages provided by GKC turns up several other cases of the Greek omitting the emphatic pronoun. It is very likely that these passages merely represent stylistic smoothing of the language by the translators:

1 Sam. 25: 24  הָבְרַנִּי = ev eμοι
2 Chron. 35: 21  לֹא לִי לַעֲלוֹר = οὐκ επὶ σέ
1 Sam. 19: 23  וַיָּהָו תֶּלֶלֶד בַּעֲלֵיהֶם = καὶ εὕενηθη καὶ επ’ αὐτῷ πνεῦμα

κοιλοστάθμως (rendering "ספונים") This is the only occurrence of the word in the LXX. However, you find the verb κοιλοσταθμεῖν in III Ki. 6: 9, 15 rendering "ספנ" and "םך" (Pi.) respectively.

6: 9  וַיִּקְרֵי הֶרְכָּבָה וְרָכָבָה לִבְנַה יִפְסָל אֵת הֶרְכָּבָה גְבוֹרַת בְּרֵי בְּרֵי יִפְסָל 16: יַחֲוִי הָרְכָּבָה בְּרֵי יִפָּסֶל מֵאֲרֵי יִפָּסֶל
καὶ οὕτως ὁ οἶκος καὶ πανετελεσέν αὐτον· καὶ κοιλοσταθμέσαν τον οἶκον κεδροις.
6: 15 ... ὑπερ-κοίλοσταθμεῖν συνεχομένα ἑυλοῖς
καὶ εως τῶν τοιχῶν· κοιλοσταθμέσαν συνεχομένα ἑυλοῖς

Liddell and Scott say that the word means, "with coffered ceilings, panelled..." They also cite the Flinders Petrie Papyri part 3, p. 143 (III B.C.) to support this meaning (θυριάς κοιλοσταθμος). The masculine noun is defined as a "coffered ceiling."21 The Supplement states under the listing of the word, "after 'Hg.1.4;' add 'with wooden frames,' and after 'p. 143 (III B.C.);' add' cf. P Cair. Zen. 764.3 (III B.C.)."22

The meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain. The word only occurs in 1 Kgs 6: 9 אֵבֶן בְּרֵי בֵּי יִפָּסֶל, 7: 3 לְסוּפָל בַּעֲלֵיהֶם אֵת הַרְכָּבָה בְּרֵי בְּרֵי יִפָּסֶל ; Jer. 22: 14 לְסוּפָל בַּעֲלֵיהֶם אֵת הַרְכָּבָה בְּרֵי בְּרֵי יִפָּסֶל and in this passage. There are two quite different views of the meaning of the word. Winton Thomas argues:

The word ceiled is sometimes taken to mean paneled. The interpretation would than be that the people are concerned only about lining their own houses with timber (cf. Jer. 22: 14; I Kings 7: 7) instead of being concerned about renewing the woodwork of the temple (cf. I Kings 6: 9), which was destroyed in the flames of 586. It
is more likely, however, that Haggai is here contrasting the people's houses which have roofs—the Hebrew word used (sephunim) means, lit., 'covered'—with the temple, which was still without a roof.23

However, Petersen counters, "The strongest contrast possible is between 'this house in ruins and your nicely finished houses,' not between 'this house in ruins and your houses with roofs.' The presumption is that the people's houses would have had roofs, since they were, according to the question, living in them."24 While admitting the difficulty of the question, it does seem that Petersen's view makes the best sense of the word in its context. Furthermore, if the choice of language (both of the Hebrew and the Greek) recalls the language of I Kings 6:9, it can only serve to accentuate the ironic force of the prophetic charge. For the Kings passage is referring to the building and adornment of the temple by Solomon, and that marvelous temple and the work which went into it stand out in sharp contrast to the present incomplete structure and the people's resistance to get on with the work.

Although the evidence is rather divided for reading the υπόμυαν in "your houses" it is in the Göttingen LXX and Rahlfs. The υπόμυαν is missing or not represented in Sca A Q 49 198 233 407 449 (770*) 456 534 130 Co Aeth Arab Arm Cyr.1196 Bas.N. Ambr. The reading is supported by B S* W and Cyr. The reading of the Hebrew text is equally uncertain for it is not supported by the Targums or the Vulgate. Petersen argues:

Nevertheless, the MT remains, in my judgment, the better reading. With the pronominal suffix, the noun is made definite and the presumption that the people's houses are in existence and inhabited is made much stronger. And this seems to be exactly the point raised by the question. The populace is now living in well-built homes while Yahweh's house is still in ruins.25

Petersen has no doubt nicely articulated the superiority of the reading from a logical and literary point of view. But this very argument can be
reversed—for it is very clear that the reading with the pronoun is more fluent and less difficult and more likely to be the product of later smoothing. The more difficult reading (which is very widely attested) and the reading more likely to represent the original is דבִּין as suggested tentatively ("prp") by the editors of Stuttgartensia.

dבִּין

dבִּין occurs in the MP only in: Ho 13.15; Am 7.9; Na 1.4; Zeph. 3.6 and here in Haggai. In every instance the Greek is a rendering of דבִּין either in the Qal or the Hiphil. Evidently the translator took the Hebrew form as the perfect of the stative verb. Even the vocalisation permits such a judgment. However, it is more likely the masculine adjective as in 1.9. The translators of the LXX treated the adjective with a good bit of freedom:

Lev. 7.10 [and every offering moistened with oil or dry]
Jer. 33.10 דבִּין / LXX 40.10 ερήμος
Jer. 33.12 דבִּין / LXX 40.12 ερήμω
Ezek. 36.35 פָּרָת / αἱ πόλεις αἱ ερήμοι
Ezek. 36.38 פָּרָת / αἱ πόλεις αἱ ερήμοι
Hag. 1.9 רָסָר דבִּין / εἰσίν ερήμος
Neh. 2.3 רָרֶב ... מַעְלֶיה / η Πόλις ... ηρημωθή
tyпшoтъ oгкa / Иерусалим ерήμος

The appropriateness of the Hebrew root is nicely explained by Petersen: The adjective הַרְבֶּה is appropriate in this context for another reason. It occurs in the first verse of the oracle delivered to Zerubbabel and Joshua, and ultimately to the people. And in the final verse of this same oracle (v. 11), the prophet uses a term--הַרְבֶּה--composed of the same three root consonants, הַרְבֶּה, to describe the divine fury in the form of a drought that has afflicted the land of Judah. This root,
hrb, establishes an inclusio around this almost essay-like collection of prophetic rhetoric and thereby emphasizes the dire situation the Judahites confront—one of devastation and drought.26

καὶ νῦν ταῦτα λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ Τάξατε δὴ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν τὰς ὀδοὺς ὑμῶν. τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν ἡ ᾿Ωσσήμον ἡ ἐνοίκιος ἡ ζωὴ ἡ ἐν οἴκῳ ἡνῆρεμοσ.

The Greek τασσόω + καρδία only occurs five times outside the LXX, and then only in the ecclesiastical writers Athanasius and Eusebius of Caesarea.27 The only other cases of τασσόω + καρδία in the LXX are:

1. Lam. 3.21 (rendering by Hi.) ταυτὴν τάξω εἰς τὴν καρδίαν μου
2. Ezek. 40.4 καὶ τάξον εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου παντα εἰς εἰς ἰδικαὶν σοι
3. Ezek. 44.5 τἀξον εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου
4. Ezek. 44.5 τἀξείς τὴν καρδίαν σου εἰς τὴν εἰσόδον τοῦ οἰκού
5. Zech. 7.12 καὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν ετάξαν απειθή τοῦ μὴ εἰσακουσίν — and they made their heart disobedient to not obey

Hag. 2.18 has the similar υποτάξατε δὴ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ... Θεὸς εν ταῖς καρδιαῖς ὑμῶν [Note that all the manuscripts in fact have τάξατε except W, B, and S*. Ziegler views the τάξατε to be the result of assimilation toward 1.5.]

6 εσπειράτε πολλὰ καὶ εισηνεγκατε ολίγα, εφαγετε καὶ ουκ εις πλησιμονην, επιπντε καὶ ουκ εις μεθην, περιβαλεθε καὶ ουκ εβερμανθε εν αυτοις, καὶ ο τους μισθους διαγων συνηναγαν εις δειμον τετραπημουν. 7 ταυτα λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Θεος τας καρδιας υμων εις τας οδους υμων. Θ αναβητε επι το ορος και κοπατε ξυλα και οικοδομησατε τον οικον, και ευδοκησω εν αυτω και ενδοξασθησομαι, ειπε κυριος.

Translation: 6 You have sown much but brought in little, you have eaten but not to fullness, you have drunk but not to drunkenness, you have dressed yourselves but you are not warmed in them, and the one collecting the wages collects it into a pierced bag. 7 Thus says the Lord Almighty, Consider your ways. 8 Go up upon the mountain and cut wood and build the house, and I will take pleasure in it and I will be glorified, says the Lord.
is the Hiphil infinitive absolute. It might be functioning adverbially---"greatly, exceedingly" or it might be functioning substantivally (Cf. BDB p. 915). The same uncertainty attaches to which can function substantivally or adverbially (Cf. BDB p. 589). It does, however, seem most likely that is functioning as a substantive as it usually does. If this be correct, the Hebrew is likely to be reading in a similar way---thus being balanced. The occurrences of in the MP are: Jl.3.(4)5; Hag. 1.6,9; Mal. 1.13; 3.10

Whereas the Hebrew has switched from 2 perfects in the first clause of 6 to infinitive absolutes, the LXX continues with the aorists. Although the LXX can at times treat the Inf. absolute very very literally, it renders the Hebrew in a number of different ways. It would indeed be foolhardy to imagine a different Hebrew than we see in the MT merely on the grounds of these infinitives being translated as aorists.

The precise syntactical function of the is unclear. BDB (p. 517) notes that it is quite common for to be used in the complement of verbal clauses with the infinitive. Often the preposition thus indicates what would best be translated as the object of the verb. which indicates negative predication will not have an object. Est. 8.8 has a similar construction which is translated hyper-literally "there is no revoking it" [TEJ]. Perhaps the Hebrew here should be rendered "there is no warmth in it". In this case "it" would refer to the act of
dressing. Of course the Hebrew might mean “for him.” The LXX with its εν αυτωις has either taken the phrase to refer to the plural “you” which it has continued -- thus “among them who dress” or to the implied ματια which is suggested by the verb περιβάλλω -- thus “in them” -- that is the clothes you put on.

και οι τους μισθους συναγων συνηγαγεν εις δεσμων τετραμενον.

Two other occurrences of δεσμος which are renderings of δεσμον and mean “purse” or “bundle” or something of that nature (perhaps “moneybelt”) are found in Gen. 42: 35 εγενετο δε εν τω κατακενουν αυτους τους σακκους αυτων και ην εκαστοι δεν ο δεσμος του αργυρου εν τω σακκω αυτων· και ειδον τους δεσμους του αργυρου αυτων, αυτοι και ο πατηρ αυτων, και εφοβηθησαν.

ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Θεος τας καρδιας ιμων εις τας οδους ιμων εν ομαι ου βεναθηται μεμο λεκενασ ευλογημενες.

Another occurrence of the fixed idiom and stereotypical rendering.

8 αναβητε επι το ορος και κοψατε ξυλα και οικοδομησατε τον οικον, και ευδοκησω εν αυτω και ενδοξασθησαμεν, ειπε κυριος.

Nowack and Budde suggest that the Variage of the LXX was τερατοι. The suggestion is utterly without merit. The verb is used in the Piel to refer to the cutting down of a forest only in the sense of clearing the land. The wood which might result from the verbal activity is never in view: Josh. 17: 15 κακαθαρον, 18 κακαθαρεις. And the fact that the Hebrew verb is never rendered by the Greek κοπτω further reduces the plausibility of the suggestion. The translator was simply
clarifying that before one could bring wood it would have to be cut. Although several manuscripts have "ουσάτε or "ετε (87°, 68, L' Th.) which would correspond to the Hebrew, the vast majority of the manuscripts have "κοσάτε (ετε).

The verb εὕδοκησαω occurs in the MP only in Hb 2.4; Hg 1.8 and Mal 2.17. Hb. 2.4 if he should draw back, my soul ouk εὕδοκει en αυτω Mal. 2.17 και en αυτως αυτος εὑδοκησε ενδοξαζω occurs only here in the MP. The Kethib is the Imperfect (חָבָל) while the Qere is the Cohortative (חָבָל). In this context, the force of the Imperfect would be quite clear. ενδοξαζω is a rendering of דבב in the Niphal in:

Ex. 14.4,17,17 in Pharaoh
IV Ki. 14.10 stay home and glorify yourself
Ezek. 28.22 and I will be glorified in you (in the judgments on Sidon)

The verb is an interesting septuagintal addition in Ezek. 38.23:

The verb is an interesting septuagintal addition in Ezek. 38.23:

Translation: 9 You looked for much and little came; and it was brought into the house and I blew it away. Therefore, thus says the Lord Almighty, Because my house is desolate—-but each one of you runs to his
house; 10 therefore heaven shall abstain from dew, and the earth shall withhold its produce; 11 and I will bring a sword upon the land and upon the mountains and upon the grain and upon the wine and upon the oil and upon whatsoever the land produces and upon the men and upon the cattle and upon all the labours of your hands.

Once again the LXX renders the inf. abs. with an aorist—ἐπεβλέψατε.

BHS suggests that ἐγενέτο was likely translating בחר rather than the בחר of the MT. This is very plausible on orthographic grounds inasmuch as the ancient * and the ancient Í looked quite similar. Furthermore, this reading is perhaps supported by the Syriac and the Targums. However, instances where בחר seems to be rendered by ἐγενέτο include:

Ex. 4.6 and his hand had become as white as snow [καὶ ἐγενέτο ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὑπεῖχιν]

Isa. 59.9 while they waited for light, darkness was upon them [ὑπομειναντῶν αὐτῶν φῶς ἐγενέτο αὐτῶις σκότος]

Eze. 33.32 and you are to them as the sound of a psaltery [καὶ γίνη αὐτῶις ως φωνὴ πιάλτηριον] Koehler/Baumgartner (p. 239) notes that the Hebrew בחר occurs "after verbs of perceiving and communicating—בחר frequently precedes the perception and information proper." The perceptual focus of the four passages in question is quite clear. Thus to alter the MT on the basis of the Greek would likely be a move toward eliminating a well-known and well-used Hebrew idiom. And as J. M. P. Smith observes, the common view that the בחר is required because of the following בחר is quite wrong for as he notes, "It is clear, however, from Gn. 18:9 that בחר can properly be employed in place of the vb. even before a preposition."30

Dingermann's suggestion that in all four of the passages the Greek translator has committed an "Irrung des Auges"31 is preferable to the view that there is something defective in the MT as it stands (which there is not). Yet, it is one of the common characteristics of ancient translation that idioms and metaphorical language are often
stripped down to their primal meanings. That is a fully adequate explanation of the present situation and somewhat reduces the apparent cumulative force of the agreement of LXX, the Peshitta and the Targums.

The change from the Hebrew “you brought it into the house” to the Greek “it was brought into the house” likely reflects nothing but a measure of stylistic freedom on the part of the LXX translator. Stekhoven lists this passage as one of 16 in the MP where the LXX renders an active Hebrew verb with the Greek passive:

Although Stekhoven’s collection of passages is helpful, it should be noted that Obadiah 6 is passive in the Hebrew and merely involves a collective
noun having a plural verb in the Hebrew and a singular verb in the Greek. Furthermore, in noting Hebrew actives rendered freely with Greek passives, it would be appropriate to note the Hebrew clauses which while using an active verb are what is referred to as an "impersonal passive."\(^\text{33}\)

Surely in the case of this Hebrew idiom, it is not at all surprising or noteworthy that the translators used the passive voice. It is possible that one finds the impersonal passive in Micah 2: 4; 6: 5; Amos 5: 16; Zeph. 2: 4 and Mal. 1: 4. But even if this is the case (and it is very hard to be sure), there remain ten rather clear instances of actual free rendering of the voice of the verb (Hebrew active » Greek passive).

καὶ εξεφυσάςα αὐτά

εκφυσῶ renders ἐγείρω(Qal) in Ezek. 22: 20,21 and ἐγείρω(Hi.) in Mal. 1: 13

διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει Κυρίος παντοκράτωρ Ἄνθων οίκος μου εστὶν ερήμος,

The occurrences of διὰ τοῦτο in the MP are:

Hos. 2: 8 (6 MT) ἔλεος, Hos. 2: 11 (9 MT) ἔλεος, Hos. 2: 16 (14 MT) ἔλεος, Hos. 4: 3 ἕλεος, Hos. 4: 13 ἔλεος, Hos. 6: 5 ἔλεος, Hos. 8: 10 ἔλεος, Hos. 9: 6 ἔλεος, Hos. 13: 3 ἔλεος, Amos 2: 13 ἔλεος, Amos 3: 2 ἔλεος, Amos 3: 11 ἔλεος, Amos 4: 12 ἔλεος, Amos 5: 11 διὰ τοῦτο ἄνθων / ἔλεος, Amos 5: 13 ἔλεος, Amos 5: 16 ἔλεος, Amos 6: 7 ἔλεος, Amos 7: 17 ἔλεος, Mi. 1: 14 ἔλεος, Mi. 2: 3 ἔλεος, Mi. 2: 5 ἔλεος, Mi. 2: 9 ἔλεος, Mi. 3: 6 ἔλεος, Mi. 3: 12 ἔλεος, Mi. 5: 2 ἔλεος, Jon. 4: 2 ἔλεος, Hab. 1: 4 ἔλεος, Zeph. 2: 9 ἔλεος, Zeph. 3: 8 ἔλεος, Hag. 1: 9 ἔλεος, Zech. 1: 16 ἔλεος, Zech. 9: 4 ἔλεος, Zech. 10: 2 ἔλεος, Zech. 11: 6 ἔλεος

Of particular interest are:

Hos. 8: 9-10 LXX στὶς αὐτοὶ ανέβησαν εἰς Ασσυρίαν· ἀνέβαλε\(^\text{1}\) καθ’ εαυτον Ἐφραίμ, διώρα παραστάτησαν\(^\text{2}\) διὰ τοῦτο\(^\text{3}\) παραδοθησονται\(^\text{2}\) εν τοις εὐνείσι. γνων εἰσδεξόμαι αὐτοὺς, καὶ καπασουσι\(^\text{4}\) μικρὸν τοῦ χριστοῦ βασιλέα καὶ ἀρχόντας.\(^\text{5}\) [For they have gone up to the Assyrians: Ephraim has sprouted again by himself; they loved gifts, therefore they shall be given over as a
gift to the nations. Now, I shall receive them and they shall cease for a little while from anointing a king and princes.] Hebrew:

For they have gone up to Assyria, a wild ass alone by himself: Ephraim has hired lovers. Yes, though they have hired among the nations, now I will gather them; and they shall sorrow a little because of the oracle of the king of princes.]

The Greek, which can only be described as having a very complex and subtle connection to the Hebrew derives from a number of confused/creative? readings: 1. פָרָא (“zebra, wild ass”) read as though פָרָה (Hi. “to sprout, bud, bloom” as rendered in Ezek. 17: 24), 2. אֲבָנִים/דֹּרֶם ηθισθησαν is difficult to understand. If the translator viewed אֲבָנִים in a gnomic sense, then the aorist is understandable. It is more difficult to imagine why דֹּרֶם might be connected with הָנוֹן. Perhaps the best guess is that the translator gave up on the Hebrew before him and guessed at the argument and in the process created a little word-play.

For the Hebrew word-play פָרָא אֲפָרִים/פָרָא אֲפָרִים is written out of the Greek while a new word-play is created by the Greek translators with דֹּרֶם/παρακθήσανται. (LS p. 465 suggests that the noun דוֹרֶם is etymologically related to the verb דֹּרֶם.), 3. The explicit inferential force of διὰ τούτων far exceeds the force of דִּבְרֶה as it would naturally be read in this context. 4. הִיוֹלָה is unintelligible and is typically emended as תִּיוֹלִלָה (חֳלֵל/חֶל) as תִּיוֹלִלָה. [See the note in BDB p. 320 and KB p. 303 where it is suggested that the latter emendation based on the LXX is superior. However, the vast amount of rewriting going on in the LXX of this passage makes all speculations about a differing Vorlage extremely precarious. If any sense in the Hebrew is to be found, it is perhaps most promising to imagine an ellipsis of the word מַה or מִי in the expression “to profane or break one’s vow or word” (as in Num. 30: 3, see KB p. 303 #3.)) 5. The Hebrew phrase “because of the oracle of the king of
princes’ has been rewritten as though ממלכתם were ממלכתה. After that change, מלך דרים was read as a compound object of the infinitive rather than as a genitive phrase.

Mi. 2: 9 δια τούτο ἐγγυμενοί λαοῦ μου ἀπορρίφθησον τε κτων οἰκίων τρυφῆς αὐτῶν, διὰ τα πονηρὰ επιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν εξωθησαν· εγγίσατε ορειν ἀιωνίος. [Therefore, the leaders of my people shall be cast forth from their luxurious houses, because of their evil practices they are rejected. Draw near to the everlasting mountains.]

[The women of my people have you cast out from their pleasant houses; from their children have you taken away my glory for ever.]

1. The causal δια τούτο is probably simply an explanatory addition indicating the logical force assumed and implied by the translator’s handling of the other components of the verse. 2. Read as though * ,N*,i2 2 2 
3. Of decisive impact on the translator’s treatment of the passage is his viewing the imperfect (or preterite minus waw consecutive) τῇ μαρτσθῇ in a future sense. The imperfect of the preceding verse makes such a future reference quite extrinsic to the thought of the Hebrew and proves it an unlikely rendering of the form in the context. The translator appears to have had no idea what was going on in verse 8! 4. LXX reads μετάλλον with a causative rather than a separative force. 5. לָלְלָה read as though לָלְלָה or לָלְלָה (both which refer to a deed, possibly good but usually bad). Except for the obvious interchange of הודים / הודו (note the plural in the construct state would be the very similar הודים / הודו, the rest of the verse is quite inexplicable.

Zech. 9: 4 In the rendering of לאלי by δια τούτο there is certainly no major change, but it does involve the Greek’s making the logical force more
explicit than the Hebrew.

It can be concluded with some confidence that the translator of the Minor Prophets was quite capable of making an alteration to the logical force of the text both where he is involved in a massive rewriting of the text or where he is subtly making explicit what was left implicit in the Hebrew. Somewhere within this broad range of possibilities lies our text of Hag. 1: 9. The contextual forces at work in the mind of the translator in this instance will be shown in the discussion of the rest of the paragraph.

The remarkable difference between the Greek and Hebrew is the fact that the Greek has cast the time of the woes into the future, making it a threat, while the Hebrew text has God providing an explanation for present problems. There are two very likely explanations for this intentional change—logical and rhetorical. With reference to the logic of the passage, commentators on the Hebrew text are all concerned to explain how it could be that the people could have been living in such nice panelled houses if they were in the midst of such a terrible drought. There are a variety of ways around the problem, but there is no doubt that the initial impression the text makes is that there is something quite incongruous in the two statements. Secondly, at the rhetorical level, the Hebrew text of verse nine seems to misfire. As Petersen notes:
Therefore the divine agent himself raises the obvious question, 'For what reason?' and immediately provides an answer. Interestingly, the answer provides no new information. It repeats what was adduced in v. 4, namely, that Yahweh's house lies in ruins. It is in view of these two infelicities that the Greek translator decided to improve his text.

It is at once obvious that the Greek text does not represent שפתי מה. The meaning of the Hebrew phrase is variously assessed as "over you", "because of you", or perhaps most likely "against you." BHS suggests that should be deleted on the grounds that it is not represented in the LXX and likely represents dittography. Rudolph, on the other hand, mentions that the Peshitta does not represent פ"מ. He suspects that both the Syriac and the LXX are best understood as the result of haplography. This is of course very possible, but since the Greek text seems to be the result of a rather substantial reworking, we cannot be sure.

It is immediately obvious that there is a close and definite relationship between this passage and Zechariah 8: 9-13. In the Zechariah passage, there is a rather explicit reversal of the conditions described in Haggai 1. The LXX of Zech. 8: 9-13 reads:

Thus says the Lord Almighty, 'Let the hands of you who are hearing these words from the mouth of the prophets in these days be strong, from the day in which the house of the Lord Almighty was founded and from the time in which the temple was built.' Because, before those days, there will be no reward unto profit, and there will be no reward for the beasts, and there will be no peace from affliction for the one going out and the one going in. And I will send forth all men, each one against his neighbor. But now, I will not do to the remnant of this people as in the former days, says the Lord Almighty, but I will show
peace. The vine will give its fruit, and the earth will give her produce, and the heaven will give its dew and I will give as an inheritance all these things to the remnant of my people. And it shall be the case that in the same way in which you were cursed among the nations, Oh house of Judah and house of Israel, thus I will save you and you will be blessed. Be of good cheer and be strong in your hands.

The part of the paragraph which does not seem to cohere with the rest is verse 10. The future tense of the section seems entirely out of place. Yet, it must be noted that the Hebrew itself raises the temporal ambiguities which at this point the LXX has merely passed on. The Hebrew reads:

וְלֹא יַדִּישׁ רַע הַמֶּרֶם הַתּוֹם לָא נִיהָ נוֹתֵן הַשָּׁמָּא הַמֶּשֶׁב אֲנָכָּה

The two problems are that one finds "those days" וַיִּחְלִּישׁ rather than the expected "these days" וַיִּחְלִּישׁ, and the fact that one does not find the "waw-consecutive" expected for the prefixed form אֲנָכָה. And the problem is certainly compounded by the fact that these difficulties have the appearance of being related to one another. They both pertain to the relative time of the action. With respect to the verbal problem, it is surely reasonable to acknowledge that the future time of the verb simply will not do in the context. The objections against the future are ancient and virtually unanimous. As Rudolph states, "Es ist notwendig, 'Niuzu lesen. Schon Hieronymus hat die Umsetzung aller Verbalformen in V. 10 (außer μαρτυρίον) ins Futurum bei LXX bemängelt."39 But there are good alternatives to repointing the text. Davidson states, "In some cases vav impf. is pointed as simple vav, e.g. Is. 10.13, 13, 43; 28

107.26-29. In most of these cases the peculiarity belongs to the first pers. In some of them the vav has evidently conversive
force, e.g. Is. 43.28; 51.2; in others, e.g. Is. 10.13, it may be
doubtful whether the impf. be not a graphic pres. or freq.40

Gesenius mentions Ez. 16: 10 ἐρριμέμενη and 2 Sa. 1: 10 εἰρριμέμενη
exceptions to the rule concerning the proper pointing for the waw
consecutive.41

The passages (excepting the Psalms, where the verbal system is quite
different) are rendered thus: Is. 10.13 ἠλπίσει, αἰφέλω, / ορνομενος; 43.28 ἀκοῦστον εὐγενετο; 48.3 ἀκούστον εὐγενετο; 51.2 / ἐκβάλλει, ἐγκαλεῖ ἐπαθεῖα, ἐπιθυμηθη, ἐπιθυμηθη, ἐπειθυμηθη; 57.17 / ἐσχάτη, ἀγαθή / κατεπατήσα, ἀρπαγμος / κατεθηλασα, ἄνθροπος / ἐπεθυμηθη, ἐπεθυμηθη, ἐπειθυμηθη; 63.3-5 / κατεπατήσα, ἀγαθή / κατεθηλασα, ἄνθροπος / κατεπατήσα, ἀγαθή / κατεπατήσα, ἀγαθή / κατεπατήσα, ἀγαθή / κατεπατήσα, ἀγαθή / κατεπατήσα, ἀγαθή / κατεπατήσα, ἀγαθή / κατεπατήσα, ἀγαθή / κατεπατήσα, ἀγαθή / κατεπατήσα, ἀγαθή; Ez. 16.10 ἐνεπέσα / περιεβαλον; 2 Sa. 1.10 ἐμπέμενη / εβανατώσα

It is quite clear that in all of the examples considered but one (Isa. 10.13), the translator rendered the Hebrew with the aorist. But in Is. 43.28 there is an unexpected change in person and in Is. 48.3 the verb is rendered as a periphrastic passive. The whole of Is. 63.3-6 is rendered very freely. All in all, it appears that the Greek translators generally interpreted the form in a way which was appropriate to the context. And it seems best not to imagine either a deliberate alteration by the scribes of the Hebrew text for the purpose of making some past situation yet future (in the MT), or to suppose that we are dealing with really unusual syntactical uses of the imperfect tense. Rather, it looks like a symptom of the phonological/morphological peculiarities of the guttural נ. It is likely just a case of irregular "implied doubling" in an instance where one expects the traditional "compensatory lengthening."42

It is quite possible that the translator of the Minor Prophets was slightly
confused by his inherited vocalisation system in Zech. 8: 10, and then to have let his rendering of that passage influence his rendering in Haggai. If in Zechariah he took the abrupt change of tense quite seriously, then the coming blessings are merely a temporary reprieve which will precede that ultimate judgment of the future spoken of in verse ten. This would have the ultimate effect on the thought of the passage in Zech., of relativizing the blessings to that of temporary and non-eschatological benefits, for the great day of judgment is yet future.\(^{43}\) The effect on the passage in Haggai is surely to cast the judgment into the eschatological future. This is made quite clear by the unambiguous apocalyptic re-reading of the LXX of Haggai 2: 6a. The two passages must be viewed in relation to one another.

11 καὶ ἐπαξεὶς ὑπομαίνεις εἰπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ εἰπὶ τὰ οὖρα καὶ εἰπὶ τὸν σιτὸν καὶ εἰπὶ τὸν αἴνον καὶ εἰπὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ σας εἰπὲ ἡ γῆ καὶ εἰπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ εἰπὶ τὰ θερμαὶ καὶ εἰπὶ πάντας τῶν ποινῶν τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν.

One immediately notices that the LXX has apparently read ἥρεμβος instead of ἢρεμ. The Peshitta follows the LXX in this reading. Every other occurrence of ἥρεμ in the MP (25x) has the expected ρομφαίαν.

The LXX renders ἥρεμ with the following:

διφαῖς Is 25.4,5
ερημοῖς Is 61.4
καιμα Gen 31.40; Jb 30.30; Is 4.6; Jer 43(36).30
καισαὶν Gen 31.40
ἐξηρασία Jud 6.37,39,40

The only other occurrence of ἥρεμ in the MP is in Zeph. 2.14: MT
"desolation shall be at the threshold" /LXX "and ravens in her porches" καὶ κορακεῖς ἐν τοῖς πυλῶσιν αὐτῆς [In 10 of 11 occurrences of κοραξ in the LXX, it is rendering the Hebrew noun חָרֶב The odd passage is Zeph. 2.14.]

The phonological similarity of the ancient ח and פ, makes it very likely that the translator of the MP did not know what to make of the noun הָרֶב. Thus he repointed it in Hag. and in Zeph. merely chose a phonologically similar word to fill in what must have been to him a non-intelligible semantic gap. This constitutes rather compelling evidence that the LXX translator was in fact looking at the same Hebrew as that in the MT and that at least in the case of Zeph. 2.14 the vocalisation system resembled that of the MT.

This is the only place where the LXX translates the Hebrew הָרֶב with the Greek verb έπαγω. This anomalous rendering is likely just another aspect of his making sense of the following word.

The preposition is not repeated in the LXX.

Both the LXX and the Peshitta have an extra pronoun here. This is likely just smoothing out of the rather peculiar Hebrew (all the other instances of this Hebrew duo have the personal suffix—Ps 128.2; Gen 31.42; Job 10.3). The surprise is that one finds the 3rd plural rather than the expected 2nd plural. The third plural pronoun must be the result of the attraction toward ανθρώπους.

tοὺς πονους The Hebrew singular is rendered by the Greek plural in: Dt 28.33; Ps 78.46; Ps 109.11; Jer 20.5; Ez 23.29. It is never rendered by the Greek singular.

12 καὶ ἦκουσε Ζῶροβαβέλ ὁ τοῦ Σαλαβίης τεκνὸς Ιουδαῖος καὶ Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ
Translation: 12 And Zorobabel the son of Salathiel from the tribe of Judah, and Joshua, the son of Josedek, the high priest, and all the remnant of the people, heard the voice of their God and the words of Haggai the prophet, just as the Lord sent him to them. And the people were afraid before the Lord.

This phrase is not represented in the Hebrew and this might suggest that its occurrence elsewhere might represent more than a mere misreading of ἄρτος (i.e. emphasis on his messianic typology).

καθότι only occurs 5 other times in the LXX of the MP:
Mi. 7.20 ἐνέματο which you have sworn to our fathers
Joel 2.32(3.5) ἐνέματο as the Lord has said
Zech. 7.3 ἐνέματο just as I have done
Zech. 10.8 ἐνέματο just as they once increased
Mal. 4.4(3.22) ἐνέματο which I commanded him

Rahlfs has εξεπεστείλεν αὐτὸν κυρίος πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔλθος. He does not discuss the reading in the apparatus but the Göttingen LXX indicates that reading is found only in the Codex Venetus, the Old Latin Fragmenta Sangallensia, some Ethiopic fragments, and Cyril of Alexandria (some manuscripts).

The Hebrew behind πρὸς αὐτοὺς is נָבִיא. This reading is supported by the Peshitta, the Targums (codex Reuchlinianus), and the Vulgate. The strength of these witnesses makes it very likely that the MT has omitted the word by haplography. Nevertheless, it is surprising that the Greek
support for the double reading is so weak.

καὶ εφοβηθῆ ὁ λαὸς ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου

In the MP ἀπὸ προσώπου renders the Hebrew יְהוָה in:

Hos. 10.15 thus will I do to you because of the unrighteousness of your sins

Mi. 1.4 like wax before the fire

Jl. 2.6 before them

Hab. 2.20 the Lord is in his holy temple: let all the earth fear before Him.

Zeph. 1.7 fear ye before the Lord God

Hag. 1.12 and in the gloss of 2.15(14)

Zechariah 2.13(17) let all flesh fear before the Lord: for he has risen up from his holy clouds

The Hebrew phrase יְהוָה אֶדֶם means to stand in awe before someone.44

As is evident from the Greek usage, the Greek can have the same nuance.

13 καὶ εἰπεν Ἀγγαῖος ἀγγέλος κυρίου [ἐν ἀγγέλοις Κυρίου]* τῷ λαῷ Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ μεθ' υμῶν, λέγει κύριος. 14 καὶ ἔχειτε ἐν τῷ πνεύμα τοῦ Ζωροβαβέλ τοῦ Σαλαθιήλ ἐκ φυλῆς Ιουδαία καὶ το πνεύμα Ἰσραήλ τοῦ Ἰωσεδὲκ τοῦ ἱερεὺς τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ το πνεύμα τῶν καταλοιπῶν παντός τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ εἰσήλθον καὶ ἐποίησαν εργὰ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ κυρίου παντοκράτορος Θεοῦ αὐτῶν. 15 τῇ τετραδίῳ καὶ εἰκαδίῳ τοῦ μήνος τοῦ εκτού τῶν δευτέρων ετεὶ εἰπὶ Δαρείου τοῦ βασιλέως.

Translation: 13 And Haggai, the angel of the Lord, spoke to the people, I am with you, says the Lord. 14 And the Lord raised up the spirit of Zorobabel the son of Salathiel from the tribe of Judah and the spirit of Joshua the son of Josedek the high priest and the spirit of the remnant of all the people, and they entered and did work in the house of the Lord Almighty their God on the twenty-fourth day of the sixth month in the second year of Darius the king.

[ἐν ἀγγέλοις Κυρίου]* Although this interesting little phrase is not in the actual text either of Rahlfs or Göttingen, it has very strong manuscript
support. It is found in B S* V C 68 Arm Cyr,F Syh. It is taken to be an explanatory gloss on the previous reference to Haggai being an ἀγγελός κυρίου by Dingermann. However, the phrase could well be a quite reasonable attempt at translating the unknown Hebrewملאתם.

Inasmuch as the Hebrew word is a biblical Ἑραξ Ἐγγενέων, it would not be the least bit surprising that the LXX translators would not know what to do with the word and would make a connection with the immediately preceding מלאך. Thus, rather than rightly reading the מלאך as a nominal pattern indicating abstraction—thus “message”, they likely took it to be an irregular plural form of what is elsewhere a masculine noun—מלאך.

Kutscher discusses the growing preference for the מלאך nominal pattern in later Hebrew in reference to a different root: “Instead of SBH מְלָכָה or מָלָכָה ‘kingdom’, LBH prefers מַלְכָּתָה which is used about 30 times in Chronicles and also in Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther and Daniel. As mentioned above (§121), the noun pattern with the derivational suffix מַלְכָּתָה became more and more prevalent in the course of the history of BH and MH.”

Jastrow lists one other occurrence of the word מלאכתם in Genesis Rabbah, s. 50 לשבת מלאכתם, “they put on the appearance of angels.” Other instances of the מלאך pattern in the MP are rendered properly:

Hos. 1: 4 מַלְכָּתָה βασιלείαν; Hos. 4: 11 מַלְכָּתָה פֶּרֶנֶיהָ; Hos. 6: 10 מַלְכָּתָה פֶּרֶנֶיהָ; Amos 9: 14 מַלְכָּתָה מֵאִשְׁמַלְוָשׁאָן; Obad. 20 מַלְכָּתָה מֵאִשְׁמַלְוָשׁאָן מֵאִשְׁמַלְוָשׁאָן; Joel 4: 1 מַלְכָּתָה מֵאִשְׁמַלְוָשׁאָן; Amos 1: 6 מַלְכָּתָה מֵאִשְׁמַלְוָשׁאָן; Amos 1: 9 מַלְכָּתָה מֵאִשְׁמַלְוָשׁאָן. But these are, after all, common words.

The Greek makes no effort to represent the λόγος of “Haggai spoke saying”.

tο πνεῦμα τῶν καταλογισμῶν παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ Dingermann suggests that
the *Variation* of the LXX must have been rather than that seen in the MT. This is possible but far from certain.

The plural here renders the Hebrew singular. This type of switch from the singular to the plural occurs fairly often in the MP.

Although this is a straight-forward enough rendering of the Hebrew, there are many questions associated with this verse which pertain to the editorial history of the book.
Chapter 2

[τὴν τετραδῆ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μήνος τοῦ εκτοῦ τῷ δευτερῷ εἰς εἰπὶ Δαρείου τοῦ βασιλέως.]

(1) τῷ εἴθῳ μηνὶ μιᾷ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μήνος ἔλαλησε χριστὸν χειρὶ Ἀγγαίου τοῦ προφητοῦ λέγων 2 Εἰπον δὲ πρὸς Ζωροβαβέλ τὸν τὸν Σαλαθηλὲ τὸ ἐφίλησι λοῦθα καὶ πρὸς Ἰησοῦν τὸν τὸν Ἰωσῆδεκ τὸν ἱερα τὸν μεγάν καὶ πρὸς πάντας τοὺς καταλοίπους τοὺς λαοῦ λέγων

Translation: [On the twenty-fourth of the sixth month in the second year of Darius the king]—in the seventh month, on the twenty-first of the month, the Lord spoke by the hand of Haggai the prophet saying, 2 Speak now to Zorobabel the son of Salathiel from the tribe of Judah and to Joshua the son of Josedek the high priest and to all the remnant of the people saying,

The double dating construction of the LXX should not be ignored or set aside casually for a number of reasons: 1. It is supported by the punctuation of the Hebrew. The : (soh pasug) following verse 14 makes a clear (and ancient) break, thus separating it from the date which immediately follows. 2. An even greater (and more ancient) break is suggested by the Ἐ (Petulah) which follows verse 14 and is observed in the margin of the text. [It is quite important to recognize that the system of paragraph division (Pisgah) is both ancient and independent of the punctuation.]50 3. This arrangement of the text is supported by the LXX, Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshitta and the Hebrew of the Complutensian, Antwerp, Paris and London Polyglots.51 And perhaps most significantly, this arrangement is supported by the ancient Hebrew text from Wadi Murabba'at.52 4. To disconnect the first date from the second creates the anomalous situation of having no year specified in the second date. The proposed “double duty” of the phrase בְּשַׁם שִׁתְיוֹנָה לַרוֹדִים הַמְּפּוֹלָר is much less probable when the two date formulas are related to two entirely different situations. 5. If 15a specifies the date of the
preceding material, it is anomalous in being the only date in the book which does not precede the material it dates. Furthermore, it creates an awkwardness in implying that the charge of Haggai which was given on the first day of the sixth month (1:1), received no particular response for 23 days. And this 23 day delay is necessarily related to a response described in the most emphatic terms. 6. And finally, the view that there is a textual dislocation or diverse views within the text itself concerning the important dates is perhaps supported from the unexpected date of 2:18 "the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month." 53

ελάλησε κύριος εν χειρὶ Ἀγγαίου (Murruba’at scroll has rather than בַּבּוֹ .) Rudolph argues that the MT has assimilated toward the reading of 1:1. He further argues that the intermediate agency implied by בַּבּ do not fit well with verse 2 where Haggai is directly speaking. He cites Is. 20.2 as an illustration of the intermediate agency implied by בַּבּ. 54 But inasmuch as the expression "by the hand of" occurs in so many different contexts (with varying emphases on agency and instrumentality) and inasmuch as we don't know what Murruba’at had at 1.1 (where Rudolph thinks the MT reading is appropriate), it seems best to regard the two Hebrew expressions as roughly synonymous. The widespread Greek support of the MT along with the support of the other major versions make it unreasonable to overturn the MT on the basis of Murruba’at.

λαλῶ renders ἐλάλησε or דְּבַר in:

11 Kings 16.7 καὶ εὐ χειρὶ ίου ποὺ Ανανί ἐλάλησεν κύριος επὶ Βαασα

18.31 ὃς ἐλάλησεν κύριος πρὸς αὐτὸν

The similarity of the first passage is so close that one would feel quite certain that the Greek of our passage represents a rendering of
The Syriac supports the reading of LXX. Yet, it is quite likely that this
pantá̂s represents nothing more than assimilation toward 1.14. The
Targum’s and the Vulgate’s ad reliquos populi confirm
the MT.55 Gelston lists the plus (טשל) of this verse along with eleven
others which he suspects are "more likely to be due to the translators
than derived from a Hebrew Variaje distinct from MT.56

Translation: 3 Who among you is there who saw this house in its former
glory? And how do you see it now—as though not existing before you? 4
And now, Be strong, Zorobabel, says the Lord, and be strong, Joshua the
son of Josedek the great priest, and let all the people of the land be
strong, says the Lord, and work. Because I am with you, says the Lord
Almighty, 5 and my Spirit stands in your midst. Be of good cheer.

3. ...כפם הקשה אסתר לה אנתרבחת הזה
This is the Niphal part. of the verb and means to be left over or
remaining. It at times is used technically to refer to the remnant. The
LXX’s omission has every appearance of being a simple case of
homoioteleuton. It is noteworthy that רון immediately follows, so that
the omission could have occurred easily. It is also noteworthy that the
reading of the MT is supported by the Vulgate, the Peshitta, the Targums
and Murruba’at.
the Niphal part. only occurs elsewhere in the MP in:

Zech. 11.9 κατεσθε τασ εκαστός τασ σάρκας του πλήσιον αυτού

12.14 πασαί αἱ υπολειμμέναι φυλαὶ

It is quite unusual for επιρροθέν to render נִפְלָה. The only parallels are:

Judg. 20.39 as in the former (first) battle
Zech. 1.4 the former prophets
7.7 former prophets
7.12 former prophets
8.11 as in the former days

Whereas the Hebrew indicates the interrogative twice with הִי and ה, the Greek merely carries the interrogative force from the first clause over to the second.

4 καὶ νῦν κατισχόμε, Ζωρωμᾶβε, λέγει κύριος, καὶ κατισχόμε, Ἰησοῦ ο του ἱσσαδηκ ο ἱερεὺς ο μεγας, καὶ κατισχούσω πασ ο λαος της γης, λέγει κύριος, καὶ ποιεῖτε· διοτι μεθ υμῶν εγὼ εἰμι, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ, 5 καὶ το πνεῦμα μου εφεστήκεν εν μεσῳ υμῶν· Βαρσείτε.

The Greek of verse 4 is a very precise rendering of the Hebrew. Except for the inversion of διοτι μεθ υμῶν εγὼ, even the word-order of the Greek follows the Hebrew.
κατισχυσεων renders מַחְיָה (Qal) in the MP:
2a 8.9 κατισχυσεσαν αι χειρες υμων
.13 Βαρσείτε και κατισχυσετε

This interesting little clause which is not included in the text of any of the major editions of the LXX has quite a lot of manuscript support. Although there are variations among the manuscripts that include the clause, the fundamental addition is represented by: C 68 538 613 Ach Syh mg Cyr.F V Sa Bo 763 22 L’ 407 mg 770 Arm Cyr.P Thht. Bas.N.
However, it must be noted that the only major codex to include the reading is Venetus (V) which is dated 8th Century. Thus, it is very likely merely another instance of the widespread assimilation toward the Hebrew. The clause is not represented by the Old Latin.57

5 και το πνευμα μου εφεστηκεν εν μεσω υμων. Βαρσείτε.

εφεστηκεν is a rather common rendering of לָעָל. What is a little surprising is that the participle was rendered by the Greek perfect tense. Although the aspects are quite different--continuous vs. perfective, nevertheless both forms are quite capable of referring to present time.

The Greek has stated positively with "be cheerful, be courageous" that which the Hebrew stated negatively "do not fear." This does not reflect any particular liberty because evidently the Greek phrase had become a stereotyped rendering of the Hebrew. In almost all of the occurrences of Βαρσεω in the LXX, you find that it is rendering the same Hebrew you have here. This is always the case in the MP:
Zeph. 3.16 betray some interesting parallels to our passage.

It is a prophecy of a coming restoration when the Lord would in a special way be in the midst of His people. The Greek of Zeph. 3.14-17 is:

Χαίρε, θυγατέρα Σιων, κηρυσσε, θυγατέρα Ιερουσαλήμ: ευφραίνου και καταπέταυ εξ ὀλής τής καρδίας σου, θυγατέρα Ιερουσαλήμ. περιελε κύριος τα αδικήματα σου, λελυτρωται σε εκ χειρος εχθρών σου βασιλεύς Ισραήλ κύριος εν μεσω σου, ουκ αυτή κακα ουκετι. Εν τω καιρω εκεινω ερει κύριος τη Ιερουσαλήμ Θαρσει, Σιων, μη παρεισβοσαν αι χειρες σου. Κύριος ο Θεος σου εν σοι, δυνατος σωσι σε, επαξει επι σε ευφρασινην και καινιει εν τη γαπησει αυτω και ευφρανθησεται επι σε εν ταρθει ως εν ημερα εορτης. (Rejoice, daughter of Zion. Proclaim, daughter of Jerusalem. Be glad and delight thyself from your whole heart, 0 daughter of Jerusalem. The Lord has taken away your iniquities. He has redeemed you from the hand of your enemies. The Lord, the king of Israel is in the midst of you. You shall no longer see evils. In that time, the Lord will say to Jerusalem, Be of good cheer, Zion. Do not let your hands go slack. The Lord Your God is among you--Powerful, He will save you. He shall bring gladness upon you and He shall renew you in His love and He will rejoice over you in delight as in a day of feasting.)

There are many differences between the LXX and the MT of this passage. Several of these differences coalesce to alter dramatically the sense of the passage. 1. περιειλε κυριος τα αδικηματα σου / περιετελε κυριος τα αδικηματα σου The Hebrew suggests that Yahweh will (futuristic perfect) remove Judah’s judgments or punishments. The Greek’s rendering is unique in the LXX and is clearly theologically-motivated. [Cf. verse 11 where instead of removing “those who proudly exalt themselves” לעליי יאונים קוקא, Yahweh removes “your arrogant acts of contempt” τα φαιλισματα της υβρως σου. 2. λελυτρωται σε εκ χειρος εχθρων σου / λελυτρωται σε εκ χειρος εχθρων σου. The Greek translator apparently has read the Hebrew verb as ללהב. 3. ουκ αυτη κακα ουκετι / ουκ αυτη κακα ουκετι The LXX has read the verb as אלתקיוט עב עדו and has with its neuter κακα read עב as an abstraction. 4. και καινιει σε / και καινιει σε The translator read the verb as some form of שחר ("to renew"),
These changes have the unmistakeable impact of changing what in the Hebrew is a judgment of a portion of the society into a dramatic spiritual renewal where the wickedness of the whole people is removed or purged.

In view of the fact that this precise theological change is also found in Malachi 3.16 and in light of the unique rendering τα ἀδικήματα σου / ἡ μοιρή, it is not improbable that the apparent misreadings are in fact deliberate.

Translation: 6 Because thus says the Lord Almighty, Yet once again I will shake the heaven and the earth and the sea and the dry land. 7 And I will also shake all the nations, and the precious things of all the nations will come. And I will fill this house with glory, says the Lord Almighty. 8 The silver is mine and the gold is mine, says the Lord Almighty. 9 Because the glory of this house shall be great, the latter more than the first, says the Lord Almighty. And in this place I will give peace, says the Lord Almighty, even peace of soul for a possession for every one building to raise up this temple.

There is, perhaps, no better assessment of the final four words of this Hebrew than that of the Meyers. They state:

"In only a moment. (Lit. "once again, in a little while.") Some see this as a gloss. Carroll (1979b:157, 161), for example, takes it as a prophetic response to the "cognitive dissonance created by unfulfilled prophecy" whereby the expected event is pushed into the future. However, this strikes us as quite unnecessary on semantic (see below) as well as contextual grounds; rather, it can just as well
indicate the sense of urgency or immediacy perceived by the prophet in the portentous events connected with the temple rebuilding and the leadership associated with it (cf. Ackroyd 1968:153-54, especially n. 3) The prophet was sure that Yahweh would carry out great deeds; he just did not know precisely when they would occur.

The grammar of the expression is complex and requires some elucidation. The last element in the Hebrew, the fem. sing. pronoun, is presumably the copula, agreeing in gender with הִת. The interesting feature is that הִת intrudes into the familiar idiom "soon," apparently to emphasize the imminence of the time specified; see GKC § 141 1; 142 f.g. The uniqueness and strangeness of the term argue in favor of its originality and make it unlikely that it was added later in an attempt to bring prophecy into line with what was predicted at an earlier date. On the contrary, the expression seems to have been coined specifically to convey a sense of the nearness of the eschatological events depicted in the rest of verse 7 and in verses 8-9.58

But if the Hebrew suggests the immediacy of this great act of Yahweh, the Greek translators with the advantage of historical perspective have quite another idea about the time frame of the passage. Stuhlmüller's assessment is acute. She states,

The statement in Hag. 2:6a, "Once again, in a little while," clearly designates an important event on the immediate horizon. The rebuilding of the temple was leading Israel quickly to the verge of an eschatological finale, a total fulfillment of promises. The ancient Greek text, however, reads differently. Changing "in a little while" to read "Yet once more," the translator shifted the emphasis from the imminent future within everyone's lifetime to a new and unknown moment in the distant future. Very possibly when the glorious finale did not quickly burst with splendor upon Israel, the Greek translator adapted the text to the necessity of waiting for still another time, "yet once more."59

The Hiphil participle has been rendered by the future of σεισθω. This is quite a reasonable rendering of the participle in view of the preceding
context. The same rendering of this verb (not participle) in the Hiph. occurs in Hag 2.22, Isa 14.16, Ez. 31.16.

7 ηηπαν is a very common rendering of ἡ δήσιμα.

7 καὶ συνοςίων παντα τα ἐβνη, και ηηπει τα εκλεκτα παντων των εβνων,

The "together" idea implicit in the prefix συν(ν) has almost completely fallen away as can be seen from Ps 28.8 and Ps 59.2 (which is rendering ταὐρησ). Thus this is another interesting example of the LXX translators having used a synonym rather than maintaining strict correspondence with Hebrew roots.

The Hebrew word means something which is desirable or precious. Because of the Greek plural, the editors of BHS have suggested that the LXX translators were reading the preferable reading ταῦτα which means valuables or treasures. Rudolph (p. 41) has rightly pointed out that the plural verb clearly enough indicates that the singular noun had the collective sense. Thus the suggested change of the vocalisation is "unnötig." The plural verb and the immediate context make it very clear that what is in view are various material treasures which would be used in the refurbishing of the temple. Thus, the messianic reading of the Vulgate which was popularized by the AV "and the desire of all nations shall come" is rightly abandoned. Other instances of ελλεκτα being rendered by εκλεκτος are:

Zech. 7.14 they have made the choice land a desolation
Jer. 3.19 and I will give thee a choice land
Jer. 38(31).39 a wall of choice stones

8 ἐμὸν τὸ ἀργυρῖον καὶ ἐμὸν τὸ χρυσῖον, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ.

As previously mentioned, this is the only place in the MP where λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ renders anything other than ἄλλη ἱλία ἐποίητο. The Greek does an amazing job of even rendering the Hebrew word order.

9 διὸ τι μεγάλη ἐστὶν η ὁδὸς τοῦ οἰκοῦ τοῦτου η ἐσχατὴ ὑπὲρ τὴν πρώτην, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ· καὶ ἐν τῷ τοπῷ τοῦτῳ διἀσω εἰρήνην, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ, καὶ εἰρήνην ψυχής εἰς περιποίησιν παντὶ τῷ κτιζοντι τοῦ αναστήσας τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον.

The causal conjunction διὸτι is not represented in the Hebrew. Surely the LXX translators have merely inferred the causal relationship between the clauses. The precise significance of the Hebrew is uncertain. “Latter” can either modify “glory” or “this house.” It is likely that the LXX has read the connection with “glory” properly.

Neither does the corresponding Hebrew etermine the precise meaning of the Greek phrase. Nevertheless, it does seem quite likely that the gloss represents a psychologized or spiritualized view of “peace.” Petersen’s assessment is helpful. As he states,

The ambiguities inherent in the Hebrew formulation elicited reflection apparently in response to the following question: For
whom will Yahweh provide this salōm? Some exegete/scribe wrote an answer into the margin of the book which found its way into the Septuagint manuscripts, an answer that linked these glorious promises to the pragmatic admonitions articulated in Hag. 1. This author believed that the salōm would not be something of material sort, but a spiritual condition resulting from a specific activity, actual participation in the construction of the temple. What was for the original speaker a material form of prosperity has, in LXX, become a highly spiritualized concept: 'and peace of soul as a possession for all who build, to erect this temple.'

παντὶ τῶν κτίζοντι Although κτίζω usually refers to the divine act of creation, it is an appropriate verb here for its connotations of laying a foundation, or founding a city. Cf. I Es. 4.53 καὶ πασὶ τοῖς προσβαίνουσιν ἀπὸ τῆς Βαβυλωνίας κτίσαι τὴν πόλιν (i.e. Jerusalem)

tου αναστησαί (ανιστημι) In the MP, when there is a corresponding Hebrew word in the MT, the Greek verb always renders some form of הָקַם.

10 Ἐπέρωτησον τοὺς ἱερεῖς νόμον λέγων

Translation: 10 On the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month of the second year of Darius, the word of the Lord came to Haggai the prophet, saying. 11 Thus says the Lord Almighty, Ask the priests for a judgment saying.

ἐπερωτάω is typically a rendering of אָסַף(Qal). It is quite common for it to have this type of double accusative construction (i.e. to ask someone concerning something). It can also have the meaning to ask someone for something. Both the Greek and the Hebrew allow that either the priests are being questioned concerning the Torah or they are being asked for a judgment or ruling. In view of the indefinite Ἀρχήν / νομον, it is quite
probable that the sense of “judgment” is required.

12 Εαν λαβη ανθρωπος κρεας αγιον εν τω ακρω του υματιου αυτου και
ανατα το ακρον του υματιου αυτου αρτου η εσεματος η οινου η ελαιου η
παντος βρωματος, ει αγιασθησεται; και απεκριθησαν οι ιερεις και ειπαν
Ου.

Translation: 12 If a man should take holy meat in the corner of his
garment and the corner of his garment should touch bread, or pottage, or
wine, or oil, or any food, shall it be made holy? And the priests answered
and said, No.

Every occurrence of the Greek κρεας represents the Hebrew בשר. Of
course, there are a number of other renderings of בשר. The expression
“holy meat” only occurs elsewhere in Jer. 11.15 where it is rendered κρέα
αγια.

κρεας is a rendering of בשר only in Hag 2.12 & 13. It is quite a good one.
The idea of wings or extensions is nicely conveyed by corners.

In the Hebrew the man is the subject of “touch.”

This is made necessary by the preposition ב. But inasmuch as the
preposition ב typically introduces the object of this Hebrew verb it is
not certain whether you have a (previously unattested) double object
construction or an instrumental ב (i.e. “should touch his skirt to the
bread” or “should touch with his skirt the bread”— quite commonly
introduces the object of the Hebrew verb as well.) In the Greek the neuter
noun which could normally either be the subject or object must here be
the subject because the verb takes the genitive object. So whatever uncertainty attaches to the syntax of the Hebrew, it is clear that the Greek has switched the subject of the verb.

καὶ εἰπεῖν ἐγείρεσαι. The Qal imperfect with the interrog. ἐ is nicely rendered by the Greek future passive.

13 καὶ εἰπεῖν Ἀγγαίος. Εἰν αἱ ποιοὶ μεμιαμμένοις εἰς ψυχῇ ἀπὸ παντὸς τῶν, εἰ μιανθήσεται; καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ εἶπαν Μιανθήσεται.

Translation: 13 And Haggai said, If someone who is defiled because of a body should touch any of these, will it be defiled? And the priests answered and said, It will be defiled.

The expression ἐπὶ ψυχῆς refers to being unclean by virtue of contact with a dead body. It occurs in: Nu 5.2, 9.6, 7, 10. However, all of these occurrences include the ἐπὶ preposition attached to ψυχῇ. The precise phrase occurs only elsewhere in Lev 22.4.

Nu. 5.2, 9.6,7,10 αἰκαβαρτοῦν ἐπὶ ψυχῆς
Lev. 22.4 ο ἀντομέος πᾶσης αἰκαβαρτοῖς ψυχῆς

Although the cognate (Hebrew) verb in its various stems is frequently rendered by various forms of the verb מְלַמֵּד the adjective is only so
It is quite uncommon for εγγίζω to render the Hiphil of בָּשָׁם. It is much
more common for it to be a rendering of the verb in the Qal. As LS (p. 467) says the Greek verb is “mostly intransitive.” As such it is a strange rendering of the transitive Hiphil but an appropriate rendering of the Qal. Other instances of the verb apparently rendering the Hiphil of הָעָלַי include:

Gen. 12.11 ενικά ηγγισέν ...εἰσελθείν εἰς Αἰγύπτον

(both the Greek and the Hebrew are using the verb(s) in a specialized construction meaning “to begin”)

Isa. 5.8 woe to them who γρον προς γρον εγγιζόντες

“joining field to field”

Rather than regarding the Greek εγγιζη as evidence that the Hiphil might not be transitive in this context, it is much more reasonable to regard that choice of verb as tendentious and supporting the translator’s view that the offerer is being defiled — “and whoever draws near there”.

The Hebrew can either represent the Qal perfect or the adjective. In either case the translation would be “it is unclean”. The Greek has the future passive “he will be made unclean”.

ενεκεν των λημματων αυτων των ορθρινων, οδυνηθησονται απο προσωπου πωσωναυτων: και εμηειτε εν πυλαις ελεγχοντας.

[It is shameful to him, of a seducer, of a seducer, seducer;]

ενεκεν των ιημματων (πλημμεληματων) αυτων των ορθρινων

plθμμεληματων in Lucianic Group I—(manuscript 86) Since Wellhausen, it has been almost universally assumed that this clause represents a misreading of a Hebrew text with the word "חֲשָׁם ("bribe"). Rudolph's statement is representative:
Der Schluß stammt aus Am 5,10, aber auch das Davorstehende scheint auf ein hebräisches Original zurückzugehen, denn der jetzige Anfang »wegen ihrer morgendlichen Abfaben (oder Verschuldungen)«, der grammatisch mit dem M-Schluß von V. 14 zu verbinden ist, ist sinnlos und verlangt die Änderung von עֹלָהֵמִי תָּשׁוּרָה וּניִמְשַׁא תָּשׁוּרָה »wegen der Erhebung von Bestechungsgeld« (πλημμα scheint nur innergriechische Abänderung zu sein, gegen Ackroyd: JJS 1956, S. 165).

However, there is a difference between Rudolph’s statement and that of Wellhausen which demonstrates the greatest difficulty in the fundamental suggestion. That difference is that Wellhausen suggested an original דָּוָה הָלָכָה. Rudolph’s suggested Vorlage rightly acknowledges that in the MP λημμα is always a rendering of the word שָׁם. Wellhausen’s suggested Vorlage represents the common Hebrew idiom for the “taking of a bribe.” But either suggested Vorlage is very problematic. One ignores a stereotypical rendering of the LXX while the other ignores the proper Hebrew idiom. It is more reasonable to question the senselessness of ὀρπινων. Inasmuch as it is certain that the latter elements of the gloss derive from Amos 5, it is quite possible that the glossator is referring to that prophecy as the earlier burdens (oracles). Thus Brenton translates the Greek “because of their early burdens.” Inasmuch as the word λημμα in the MP always refers to a prophetic burden, i.e. an oracle, this is the most natural and probable meaning of the Greek. However, it should be noted that the supposed Vorlage is without analogy in the MT. The concrete associations of “morning” always are found in the Hebrew לָבֵן. This is not quite as true of the Greek ὀρπινος (variant of ὀρβινος). The Greek word does at times approach the meaning of early (with no apparent associations of morning). Cf. the meaning of the comparative used as an adverb “also ὀρβινετον as Adv., earlier” (LS p. 1250). This discrepancy between the
Greek and Hebrew might constitute a slight evidence that the gloss derives from the translator himself rather than from his *Vorlage*.

"οδυνηθησενται απο προσωπου πονων αυτων"

The difficulty of the text caused both ancients and moderns to emend it. *πονηριων* is found in place of *πονων* in Wmg Sc L-36 -407-613-770 C-68 -239 Syh(sing.) Arm Cyr. Th. Thth.(των πον.) Hi.

No doubt Ziegler (Göttingen) and Rahlfs are correct in reading the more difficult *πονων*. If our reading of the previous clause is correct, then we should probably conclude that this clause is referring to the inadequacy of their previous labor toward the reconstruction of the temple. The translator betrays a partiality to the expression which is another evidence that this gloss derives from him. Compare:

Zech. 9.5 και οδυνηθησεται (יוֹדִיעָה) σφόδρα "Gaza also shall be greatly pained"
Zech. 12.10 και οδυνηθησεται (יוֹדִיעָה) οδυνην, ως επι τω πρωτοτοκω "and they shall grieve intensely, as for a firstborn son."

*πονων αυτων* *πονος* is certainly capable of carrying negative overtones—"hard labor", "toil". Yet it can have a more neutral reference to "labor." The word occurs in the LXX of Hag. 1.11 "and all the works of your hands" in the neutral sense. It is probably best to regard this as a reference to the inadequacy of the previous work on the temple. Whereas they should have been at pains to give their all in the work on the temple, because this was not the case, they will now suffer pains or great grief over Yahweh's refusal to bless them.
Petersen's discussion of this clause is very good. He states,

Clearly the final clause in the LXX represents an insertion into the text based on Amos 5:10, though in the second and not the third person as in MT and LXX of Amos 5:10: "They hate him who reproves in the gate" (LXX, *emisesan en pylais elegchonta*). This dependence on the LXX of Amos for a gloss in the book of Haggai is suggestive of the scribal work present in the deuteroprophetic material, i.e., the insertion of one part of the canonical text as commentary into yet another part of the canon... Since the dialogue with the priest and Haggai's use of that dialogue both have to do with holiness and uncleanness, the moralism present in LXX appears to be a secondary expansion. Ackroyd, (*Exile and Restoration*, 169-170) rightly sees the LXX material as an early interpretation, pushing the notion that becoming *tame* was due to moral failure, a view lacking in MT.55

It is possible that Rudolph is correct in suggesting that the change in person indicates that the gloss is not the product of one glossator. However, it is also quite possible that a single glossator (the translator (?) switched to the second person to heighten the direct and pointed applicability of Amos's previous prophetic charge.

15 καὶ νῦν θεσθε δή εἰς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν απὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης καὶ ὑπερανῷ πρὸ τοῦ θειναι λίθον ἐπὶ λίθον ἐν τῷ ναῷ κυρίου, 16 τίνες ἦσεντες εἰς τὴν ἐνεβάλλετε εἰς κυψέλην κρίθης εἰκοσά σατά, καὶ εγένετο κρίθης δέκα σατά: καὶ εἰσεπορευεθείς εἰς τὸ ὑπολήνιον εξαντλήσατε πεντήκοντα μετρητάς, καὶ εγένετο εἰκοσά. 17 επατάξα ὑμᾶς ἐν αφορία καὶ ἐν ἀνεμοφόρειᾳ καὶ ἐν χαλάζῃ πάντα τὰ ἑργά τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστρέψατε πρὸς με, λέγει κυρίος.

Translation: 15 And now consider, from this day and beyond, before you had put a stone on a stone in the temple of the Lord, 16 who were you? When you put into the grain bin twenty measures of barley, and there were ten measures of barley. And you entered into the press to draw out fifty measures, and there were twenty. 17 I struck you with barrenness and with blasting and all the works of your hands with hail, and you did not return to me, says the Lord.
The expression to consider or take to heart where the preposition is affixed to heart rather than to the subject of consideration occurs in Mal. 1.1 in the Greek and Mal. 2.2 (2x) in the Greek and Hebrew and in Hag. 1.19(18) Greek and Hebrew.

This Hebrew word represents the noun מַעֲלָה (ma'alah) which means "the higher part" + the directive מ. Thus is it an adverb usually meaning "above" but by extension also meaning "afterwards" as in 1 Sam. 16.13, 30.25 "from that day and afterwards." BDB (p. 751) lists Hag. 2.15 and 18 as instances of the meaning "from this day and upwards (i.e. and back )." However, note in the Addenda et corrigenda (p. 1125), "and onwards is more prob." KB (p. 548) lists our passage as meaning "onwards" with 1 Sam. 16.13.

It is quite probable that this is the correct meaning of the Hebrew. Furthermore, it is the likely meaning of the Greek ὑπὲρπανω. Although it must be noted that LS (p. 1859) indicates that the word is used in the phrase εκ τῶν ὑπὲρπανω χρονῶν (SIG 742.58=Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, ed. W. Dittenberger, editio tertia, Leipzig 1915-24 [Ephesus, i B.C.] ) as meaning "of time, further back." It is totally unclear whether the direction of focus is derived from the context or the phrase itself. There is no other instance of ὑπὲρπανω having anything but a spatial significance anywhere else in the LXX.

The precise meaning of ὑπὲρπανω in this passage might be indicated by comparing it to synonymous constructions. For example:

1 Sam. 16.13 ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας εἰκείνης καὶ ἐπάνω

30.25 ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας εἰκείνης καὶ ἐπάνω

It is clear that the meaning in these two passages must be "from that day
and forward." It is interesting to note that 410 have επεκείνα in place of ὑπερανω in our passage in Haggai. Evidently the words are interchangeable. Most decisive with respect to the meaning of the Greek in Haggai is the parallel phrase in 2.18 ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ταυτῆς καὶ επεκείνα. επεκείνα clearly means beyond in the sense of later.

I Kings 18.9 "and Saul looked suspiciously at David from that day καὶ επεκείνα" (שָׁלֹא)
Ezek. 39.22 "and the house of Israel shall know that I am the Lord their God, from this day καὶ επεκείνα" (וַשְׁלֹא)
Susanna 64 "Daniel was held in great reputation from that day καὶ επεκείνα."
I Mac. 10.30 "from this day καὶ επεκείνα ὁρ ἐ ὑ ὅ ν ξ ρ ο ν ω ὑ ρ ι ο ρ ο ν" πρὸ τοῦ βεύιναι λίθου επὶ λίθων ἐν τῷ ναῷ κυρίου

The rendering of the Greek is so literal that it even maintains the infinitive.

16 tives ητε The LXX evidently was translating מַ考评 The MT would likely be translated "since they were." If one were to stick with the MT, the plural suffix would probably be related to an implied days. The AV translates, "Since those days were, when one came..." The Targum Jonathan not only punctuates the sentence with the MT but has the equivalent מַ考评 .

οτε ενεβαλλετε εἰς κυψέλην κριθῆς εἰκοσὶ σατᾶ, καὶ εγένετο κριθῆς δεκα σατᾶ. The Hebrew which includes the preceding inf. in the sentence reads, "Since
they were--i.e. the days when one came to twenty heaps and there were ten."

There is no instance in the LXX where εὑρίσκω renders Ν.*

κοιμήλην occurs nowhere else in the LXX.

καθαριθμη virtually always is a rendering of שערוּה.

There can be little doubt that the LXX reading came about through metathesis for the plural of the two nouns look very similar שׁערוֹת / נַעְרֵיהֶם. Perhaps the Vorlage of the LXX had נַעְרֵיהֶם שׁערוֹת. The omission of the unit of measure after “barleys” would not be in the least surprising for as GKC (§134n) states, “Certain specifications of measure, weight, or time, are commonly omitted after numerals.” It gives Ru 3.15 as an illustration שׁערוֹת שׁערוֹת שׁערוֹת שׁערוֹת שׁערוֹת שׁערוֹת שׁערוֹת שׁערוֹת שׁערוֹת שׁערוֹת שׁערוֹת שׁערוֹת שׁuerdo שordania. Here it renders שׁuerdo.

The meaning of the Greek verb is to draw out water--the particular idea
of skimming off the top implied in the Hebrew is not a part of the meaning.

The word לַשָׁ֫כֶ֣ה means a wine trough. Either the word by extension came to refer to some unit of measure or because of the final מ on the preceding word the מ preposition was omitted by haplography. The word only occurs elsewhere in Isa. 63.3 “I have trodden the winepress alone”–clearly not the lower receptacle but the upper cavity.

17 ἐπατάξα ὑμᾶς ἐν αὐστήρια καὶ ἐν ἀνεμοφθορίᾳ καὶ ἐν χαλαζίᾳ πάντα τὰ ἑργά τῶν χείρων ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς με, λέγει Κύριος.
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πατασσω is the typical rendering of נִכְנֶה (Hi.).

αὐστήρια only occurs here in the LXX. It means “non-production, dearth, barrenness, sterility” LS (p. 292).

שֵׁרְפָּל refers to scorching by the desert wind. It only occurs elsewhere in Dt. 28.22, 1 Ki. 8.37, Am. 4.9 and 2 Chron. 6.28.

ירוק usually occurs in combination with שֵׁרְפָּל in the above-mentioned passages (always except Jer. 30.6—the only place where it is not referring to a problem with crops. There it refers to men’s faces). It might well be translated “mildew.”

אָנֶמֶוּףְבּרִיַּא only occurs elsewhere in Dt. 28.22 and 2 Chron. 6.28 where
it is rendering the other noun of the Hebrew twosome.

χαλατά is the typical rendering of דבב and they both mean "hail."

καὶ οὖν ἐπεστρεψάτε πρὸς με, λέγει κύριος.

This seems quite precarious in view of the fact that the Hebrew is clearly very difficult and may be idiomatic. Surely the translator was merely exercising some liberty. Furthermore, he was likely assimilating toward Amos 4.9. The expression "there is (was) nought of you with me" should likely be seen as a development of the idiomatic "what do I have to do with you?" מְבַהֲלָי יָרוֹל (Judg. 11.12) which is able to employ the נ as well מְבַהֲלָי יָרוֹל (Jer. 23.28 "what has straw in common with wheat?"). The use of the negative predication rather than the interrogative probably just increases the force of the phrase. Ralph Smith's treatment is very good "you were as nothing to me." (p. 159)

Translation: 18 Set your hearts to consider from this day and beyond, from the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, even from the day in which the temple of the Lord was founded—consider in your hearts whether it shall yet be known to be such on the corn-floor and whether
As in 2.10 the Greek μονός represents only an implied χάρη.

The Hebrew אַלֶּחָן renders the Pual of יָדַל in:

III Ki. 6.1; 7.10; 16.34; 2 Es. 3.6; Cant. 5.15; Zech. 8.9.

The Greek certainly has the basic meaning of "to lay a foundation" yet would be fully able to bear subtle nuances of the Hebrew verb. Thus the questions about the meaning of the Hebrew are not in any way decided by the Greek rendering.

The Greek εί ετί επιγνωσθησαται is nonsensical and likely represents a misreading of the Hebrew of הָרַדָע הָרַדָע as הָרַדָע הָרַדָע (the Hophal perf.). The Greek verb is frequently used to render a form of רוּדָע.

מַעֲנָה only occurs here and in Joel 1.17 where it occurs in parallelism with תְּדוּרָה in storehouses. It must mean something like "barn." In Joel 1.17 תְּדוּרָה in the plural is rendered by ληνοι "wine-presses."

The second καί εί ετί suggests that the Variage of the LXX probably had another δύναμις rather than the MT's דָוֵד. It is probably best to emend the MT.

20 καὶ εὑρετεὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐκ δευτεροῦ πρὸς Ἀγγαίον τὸν προφητήν τετραδί καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ μνῆς λεγὼν 21 Ἐπον πρὸς Ζοροβαβέλ τὸν τοῦ Σαλαβίηλ ἐκ φύλης Ιουδαία λεγὼν Ἐγὼ σεῖω τὸν οὐρανον καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ
And the Word of the Lord came a second time to Haggai the prophet on the twenty-fourth day of the month, saying:

21 Say to Zorobabel the son of Salathiel from the tribe of Judah saying, I am shaking the heavens and the earth and the sea and the dry land. 22 And I will overthrow the thrones of kings, and I will destroy the power of the kings of the nations and I will overthrow chariots and riders, and horses and their riders will each one come down with a sword against his brother. 23 In that day, says the Lord Almighty, I will take you, Zorobabel, the son of Salathiel, My servant, says the Lord, and I will appoint you as a seal, because I have chosen you, says the Lord Almighty.

20 LXX adds “the prophet.”

21 Hiphil Part. from verb meaning cause to quake or shake.

This addition is marked with an obelisk in the Syro-hexapla and is missing from Venetus.

22 The verb פָּרַל means to overturn or overthrow and evidently came to have rather fixed associations. As Petersen states,

Many commentators have noted that much of the language in Hag. 2:22 is associated with important traditions or narrative contexts in the
Hebrew Bible. So, for example, the verb הָפַּךְ, "overturn," is regularly used to describe the defeat of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19:25, 29; Isa. 13:19; Amos 4:11; Deut. 29:23). Interestingly, Jer. 20:16 uses this same verb and does not mention those cities by name: 'Let that man be like the cities which Yahweh overthrew without pity.' This development in Jer. 20:16 suggests something of a generalizing trend; it is not unlike the way in which this same verb is used in Hag. 2:22. This formulation in Haggai appears to function even more strongly as an oracle against a foreign nation or city than it does as a reference to the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition.67

The singular נַכֵּס is properly rendered by the Greek plural for this is likely "an example of a common Hebrew idiom, the use of the singular for the plural in the construct before the plural, and translated "thrones," cf. GK §124, 2c."68

βασιλεύς (kings) is found in the LXX rather than the expected βασιλείων (kingdoms). However there is an obvious interchange between the two words no doubt by metonymy. Thus βασιλεία can render μελεκ and βασιλευς can render ממלכה. Cf. Zephaniah 3.8 ממלכה/ βασιλεία.

 אומר is nicely rendered by εξολοθρεύω inasmuch as both mean to utterly destroy or exterminate. The rendering is quite common.

הָזֵק only occurs 4 other times and then only in the expression be + הָזֵק.
Ex. 13.3; 13.14; 13.16 χειρι κραταία
Amos 6.13(14) εν τη ισχιν
και καταστρέψω αρματα και αναβατας
The Greek does not represent the pronominal suffix.
Alexandrinus includes at this point the clause καὶ καταστρέψω πᾶσαν τὴν
dύναμιν αὐτῶν καὶ καταβάλω τὰ οἰκα αὐτῶν καὶ ενισχύσω τοὺς εκλεκτοὺς
μου. ("and I will overthrow all of their power, bring down their borders,
and strengthen my chosen ones.") This is probably simply a verbose
scribal insertion.69

καὶ καταβήσουνται ἵπποι καὶ ανάβασαι αὐτῶν ἕκαστος ἐν ρομφαίᾳ πρὸς τὸν
ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. The Greek has filled in the thought of the Hebrew in making the active
hostility of each rider against his fellow rider more explicit by means of
the preposition πρὸς —"horses and their riders shall go down, each with a
sword against his brother." This alters the force of the verb so that the
verbal action is that of coming down against someone militarily. The
Hebrew could mean the same thing. But it is quite possible that אָדָם
refers to their descent to Sheol. There is a surprisingly widespread
reading of αναβαςαι among the manuscripts [A 198 233 407 534 544
Qc L-36 147c 770c Bo Cyr. Tht. Bas. N.] This surely represents nothing
more than a widespread confusion resulting from the proximate αναβασαι.

23 The Greek of this verse follows the Hebrew very closely and
predictably. The only point worthy of mention is the fact that in the
important parallel passage Jer. 22.24 of which this passage is a direct
reversal, the word for seal is ἀποσφραγίσμα. In general ἀποσφραγίσμα
refers to the impression made by a seal while σφραγὶς refers to the
signet itself. But this is not always the case. And clearly in Jer. 22.24 the
signet ring is in view.
Notes


8 Ibid. pp. 157 & 160. (There is an intervening table #17 on pp. 158-9).

9 BAGD p. 880.

10 A number of commentators on the Hebrew text have found special, emphatic significance in the expression יַֽהְנָא. Among recent commentators, Petersen says, "This is an unusual way of putting the matter. Normally the word comes to ('el) the prophet rather than having the prophet act as a functioning intermediary." [David L. Petersen, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Commentary* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1985), p. 45.]


Meyers and Meyers argue:

The rendering in Haggai is significant in its expression of prophetic instrumentality without the use of an active verb. Instead, הוהו (‘came’) expresses the verbal idea in keeping with traditional formulaic introduction to prophecy, ‘the word of Yahweh (which) came to X’ (cf. Hos. 1: 1; Jer. 1: 1-2; Zeph. 1: 1; etc.) Haggai uses be’ed (‘by the hand of’) in place of the expected ‘to’ (?el), a shift which has the effect of emphasizing the instrumentality of the prophet. In Malachi this change is carried one step further and no verb at all appears: ‘The word of Yahweh to Israel through Malachi’ (Mal 1: 1). The use of be’ed also heightens the authority of the prophet as Yahweh’s spokesman. [Carol L Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8:*
However, it is intrinsically improbable that an expression which in its instrumental meaning occurs at least 120x, could yet retain any particularly emphatic force. Perhaps a bit more likely is the view of Ralph Smith, who says:

The source or authority of the word of Haggai is indicated by the expression, "the word of Yahweh came by the hand of Haggai the prophet." That is, Haggai was the instrument through whom the word of Yahweh came. This construction "by the hand of..." is rare in the prophets. It is found only in Hag 1:1, 3; 2:1; and Mal 1:1. It is used in this sense frequently in the Pentateuch (Lev 8:36; 10:11; Num 4:37,45) and in the Deuteronomic history (Josh 14:2; Judg 3:4; 1 Kings 12:15; 16:7). The more common expression, "The word of Yahweh came unto (יְהֹוָא) Haggai," is found in 2:10,20 and in 2:1 in the Murabba'at scroll. No distinction should be made between the two expressions. [Ralph L. Smith, Micah-Malachi, Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 32, (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1984) p. 152.]

Baldwin plausibly suggests that, "In this sentence the less usual preposition may have been used to avoid repetition of the word 'to'". [Joyce G. Baldwin, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary, The Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press, 1972), p. 38.]


14 Gerhard Von Rad, Old Testament Theology: Volume Two, trans. D. M. G. Stalker from the German Theologie des Alten Testaments II, Munich


17Rudolph, p. 29.


20GKC, p. 438 §135d.


24Petersen, p. 48.

25Ibid.
The five occurrences of the expression outside the LXX are found in Athanasius's *Epistolae Quattuor ad Serapionem* 26.541.17-18, 26.601.35 & 26.633.1 and in Eusebius of Caesarea in his *Commentaria in Psalmos* 23.426.27 & 23.597.18-19. The three occurrences in Athanasius are exact quotations from Zechariah 7.12 τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν εταχάν απειθή τού μὴ εισακουεῖν and as such are not worthy of comment. The two occurrences in Eusebius are a bit more interesting for in both of them he is quoting Symmachus: [In ref. to Psalm 47.14 and instead of LXX's θεοθε τος καρδιας υμων] Καθατε τας καρδιας υμων εις την δυναμιν αυτης, και καταδιελεσθε τας βαρεις αυτης: κατα δε τον Συμμαχον. Καθατε τας καρδιας υμων εις τον περιβολον αυτης: (“consider her power, and observe her palaces, according to Symmachus, consider her circumference”) and again [In ref. to Psalm 61.11 and instead of LXX’s προστιθεσθε καρδιαν] ἐλθετε δε τω της ροης ονοματε κεχρηται, “Πλουτος εαν πει,” φησιν: κατα δε τον Συμμαχον. “Πλουτος, φησιν, εαν καρποφορη, μη πααστε την καρδιαν.” Αλλα επι τινα δε παασιν την καρδιαν και τινι προστιθεσθαι, ειρηται πολλαις εν τω, “Δυχε τω θεω υποταγησεται η ψυχη μου” (“But wondrously in the saying of the flowing it is proclaimed, ‘if riches should flow in,’ according to Symmachus, ‘Riches,’ he says, ‘if it should bear fruit, do not set your heart upon it, but set your heart upon this and give your attention to that is often stated in the *psalm which begins*—Shall not my soul be subject to God?’”)

34 Leslie Allen lists this passage (along with 6: 9-12; 7: 11,12) as an instance in which "MT appears to have lost the thread of the original meaning." (p. 253)

35 Cyril of Alexandria, in a remarkable spiritual reading of the passage in the LXX, sees inattentiveness to the external aspects of the Christian religion to be a sure source of inner spiritual impotence and a certain cause of future torments. Even the most mystical and potent aspects of Christian experience—the sacramental, can be robbed of all dynamic force (Pusey, vol. II, pp. 255-6):

"Therefore, for those hesitating to complete those things which pertain to the glory of God and the things through which his house is seen fitted together—that is the church, may there not be spiritual dew, which is that exhortation which fattens both the soul and heart. Neither the fruitfulness from the earth, that is the virtuous deeds done through the body—neither grain nor wine nor the use of oil. For they will be entirely powerless and far from able to be made glad, in no wise able to be fattened with the intellectual oil of exultation. And those having absolutely no taste or share in the blessing of Christ, will remain behind. And beyond these things, they will be subjected to the sword and they will await hard labour, entirely without reward, even if any manner of goodness should be practiced among them."

The sacramental significance of the oil is perhaps clarified in the reading of Codex Vaticanus 587, which in place of ἐλαιον χρησις has ἐλαιον χρησις.
Yet, in view of Cyril's view of the dew, the use of κατορθώμα in Patristic Greek [G. W. H. Lampe's *A Greek Patristic Lexicon* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961), pp. 735-736], and the importance of wine, bread and oil in early Christian thought, there can be little doubt concerning his point.

[36] Petersen, p. 52.


[38] Meyers, p. 423. "A nearly identical pair of clauses appears in Hag 1: 10, in the negative and in the opposite order, in reference to past conditions: the heavens withheld the dew so that the earth limited its yield."


[41] GKC p. 133 §49 2a.

[42] Thomas O. Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), pp. XX-XXI §6. He states, "Whenever a long vowel (a e o) occurs before a guttural or r and corresponds formally to a short vowel before a doubled non-guttural, the vowel is said to be long by compensatory lengthening, i.e. to compensate for the non-doubling of the guttural. When a short vowel (a i u o) occurs before a guttural in similar situations, the guttural is said to be virtually doubled."

[43] Both Cyril and Theodore read verse 10 with the past tense. Interestingly, Cyril is aware that the Hebrew and Greek disagree. For he introduces his commentary on the verse with the following (Pusey, Vol II, p. 389):

> Η των Εβραιων εκδοσις ουχ ως επι μελλοντας καιρου παιειται τους λογους, χρονον δε τιθαι τον παρωχηκοτα. προ γαρ των ημερων εκεινων φησιν ο μισος των ανθρωπων ουκ ην εις ανησιν και ο μισος των κτητων ουχ υπηρχε και παλιν τω εκπεμημενω και τω
The version of the Hebrews does not treat the words as dealing with a future time, but puts it in reference to time-past. "For before those days," he says, "the reward of men was not unto profit and there was no reward for the beasts." And again, "There was no peace for the one going out and the one going in," and in place of the written "I will send forth all the men," it has put "I sent all the men." The version (Hebrew) has the greater probability, and the interpretation of the narratives will concern itself precisely with these words.


45Dingermann, p. 195.


48Dingermann, p. 195.

49Stekhoven, pp. 75-76.

50Israel Yeivin, Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah, translated and edited by E. J. Revell, (Scholars Press: 1980). Yeivin states: The marking of pisqot is old. It is mentioned in the halakic midrashim (about 3rd cent. CE) 'Why were the pisqot introduced? To give Moses time to reflect between each parashah, and between each subject.' (Sifre, Leviticus 1:1, ed. Finkelstein p. 6) 'If a petuhah is written instead of a setumah, or a setumah instead of a petuhah, the scroll should be removed from liturgical use' (Sifre in Deuteronomy, sect. 36).
A division between different subjects is marked by a space in the non-Biblical scrolls from the Dead Sea. The same method is used in the Biblical scrolls. In some of these, such as the complete Isaiah scroll (1QIsa 8) the divisions do not correspond closely to the received tradition, but in others, such as the scroll of the twelve prophets from Murabba'at (Mur XII) the correspondence is very close. The pisqat seem also to have been marked in early (Jewish) MSS of the Greek translation, showing that they were already a well-established feature of the text before the turn of the era. (pp. 41-2)

And on the independence of the punctuation and paragraph systems he states, "Verse division does not always coincide with the earlier pisqah division, so that occasionally a pisqah division occurs within a verse, forming the so-called pisqah be-emsâ' pasug, on which there are comments in the Masorah." (pp. 42-3)

W. E. Barnes, in his Haggai and Zechariah, Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, (Cambridge: 1917), p. 10 states,

As printed in R.V. and in most editions of A.V. this date belongs to the event described in v. 14, the commencement of the work of Temple-building. The Hebrew text however has a full stop (sofḥ pasuk) at the end of v. 14, and careful editions (e.g. Ginsburg's of 1910) show a division of paragraphs between vv. 14 and 15. This treatment is no doubt intended to mark the verse as giving an erroneous date for the resumption of work on the Temple. The true date (ninth month) is preserved in ch. ii.10.


It is quite clear that the text has a major break before the date formula and then is defaced below that point. Thus it is difficult to follow the short note on p. 205 where the editors state, "XXII 11-13: Agg1 15. Une grande partie de la 1.11,1.12 toute entière et le début de la 1.13 n'étaient probablement pas inscrits a cause de la surface défectueuse de
It would run far wide of our purpose to interact with all the various theories about the compositional history of the Hebrew text, but it is perhaps not inappropriate to quote the very nice summary of Childs:

The difficulty of following the logic of the latter half of ch. 2 (vv. 15-19) has long been felt (cf. A. Köhler). Both the shift in tone and the peculiarities of the chronology seemed puzzling. At first the suggested corrections involved only the removal of a few phrases (Wellhausen, Marti), or a reinterpretation of the Hebrew syntax in order to by-pass the problems (Keil, van Hoonacker). Later a more ambitious attempt toward resolving the difficulties was made by E. Sellin (Studien II, 50ff.). He argued that the date formula in 1.15a represented a fragment from a passage which had been lost. Since 1.12ff. spoke of the beginning of the work on rebuilding the temple, and 2.1ff. already described the building as well under way some seven weeks later, Sellin reasoned that the report of the laying of the foundation stone must have occurred in between these two passages. He concluded that the passage in Haggai had been suppressed because the dating of the laying of the foundation stone conflicted with the Chronicler's report (Ezra 3.8ff.).

Sellin's suggestion was next picked up by Rothstein (53ff.) who argued that Sellin's lost passage was actually preserved in 2.15-19 and that, when joined to 1.15a, it formed the missing oracle. Rothstein adduced a variety of literary and historical proofs for supporting his case that the present unit, 2.10-19, was an artificial construct of two totally different passages. With slight variation (e.g. Mitchell, Horst, Elliger) Rothstein's reconstruction of the original setting of two separate passages has been widely accepted (cf. Wolff, Hesse, von Rad, OT Theology II, 282-5). Brevard Childs, Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture (Philadelphia:
R. K. Harrison sees a possible textual disruption with respect to 1.15a and 2.18. He states:

It may well be, as Stafford Wright has suggested, that the revival of enthusiasm had been marked by a fresh foundation ceremony (Hag. 2: 18; cf. Ez. 3: 10), since it was by no means unusual to have more than one foundation ritual for dwelling-houses and temples alike. The date given in Haggai 2: 18 may perhaps be a scribal error that has confused the twenty-fourth day of the sixth month (Hag. 1: 15) with the twenty-fourth day of the ninth month, when the prophecy was uttered (Hag. 2: 10). ... There may be some possibility of textual dislocation, as in Haggai 2: 15-19, which may have arisen from the confusion of dates in Haggai 1: 15 and 2: 18.


54 Rudolph, p. 40 f.n. 1a.

55 Cf. Wolff p. 70 f.n. 2c.

56 Gelston, p. 135. Note also his comment on p. 173: "The addition of πασαν (Haggai 2: 18) in Am vi 2 is an expansion similar to those at Hg ii 2 and Sa xiv 17 noted on p. 135 supra, and differs from them only in that it appears to be reflected also in V."

57 There are two important internal considerations which suggest that the clause is a later gloss:

1. The phrase to cut a word is anomalous—it does not occur anywhere else. However, it must be said that you have a similarly anomalous phrase in Neh 10: 1 (to make an agreement) which might suggest that in LBH you have a movement away from the more stereotyped phrase (to cut a covenant) toward more diverse expressions.

2. The clause breaks up the passage—the thought, the formula, the chiasm.

a. It is clear that the clause does not fit nicely between the two statements—"I am with you" and "My Spirit abides among you." The disruptive nature of the clause is further indicated by the difficulty of
explaining the precise syntactical function of the בֵּית.


c. Fishbane further argues that a chiastic pattern (be strong; I am with you) / (My Spirit is with you; do not fear) is disrupted by the clause. [The correspondency of be strong and do not fear is argued on the grounds that they are "often used as a hendiadys in commands to individuals to embark on a new and dangerous task." (ibid.)

58 Meyers, p. 52.


61 Petersen, p. 70.

62 Verhoef, p. 110 f. n. # 4.

63 Wellhausen, p. 170.

64 Rudolph, p. 45.


66 Petersen, p. 71.

67 Petersen, p. 99.

CHAPTER FOUR
Commentary

МАЛАХИАС

Chapter I

1 Λήμμα λόγου κυρίου επὶ τὸν Ἰσραήλ ἐν χειρὶ αγγέλου αὐτοῦ. Θεαθε δὴ ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας ὦμων.

2 Ἡγάπησα ὦμας, λέγει κυρίος, καὶ εἰπάτε Ἐν τίνι ἡγάπησας ὦμας; οὐκ ἁδελφὸς ἦν Ἡσαυ τῷ Ἰακώβ; λέγει κυρίος καὶ ἡγάπησα τὸν Ἰακώβ, 3 τὸν δὲ Ἡσαυ ἐμισήσα καὶ εταξὰ τὰ ὀρια (ορη ?) αὐτοῦ εἰς αφανισμὸν καὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ εἰς δοματα ἐρήμου. 4 διὸ εἶναι ἡ Ἰδουμαία Κατεστραπται, καὶ εὐπρεπῶμεν καὶ αὐτοκαταρρέωμεν τὰς ερήμους· τάδε λέγει κυρίος παντοκράτωρ. Αὐτοὶ οἰκοδομησώμεν τὰς ερήμους· καὶ εγὼ καταστρεψώ· καὶ εἰκληθήσεται αὐτοῖς ὀρια ἀνομίας καὶ λαὸς ἐφ' οὐ παρατετάκται κυρίος εὼς αἰωνός. 5 καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὦμων ὁφόνται, καὶ ὦμεις ὑπείτε Ἐμεγαλυνθῇ κυρίος ὑπερανῶν τῶν ὀριων τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

Translation: 1 The burden of the word of the Lord against Israel by the hand of His messenger, lay it to your hearts!

2 I have loved you, says the Lord. And you said, In what way have You loved us? Was not Esau Jacob's brother, says the Lord? And Jacob I loved 3 but Esau I hated. And I appointed his borders [mountains?] for annihilation and made his inheritance unto gifts of the desert. 4 Because Idumea will say, It is overthrown, and yet let us return and build up the desolate places. Thus says the Lord Almighty, They will build but I will cast down. And they shall be called the borders of lawlessness and a people against whom the Lord has set Himself forever. 5 And your eyes will see and you will say, The Lord is magnified above the borders of Israel.

МАЛАХИАС Although there is a considerable amount of minor variation about the precise form of the superscription, the form of the title is relatively consistent in attaching the abbreviated form of the divine name to the noun mal'akh. The ias form is the Greek representation of the
shortened Hebrew form מלך. Thus, this form probably means “messenger of Yahweh.” It is possible although unlikely that the Hebrew form represents a mere variation for מלך. It is possible that the translator thought it unlikely that anyone would name their child “My Messenger” and chose to ignore an inherited vocalization and to treat the final י as representing the divine name.

It is possible that the strengthened preposition επί merely represents assimilation to the more standard formula of Zech. 12.1. However, there can be little doubt that the translator of the MP is fully capable of using his historical/theological vantage point from which to frame the text in language which is more emphatic than the Hebrew in front of him. A bold reinterpretation of the tone, perhaps content, of the prophets is found in LXX Zech. 1.4 και μη γινεϊε καθώς οι πατερες μων, ας ενεκαλεσαν αυτοις οι προφηται οι εμπροσθεν λεγοντες. It cannot be without significance that this is the only instance of this Greek verb rendering the Hebrew בק in the entire LXX. This verb occurs elsewhere only in: Ex. 22.9 (8) και πασης απωλειας της εγκαλουμενης “and every loss charged.” The context is explicitly legal. (Rendering בק) Pr. 19.5 ο εγκαλων αδικως Parallelism equates the expression with the preceding μαρτυς ψευδης. It renders the Hebrew בק technical expression for a false witness (in a legal context). Wis. 12.12 For who shall withstand thy judgment or who shall accuse thee for the nations that perish? τις δε ενεκαλεσει σοι κατα εθνων απολωλωτων

Si. 46.19 and before his eternal sleep he charged before the Lord and
Christ, I have not taken any man's goods, so much as a sandal: and no man did accuse him (καὶ οὐκ ἐνεκαλέσεν αὐτῷ αὐθρώπας.)

II M a. 6.21 (A') This would represent a weakened, non-technical use of the verb inasmuch as it replaces the more widely read παρακαλέω except that it appears to be a scribal error of sight based on the similarity of the following word. The text is παρακαλουν (ἐνεκαλουν) ἐνεγκαντά κρεα "they were encouraging him to use meat brought by him" Thus there is no likely example of the verb having other than a technical legal or criminal nuance in the LXX. This accords with the opinion of the lexicons. BAGD (p. 215) says "Legal t.t. accuse, bring charges against someone." MM (p. 179) states, "For ἐν which was early specialized in malam partem, calling in a man to accuse him, and hence 'bring a charge against.'" All things considered, it seems very likely that the translator of the MP has made an emphatic semantic contribution to the Zechariah passage and a deliberate albeit subtle contribution in Mai. 1.1. 2

ἐν χειρὶ σαγγελου αὐτοῦ / The Greek manuscripts are very consistent in reading with σαγγελου αὐτοῦ (as do Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion). 86mg (Rom. ix-x) has ἐν χειρὶ μαλαχιοῦ. Venetus omits the αὐτοῦ. The Targum follows the MT but adds to it "whose name was Ezra the Scribe" (מִלְאַמְרֵי יְוֹדֶהוֹ שֵׁם הַצוֹרָא מָפיֵרָא). The Babylonian Talmud (Megilla 15a) and Jerome share this tradition.

Although if the text were slavishly literal one might expect an original Vorlage of מִלְאַמְרֵי מִלְאַמְרֵי, it is more likely that the translator was smoothing his text a bit. As Rudolph states, "Das bedeutet nicht, daß LXX in seiner hebräischen Vorlage ἔστα, sondern er glich aus stilistischen Gründen an den Anfang der Überschrift an, wo von Jahwe in der 3. Person die Rede ist." 3

Θεσθε ὥτι εἰς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. This little gloss could well derive from the translator's reminiscence of Hag. 2. 15 & 18. It is, however, equally likely that the translator borrowed the phrase from Mal. 2.2. Sellin (Komm. p. 540) sees the gloss as an expression of the zeal with which the
passage was read in the synagogue (a refrain of admonition). Bachmann's unusual view that was originally was Caleb', thus an explicit identification of the unknown prophet, is entertaining but hardly likely. J. M. P. Smith's rebuttal stands: Bach. finds in this gloss from LXX the otherwise unknown name of the prophet, by supposing LXX to represent the original of which was not good Hebrew, which would require either or as in Hg. 2. Ziegler has judged which is the attested reading to be an early scribal error. If he is correct, this is a pointed reminder that agreement with the MT need not signify late assimilation. However, Stekhoven makes the interesting suggestion that the LXX translator(s) deliberately chose a Greek word which phonologically resembled the Hebrew word. Obviously the rough breathing of would be phonologically closer to the Hebrew than . He states, "Somtijds kiest hij een minder juist woord om een Hebreeuwsch woord van ongeveer gelijken klank weer te geven." He gives numerous other examples from the MP. However, it must be remembered how difficult it is to prove homoiophony and it does seem quite likely that the translator might have assimilated to verses 4 and 5 (). Both the Hebrew and the Greek here are difficult. Verhoeft both provides a helpful assessment of the recent treatments of the Hebrew and repeats a very common misjudgment concerning the Greek. He states:
Since Capellus most scholars emended the Heb. \(\text{תננתות} \), "for the jackals," to \(\text{תננות} \), a shortened form of \(\text{תננותות} \), from the root \(\text{naw} \) or \(\text{naw} \), meaning "pastures" (of the wilderness). This rendering seems to be substantiated by the rendering of the LXX: \(\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\,\dot{\delta}ο\mu\sigma\tau\alpha \), "to habitations," a reading supported by the Peshitta and the Syro-Hexapla. It is also supported by scriptural evidence, where reference is made to "desert pastures" in a context of judgment (cf. Jer. 9:9 [Eng. 10]; 23:10; Joel 1:19,20; 2:20; Ps. 65:13 [Eng. 12]). The main reason for this proposed emendation is that a feminine plural of the Hebrew word \(\text{תננה} \), "jackal," is unknown. But the ending -\(\acute{o}t \) originally was just another plural ending, without the definite distinction in gender. The expression 'jackels of the desert' is well attested to denote the effect of the divine judgment (cf. Isa. 35:7; Jer. 9:11 [Eng. 12]; 10:22; 49:33; 51:37; Ps. 44:20 [Eng. 19]; Job 30:29).7

Concerning the Greek, there are a number of points of interest. While it is true that \(\delta\omega\mu\alpha \) can represent a variant spelling of the word \(\dot{\delta}\omega\mu\alpha \), it is very unlikely that this is the case in this instance.8 First, it should be noted that \(\delta\omega\mu\alpha \) is the stereotypical rendering of the Hebrew word \(\text{תננה} \). There is no instance of \(\delta\omega\mu\alpha \) rendering any Hebrew word for "pasture." And just as \(\text{בֶּלֶשׁ} \) is a technical term meaning the roof of a palace, tower or a place of cult, in the LXX \(\delta\omega\mu\alpha \) has acquired the same specific associations. Thus there are no grounds for the often repeated view that "the LXX here reads \(\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\,\dot{\delta}ο\mu\sigma\tau\alpha \) which is the equivalent of \(\text{בלשׁ} \) for 'pastures' or 'dwelling places of.'"9 Furthermore, it is quite interesting to note that a number of the Hebrew words apparently rendered by the Greek word \(\delta\omega\mu\alpha \) have the Hebrew letters \(\text{כ} \) as in the MT's \(\text{כַּלַּנְתָל} \) \(\text{כַּלַּנְתָל} \) [\(\text{כַּלַּנְתָל} \) \(\text{כַּלַּנְתָל} \)]. Thus it is very likely that the translator was confused by the unexpected feminine plural ending and decided that the form was somehow related to the Hebrew verb "to give" \(\text{כַּלַּנ} \). Dingermann (p. 227) posits an LXX \textit{Vorlage} reading of \(\text{כַּלַּנְתָל} \). A similar form occurs in Num. 3.9 and is rendered by \(\delta\omega\mu\alpha \) \(\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\,\dot{\delta}ο\mu\sigma\tau\alpha \) \(\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\,\dot{\delta}ο\mu\sigma\tau\alpha \) \(\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\,\dot{\delta}ο\mu\sigma\tau\alpha \) \(\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\,\dot{\delta}ο\mu\sigma\tau\alpha \) \(\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\,\dot{\delta}ο\mu\sigma\tau\alpha \) \(\varepsilon\iota\varsigma\,\dot{\delta}ο\mu\sigma\tau\alpha \)
Aquila translates the Hebrew with σ(ε)ρήνας “the Sirens” which is a rendering for נֶחֶשׁ in Job 30.29, Is. 34.13 and 43.20 in LXX. Symmachus, Theodotion, 86 and Syh represent ανεπιβατα, an adjective meaning “not to be climbed or inaccessible” (LS 133). Interestingly, Symmachus also uses ανεπιβατα to render מַשָּׁל in Jer. 9.11. W. E. Barnes, in his brief little commentary, has described the sense of the LXX very accurately: “LXX ends the verse, εἰς δοματα ερημον, as though the sense were, ‘I will appoint his heritage to be gifts to the wilderness,’ i.e. to become wilderness-land.”

It would also be possible to understand ερημον to be an attributive genitive in which case the translation would be “I made his heritage unto desolate (or barren) gifts.”

Both the Hebrew קַשַׁנָא and the Greek καὶ εταξα represent a semantic zeugma, for the verbs are doing double-duty with a different nuance in the two clauses (appoint to / make). Glazier-McDonald rightly criticizes Torrey’s view of the impossibility of such a construction. As she states:

However, usage should not be anticipated, but should be defined on the basis of context. In this case, the lamed before επτπα τριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστριστρισ�οντο γυναὶς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυναῖς γυ

The LXX can be translated either “because someone will say, ‘Edom is overthrown’” or it can read “because Edom will say, ‘it is overthrown’”

εἰσὶν ιδουμαία καταστράπται, καὶ επιστρεφόμεν καὶ
ανοικοδομήσωμεν τας ερημον τα δε λεγει κυριοι παντοκρατωρ Αυτοι
οικοδομήσονται, καὶ εγς καταστρεψω

4 δοιμε ρειη η ιδουμαια Κατεστραμμαται, και επιστρεψομεν και
ανοικοδομησομεν τας ερημους τα δε λεγει κυριοι παντοκρατωρ Αυτοι
οικοδομησομεν, και εγς καταστρεψω

The LXX can be translated either “because someone will say, ‘Edom is overthrown’” or it can read “because Edom will say, ‘it is overthrown’”
The Hebrew is quite unambiguous with its “because Edom will say, ‘We are crushed.’” Swete capitalizes his text so as to support the first reading (ὅτι εἰρήνῃ Ἡ Ἑθομᾶμα καταστράφηται) while Rahlfs and Ziegler support the second. In support of the first reading is the fact that if Edom were speaking one would expect the translator to maintain the direct discourse with the first person form of the second verb (as in the MT). And inasmuch as Ἄδωνις is usually masculine, the translator might have been hesitant to link Ἄδωνις and Ἀμφίρ (which is feminine). Indeed, he might have read λῆμψις as the 2nd masc. sing. functioning as an indefinite (Cf. GKC §144 ḥ). In support of the second reading is the fact that if indeed the subject of ἐπεί were indefinite, one would surely expect the indefinite pronoun τίς. Perhaps, in view of the rarity of the 2nd masc. sing. functioning as an indefinite, this observation is decisive. In view of the discrepancy in gender and the abrupt shift of person in the Hebrew, the LXX translator just reworked the text.

Concerning the semantical shift from שָׁבַשָּׁ ("to batter down") to καταστρέφω ("to overthrow"), it is quite likely that the translator did not know the meaning of this unusual Hebrew root and filled the void with a word which makes sense in the context. He probably assumed the essential synonymity of רָדָה and שָׁבַשָּׁ and for that reason used καταστρέφω to render both Hebrew verbs. Although this is the only time that particular Greek word renders רָדָה in the OG, you do find the same rendering in Alexandrinus (Job 12: 14; Prov. 14:1). The only other occurrence of the Hebrew שָׁבַשָּׁ is in Jer. 5: 17 [(BHS prefers רָדָה) יֶרֶשׁ ὑπὲρ τοὺς πολέμους τὸς ὀχυρὸς μῦλον.] It looks suspiciously as though the translator of Jeremiah did not know the Hebrew word and borrowed meanings suitable to a hypothetical
orthographically-similar שֵׁמֶשֶׁנָר (Pol). Although there has been a long-lived
doubt about the existence of the root שֵׁמֶשֶׁנָר, we can with KB take the
existence of the Syriac word *, the existence of the Akkadian root
*סָסָסָא, and the likely derivation of the place name שֵׁמֶשֶׁנָר (which KB
suggests means “foundry, refinery”), as a sound basis from which to
derive the fundamental meaning of “to beat down, shatter.”

LXX renders ἱλίτ both by ὁικοδομεῖον and ἀναhoικοδομεῖον.

καὶ εἰκάζεται αυτοῖς οἰρισ εὐνοίας καὶ λαὸς εφ οὐν παρατενάκται κύριος
κόραι λέε σαβελ φήσει τὸν αἰσχρὸν εἴπῃ ἤρθη πρός ὑμᾶς:
The Future Passive of the Greek is a good rendering of the Hebrew. The
3rd plural is oftentimes used to express an indefinite subject, which can
be rendered by a passive (GKC §144 f,g).

דְּבָא is not elsewhere rendered by παρατασσεῖν. Rudolph translates the
final Hebrew verb with zurmt (“and the people with whom Yahweh is
forever angry [annoyed]”). He also suggests that the LXX might have
confused דְּבָא and דֶּבָא. He notes Zech. 1.6 where παρατενάκται renders
דְּבָא. It is more likely that the LXX translator was using battle language
to accentuate Yahweh’s perpetual wrath against Edom. Other occurrences
of the verb followed by the preposition εἰς include: Num 31.7; I Chron
19.17; Jer 6.23; 27.14 (this final passage with the meaning of to take
one’s stand against militarily—probably resembles the intended meaning
in our passage). The heightened force of the Greek—compared to the
Hebrew might reflect the advantage of historical perspective on the
downfall of Edom.

5 καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ υμῶν ὀφνται, καὶ υμεῖς εἰρεῖτε Ἐμεγαλυνθη κυρίος
It is possible (with BHS) to imagine that the ו prefixed to בבל is the result of dittography. However, Verhoef's comments are pertinent: we deliberately prefer the translation of me’al (ל) as above, because this is how it is rendered in all the passages where it is used, with the possible exception of 2 Chron. 24:20 and 26:19 (cf. Gen. 1:7; 1 Sam. 17:39; Ezek. 1:25; Jon. 4:6; Neh. 12:31, 37; 2 Chron. 13:4). The main reason for our preference is to be found in the analysis of the discourse: the pervading theme is God's love for his people. This theme is worked out negatively by demonstrating God’s love in what happened and is going to happen to Edom, and is then emphasized by Israel’s acknowledgment of the greatness of God’s love for his covenant people and country. The greatness of the Lord is not so much seen in his judgment upon Edom, but rather in the manifestation of his love for Israel. Our rendering of me’al (ל) is supported by the LXX hyperan and the Vulgate super. The alternative translation, ‘beyond,’ is supported by the Peshitta and Targum. The territory of Israel is preeminently contrasted with the wicked country of Edom: in one God's glory and love is manifested and acknowledged, in the other his anger is felt for ever.15

This assessment is probably correct, yet it must be remembered that the Gk. υπέρανω does not always in the LXX mean “above.” Note esp. the clear temporal reference in Hag. 2.16 απὸ τῆς ἡμερᾶς ταύτης καὶ υπέρανω.

The rest of the verse is quite straightforward. The Greek is a good rendering of the Hebrew.
Translation: 6 A son glorifies a father and a servant his lord. And if I am a father, where is My glory? And if I am a lord, where is My fear? says the Lord Almighty, Oh you priests who defile My name. And you say, In what way have we defiled Your name? 7 In your bringing to My altar polluted bread. And you say, In what way have we polluted them? In that you say, The table of the Lord is despised and the foods set upon it are despised. 8 Because if you bring a blind one for sacrifice, is it not evil? And if you bring a lame or sick one, is it not evil? Take it to your governor. Will he receive you or will he show favor to you, says the Lord Almighty?

Budde states, "Richtig schiebt man seit Smed (bei Wellhausen) nach dem Zeugnis der LXX ein zwischen יְהֵא ולִבְּרָא und יְהֵא ולִבְּרָא ein; ein hübsches Beispiel für den Ausfall durch Ähnlichkeit der Buchstaben." Although the manuscript evidence for the added φοβηθησαί is far from insubstantial, it must be noted that the addition(?) certainly smooths the passage a bit inasmuch as it clarifies that the relationships between a father and son and a master and slave are quite different. This might be the mark of lateness. The later scribes certainly might have been influenced by the הָרָא of the second clause. Furthermore, verse 3 showed that the author is not averse to shifting nuances rather abruptly (אַל מָאָרָה אָסַח חוֹרָא לָהַנּוֹת). This might be another instance of the same.

Ziegler follows the suggestion of Vollers that υμεῖς is merely a scribal error from υμίν. Vollers confidently asserted, "Ohne Zweifel ist jenes aus υμίν verderbt." But, in view of the lack of attestation for υμίν, the obvious difficulty of the attested υμεῖς, and the probability that the translator is merely judging the Hebrew לָכְכֶם to be emphatic, it is
preferable to read with the manuscripts.

Although one usually finds יְהוּדִי being rendered by ἐπί when in connection with θυσιαστήριον, in this instance the Greek πρὸς probably reflects the Greek tendency to repeat the preposition attached to the verb. However, one cannot be sure for there is no other instance of προσαγωγὸς πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον in the LXX.19 יְהוּדִי / αρτους The Hebrew collective singular is often rendered by the Greek plural (in MP cf. Ho. 2.5; 9.4; Am. 4.6; 8.11).

ณา is the Pual participle meaning “made cultically impure” The Greek which means “to be polluted” does the job nicely.

A substantial difference is found in the LXX’s ἐν τινὶ ἡλισθησάμεν αὐτοὺς; The Hebrew has the 2nd masc. pronominal suffix בְּנֵי. The Hebrew is supported by the Targums, Peshitta, Vulgate and the Ethiopic (which has “your name”). BHS suggests reading with the LXX as בְּנֵי. However, with Verhoef and Rudolph we agree that the more difficult reading of the Hebrew should be retained. As Verhoef states:

We agree with Lattey that ‘such vigorous phrasing would far more easily be changed than invented.’ The idea behind this ‘vigorous phrasing’ is that the defiling of the sacrifices of God’s altar is in itself a defiling of the Lord.20

This opinion was expressed long ago by Jerome, “For when the Sacraments are violated, Himself, whose sacraments they are, is violated.”21 The LXX
reading likely reflects an attempt to gloss over the idea that Yahweh could be defiled by human activity and an attempt to tighten up the logic of the passage. For the question sounds a bit superfluous. And for this reason Wellhausen and Nowack completely delete the clause. In response to this supposed breakdown in the logic of the MT, G. A. Smith suggests reading the Hebrew text differently:

Or used polluted things with respect to Thee. For a similar construction see Zech. vii. 5: תָּמְלֹקִים This in answer to Wellhausen, who, on the ground that the phrase gives נָא a wrong object and destroys the connection, deletes it. However, it must be questioned whether the Piel of נָא would best be translated as “to use polluted things.” It is much more likely that the Piel would have a causative sense—“to defile” (Cf. BDB p. 146 and KB p. 163). And in the case of the causative Piel, the suffix would likely represent the direct object. The correspondence to Zech. 7. 5 is not very great for the verb “to fast” takes no object but an occasional cognate accusative “to fast a fast.” It is most likely that you have extremely bold language in the MT which was toned down in the LXX. In like manner the LXX reads with the MT against a supposed blasphemous original in the case of the altered text of verse 13 (Cf. the discussion of the Tiqqune Sopherim in Chapter 2).

The prep. בּ (when prefixed to an infinitive) need not be translated temporally. KB (p. 104) says, “In the literal sense בּ in all this cases means: in that, that, the specific meaning being to be gained out of the context; the temporal determination is less strong than in sentences formed with בּ c. inf." (sic.) The Greek addition κατ’ τα επιτίθεμενα

εν τω λεγειν υμας Τραπέζα κυριου εξουθενωμενη εστι και τα επιτίθεμενα βρωματα εξουθενωμενα.

The prep. בּ (when prefixed to an infinitive) need not be translated temporally. KB (p. 104) says, “In the literal sense בּ in all this cases means: in that, that, the specific meaning being to be gained out of the context; the temporal determination is less strong than in sentences formed with בּ c. inf." (sic.) The Greek addition κατ’ τα επιτίθεμενα

εν τω λεγειν υμας Τραπέζα κυριου εξουθενωμενη εστι και τα επιτίθεμενα βρωματα εξουθενωμενα.
βρωματα εξουδενωμενα is variously represented in the manuscripts. βρωματα which is found in A Q W S° is lacking in B S* L° C.
eξουδενωμενα is found in A Q W but -νωται in V C°, -νωσατε in B S L°
This entire little gloss is no doubt derived from v. 12.23

8 δειτε εαν προσαγαγητε τυφλον εις θυσιαν, ου κακον; και εαν προσαγαγητε χωλον η αρρωστον, ου κακον; προσαγαγε δη αυτω τω ηγουμενω σου, ει προσδεξεται σε, η ει λημψεται προσωπον σου, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.

See GKC §159 aa-bb for ἢ ἢ introducing a conditional clause. The LXX's εαν + Aorist subjunctive is a very common protasis in a conditional clause.24 In rendering the Hiph. τυποθετηθα with the same Greek verb (προσαγω), the translator shows a disregard for distinguishing varying roots (at this point). However, the rendering is very common. προσδεχομαι in the sense of "to receive favorably" is not too distant in meaning from the Hebrew רצון "to be pleased with." One finds the same rendering in 1.10 and 13.

Ziegler and Swete read with σε while Rahlfs has αυτο (also supported by the Vulgate). The evidence for Rahlfs' reading is very strong indeed (A Q W S°) vs. (B S* V). The uncertainty within the Greek tradition and the likeliness that αυτο represents a harmonizing alteration makes it unwise to follow BHS and read against the מַזִּיגֵל וֹא רִשְׁתָּא מְפַגּוֹל.
The Hebrew expression to "lift up the face" can mean to receive favorably or to show partiality (KB p. 635). In Malachi, both meanings are found—the first here and the second in 2.9. This Greek expression and its related forms ἐπιστάειν, προσωπολημπτης, προσωπολημπτως and ἀπροσωπολημπτως are either septuagintalisms or earlier products of Hellenistic Jews. As concludes Eduard Lohse:

The translation of ἐπιστάειν by λαμβάνειν προσωπον is modelled closely on the Hebrew expression. In secular Greek, of course, λαμβάνειν means only "to take," "to accept," never "to raise up." But since ὑπερ can mean "to take" as well as "to lift," λαμβάνειν was used for it in Greek. This rendering must have been virtually unintelligible to the Greek.25

It is a curious fact that the two εἰ's of verse 8 are typically read as conditional particles. (So Ziegler, Rahlfs, Swete, Hatch and Redpath and Brenton.) This would suggest that the verse should either read "Present it to your governor if he will receive you or if he will receive your face" or if there be an assumed ellipsis "Present it to your governor and see if he will receive you or if he will receive your face." This reading of εἰ is surely wrong and puts a distance between the structure of the Hebrew and the structure of the Greek which is simply not there. It is absolutely common for εἰ to introduce a direct question in the LXX. As Blass/Debrunner (p. 226 § 440 #3) note:

This usage is unclass., but it is found in the LXX also (Gen. 17: 17 etc., Winer 474 [Winer-M.3 638ff.]), and is therefore probably a Hebraism (Viteau 22) as a translation (along with μη) of Hebr. מ and מָיה, which in an indirect question correspond to Greek εἰ, but which also introduce direct questions.

The interrogative nature of the two εἰ's in verse 8 is clearly proved by the
identical Hebrew structure and Greek rendering of verse 9--

Translation: 9 And now propitiate the face of your God and entreat Him. These things have happened by your hands. Will I receive your faces favorably, says the Lord Almighty? 10 Because the doors will be closed among you and you shall not kindle My altar in vain. I have no pleasure in you, says the Lord Almighty, and I will not receive a sacrifice from your hands.

The Piel of מָֽעַ֔ה means “to appease,” or “to put someone in a gentle mood.” The Greek εξιλασκομαι means “to propitiate.” The Greek word almost always is a rendering of עָנַה (Piel) which means “to atone.” Interestingly, it is in the MP that one observes a greater variety of correlations: Hb. 1.11 ( birkaç); Zech. 7.2; 8.22 and Mal. 1.9 (حال). It is normal for the Hebrew שלח (with God as object) to be rendered by the Greek verb δεσμαι (Ex. 32.11; 1 Ki. 13.12; 3 Ki. 13.6; 4 Ki. 13.4; Ps. 118.(119)58; Zech. 8.21; Jer. 33(26).19; Da. Th 9.13). The three other occurrences of this Hebrew expression in the MP are: Zech. 7.2 τον εξιλασκομαι του κυριον; Zech. 8.21 δεσμαι του προσωπου κυριου and 22 του εξιλασκομαι το
There is no instance of εξιλασκομαι rendering the Hebrew הלא (Pi.) outside the MP.

The extra Greek pronoun is surely just an instance of smoothing as later in the verse with εξ υμων προσωπα υμων. Both are rather natural assimilations toward εν χερσιν υμων (πληγη).

The LXX has read the verb in a way appropriate for the Hithpael stem, but not for the Qal. The ambiguity of the pronominal suffix contributed to the problem. It is possible that as Verhoef suggests the translators were perhaps interested "to exempt the prophet (υς) from having part in the guilt of the priests and people." This suggestion would gain force if the additional clause ινα ελεηση υμας be accepted as genuine (569L 407, 576, 613, 770, 233, Bo, Th., Tht.) The υμας rather than the expected ημας is indeed suggestive. However, the clause is surely a rough doublet.

The Greek dative of instrumentality (+ εν) is so like the ηλ of source that it is not surprising that one renders the other. The meaning of this clause is very uncertain. Gelston notes that the Syriac does not represent the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew or Greek. As he states:

The modification of anthropomorphic and anthropopathic language in relation to God has often been detected in the versions, particularly in the Targums. It is however never consistently carried out in a version, and it is now widely questioned whether this is always the most natural explanation of linguistic phenomena of this kind. The avoidance of terms denoting the parts of the body in relation to God...
may seem a natural instance of this kind of reverential modification, yet the rendering of מִלְדוּתָה in II 110, when the hands are human and there can be no question of avoidance of anthropomorphic language being the reason for the modification, indicates that caution is appropriate in detecting the presence of this particular motive.27

This is the same expression with the same rendering as that in v. 8 except for the partitive min + suffix מֵלֵכָה and the second וּמֶלֶן which would represent the Hebrew מֵלֵכָה. The LXX has the statement in the first person. This reads better than the Hebrew because of the closing formula ("thus says the Lord of Hosts") and is thus likely a later smoothing out by the LXX translator. BHS suggests that the closing formula should be deleted on metrical grounds. This is surely a reckless suggestion.28

Translation: 10 For the doors will be closed among you, and you will not kindle My altar in vain. There is no pleasure for Me in you, says the Lord Almighty, and I will not receive sacrifice from your hands. 11 Because from the rising of the sun till its setting My name is glorified among the nations. And in every place incense is offered to My name, even a pure offering. For great is My name among the Gentiles, says the Lord Almighty.
Verhoef states:

The LXX *dioti* reflects *ki gam* instead of *mi gam*; the LXX also reads the Hebrew verb as a Niphal, 'shall be shut,' and *ta'iru* as a singular: 'because even among you the doors shall be shut, and (one) will not kindle (the fire of) my altar for nothing.' The Vulg. deletes *gam* and the negative *la'* in the second clause: *Quis est in vobis, qui claudit ostia et incendat [sing.] altare meum.* The Targ. paraphrases 'the doors' by explaining: 'of the house of my sanctuary,' and adds: 'that you might not bring detestable sacrifices upon my altar.' The Pesh. replaces the uncommon Hebrew word *ta'iru* with a verb meaning 'to bring.'

There can be little doubt that the Hebrew מֵתוֹ לִבְרֹבֵינוּ וָרְבֹּצוֹ דְּלַהֵיתָם means "O that someone among you would close the doors." [Cf. GKC §151a. Other occurrences of the idiom include: I Sam 20:10, 2 Sam. 15:4 and 2 Sam 23:15. In these three instances which include the imperfect—the LXX renders with an interrogative τις]. The general force of this clause in the LXX is that of a prediction of a future judgment in which God forcibly closes the doors to the temple. What is clearly a hyperbolic statement of wish in the MT is translated into sober prediction in the Greek. In this way the statement has been intensified.

The remarkable literalness of the Greek rendering is noteworthy. The expression occurs elsewhere only in I Sam. 18.25 (οὐ βουλεταί... εν δοματί); Jer 22.28 (οὐκ εστι χρεαί αυτου); 48.38 (οὐκ εστι χρεαι αυτου;); Hos 8.8 (ὡς σκέυος αχρηστων); Koh 5.3 (οὐκ εστι θελημα εν αφροσι); 12.1 (οὐκ εστι μοι εν αυτοις θελημα). It can be seen that the only other renderings which are like the one here are the Aquila-like renderings in the LXX of Ecclesiastes.
Translation: 11 For from the rising of the sun until its setting, glorious is My name among the nations. And in every place incense is offered to My name and a pure sacrifice, for great is My name among the nations says the Lord Almighty. 12 But you have profaned it in that you say, The table of the Lord is polluted and the foods placed upon it are despised. 13 And you say, These things are of suffering, and you puff them away, says the Lord Almighty. And you bring in those things which are torn and the lame and the afflicted. And if you should bring the sacrifice, will I receive it from your hands, says the Lord Almighty? 14 Indeed cursed is whoever is able and should have in his flock a male and his vow should be upon him and should sacrifice something corrupted to the Lord. Because I am a great king, says the Lord Almighty, and My name is glorious among the nations.
Dingermann rightly comments that, "Das Suffix wurde wie so oft, wenn die Beziehung klar ist, nicht übersetzt."30

renders the adjective elsewhere only in Esther 10:3 (כדאלים ותHibernate = ככ קודס(tokens) בככ תوبة). Although Vollers speculates that the translator read the form as the Pual ידאל, inasmuch as there is only one instance of the Pual in the Hebrew Bible (of plants in Ps. 144.12 "grown up"), we must regard such a suggestion as very unlikely. The time frame of the LXX of the verse is clearly present. Although the Perfect might have a past meaning, it is more often used to refer to a presently existing state. And the next verb προσαγαγέται makes it very clear that the action is present.

This Greek verse soon began to be regarded by the Christian Church as predictive of the world-wide worship to be offered God through the new spiritual worship of the Christian dispensation.31

See facing page.

Compare

12 רוחא ו the discussion in Chapter 2 concerning the Tiqqune Sopherim. The original reading רוחא. [God is the object of the verb in Ezek. 13.19 (רוחא = ככ εβεβηλαυν με). A similar passage (although the verb is in the Niphal and thus is passive) is Ezek. 22.26 "Her priests have violated My law and profaned My holy things; they have not distinguished between the holy and unholy, nor have they made known the difference between the unclean and the clean; and they have hidden their
eyes from My Sabbaths, so that I am profaned among them" (אֶלְחָלֵים וְיָשָׁבוֹת = καὶ εβεβηλούμην εν μεσω αὐτῶν). The MT pointing relates the suffix to שֶׁכִּי mentioned in the previous verse. The Greek αὐτο similarly relates to the Neut. ονόμα.

τα επιτίθεμενα εξουδενοῦνται βρώματα αὐτοῦ. It is quite unclear whether τα επιτίθεμενα βρώματα is the noun clause with the participle qualifying the noun, or if the participle is functioning as the independent subject with the following noun being in apposition. The translation of Sir Lancelot Brenton is probably right—"and His meats set thereon are despised."

וְרָבִּיעַ ("and its fruit") It would be most natural to associate the pronominal suffix with the masculine noun שלוחה. However, the Greek word for table θρήσκα is feminine and for that reason the αὐτοῦ of βρώματα αὐτοῦ must relate to the earlier κυρίου.

BHS suggests that we should delete בְּשֵׁלָה on the grounds that it is the result of dittography and is not represented by the or Peshitta. KB (p. 614) suggest that the word might be a gloss. Dingermann (p. 229) suggests that the LXX translator read the Hebrew of the MT wrongly as בְּשֵׁלָה as a Niphal of נוּבָה. However, when one considers that the word only occurs two times in the MT and that in the other occurrence in Isa. 57.19 the clause בְּשֵׁלָה נוֹבָה שִׁפְחָה is simply omitted, then the solution becomes rather simple. The word was not known, and it was omitted. As Gelston states concerning the omission in the Peshitta: "One further method of dealing with unintelligible words and phrases in the Vorlage may however be included here. This was the simple expedient of omission. In
contrast with the minuses considered in the previous section the following, most of which are peculiar to the Peshitta, are probably to be accounted for in this way.\textsuperscript{32} He includes among the list Mal. 1 12.

The LXX and Peshitta have read with a different vocalisation.\textsuperscript{33} The LXX, Peshitta and Vulgate read with different vocalisation— thus \textit{πατηλαία} is apparently derived from \textit{λανή} (to be or become weary) and thus means "weariness" or "hardship." The assimilation of \textit{πατηλαία} in is discussed in GKC §37c.

\textit{εκ κακοπαθείας εστί} The noun only occurs in 2 Mac. 2.26, 27; 4 Mac. 9.8. The verb occurs only in Jon. 4.10.

Ziegler has judged \textit{εξεφυσησατε} to be the original reading. This reading is supported only by Sinaiticus, 130 (XII-XIII), 239 (1046) and Jerome. Ziegler's note suggests that he thinks the vast majority of the manuscripts have assimilated toward Haggai 1.9 (\textit{και εξεφυσησα αυτα}). It is certainly much more likely that the 4 manuscripts supporting \textit{εξεφυσησατε} have assimilated toward the Hebrew. For the \textit{αναθε} has traditionally been regarded as one of the Tiqunne Sopherim--original \textit{αναθε}. Surely the switch in the person of the verb would represent a similarly motivated reverential alteration of the text.\textsuperscript{34}
The Hebrew participle meaning "the weak" or "the sick" was nicely rendered in v. 8 by ἀρρώστον. Here one finds the present pass. part. from a verb meaning "to trouble, disquiet, annoy." (Cf. Gen 48.1; I Ki 19.14; 30.13 for a similar rendering). It is possible that the rendering reflects the view that sickness suggests affliction by the spirit world. (Cf. Luke 6.18 οἱ ηλίβοι ἀκουσαί αὐτοῦ καὶ ἠθηναι ἀπὸ τῶν νοσῶν αὐτῶν; καὶ οἱ ἐνοχλουμένοι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων ακαθαρτῶν Εβεραπευοντο.) It is quite noteworthy that this view of the spiritual causes of sickness might be applied even to animals.35

καὶ εὰν φέρητε τὴν θυσίαν, εὶ προσδέξομαι αὐτὰ ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν;

The syntactical function of the first clause is very uncertain. The verbs of the verse which would be most suggestive in establishing the force are:

In view of the clearly established verbal sequence, it would be a bit surprising to have the clause in question suddenly pick up an interrogative or conditional force. The continuity of verbal force would be nicely established if one could justifiably translate the clause "and you offer them as sacrifice." However, the reading is not justifiable. The suffix just is not there and an imagined ellipsis is just too incomprehensible. (Although Rudolph (p. 260) suggests emending to ἔφεσαν ἄνθρωπον "and you bring her as an offering." This is conceivable, but one wonders why there would be a feminine rather than masculine pronoun. Furthermore, it
is not so easy to understand how that easy reading would have been absolutely supplanted in the textual tradition by the much more difficult reading. Furthermore, a reading such as he suggests would not explain what we find in the LXX.

It is, however, possible for a summation clause to be introduced by nothing but the 1. Thus Gen 2.1 'thus the heavens and the earth were completed'. This is perhaps the best way to read this clause—"thus you bring the offering." Surely, the LXX translator was simply trying to make sense of the ambiguous Hebrew syntax. It would be misguided to emend the MT on the basis of it at this point.

 λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ. The LXX has added παντοκρατωρ in assimilation to the earlier part of the verse.

וַיַּעַל לְעֵבְרֵי נֶדֶר וּרְבָּא מַשְׁחַת לָאָלְןי

בר 말ר גוֹרִי אָמְרָה יְהוָה עֲבַרָתָה יָדוּעָה חָמָּה בָּנֵיהֶם;

גִּוָּד הַדַּעֲנָטָס לְבוֹלֵל is the Qal Act. Part. from a root meaning "to act cunningly or deceitfully." This is the only occurrence of the verb in the Qal stem. The LXX is derived from יָבֳל. The ancient 3 and 4 could easily have been confused. The Peshitta does not represent the word in question. Gelston states, "In Mi i 14 the omission of לְבוֹלֵל in the Peshitta, already noted at p. 133 supra, may have been due to the influence of its rendering in LXX by δυνατός, a concept which the Peshitta translators may have felt was already adequately represented in the rest of the clause." 36

αρσεν זָבַר There is no doubt that the LXX is translating the same word as that in the MT. However, it is not clear how the word is particularly
sensible. Why would a male be regarded as the opposite of a blemished animal? It is in view of this uncertain parallelism that BHS and Rudolph (following Horst) suggest that there was originally an unknown adjective from the verbal stem meaning to be impure. However, Baldwin notes: "The particular example given in this verse is the voluntary offering, vowed under stress as a thanksgiving if God will grant deliverance (Gn. 28:20-22; Nu. 30:2; Jon. 2:9). A male animal is specified for such a sacrifice in Leviticus 22:19."37

καὶ εὐχὴ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ αὐτῷ οὐδὲν. Perhaps the 1 dropped out by haplography.

diephθαρμένον ἄφθαρτος The masc. sing. Hoph. part. means "ruined or spoiled." KB (p. 963) suggest "castrated?" If that in fact be the intended meaning, then perhaps some light is shed on the previously-mentioned contrast. Surely a common way that an animal would be ruined would be for its breeding capabilities to be impaired. Thus in the context "male" might mean an animal with its virility unimpaired.

καὶ τὸ ὄνομα μου ἐπιφάνεις ἐν τοῖς εβνεσιν. The rendering of the LXX is typical. In fact the regularity with which the Niphal of ἄφθαρτος is rendered by this adjective makes it very unlikely that you have a simple misreading of ἄφθαρτος. It is more likely that the LXX translators had a preference for the idea of "glorious" over against "fearful."
Chapter 2

1 And now, this commandment is to you, 0 Priests. 2 If you do not heed or if you do not put it in your heart to give glory to my name, says the Lord Almighty, indeed I will send forth upon you the curse and I will curse your blessing, indeed I will curse it. [And I will render ineffectual your blessing, and it will not be among you], because you did not put it in your heart. 3 Behold I am setting aside for you the shoulder and I will scatter stomach upon your faces—stomach of your feasts, and I shall take you into it.

1-3 There are numerous differences between the Hebrew and Greek of these three verses. The first to be observed is that the Greek includes an expected pronoun θησοθε εις την καρδιαν υμων (cf. vs. 2 θησοθε εις την καρδιαν υμων). But we are surely right to follow Dingermann in viewing this to be an addition of the translator: "Das Pronomen ist vom Übersetzer hinzugefügt. Er dachte dabei vielleicht an Agg. 1,5,7; 2,18 (vgl. auch den LXX-Zusatz Mal. 1,1)." (p. 230) There really is no good reason to imagine a different Vorlage here. Secondly, one notes that the Greek επικαταρασσομαι την ευλογιαν υμων does not reflect the plural of the Hebrew בברכהיכם. BHS suspects the superiority of a supposed בברכהיכם corresponding to the singular suffix of בברכהיכם. This is possible, yet the difficulty of the plural might suggest its
originality.

These two clauses have been regarded as "a clear case of verbose expansion." However, it is much more correct to judge them to be two separate doublets of the Hebrew text: אָרָהָה הַבָּרֹכָתָה אֶל-לֵל = επικαταρασσομαι τὴν ευλογίαν ὑμῶν and διασκέδασω τὴν ευλογίαν ὑμῶν; and אָבָבְּרַימ = ὑμείς οὐ τίθεσθε εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν and καὶ οὐκ εσται εν ὑμῖν. Although Dingermann’s view that it is “ausgenommen” that the two doublets could derive from the translator himself is perhaps a bit overstated, it is quite true that the second doublet implies an entirely different grammatical function of אָבָבְּרַימ. For whereas in the first rendering of the Hebrew clause אָבָבְּרַימ is viewed as in a bound structure with the following infinitive, in the case of the doublet the Hebrew is read as though it were אָרָהָה הַבָּרֹכָתָה. This was likely a marginal gloss which later was incorporated into the text. Nevertheless, its incorporation into the text was evidently so early that it found its way into virtually the entire manuscript tradition. For this reason, it is perhaps correct to view it as an authentic part of the early Septuagintal tradition. And as such it should probably be judged to mean that the benedictory force of the priestly blessing upon the offerer was being annulled so that the power which was to attend such priestly blessings would not in the future be found among them (Cf. Num. 6.22-7). The verb διασκέδασαω is a stereotypical rendering of the Hebrew verb פָרֵר (Hil.) and often occurs in contexts which suggest the nullification or frustration of the covenant with God (Gen. 17.14, Lev. 26.15, 44; Zech. 11.10) or the counsel of men (2 Sam. 15.31, 34; Ezra 4.5). It would function very nicely in a context suggesting the nullification of
what were in the past powerful and effective priestly benedictions. Although a different Greek verb is found in the passage, a very suggestive use of ἄρρητος (Hi.) is found in Num. 30 where it is specified when the vows of a woman might be rendered ineffectual (vv. 9, 14). It is also quite possible that the the Greek verb διασκεδασμός was used because the Hebrew typically behind it shares the double ̀ of the verb “to curse” (נָשָׁה / נָשָׁה). This would then constitute an example of palaeographically tendentious translation.

Most modern commentators have concluded that the Vorlage of the LXX was ἄρρητος or/and ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκτητικῆς τῆς ἱερουργίας. There are difficulties in the suggestion. First, it must be observed that in the LXX ἄφορίζω never renders ἄρρητος or ἄρρητα and ὁ λόγος never renders ἄρρητα. But it does seem quite likely that the translator is viewing the form ἄρρητος as referring to that special priestly portion, the shoulder. For the translator’s method is surely clarified when one considers his rendering of the next clause καὶ σκορπίων ἐνυστροφ ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα ὑμῶν, ἐνυστροφ ἐρτῶν ὑμῶν. ἐνυστροφ, which means the fourth stomach of a ruminating animal only occurs in Deut. 18.3 and in this passage. The Deuteronomy passage is instructive, καὶ δώσεις τὸν βραχίονα τῷ ἱερεί καὶ τὰ σιαγονία καὶ τὸ ἐνυστροφ. The ἐνυστροφ is listed along with the upper arm and cheeks as the special gifts to the priests. What is also quite suggestive is the fact that the Hebrew שָׁם simply does not mean the same as the Greek word ἐνυστροφ. For the Hebrew word שָׁם, in its every occurrence means either the contents of the stomach or of the intestines,
never the stomach itself. And in every other occurrence of שַׁם in the Hebrew Bible, the Greek renders with the close equivalent κοπρός which means "dung" (Ex. 29.14, Lev. 4.11; 6.17; 16.27; Num. 19.5). Thus it is very clear that in Malachi 2 we are dealing with a deliberately tendentious translation. And the nature of the tendency in the passage is to focus on the special priestly gifts. It is against this background that one can understand the translator's choice of the verb αφορίζω. For when one examines the usage of the verb αφορίζω in the LXX, one is immediately struck by its special function in Exodus 29 which describes the consecration, purification and investiture of the priests. For in verses 24, 26, and 27 those special offerings which are waved are in the Greek said to be set aside (αφορίζω) as a set apart offering (αφορίσμα). Thus the meaning in Malachi 2 appears to be that Yahweh sarcastically tells the priests that He has set apart for them their special portions, but not for their usual enjoyment but rather in order that He might humiliate and befoul them with it. Whereas in verse 2 Yahweh indicated that He had taken away the priests' benedictory power, now He makes it clear that they are no longer to enjoy their sumptious priestly feasts. What is threatened is no less than the abrogation of the entire priestly order. The translator, working from his understanding of the likely significance of שַׁם, and then translating שַׁם tendentiously and finally freely importing αφορίζω from that ultimate text about the priests gifts, Ex. 29, has created a beautifully crafted and elaborate threat of disinvestiture. It is unlikely that the Hebrew should be read in the same way. The LXX translator has skillfully gone his own way.
The Hebrew verb, with its indefinite third person, should probably be viewed as an impersonal passive. And if the translator read the construction in that way, then it is likely that he was merely making the unknown subject explicit and continuing the verbal construction which preceded εγώ αφορίζω...και σκορπίω...και λήψομαι (See Stekhoven p. 87) It would be quite natural to read εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ temporally (“at the same time”) as does Brenton, yet it looks as though the translator is following the structure of the Hebrew quite closely. And if the translator is following the structure of the Hebrew then it is probable that he has retained the directional force of μᾶς (as in the next verse ἀνάλλοις = πρὸς υμᾶς). If that be the case, then the Greek means “and I shall take you and place you into more of the same.” The translator imagines that Yahweh is not satisfied to scatter bits of stomach (or perhaps by metonymy its contents) on the priests, rather they are to be placed in a heap of it.

Translation: 4 And you will know that I have sent this commandment to you, that My covenant might be with the Levites, says the Lord Almighty. 5 My covenant was with him, a covenant of life and of peace. And I granted to him that he might greatly fear Me and might stand aloof from before My name. 6 A true judgment was in his mouth and unrighteousness was not found in his lips. Directing others in peace, he proceeded with Me and turned many from unrightousness. 7 For the lips of a priest will
guard knowledge and they will seek a judgment from his mouth, because he is the messenger of the Lord Almighty.

καὶ εἰπήγνωσεν διότι Although διότι often has a causal force, it is certainly not particularly unusual for διότι to introduce a noun clause. ⁴³

πρὸς τοὺς Λευίτας In this verse Levi refers to the priestly family which descended from Levi. In verse 8-7 refers to the historical person. The LXX makes this distinction explicit with its different renderings.

καὶ εἴδωκα αὐτῷ εὐ φόβῳ φοβεῖσθαι με The pronominal suffix of βασιλέως is not represented in the Greek. But this is best explained as having been lost in the rather substantial grammatical transformation of the translation. For the translator has taken as the object clause of βασιλέως and has in the process lost the resultive force of the Hebrew βασιλείς. There was no place for an objective suffix when the following clause was read in that way. The implication of the reading of the Greek is very substantial. For whereas the Hebrew should probably be read as listing three components of the covenant with Eli in terms of two blessings (life and peace) and one obligation (reverential fear), in the Greek even the obligatory fear is a blessing of God. ⁴⁴

καὶ απὸ προσώπου ονόματός μου στέλλεσθαι αὐτὸν Rengstorf argues that στέλλεσθαι in this passage suggests "the idea of priestly service, namely, 'to place oneself at disposal,' to be available
However, the rendering of Hesychius (στελλεται: φοβεῖται), and the rather clear parallelism with φοβεῖσθαι suggests the idea of "keep away, stand aloof από τινος (Polyb. 6,22, 4; cf. Mal 2:5) from someone 2 Th 3:6." (BAGD p. 766).

The renderings of ἔλπις (Ni.) are: Deut. 1.21 δείλισσητε 31.8 δείλια Josh 1.9 φοβηθήσα (transposition?) θ.1 δείλισσῃς 10.25 δείλισσης 1 Sam. 2.10 ασθενῆ ποιήσα 17.11 εἴσασαν Isa. 7.8 εκλειφεί 30.31 ἄπηθονται 31.4 ἄπηθοντα 31.6 εκλειφ 7 ἄπαισε Jer. 1.17 πτοήθη 10.2 φοβεῖσθαι, φοβοῦνται 17.18 πτοήθησαν 23.4 πτοήσανται 30.10 δείλισσης 46.27 πτοήθης Eze. 2.6 εκάστης 3.9 πτοήθης Job 21.13 ἐκουσθήσαν 39.22 ? 1 Chron. 22.13 πτοήθης 28.20 πτοήθης 2 Chron. 20.15 πτοήθης 17 πτοήθης 32.7 πτοήθης. The only other occurrences in the MP are: in Qal Ob. 9 πτοήσανται and in Hiphil Hab. 2.17 πτοήσει (Hebrew uncertain)

It seems very unlikely that the translator did not know the meaning of the root. Nor is it likely that he was thinking of an Aramaic word (so Vollers p. 75), rather it is more probable that he was making concrete the abstract concept of the "terror" which the Levis manifested. And this "terror" was manifested in their keeping a proper distance between themselves and Yahweh. This standing aloof in reverential fear is a perfect contrast to the priests of Malachi's day who are brazenly coming before Yahweh with all sorts of defective offerings.

The rendering κατευθυνων is surprising and has led many to suppose that the translator read the Piel Participle rather than the noun form (Μισθώρ).

However, the noun Μισθώρ was very often mistranslated throughout the LXX. It is rendered by: Deut. 3.10 Μισθώρ 4.43 πεδινὴ Josh. 13.9 Μισθώρ 16 Μισθώρ 17 Μισθώρ 21 Μισθώρ 20.8 πεδίων 1 Ki. 20.23 κατ εὐθὺ 25 κατ εὐθὺ Isa.
40.4 εἰς εὐθείαν 42.16 εἰς εὐθείαν Ἰερ. 21.13 πεδείνην 48.8 η πεδείνη 21
Μεισωρ Πσ. 26.12 εν εὐθυτητι 27.11 εὐθεία 143.10 εὐθεία 2 Χρον. 26.10
πεδεύνη Abstract sense: Ἰσα. 11.4 not translated Πσ. 45.7 εὐθυτητος 67.5
εν εὐθυτητι

The only other occurrence of the noun מְשָׁלָה in the MP is in Zech. 4.7
tis ei su, to oros to mega, pro prosowpou Zorobabel tou katorbwsai;

It is surely significant that one finds an inappropriate verbal rendering
only in the MP. This was apparently his way of dealing with a form which
confused many of the LXX translators.

8 ημεις δε εξεκλινατε εκ της οδου και ηθενησατε πολλους εν νομω,
diefbeirate tēn diathēkēn tou Lewi, legēi kuriōs pantokratōr. 9 kai εγω
dēwka umeis exoudevenmenous kai pameimenous eis pantα τα ουνη, ανθ ων
umeis ouk efulaξaste tας οδους μου, allα elamβanεte prosωpa εν νομω.

Translation: 8 But you have turned aside from the way and you have made
many weak in judgment: you have corrupted the covenant of Levi, says the
Lord Almighty. 9 And I have made you despised and neglected unto all the
nations, because you did not guard My ways, but you showed partiality in
judgment.

It is strange to find ηθενησει with a causative sense. One would expect
the Hiphil of בשלום to be rendered by ηθενησω or ηθενησιω. But those
forms never occur in the LXX. The occurrences of the Hiphil of בשלום are:
Jer. 18.15 απεκκρισαν (both the subject and the object of the Hebrew
are uncertain בשלום), Ezek. 36.15 ατεκνωσες (stereotypical rendering
of בשלום which occurs several times in the context), Ps. 64.9 ? εφοβηθη,
Prov. 4.16 not translated, Lam. 1.14 בשלום = ηθενησεν η ισχυς μου
(the grammatical object of the Hebrew causative verb becomes the
grammatical subject of the Greek stative verb), 2 Chron. 25.8 (2x)
τροπωσται, τροπωσασθαι [This is surely borrowed from verse 22 where
the same verb renders the Hebrew יָדוּב (Nt.), 26.23 αὐτῶν (typically a
rendering of מַפּוֹלִים "snare" but not an inappropriate rendering of "stumbling block")
The great variety of renderings of the Hiphil of בָּשָׁל suggests that
throughout the LXX, the translators were somewhat at a loss concerning
its precise meaning, or at least how it should best be rendered. The
translator of the MP demonstrated his confusion and creativity in placing
a stative verb in a construction where it must have a causative nuance.
καὶ εγὼ δεδώκα ὑμῖς εξουσιώμενος καὶ παρειμένος εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐθνῆ
ὅπως ἀναθέσῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀνακοιμήσεως τῶν πρεσβευτῶν καὶ
παρειμένος is the perfect passive participle of παρείμη and means "to
have been neglected" or "to have been left in a weakened state." (BAGD p.
627). The Hebrew רָשָׁל means "low" or "humble." It is likely that there
are two reasons why the translator used this Greek word. First, the
implication of being in a weakened state provides a nice correspondence
to the debilitating poor judgments of the priests (καὶ ἡσανησατε
πόλλας ἐν νομίω). Second and more decisively, the choice of the word
fits in nicely with the tendentious alteration of the singular לָבַלְדוּתֵם to
the plural εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐθνῆ. Whereas the Hebrew would surely mean
that the priests would be held in contempt by the people of Israel, the
Greek would most naturally mean that the priests are neglected by
Yahweh in their being scattered throughout the various Gentile nations.
This idea of diaspora would reflect the historical circumstances of the
translator and might suggest something of the experience of that period. Whereas the reading of παρειμένους focuses on the fact that the Jews are left neglected in the Diaspora, the widely-attested scribal correction to various forms of πεπτω (παρά, ἄπω) stresses the fact that Yahweh had cast them off into the various Gentile nations.

10 Οὐχὶ θεὸς εἰς κτίσειν ἡμᾶς; οὐχὶ πατὴρ εἰς παντὶν ἡμῶν; τι οτι εγκατελίπετε ἐκαστὸς τον ἀδελφὸν αυτοῦ τον βεβηλώσαι τὴν διαθήκην τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν; 11 εγκατελείψας Ιουδαίας, καὶ βδελύγμα εγένετο εν τῷ Ἰσραήλ καὶ εν Ἰερουσαλήμ, διότι εβεβηλώσας Ιουδαίας τα αγία κυρίου, εν αἷς παγάνσε, καὶ επεκένδεσεν εἰς θεοὺς ἄλλοτρους. 12 εξολοθρεύει κυρίος τὸν ανθρώπον τὸν ποιοῦσα τάυτα, εἰς καὶ ταπεινωθῇ εἰς οἰκονομίαν ἱκώμος καὶ εἰς ποιητοὺς θυσιὰν τῷ κυρίῳ παντοκράτειρι. 13 καὶ τάυτα, αἱ ἐμίσουν, ἐποιεῖτε εἰκάλυπτε δακρυζεῖ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κυρίου καὶ κλαυθμός καὶ στεναγμῷ εἰς κοπῆν. εἰς άξιαν εἰπλεφαι εἰς θυσιαν η λαβείν δεκτὸν εἰς τοὺς θεουργούς;

Translation: 10 Did not one God create us? Do not we all have one father? Why has each one of you forsaken his brother to profane the covenant of our fathers? 11 Judah has been forsaken, and an abomination has occurred in Israel, even in Jerusalem. For Judah has profaned the sanctuary of the Lord, which He loves, and has gone after foreign gods. 12 The Lord will destroy the man who does these things until he be humbled from the tabernacles of Jacob and from those offering sacrifice to the Lord Almighty. 13 And these things, which I hated, you did: you covered the altar of the Lord with tears and mourning and groaning because of troubles. Yet is it right that I should look favorably upon the sacrifice or receive it as welcomed from your hands?

10 The translator betrays his view of πατὴρ εἰς through the interchanging of the two clauses. Viewing (perhaps wrongly?) the “one father” to be either Abraham or Jacob, he deemed it more reverent to show preference to God the creator through the alteration of the order of the clauses. Surely the creator has preeminence even over the great
The pointing of דבּ is rather unexpected. It is possible with four
manuscripts of Kennicott to repoint with the expected holem. However,
it is probably best to retain the pointing which for some reason in this
instance alone follows the vocalisation of the stative verb (or 2nd or 3rd
Gutterals). It is impossible to make any sense of the Niphal. The second
person of the Greek is certainly no grounds for altering the Hebrew, for as
we observed already in Mal. 1.9, the translator is at pains to exempt the
prophet from the guilt of the priests. [See discussion of Mal. 1.9 (καὶ
deθήτε αὐτοῦ MT ἀπώθητι).] It is interesting to note that only in the MP
is εὐκαταλείπω found as a rendering of דבּ. Elsewhere εὐκαταλείπω is
usually as expected a rendering of some form of לְבִּיבָך. In the MP is
rendered: Hos. 4.10 εὐκαταλείπον, Jon. 2.9 εὐκαταλείπον, Zeph. 2.4
dιηρπασμένη (borrowed from v. 9 ?), Zech. 11.17 καταλείποντες, Mal.
3.19 ὑπολείψῃ. However, that departure or forsaking is somehow
implicit in the treachery of דבּ is clear from Jer. 3.20 ἀσθένει αὐτῷ
(see esp. BDB p. 93).

11 εὐκαταλείψῃ Ιουδᾶς ἢ πρὸς τὴν Ἰωρώλ. Because of the lack of an object in
the Hebrew and the following verb in Niphal, the translator imagined a
passive meaning for דבּ. All of the occurrences of דבּ in the MP are:
Hos. 5.7 εὐκαταλείπον, 6.7 κατεφρονήσε, Hab. 1.13 κατεφρονοῦντας, 2.5
κατεφρονήσε, Mal. 2.10 εὐκαταλείπε, 11 εὐκαταλείψῃ, 14 εὐκαταλείpes,
15 εὐκαταλίπτῃ, 16 εὐκαταλίπτῃ. There are no parallels for the switch
in voice. The Greek εὐκαταλείψῃ Ιουδᾶς, if it be anything other than
nonsense, would suggest that in the conditions of the Diaspora in which the Jews were dispersed throughout the Gentile nations, this separation from the holy land constituted an abandonment by the people. And as such, it becomes in the Greek part of a triad of offenses against Yahweh for which He is about (or has already begun) to judge his people.

τα αγία κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν The plural is typically used in reference to the sanctuary (BAGD p. 10). The Hebrew probably refers to the same.

καὶ επετήθευσεν εἰς θεοὺς αλλοτρίους θεῖον

Dingermann's view of this clause is helpful. He states:

Sehr wahrscheinlich handelt es sich hier um eine absichtliche Änderung durch den Übersetzer. Er wählt einen allgemeinen Ausdruck, da in der alexandrinischen Diaspora bezüglich der Mishehe die alte strenge Weisung nicht mehr befolgt wurde.49

Interestingly, this is not the only time that the LXX translator opts for a deliberately general or abstract rendering where the Hebrew has a very specific and concrete meaning with reference to foreign women. For as noted by Hengel:

The foreign woman who appears frequently in Prov. 1–9 (2.16ff.; ch. 5; 6.24ff; ch. 7), and probably also the foolish woman, were already interpreted metaphorically in the Septuagint of Prov. 2.16–18 (διδασκαλίαν νεοτητος, v. 17) as referring to 'foreign wisdom', whereas Clement of Alexandria later interpreted Prov. 5.3 as Ἑλληνικὴ παιδεία and probably took over this conception from Alexandrian Jewish exegesis.50

Whereas in the Hebrew the danger is the הַנְּשָׁה, in the Greek the enemy is explicitly stated to be κακὴ βουλὴ. And while Hengel might be right in thinking that an apologetic interest in preventing "the development of an alien wisdom which endangered traditional belief" lie behind the LXX of Proverbs 2, it is very likely that much as in the case of Mal. 2 the
translator is interested to make a distinction between the pagan women and the spiritual (or philosophical?) dangers they might represent. For the Greek texts would not explicitly exclude intermarriage with Gentile women if the attendant dangers of an alien wisdom or of idolatrous worship were carefully avoided.  

The other renderings of בָּנָה in a marital sense are: Deut. 21.13 

The meaning of the Greek would be that Yahweh would so utterly destroy the man offending in these ways that he would be permanently removed in humiliation from among the holy nation and more particularly from among those who offer sacrifices to Yahweh. The second εκ should not suggest that an original מָלַמַּשְׁת had been corrupted by haplography, rather the force of the מ in מֵאֲלָהִי has been judged to apply to the second clause as well.
Unless translated as the verb 'עשתה as the verb 'עשתה Clearly the translator has misread the adjective 'עשתה as the verb 'עשתה. Except for the case of the gloss in Hag. 2.15, every occurrence of 'עשתה in the MP corresponds to the Qal of 'עשתה. Other occurrences of 'עשתה in the MP include: Jon. 3.1 'את מתפוע, Hag. 2.20 'את מתפוע, Zech. 4.12 'את מתפוע, 6.2 'את מתפוע. The relative relationship between 'עשתה and 'עשתה was likely inferred. The presence of 'עשתה in the Vorlage is unlikely. The second person of the Greek is derived from 'עשתה. There is no good reason to change the infinitive 'עשתה to 'עשתה as suggested by BHS. But of some considerable interest is the rendering 'עשתה. This would probably represent the translator's rendering of 'עשתה. Elsewhere in the MP, 'עשתה is rendered: Hos. 6.8 מְאָה, 10.8 'יסנ (Place name), 12.12(11) מְאָה. 'יסנ, Amos 5.5 'יסנ עָמַךְ, Mi. 2.1 'יסנ, Hab. 1.3 'יסנ, 3.7 'יסנ, Zech. 10.2 'יסנ. The confusion of 'עשתה and 'עשתה is clear in the cases of Hos. 12.12 and Amos 5.5. The logical implications of 'עשתה are quite considerable. For whereas the Hebrew probably speaks in anticipation of vv. 14-16 of the treachery of the husbands against their wives for which reason Yahweh is angered and unresponsive to His supplicants, the Greek would clearly make the mourning the direct result of the hard labors of the people. Then the following interrogative clause necessarily converts the preceding into a concessive clause—"Yet, in
spite of your hardships and great grief over them, would it be right for Yahweh to receive favorably your offerings? Clearly then, the ταυτα at the beginning of the verse looks back to the previous 3 verses while the ΠΝΥ of the Hebrew looks forward.53

eτι αξιον επιβλεψαι εις θυσιν η λαβειν δεκτον εκ των χειρων υμων; The extra αξιον is simply a clarification by the translator. It stresses that not only does Yahweh not attend to such sacrifices or offerings, but that it would actually be unfitting for Him to do so.

14 και ειπατε Ενεκα τινος; οτι κυριος διεμαρτυρατο ανα μεσον σου και ανα μεσον γυναικος νεοτητος σου, ην εγκατελιπες, και αυτη κοινωνος σου και γυνη διαθηκης σου. 15 και ουκ αλλος επιησε, και υπολειμμα πνευματος αυτου. και ειπατε Τι αλλο αλλ η σπερμα ζητει ο θεος; και φυλαξασθε εν τω πνευματι υμων, και γυναικα νεοτητος σου μη εγκαταλιπησης. 16 αλλα εαν μισησας εξαποστειλης, λεγει κυριος ο θεος του Ισραηλ, και καλυψει ασεβεια επι τα ενδυματα αυτου, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ. και φυλαξασθε εν τω πνευματι υμων και ου μη εγκαταλιπησε.

17 Οι παροξυνοντες τον θεον εν τοις λογοις υμων και ειπατε Εν τινι παροξυναμεν; εν τω λεγειν υμας Πας ποιων πονηρον, καλον ενωπιον κυριου, και εν αυτοις αυτος ευδοκησε· και Που εστιν ο θεος της δικαιοσυνης;

Translation: 14 And you say, Why? Because the Lord has borne witness between you and between the wife of your youth whom you have forsaken. And she is your partner and the woman of your covenant. 15 And no other made her, indeed a remnant of His spirit. And you say, What other than a seed does God seek? And watch over your spirit, and do not abandon the wife of your youth. 16 But if you hate her and send her away, says the Lord God of Israel, ungodliness will also cover his garments, says the Lord Almighty. And watch over your spirit and do not forsake her.

17 Oh you who are provoking God with your words—and you say how have we provoked Him? In that you say, Everyone doing evil is good before the Lord and He is well-pleased with them, and where is the God of righteousness?
14 ην εγκατελίπεσεν τον βασιλέα Βασαρέως. See discussion of Mal. 2.10.

15 καὶ οὐκ ἀλλος ἐποίησεν, καὶ ὑπολειμμα πνευμάτος αὐτοῦ. Λέοντων

This is surely a case where the original reading is not found amongst a great number of the most important manuscripts. οὐ καλὸν Β, Νσ, 68; οὐ καλὸς Νο, 410 534. However, there can be little doubt that the original οὐκαλὸς came to be shortened by haplography to οὐκαλὸς.

For ἀλλος is a fairly clear misreading of the Hebrew—יָד read as יָד. (Cf. Ex. 33.5, 1 K. 14.4, 5, 2 K. 7.23, 3 K. 18.6(2x), 23, Ezek. 19.5). The Greek and Hebrew of this passage are both rather incomprehensible. Yet one ambiguity of the Hebrew is not shared by the Greek. For יד/ירד was read as the subject of the verb, whereas the Hebrew at least allows the possibility that יד is the object. Whereas the Greek is a rather unilluminating and slavish rendering of the Hebrew, we need not discuss its possible meaning in detail. On the whole, the translator was content to pass on the text in its incomprehensibility.

καὶ εἶπατε Τι ἀλλο ἄλλη σπέρμα ἔχετε θεός;

The translator has with his addition of καὶ εἶπατε given much help in understanding his reading of this passage. For he, in putting this line in the mouth of the people, betrays his understanding that it is an expression of the foolishness or spiritual blindness of the people. The Greek means that the people in self-justification argue that Yahweh's sole concern is that the people have physical descendants.
The MT probably states that if a man hates his wife, he is to divorce her (יָשֶׁלֶךְ = Piel imperative. Although the pointing could represent the infinitive construct, it would not likely do so in connection with the form of the third person perfect. And one should assume that there is some measure of internal coherence in the vocalisation of the MT. Furthermore, there is no analogy for the infinitive construct of יָשֶׁלֶךְ functioning as a grammatical absolute.) Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." Thus, Schreiner's translation reflects the natural meaning of the MT, "wenn einer nicht mehr liebt, Ehe scheiden." However, the pointing of the MT is regarded by most commentators as impossible, making nonsense of the whole passage. So Baldwin states, "For I hate divorce, says the Lord." English Versions agree that this is the prophet's meaning, even though the Hebrew in fact reads 'if he hates send (her) away', a sense found also in the ancient Versions. Evidently the text suffered early at the hands of some who wanted to bring Malachi's teaching into line with that of Deuteronomy 24:1, which permitted divorce. Such a reading undermines all that the prophet is seeking to convey.

This view is not as obvious as often implied. The verbal parallels with that ultimate passage on divorce, Deut. 24:1-4, are substantial. (בִּלְעַל vv.1,4 שָלָלָה vv. 1,3,4 שָנָה v. 3). This type of lexical sharing more likely demonstrates an original harmony of thought rather than a late correction or assimilation. And perhaps in the difference between the treachery of בָּנָר and the legislated protections implicit in שָלָלָה there is room for the reading of the MT. And that a divorce might have represented in ancient Israel a much desired freedom for the unloved wife is clearly suggested in Deut. 21:14 where the man who loses interest in his captive bride is instructed "to send her away wherever she desires" (וָאָשֹׁלְתָה לְנַעֲשֶׂה לְבָרָנָא לְנַעֲשֶׂה) (cf. KB p. 976 where לְנַעֲשֶׂה is viewed to mean "wohin sie will.")

The imperative of the MT is represented in a number of Greek
manuscripts: εξαποστειλόν W, Q\(^{ab}\), L\(^{-36}\), 06\(^{mg}\), 576, Th., Tht. This might, of course, represent assimilation toward the Hebrew. Yet it is also possible that the subjunctive form merely reflects the force of the εαν or the interests of the scribes to soften the text. For it must be clearly stated that the text ἀλλα εαν μισησας εξαποστειλης is in no way a justification of divorce. The Vulgate and the Targums do indeed instruct one who hates his wife to divorce her, but the Greek says no such thing. For it can be regarded as certain that in its proximity to εαν, there is absolutely no chance that εξαποστειλης is a hortatory subjunctive. It is clearly a conditional clause. And the consequences of divorce, as suggested in the following clause, are unambiguously negative.

και καλυψει ασεβεια επι τα ενθυμητα αυτου
The reading ενθυμητα is very poorly attested (only in 410, Ethiopic and Arabic). Elsewhere one finds the form ενθυμητα. Because ενθυμητα is a common rendering for לְלוֹבָשׁ, most commentators regard ενθυμητα as simply an inner-Greek corruption. Vollers, on the other hand, argues that ενθυμητα is original and based on an Aramaic root שַׁמְבָּה, while ενθυμητα is a later correction toward the Hebrew. He states:

Das fiel aus wegen des vorangehenden לעל und S. las ein Derivat von שַׁמְבָּה, aramaisrend. Zu evθ. etc. in diesem Sinne cf. Soph. OT 739; Trachin. 109; Jer. 3,14; 7,24; Thren. 2,17 Ps. 9,25 (10,9) Sy., Hiob 42,2 (οι αλλοι); Ez. 14,23; Ps. 119,118; Hiob 21,27 Sy. Epictet εγχευρ. c. 21; Sap. Sal 3,14; Matth. 9,4; 12,25; Hebr. 4,12; Poll. Onom. II 231; P u. T machen wahrscheinlich, dass die Stelle undeutlich geschrieben war; sie scheinen fur לעל: מַלֵּך to lesen. ενθυμητα (Georg.) is Correctur.

However, it must be noted that in most instances where the thoughts are clearly evil, there is a qualifier or context which makes that clear: Jer.
3.17 γονήσας, 7.24 κακὴς; Ps. 9.24 ὁ ἀμαρτωλὸς, 119.118 ἁδικὸν; Enchiridion 21 ταπεινόν; Sap. Sol. 3.14 γονήσα. Surely we would expect a γονήσα or κακὴς here if the Aramaic root were in mind. Furthermore, that there occurred an early corruption in the Greek text was already seen in the case of οὐκ ἀλλὸς of the previous verse. If ενδυματα is original, then the Greek has passed on (without comment, perhaps without understanding) the principal ambiguity of the Hebrew. However, it should be noted that the Greek regards Θεὸν as the subject of the verb while in the Hebrew it is more likely the object. The Greek means that if a man hatefully sends away his wife (in divorce), he will inevitably be causing himself or perhaps his wife to be covered with ungodliness.

17 Οἱ παραξενυντες τὸν θεὸν ἐν τοῖς λογοῖς υμῶν καὶ εἰπατε Ἥν τινι παραξενυμαθὲν; ἐν τῷ λεγειν υμᾶς Πας ποιῶν γονήσαν, καλὸν ενωπῶν κυρίον, καὶ ἐν αὐτοὶς αὐτοὺς εὐδόκησε καὶ Ποὺ εστίν ο θεὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης; This is the only instance (2x) where παραξενω apparently renders any form of ἔλλι. Elsewhere the Hiphil of ἔλλι is rendered: Isa. 43.23 εγκοπὸν εἰσῆλθα, 24 προετῆς μου (as though a form of ἔλλι) The semantic shift is rather substantial. The Hebrew merely means "put to work," "to make weary" while the Greek means "to provoke" or "exasperate." Perhaps the Greek is a conscious strengthening of the verbal idea with remembrances of Hos. 8.5 παρωξύνθη ο θυμὸς μου επ αὐτοὺς and Zech. 10.3 επὶ τοὺς ποιμένας παρωξύνθη ο θυμὸς μου.

The participial construction reflects the translator's interest to create a vocative force in anticipation of the dramatic introduction of τον αγγέλου μου. The direct address is left suspended for what seems an impossible length of text until it and the interrogative Ποὺ are
dramatically resolved with יָשָׁע. This is high drama. Suggestions of a different Vorlage such as הַרְגָּזְיוֹנָם or הפָּפוּזִיֵּי is are unconvincing.⁶⁰
Chapter 3

1 Behold, I am sending forth My messenger, and he will survey a way before Me. And suddenly the Lord will come into the temple, even He whom you seek, even the messenger of the covenant, whom you desire. Behold, He comes, says the Lord Almighty. 2 And who will endure the day of His entrance? Or who will withstand at His appearance? For He is entering as fire of a furnace and as an herb of cleaners. 3 And He will sit refining and cleansing like silver and like gold. And He will cleanse the sons of Levi and will pour them like gold and like silver. And they shall offer to the Lord a sacrifice in righteousness.

It is clear that the translator read the verb as the Qal.

Dingermann states, "Im Piel hat הָלַל nie die Bedeutung 'blicken, schauen'. An 30 Stellen gibt die LXX aber das Kal von הָלַל mit epiblepein, sodass es sicher ist, dass man auch hier die Vokale des Kal vorausgesetzt hat."

What is not so clear is why he would do that. The meaning of the verb in the Piel ("to clear") is much more suitable for the context. The Piel of הָלַל occurs in:

Gen. 24.31 אַעֲרַת, Lev. 14.36 אָעַקֵּשַׁי, Isa. 40.3 אַעֲרַת, 57.14 קָאָרָשַׁי or more likely אַעֲרַת instead of יָגוּל, 62.10 יָגוּל=אָעַקֵּשַׁי, Zeph. 3.15 יָגוּל=אָקֵּשַׁי=לְהַלָּקַשְׁטַיָּא סְדֶר הָאָרֶץ
Although it would be possible to argue that the translator understood the Piel of Zeph. 3.15 and was rendering the Hebrew very loosely, it is more likely, in view of the probable substitution of a form of נָשָׁן, that the translator did not understand the verb in Piel. And interestingly, the translator of the MP viewed the noun נָשָׁן ("corner, corner-stone") as a verb and rendered it with ἐπέβλεψε in Zech. 10.3(4). It appears to be the case that the translator found the form נָשָׁן inscrutable, whether verb or noun.

The translator has omitted the pronoun. He probably judged it to be superfluous.

Dingermann (and BHS) suggest that the Greek εἰσπορευεῖται reflects a Hebrew נָשָׁן which fell out of the MT because of homoioteleuton (שָׁנָבָן). This is possible but unlikely. The Greek verb is easily explained as an addition based on the earlier נָשָׁן (ἐρχέται) or נָשָׁן (εἰσοδὸν αὐτοῦ). Furthermore, the reconstructed text has the serious disadvantage of shifting the figure from a description of the Lord in his judgment to a description of his entrance. And neither a refiner's fire nor fullers soap is an apposite simile for someone's entrance. χωνευτηρίου is a "smelting-furnace" (LS p. 2014). The Hebrew form נָשָׁן is the Piel Part. of נָשָׁן and means "a refiner." It is possible that the translator thought of the noun נָשָׁן which has the expected meaning "crucible," yet in its two
occurrences in the Hebrew Bible, it is apparently rendered χαμμα (Prov. 17.3) and δοκιμον (Prov. 27.21). The translator of the MP rendered with χωνευτηριους two other times when the word was quite unexpected in Zech. 11.13 και εις γενεσεις προς με Καθεσ αυτους εις το χωνευτηριους, και σκεψοι τυ τοις χωνευτηριους εστιν, αν τροπον εδοκιμασθην υπερ αυτων. και ελαβον τους τριακοντα αργυρους και ενεβαλον αυτους εις τον οικον κυριου εις το χωνευτηριους. In this verse χωνευτηριους is apparently rendering ἡλικια ("the potter"). However, many commentators (and BHS) imagine an original Hebrew ἡλικια "the treasury" (supported by the Syriac) to be required in the context. It could be that the translator is simply fond of the Greek word and that he freely inserted it into a semantic gap created by what he viewed to be the nonsensical "potter." And this free insertion might well have been influenced by its (exegetically-motivated?) connection with the form ἡλικια "he who casts metals." In Mal. 3, the translator is probably just stressing the location of the fire rather than the one who uses the fire. His rendering of the same word in the next verse is predictably χωνευνων.

ως τη αργυριου και ως τη χρυσιου. This is simple assimilation toward the second half of the verse ἡσυχα θησεται.

4 καὶ ἀρεσει τω κυριω θυσια Ιουδα και ἱερουσαλημ καθως αι ἡμεραι του αιωνος και καθως τα ετη τα εμπροσθεν. 5 και προσαξω προς υμας εν κρισει και εσομαι μαρτυς ταχυς επι τας φαρμακους και επι τας μοιχαλιδας και επι τους ομνυοντας τω ονοματι μου επι ψευδει και επι τους αποστερουντας μισθον μισθωτου και τους καταδυναστευοντας χηραν και τους κονδυλιζοντας ορφανους και τους εκκλινοντας κριθν προσηλυτου και τους μη φοβουμενους με, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.
Translation: 4 And the sacrifice of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasing to the Lord just as in the ancient days and just as in the former years. 5 and I will come before you in judgment and I will be a quick witness against the sorceresses and against the adulteresses and against the ones swearing by My name falsely and against the ones withholding the wage of the hireling and the ones oppressing the widow and the ones beating the orphans and the ones averting justice from the proselyte and the ones who do not fear Me, says the Lord Almighty.

The translator has switched the genders of the two words. It is not clear that the feminine of φαρμακος occurs elsewhere in the LXX. In Exodus 22.17 the Hebrew נָשִּׁית נַעַרְשֵׁי נַעַרְשֵׁי נַעַרְשֵׁי is rendered with the ambiguous φαρμακος ον περιποιησετε. Elsewhere, the word is unambiguously masculine. It must be imagined that the translator thought that the women were particularly guilty of these two sins. The word μοιχαλις means “adulteress,” yet it has gathered up some associations particularly in reference to the fact that this woman has displaced her superior. Cf. Prov. 18.22b (only in Greek) οσ εκβαλλει γυναικα αγαθην, εκβαλλει τα αγαδα: ο de κατεχων μοιχαλιδα αφρων και ασεβης. and Prov. 30.20-21 &23a xoiauxq o ο < ; yuvaiko< ; yoixaXt&o^. q oxav npa|q, cmovufiayevq ou&ev ipqaiv TitTipaxevai aroirov. &ia xpituv aEicrai q yq, to fie xexapxov ou Suvaxai (jicpciv.. .Kai oiketis cav EKpaXq Tqv EauTqs Kupiav. Although the Hebrew text makes no reference to the women who are involved in the treachery against the men’s wives, the translator of the LXX was not willing to let their sins go unmentioned. Perhaps there is even the implication that they bewitched the men into their treacherous infidelities.

This verse in the Greek has so many additions that it would be unwise to
imagine an original אֱלֹהִים בְּשֵׁם לִשְׁכָּר. The translator has already shown through the gender switch that he has something to contribute to the passage. In the additions of this verse, you have a lavish enrichment of the passage from similar passages and phrases elsewhere in the prophets. This insertion is probably derived from Zech. 5.4 εἰς τὸν οἶκον του ὀμνυοντος τῷ ὀνόματι μου επὶ θεοῖ.

καὶ τοὺς καταδύναστευοντας χρην. The Hebrew verb עָנָחַךְ can mean both "to defraud" and "to oppress." The Hebrew construction represents a zeugma where one sense of the word is required in reference to the first object (יָשָׁר) and another sense is required for the second and third (אלפבנט רזרב). A very similar zeugma is found in Mi. 2.2 ὑπὲρ ὁματία. In Mal. 3.5 the translator has simply eliminated the zeugma. The multitude of suggestions about how the MT might be rewritten only demonstrate the extent that zeugma and bold parataxis are unappreciated by modern readers. At a textual level, the suggestions are probably worthless.

καὶ τοὺς κονδυλιζοντας ὀφανοὺς. The verb κονδυλιζω means to "beat with the fists" and thus suggests much more than mere neglect, but rather active hostility and abuse. This expression is probably borrowed from Am. 2.3 (LXX) εκονδυλιζον εἰς κεφαλὰς πτωχον.

καὶ τοὺς κεκλινοντας κρίσιν προσηλυτοῦ. The LXX translator has rightly judged that this Hebrew phrase must resume the logical force of the hostile ב of בְּשֵׁם לִשְׁכָּר. Furthermore, he has filled in what is clearly
elided from the construction (ἐκκλίνοντεςκρίσαν).65

καὶ τοὺς μὴ φοβουμένους με... The translator, acting out of stylistic sensitivities, continues with the participial construction. The Hebrew’s switch to the perfect tense signifies a circumstantial clause which qualifies all the preceding groups of offenders. The LXX views yet another group.66

Translation: Because I am the Lord Your God, and I am not changed. 7 And you, 0 sons of Jacob, do not refrain from the iniquities of your fathers: you have perverted My statutes and you have not kept them. Return to Me, and I will return to you, says the Lord Almighty. And you say, How shall we return? 8 Will a man supplant God? For you supplant Me. And you say, How have we supplanted You? Because the tithes and first-fruits are among you. 9 And you surely look away, and you supplant Me. The nation is finished! 10 And you brought all the produce into the storehouses, but there shall be plunder in My house. Look now in this matter, says the Lord Almighty, whether I will open for you the floods of heaven and will pour out for you My blessing until you are satisfied. 11 And I will give...
orders concerning food for you, and I will not corrupt against you the fruit of the earth. And the vine in the field shall not be weak against you, says the Lord Almighty. And all the nations shall bless you, for you will be a desired land, says the Lord Almighty.

6 οὐκ ἰσχύσει ἁγιός ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἠλλοιωμαι

The translator regards this verse with its introductory ὅτι as an explanation of the preceding judgment. Most commentators on the Hebrew do not view the ὅτι as causal in force. The parallel structure of 6a and 6b proves that in the Hebrew ἡμών is not the predicate of ἡμῶν but rather stands in apposition to it. The Greek wrongly presents the clause as a predicate and fortifies the construction with ὅτι. The translator thinks of God's unchanging righteousness and the people's persistent sinfulness as virtually equally absolute. On the translator's interest to accentuate the people's sinfulness compare the discussion of Mal. 1.1 (and Zech. 1, f.n. #2). There have been several suggestions about how the translator might have misread the word. Dingermann states, "Die LXX haben nicht von ἤλθε = verhindern, meiden' hergeleitet." (p. 234). Vollers opines, "S. las ἥλθε oder ἤλθεται." (p. 77) It is unlikely that the error is merely one of sight. First, it must be noted that ἀπεχθη never renders any form of ἠλθε or ἤλθε. In the MP is rendered: Hos. 11.6 (Pi.) κατεπαύσει, Amos 7.2 (Pi.) συντελεσθ, Zech. 5.4 (Pi.) συντελεσθ. ἤλθε is rendered: Hag. 1.10 2x (Qal) ανεξει, υποστελεται. It is interesting to notice the number of times that a form of ἤλθε is rendered with either συντελεσθ (Hos. 13.2 ἤλθε, Na. 2.1 ἤλθε, Mal. 3.9 ἤλθε) or
This particular rendering is unique to the MP. It seems that either the feminine (ה) or the old masculine form of the pronoun (ה) on בבל confused the translator. See Chapter 2 on the Kethib/Qere of Hos. 13.2, Na. 2.1, Hab. 1.9 & 15. But what seems quite clear in the case of Mal. 3.6 is that the mistaken rendering of 3.9 must have controlled the translation of verse 6. For inasmuch as the translator imagines that verse 9 states that “the nation is finished,” it was hardly possible for him to think that verse 6 could be rightly understood to say that “the sons of Jacob are not at an end—not finished.” So to remedy the contradiction, the translator intentionally read בבל as though it were instead בבל. Assuming the correctness of his view of verse 9 and being totally confident that the text could not contradict itself in such a blatant manner, he felt it quite within his rights as a translator of the sacred text to produce a different verb.

Probably the translator read the first יא as a י, thereby reading יא. The ease with which the two forms might be confused is seen in the translation of Job 11.15 יא by αυτος γαρ αναλαμβαινει σου το προσωπον οποστε υπωρ καθαρον. Obviously he is thinking of יא. And although the Hebrew יא is almost consistently rendered with its Greek counterpart μωμος, the spiritualization of the concept can perhaps be seen in such a passage as Job 31.7 ει δε και τας χερις μου ηπαμην δωρων. And if we can imagine that the translator’s association of יא and δωρον is still in mind five chapters later, then the specific lexical association of יא and αδικια can be inferred from the Greek of Job 36.18 θυμος δε ει ασεβεις.
The Greek verb πετρνιέω means "to strike with the heel" or "to trip up, supplant." (LS p. 1546) Outside of Malachi, it is always a rendering of בְּפַלְפַל : Gen. 27.36 επετρνιέε [ιακωβ] γαρ με ιδου δευτερον τουτο (Cf. 25.26 και η χειρ αυτου επειλημμενη της πτερνης Ησαυ), Hos. 12.3 εν τη κοιλια [ιακωβ] επετρνιε των αδελφων αυτου, Jer. 9.4(3) εκαστος απο του πλησιον αυτου φυλαξασθε, και επ αδελφων αυτων μη πεποιθατε, στι πας αδελφως πτερνη πτερνιε, και πας φιλος δολιως περευσεται. [Jer. 9.4(3) is a very explicit allusion to Jacob. The Hebrew reads בְּפַלְפַל אַחֵלִי בּוּלֵי כְּתָרֵי בּוּלֵי. The Hebrew verb would sound virtually identical to the name of the patriarch. In fact this homoiophony is the basis of Esau's statement in Gen. 27.36 "Is he not rightly named Jacob? for he has supplanted me these two times" (כְּתָרֵי כְּתָרֵי). That the allusion was not lost on the translator is clear from the next clause where the Hebrew רַבֵּל יבּרַכְוּ which means "as a slanderer" is rather tendentiously rendered with δολιως which adverb would immediately call to mind the guile or deception (δολος) of Jacob (Cf. Gen. 27.35 ειπε δε αυτω, ελθων ο αδελφος σου [ιακωβ] μετα δολου ελαθε την ευλογιαν σου. Thus, the Greek verb πτερνιέω has such specific associations with Jacob that there can be little doubt that the usei Ιακωβ of verse 6 served as the inspiration of this paronomastic rendering. Although it is certain that intentional paronomasia is involved, some have maintained that an original בַּפַלְפַל was altered to בְּפַלְפַל perhaps "to avoid assonance to בַּפַלְפַל." (KB p. 820). J. M. P. Smith argues against an original Hebrew paronomastic בַּפַלְפַל with the following, "Not much stress may be
laid on the fact that 3p35 would furnish a pun on 3p71 of v. 6; for
close connection between the two verses is broken by v. 7 and,
furthermore, Mal. is not characterised by any effort after paronomasia."
(p. 74) This is perhaps a bit overstated. Neither the length nor the
content of verse 7 is an adequate cause for the author (or a translator or
scribe) to have forgotten the audience of the address. But it is true that
the Hebrew of Malachi does not reflect paronomastic interests. The LXX
of the MP, on the other hand, reflects paronomastic translation
throughout. This fact, the high level of intentionality observed in the
translation of the immediately preceding context, the fine suitability of
the Hebrew verb הָלֻּעְלָּעַל as indicated by its only other occurrence in Prov.
22.23, and the greater difficulty of the MT in view of the rarity of the
verb all suggest that the הָלֻּעְלָּעַל of the MT is original and the bold
paronomasia is the work of the clever translator of the LXX.

There is a good chance that the Vorlage of the LXX differed from and was
superior to the MT at this point. As Dingermann states:

Der Schluß des Verses ist am besten mit LXX als

(cf. KB) zu lesen, "3 könnte im MT durch Haplographie mit dem

vorausgehenden 3 verloren gehen und 33 vor den folgenden 33 leicht
übersehen werden."

It is, of course, quite possible to argue that the translator has simply
filled in the gaps of the highly elliptical Hebrew. But when one puts
the reconstructed LXX Vorlage in its context, it looks suspiciously as
though the MT reflects corruption.
The first clause appears to be a translation of מִן נַפְּלוּ מִיָּדָי. It is quite probable that the translator was not familiar with נַפְּלָי in the Niphal (this is its only occurrence) and simply rewrote the text through intentional metathesis and the deletion of the ל of מִיָּדָי. If the translator read the root “to curse” but did not know it in the Niphal, then he well might have imagined that the verbal action was active and that נַפְּלוּ did double-duty between 9a and 9b. If that were the case, then he would very likely have altered the text to avoid a blasphemous construction. It is also possible that the translator was somewhat confused by the abrupt Hebrew syntax and assumed a continuation of the explanation of verse 8 and could not understand the sharp disjunction between 9a and 9b.

tο εἶναι συνετέλεσθαι. The Greek verb συνετέλεσθαι is best explicable if we understand the Vorlage of the LXX to have had the older masculine suffix ἔλικα. In view of the widespread interchange between the forms in K/Q, this is the best explanation. But it would not be out of the question to consider the possibility of homoiophonic translation. The noun εἶναι is very poorly attested [א, O (Qmg, Syhbr)]. Virtually the entire manuscript tradition has instead ετος. This reading likely reflects a scribe’s learned and intentional alteration of the passage based on the word’s obvious resemblance to his parent text’s εἶναι but also in view of the perfect suitability of the word ετος in the context. For the text with ετος states very coherently that the crop year is over (and all harvesting) and the produce is in the barns, yet Yahweh is going to plunder it if they do not repent. The text actually reads more fluently than the original
Greek. This is both the mark of lateness and intentionality.

10 καὶ εἰσηγεῖσθε πάντα τὰ ἐκφορία εἰς τοὺς θησαυροὺς, καὶ εστὶν η ἀπεργία εἰς τῷ οἴκῳ μου.

This text has been dramatically reworked. First, the imperative has been altered to the indicative. Secondly the word ἐκφορία is tendentiously translated as ἐκφορία, and finally the word μετέτρεψα is rendered with διαρρήγη which means "plundering." The renderings μετέτρεψα/ἐκφορία and μετέτρεψα/διαρρήγη are both without parallel. In the MP, μετέτρεψα is elsewhere rendered predictably with επίδεκτος (Ma. 3.8 & Amos 4.4). Inasmuch as the word μετέτρεψα can refer to the produce of the ground, it is conceivable that the translator deliberately chose to read the word μετέτρεψα as μετέτρεψα Although μετέτρεψα is never elsewhere rendered with ἐκφορία, a close semantic association is perhaps implicit in Hab. 3.17 διὸ τί συκῆ οὐ καρποφορησεν, καὶ οὐκ εστὶν γενματα (ריבא) εὐ ταῖς αμπελοῖς: πειράσται εργαν ελαίας (נתנה תלתך מלחמה יתיה) And ἐκφορία renders ריבא in Jd. 6.4 and in Hag. 1.9. The other occurrences of the word μετέτρεψα in the MP are: Am. 3:4 θηραν; Nah. 2:12 θηρας, 13 θηραν; 3:1 θηρα. The word διαρρήγη emphatically accentuates the extreme violence to be experienced. Thus, it is unlikely that all the differences in this verse should be regarded as the Fehlerkonsequenz of a simple misreading of μετέτρεψα. For it should be noted that in those instances in the Hebrew, where the context demands the minority nuance of the Hebrew word, the LXX translators seem to have no difficulty—Ps. 111:5 (τροφήν); Prov. 31:15 (βρωματα); Job 24:5 is disrupted both in the Hebrew and Greek and is not instructive here.
Furthermore, the translators have not chosen the rendering which in the MP is expected for מֹסָר—namely בְּמִסְר.

But whatever the precise reasons for the specifics of the differences in the clause, the overall effect of the changes is quite obvious. The apparent meaning of the Hebrew is that if Israel will only bring in the required tithes, God will surely open his floodgates and will pour forth all the material blessings associated with the messianic age. His return (v. 7) is thus concretely conditioned upon their faithfulness in tithing. J. M. P. Smith, in an often-contested statement, stresses the rather mechanistic and unspiritual nature of the passage. He states,

That the prophet should condition the bestowal of Yahweh's favour upon the payment of the tithe alone is surprising. To be sure, this act would in itself indicate a change of attitude toward God, without which there could be no manifestation of his favour. Nevertheless, the prophet's conception of the nature of religion is evidently less ethical and spiritual than that of his great predecessors, viz. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. It is inconceivable that they could have represented Yahweh as contented with the performance of any single act, least of all one in the sphere of ritual.

This statement has been criticized by Verhoef who objects, "Malachi's appreciation of the cult is nowhere abstracted from the covenant relationship of the people, and is therefore strictly religious and also prophetically legitimate! The testing of God is an aspect of their return to him." It is probable that Smith has overstated his point slightly. The passage in context would not suggest that Yahweh would be contented with "the performance of any single act." But the text surely does suggest that Yahweh will respond to faithfulness in the area of tithing by ushering in the messianic age with all its grandeur and prosperity. For as Verhoef states,

We agree with Von Bulmerincq that the terms of the promise include an eschatological aspect in addition to the concrete element. The same relationship between abundance of rain and the future fertility of the promised land is found in Isa. 30:23; 44:3; Joel 2:23; Zech. 10:1;
along with a rich harvest in Isa. 30:23-26; Joel 2:26-27; 3:18 (Eng. 4:18); Amos 9:13; Hag. 2:18, 19; Zech. 8:12.76

And it is surely this apparent direct correlation between faithfulness in tithing and the ushering in of the messianic age which our translator could not countenance. Just as he altered the tense of the verbs in Haggai to sever the explicit connection between the completion of the temple and the beginning of the messianic age, so here he eliminates a very (and unusually) specific pre-condition. The translator, either through the advantage of historical perspective or perhaps simply a profound theological reflection, understood that it was impossible to link directly and unambiguously any human response with the ushering in of the promised time of abundance and glory. It was required that Israel repent, but even so the introduction of the promised kingdom was to be in Yahweh's own and unknown timing. (Cf. the discussion of Hag. 2 where the translator boldly transfers the promised kingdom prosperity into the unknown apocalyptic future!)

Although Ziegler, Rahlfs and Swete posit επισκέψασθε as the OG, it should be noticed that there is substantial variation among the manuscripts. The reading suggested is supported by W B S* 239 and Q. 410 reads with the same word but in the indicative mood (επισκέψασθε). One finds επιστρέψατε in the rest of the Greek manuscripts. But επιστρέψατε does seem more likely to be a later development in view of the absence of the expected object and perhaps in assimilation toward verse 7. This is the only time in the LXX that this verb (επισκέπτω) corresponds to the Hebrew וח. The occurrences of the Hebrew verb וח are:
1 διακρίνω 2 κρίνω 3 δοκιμάζω 4 μανθανω 5 αντίστημι
6 ἐπισκέπτομαι 7 εκτάσσω 8 εταξίω 9 φαινομαι 10 γινομαι φανερον
11 ἀπωθεω (Pess.)

*Ps. 17.3 links δοκιμάζω and ἐπισκέπτομαι in an interesting way!
**Ps. 95.9 links δοκιμάζω and πειράζω but more importantly, it deletes
the personal suffix which would have made God the object of ἡμᾶς.

The Greek verb ἐπισκέπτομαι is almost always a rendering of the Hebrew
יִתְנָה. In view of how many times both the Greek and the Hebrew verbs
occur, this is significant. Furthermore, the Greek has deleted the
personal suffix (“test me”). There are only three places where God is the
object of the Hebrew verb יִתְנָה: here, Mal. 3:15 and Ps. 95:9. Although Ps.
95:9 has the expected δοκιμάζω, you do not find the personal suffix me (in
reference to God) represented by the Greek. In fact, the Greek really
implies that God’s works were being tested (οὐ επειρασαν οι πατερες
υμων, εδοκιμασαν και είδοσαν τα έργα μου). And in Mal. 3:15 we
encounter the surprising και αντιστησαν θεων ζωνοσαν υμαν. It
certainly looks like a resistance to the idea of man being able to “test
God.” Thus, it is very likely that we are dealing here with a reverentially
tendentious translation.

The Hebrew word means “window” or “chimney”. [Like the Ugaritic
úrbt—“lattice, sluice”] However, the Greek rendering, which surely
represents a metonymy, refers to the flood of blessing which will flow
through such a window of heaven. The same rendering is found in Gen.
Rudolph says, "Wörtlich: Bis es nicht mehr Bedürfnis ist." However, it is not clear that "ever means "need." It seems to always mean "sufficiency." BDB (p. 191) states, "I will pour out a blessing until there is not sufficiency, i.e. until my abundance can be exhausted, or, as this can never be, forever." It is also possible that the meaning is that Yahweh will pour out a blessing until there is not adequate place for its storage. This meaning fits nicely in the context of the challenge to bring all the tithes into the storehouse. However, inasmuch as the first verb has connotations of "emptiness" (cf. adjective יֹרָד "empty, vain"), the suggestion of BDB is to be preferred. So it is very likely that the translator of the LXX rightly judged the meaning of the Hebrew to be that Yahweh would give to the very limits of His resources. Thus, it is equally likely that the LXX represents a classic example of converse translation. For in looking at the occurrences of the adjective יִקְנֹא, one observes that it is a very common rendering of the Hebrew יִרְד. [See Ex 36.7; Lev 5.7; 12.8; 25.26,28; i Kings 18.30; IV Kings 4.8; Prov. 25.16, Ob. 1.5; Nah 2.12(13); Hab 2.13(?); Is 40.16] In other words, the translator of the MP has in our passage given a reading which might have been expected if there had been no negative בֶּלַי. This is converse translation in classic form! The Hebrew represents an effective and provocative metaphor of quantity (cf. Ps. 72.7 יְרֵד "and much peace until there is no moon"). The Greek, on the other hand, represents a more philosophically precise representation of the same general idea. But that philosophical or theological sensitivities were at work in the translation
seems certain.

It is no doubt in the context of this material change that we should view the insertion of the personal pronoun in the Greek. The μου makes explicit what is merely implicit in the Hebrew. But that emphasis on the close association of the blessing with Yahweh increases the impossibility in the mind of the translator of reading the Hebrew literally as it stands.

11 καὶ διαστῆλὼς ὑμῖν εἰς βρῶσιν καὶ ὑμᾶς διαφθείρω ὑμῖν τὸν καρπὸν τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὑμᾶς αἰσθήσως ὑμῖν ἡ αμπελῶς ἐν τῷ αὐγῷ, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ.

The Hebrew means, “I will rebuke on your behalf the devourer.” The meaning of the Greek is not as clear. There is a general rule that the active verb means “to separate, divide” while the middle voice means “to command.” But there is some evidence that the distinctions of voice are not rigidly maintained in the papyri. Thus the Greek should probably be viewed to mean, “I will give orders on your behalf concerning food.” Vollers believes the Greek reflects a Hebrewラレビית. But the Hebrew verb בָּרֶכֶת means “to diminish, to take away.” And it is unlikely that the Hebrew could have represented the meaning which Vollers imagines the Greek to have—“anweisen, zuteilen.” Furthermore, it must be noted that the verb בָּרֶכֶת is never elsewhere rendered by διαστῆλω. It is probably best to imagine that the translator is engaging in very free translation and that the clause should be translated as suggested by Brenton as meaning, “I will give charge for you to be fed.” εἰς βρῶσιν “for food” merely represents a free rendering of the preposition בּ and a different vocalisation בּ rather than בּ.
The translator's treatment of "אובד" has obscured the natural subject of "ישב", thus he really is somewhat compelled to alter the person of the verb.\(^{81}\)

απηνήσης υμών η αμπέλος εν τω αγρω ασθένεω is the standard rendering of "גשא", so it is very likely that the translator treated the form as "גשא". There is no other instance of ασθένεω rendering "גשא". Elsewhere in the MP "גשא" is rendered:

Hos. 9.12 ατεκνώθησαν, 14 ατεκνώσαν Mal. 3.12 is the only instance of this Hebrew verb having the meaning "to miscarry" while being applied to inanimates. The translator evidently did not appreciate the unusual expression.

Finally, it should be noted that the net effect of the differences in the Greek and Hebrew of the passage is once again that of deflating what would surely be highly eschatological language to the readers of the Hebrew. We must bear in mind that "locusts and vine are elements of the eschatological perspective (cf. Joel 2:11, 22; Hos. 14:8; Amos 9:13-15; Hag. 2:20; Zech. 3:10; 8:12)."\(^{82}\) Thus the translator has reshaped both the explicit condition of verse 10a and the explicit eschatological blessing to result of vv. 10b-11. Inasmuch as there is no evidence of systematic alteration of the other passages which refer to eschatological fertility, it was probably the highly formulaic and specific construction of a concrete condition which would (according to his reading of the Hebrew) surely result in the blessing which the translator felt the need to obscure.

13 ἔβαρυνατε ἐπὶ εἰμὲ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, λέγει κύριος, καὶ εἰπάτε Ἔν τινι κατελαλησαμεν κατὰ σου; 14 εἰπάτε Ματαιος ὁ δουλευων θεω, καὶ τι
Translation: 13 You have spoken weighty words against Me, says the Lord. And you say, In what way have we spoken against You? 14 You say, Vain is the one serving God. And what advantage is there that we have kept His ordinances and that we have walked as suppliants before the face of the Lord Almighty? 15 And now we bless foreigners and those who do lawless acts are built up and they stand in opposition to God and are saved. 16 These things the ones fearing the Lord spoke against Him, each one to his neighbor. And the Lord gave heed and heard and he wrote a book of remembrance before Him for the ones fearing the Lord and the ones reverencing His name. 17 And they shall be Mine, says the Lord Almighty, in a day which I am making for an inheritance. And I will choose them the way a man chooses his son who serves him. 18 And you shall return and discern between a righteous man and a lawless man and between the one serving God and the one not serving Him.

This Hebrew expression is also found in:

2 Sam. 24.4 מְלֹא חֹזֶן יַעֲשֶׂה = וַעֲשֶׂה הַחֹזֶן כְּאֶלֶף עַל שֵׁרֶץ הַחֹזֶן

1 Chron. 21.4 מִלְיֶה יָעַב = יִשַׁק עָלָיו הַשֵּׁרֶץ הַחֹזֶן

The translator opted for a unique rendering which is more in keeping with
Greek idiom. The change to the second person is simply part of the switch in idiom.83

14 o δουλευων θεω τον Θεον The translator read instead as 14 o δουλευων θεω τον Θεον. This vocalisation is shared by the Targums and the Vulgate.

και τι πλεον μενισκεται The only other occasions of this Hebrew noun in the MP are: Mic. 4.13 = το πληθος αυτων και τηνιαξν αυτων and Hab. 2.9 = ο πλεονεκτων πλεονεξιαν κακην τωικω αυτου. [LS say of the question τι πλεον, "what more, i.e. what good or use is it?" (Note τι πλεον πλουτειν. παντων απορουντας) p. 1415]

ta phulagymata autou במשמחת משמחתה (Cf. Nu. 8.26HashMaps though [LS]HashMaps though [LS])

However, it should be noted that every occurrence of the word φυλαγμα in the LXX is plural and in the case of those which correspond to a Hebrew word, the Hebrew is singular: Lev. 8.35, 22.9; Nu. 4.31 (האנת משמחת = tauta ta phulagymata); Deut. 11.1. And as is clearly seen in Nu. 4.31, it is not always the case that the translator might have simply vocalised the text differently. In fact, it is more likely that the translators simply viewed the Hebrew to represent a collective singular.

διοτι επορευθημεν ικεται κατι ηλιου κρατησει The Hebrew adverb κρατησει only occurs here. Yet, there can be little doubt that it derives from the cognate verb דָּרַךְ and means "as mourners" (BDB p. 871). In the MP the verb דָּרַךְ is rendered: Joel 2.10 o ηλιος και η σεληνη συσκοτασουσι, 4.15 o ηλιος και η σεληνη συσκοτασουσι, Mi. 3.6 και συσκοτασει επ αυτους η
Ticpa. Vollers astutely observes that there is an analogous association of ideas implicit in the LXX’s use of σκυθρωπός (“one with sullen countenance”). And of special interest is the fact that the verb σκυθρωπατζω (“to be of sad countenance”) is several times used to render the verb לְלֹל (Ps. 34(35).14; 37(38).6 and 41(42).9. The rendering in Mal. 3 is based on the metonymic shift from the attitude of humiliation and contrition (metaphorical extension of the idea of “darkness”) to those who exhibit such an attitude—“the suppliants.”

15 καὶ νῦν ἡμεῖς μακαρίζομεν ἀλλοτρίους ἄριστος ἄριστος is a very common rendering of the participle of ἄριστος, so ἀριστομένας as ἀριστομένας. Thus it is quite likely that the translator inadvertently read ἀριστομένας as ἀριστομένας. He apparently does the same in 3.19 = παντες οι ἀλλογενεῖς. Cf. Ps. 19.13(14) = και απο αλλοτρίων φείσας του δεινου του. The adjective ἄριστος is far too common to imagine that the translator did not know the word. It should be noted, however, that there seems to be the suggestion of a metaphorical view of “foreigner” in the Greek gloss of Jer. 49(42).17. For in this suggestive passage, the Judeans forsaking the land and fleeing to Egypt are interpretatively referred to as “the foreign born.” ἐπειδὴ αὐτοὶ παντες καὶ παντες οι ἀλλογενεῖς, οι θεντες το πρόσωπον αὐτῶν εἰς γνὴν Αἴγυπτου ενοικείν εκέλ. While it is possible that as suggested in BHS the Greek reflects a misreading of הָלִיוֹן which was borrowed or perhaps displaced from 43.2 where הָלִיוֹן is not represented in the Greek, it is at least equally likely that the Greek of 49.17 reflects a double translation of the infinitive הָלִיוֹן (οι ἀλλογενεῖς
and εὐοικεῖν) and that the translator has absorbed the ἐβέλθον τῶν ἁγίων of 43.2 into his view of οἱ ἀλλογενεῖς. And such a double translation would probably imply the translator’s opinion that anyone who chose to live in Egypt was really no better than one who is “foreign born” άλ/ἀλλογενεῖς. It would not be totally unexpected that the Jeremiah passage with its very emphatic view concerning those who went to Egypt might well have had a place of importance in the minds of the translators of the LXX. (And of course it might be argued that this negative attitude is counter-evidence against an Egyptian provenance for the LXX of Jeremiah.) While it does not appear that the translator of the MP develops any line of thought in Mal. which is based upon a metaphorical view of “foreigners;” if the Jeremiah passage were well known it might have stimulated various types of hermeneutical musings on the basic formula μὴ ἀρνηθείτε. Whether the shift to αλλοτρίους be intentional or unintentional, the effect on the passage appears to be that of altering what was originally an innerjudische matter with the result that the problem of faith becomes the apparent impunity of the “arrogant” heathen nations. The intention of the Hebrew is quite different.

ανομία ἡ ἀρματεία The Greek is the plural, referring to concrete acts of lawlessness, while the singular Hebrew is the abstraction. This shift, while subtle, is related to the earlier τα φυλαγματα αυτου/mighty

αὐτοτηλευταν θεος ἡ θεοτ υιος This is not simply free translation. Rather, it must be regarded as an expression of the translator’s discomfort with the idea that man can ἔρημος Yahweh. The rendering is without parallel. See the discussion of v. 10.
The Greek probably reflects a *Vorlage* of Τουτα κατελαλησαν. Grabe's conjecture of an original *tote* which was corrupted to *tauta* is to be rejected as totally lacking in external corroboration and for being overly simplifying. The overall effect of this slight textual difference is incredible. For while the MT would suggest that v. 16 introduces those who fear the Lord who evidently stand in distinction to those faithless agnostics of vv. 14 and 15, the LXX clearly suggests that it was those who fear the Lord (sharp irony?) who spoke the outrageous statements which preceded. And this meaning is even clarified by the addition of the prefix κατα of κατελαλησαν (cf. v. 13 οἱ κατελαλησαμεν κατα σου). The Peshitta also reflects the reading of the LXX. J. M. P. Smith describes the meaning of the LXX (which he views to be the proper view of the Hebrew when properly restored with הָיְתָה):

Yet in reality his thought is meant for the encouragement of the doubters to whom he has just been speaking. This rendering, based upon LXX ἘΣΤΙ, shows unmistakably that the words of vv. 14-15 are spoken by those who worship Yahweh. מ, however, reads “Then spake together those who feared Yahweh, etc.” Aside from a grammatical difficulty, this involves assigning the foregoing doubts to the godless in Israel, interpreting “the arrogant” as characterising the heathen, and leaving the words of the pious unrecorded.

While admitting the uncertainties inherent in any consideration of the *lectio difficultior* of this passage, a few inconclusive remarks are in order. First, if our retroversion of הָיְתָה is correct (so Dingermann), then the absence of any specific feminine antecedent might tell in favor of the LXX. Secondly, to put the outrageous language of vv. 14-15 into the mouths of those who “fear Yahweh” is perhaps to amplify the blasphemy.
and to increase the affront to the divine majesty. And finally, the promises of blessings which follow in verses 16b-17 are difficult to square with such impudent language as that of vv. 14 & 15. In fact this difficulty is what is viewed to be absurdity or impossibility by many commentators. These three difficulties strongly suggest that the superficially smooth reading of the MT is later.89 But if there is any coherence or sense in the Greek, then that text must be understood to suggest that while the day of Yahweh represents utter destruction for the ἀλλογενεῖς and the ποιεῖται ἀνομία (v. 19), in the preparatory work of Elijah there remains the possibility of a spiritual restoration for those fearing Yahweh. And it is this profound spiritual restoration which will prevent their experiencing “utter destruction” (αὐρώ v. 24). Thus, while the MT relates the promise of blessing both to existing distinctions within the community and the future ministry of Elijah, in the Greek the startling and unexpected promises of blessing are based solely on the purgatorial ministry of Elijah. And as is very clear, this alteration in focus (or essential message) is also supported by the interesting ἀλλοτρίοντος, ἀλλογενεῖς renderings. These renderings (perhaps unintentionally?) emphasize the fact that it is the Gentiles who are the object of Yahweh’s destructive wrath, not a particular group of the Jewish community.

καὶ ἕγραψε βιβλίον μνημοσύνου. Read as though מִּשְׁפָּר לְאָרְצַךְ.

This difference in voice nicely illustrates the fact that there is little anti-anthropomorphic consistency in the ancient versions.90

καὶ ἐκλάβωμενοις τῷ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. The other occurrences
of בּוּשַׁ in the MP are: (Qal) Mic. 2.1 λογίζομαι, 3 λογίζομαι; Na.1.11 λογισμος; Zech. 7.10 (+ πᾶσα) μνησικακήτω; 8.17 λογίζεσθε; Amos 6.5 ελογίσαντε; (Niphal) Hos. 8.12 ελογισθήσαν; (Piel) Hos. 7.15 ελογίσαντε; Jon. 1.4 εκείνους (anti-personification); Na. 1.9 λογίζεσθε. It has plausibly been suggested that because the translator did not know the expression בּוּשַׁ "to value, esteem" he thought instead of the form רָעַת. This suggestion is strengthened by the fact that in every occurrence of רָעַת in the MP, it is rendered with εὐλαβεῖοι (Na. 1.7, Zeph. 3.12). Furthermore, the interjection רָעַת is several times rendered with εὐλαβεῖοι as though derived from רָעַת (Hab. 2.20, Zeph. 1.7 and Zech. 2.13(17). However, it is conceivable that the translator with no thought of רָעַת whatsoever simply assimilated toward the very similar passage in Zephaniah 3. For this passage also speaks of a future spiritual renewal of Yahweh’s people and the language is remarkably similar: καὶ ὑπολειψόμει εἰς σοι λαόν πράων καὶ ταπεινῶν, καὶ εὐλαβηθήσονται απὸ τοῦ ὄνοματος κυρίου οἱ καταλοίποι τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ οὐ ποιήσωσιν ἀδίκιαν καὶ οὐ λαλήσωσιν ματαια καὶ οὐ μὴ εὑρέθη ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν γλώσσα δόλια, διότι αὐτοὶ νεμήσονται καὶ κατασθήσονται καὶ οὐκ εστίν αἱ ἐκφοβών αὐτῶν. (vv. 12 & 13)

17 καὶ εσονται μοι, λέγει κυρίος παντοκράτωρ, εἰς ἡμέραν, ἦν εἰς ποὺ εἰς περιποίησιν, καὶ αἱρέτως αὐτῶς ον τροπον αἱρετίζει ανθρώπος τον οὐν αὐτον τὸν δουλευοντα αὐτὸ. 18 καὶ επιστραφησεθε καὶ σφεθε ανα μεσον δικαιο καὶ ανα μεσον ανομοι καὶ ανα μεσον τον δουλευοντος θεο καὶ τον μη δουλευοντος.

17 εἰς ἡμέραν, ἦν εἰς ποὺ εἰς περιποίησιν λήθη ἔσται ἐν χωρὶς ὁμολογίας The Greek for “day” is anarthrous. See 4.1. Kaminksa suggests the possibility that the rendering περιποίησιν/λήθη reflects dependence on
the LXX of Isa. 43.21 = λαον μου, ον περιεποιησαμην.
This is highly unlikely inasmuch as the Greek of Mal. 3.17 (perhaps the Hebrew ?) speaks of "a day" which Yahweh will make as His inheritance. Unlike Isa. 43.21, the predication does not concern the people.92

Dingermann (p. 236) suggests that the Greek verbs reflect a confusion with ἔντον/ἐποντέα. This is unlikely both with respect to the issue of a possible Vorlage and with reference to a probable translation. In the MP, ἔντον is only rendered ἐπεθύμουν (Mi. 2.2). And in no instance throughout the LXX is ἔντον rendered with αἰρετίζω. Furthermore, there is no instance of the constructionنقل + ἔντον. Thus one would be forced to imagine a vastly divergent Vorlage which is without analogy in its rendering in the LXX. We must be dealing with free translation. The translator's willingness to depart from the natural meaning of ἔντον ("to have compassion for," "to spare") is clearly observed in the case of Zech. 11.5 ὁρᾶτε ὅταν ἔντον γίνηται = καὶ οἱ παῖες αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐπάρχον οὐδὲν ἐπ' αὐτῶις.

18 καὶ επιστραφεσθε καὶ ὑπασθε The LXX, Peshitta and Vulgate regard ὁρᾶτε ὅταν as a separate and independent verb. It is probably more natural to find an adverbial ("again") force in the first verb. Cf. Zech. 5.1 καὶ ἐπιστρέψα τὰ ἡρα, 6.1 καὶ ἐπιστρέψα καὶ ἡρα but see Hos. 11.9 λαοῦ ἀφετηρίας = οὐ μὴ εἰκασταί τού τεξαλειφθηναι τον
(Chapter 4)
1 διότι ἡμέρα ἐρχεται καίομενη ὡς κλίβανος [καὶ φλεξει αυτοὺς], καὶ ἐσονται πάντες οἱ ἀλλογενεῖς καὶ πάντες οἱ ποιοῦντες ανόμα καλαμή, καὶ ἀναψει αυτοὺς η ἡμέρα η ἐρχομενη, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ, καὶ ου μὴ ὑπολειψῃ εξ αυτων ρίζα αυδε κλημα. 2 καὶ ανατελει υμιν τοις φοβουμενοις το ονομα μου ηλιος δικαιοσυνης και ιασις εν ταις πτερυξιν αυτω, και εξελευσεθε και σκιρτησετε ως μοσχαρια εκ δεσμων ανειμενα. 3 καὶ καταπατησετε ανομους, διοτι ϑα αποθε υποκατω των ποδων υμων εν τη ημερα, η εγω ποιω, λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ.

Translation: 1 For behold, a day comes burning like an oven and it will consume them, and all the aliens and all those who commit acts of lawlessness will be chaff. And the coming day will kindle them, says the Lord Almighty, and neither root nor branch will be left of them. 2 But for you who fear My name, the sun of righteousness will rise, and healing in its rays, and you shall come out and skip like calves released from bonds. 3 And you shall shall trample the lawless ones, for they shall be ashes under your feet in the day which I am making, says the Lord Almighty.

4.1 (3.19) ημέρα ερχεται τώρα. The translator has maintained the anarthrous phrase of 3.17 (ὁ μετήν = εἰς ημέραν). In that verse, we might have imagined that merely a question of pointing was at stake. However, when seen in relation to this verse we must conclude that the translator has deliberately rendered the phrase indefinite. Perhaps this is just another way the translator stresses the uncertainty of the timing of that great day. However, notice ῥόμεος = ως κλίμανως. It is certainly possible that simple and inconsequential stylistic concerns are behind the anarthrous Greek.
Dingermann suggests that this clause “dürfte eine Glosse zu kai anaφei autous sein, die diesen Ausdruck erklären sollte, später aber an anderer Stelle in den Text geschrieben wurde.” (p. 236)

This is very possible. Yet, one need not imagine that a complicated series of dislocations ultimately led to the present position of the gloss. For it is very likely that the passage and gloss were written as follows:

διοτιηθημεραρθεταικαιομενη ωςκλιβανος
καιενηπαντεσουαλλογεινειςκαιαντες καιφλεξειαυτους
οιποιοντεςανομικαλαιη καιαναφειαυτους
ημεραπερχομενηλεγεικυριοςπαντοκρατωρ
καιουμηνολειφθηαιτωνωνρεκλημα

Clearly the gloss might have been incorporated into the text after κλιβανος very early in the history of the Greek text. Indeed, one cannot rule out the possibility that the translator himself interjected the clause as an afterthought. On οι αλλογενεις see the discussion of 3.15.

The Greek “day” is articular here. The correlation of ωςλαθυ (Pi.)/αναφτω only occurs in the MP (Joel 1.19, 2.3 and here). Elsewhere ωςλαθυ (Pi.) is rendered: Deut. 32.22 φλεξει, Isa. 42.25 οι σμφλεγοντες, Ps. 82(83).15 κατακαυσαι, Ps. 96(97).3 φλογει, Ps. 105(106).16 κατεφλεξεν, Job 41.13 ανθρακης (free rendering). The uniqueness of the renderings in the MP and the frequency with which some form of φλεγω is employed outside the MP might strengthen the view that the earlier clause kai φλεξει αυτους if indeed a gloss, did not derive from the translator himself.
The translator read the verb as the Niphal—ןוֹתְנָה. The MT could in fact represent an impersonal passive (So J. M. P. Smith, p. 84).

However, although the precise function of הניה is uncertain, there is some probability that it implies the nominal antecedent הניה which would then function as the implicit subject of נוֹתְנָה. This would then represent an unusual instance of the Hebrew reflecting a rather high level of syntactical subtlety which is lost in the extremely paratactic rendering of the Greek.

4.2 (3.20) σκόπησατε ὑμεῖς μεσαρία χεὶς ἀπὸ μανων ανείμενα

The differences between the Greek and Hebrew of this clause are often blurred by an erroneous view of the meaning of the Hebrew verb מָלַש. It is widely assumed that the verb means “to spring about” (BDB p. 807) or to “(playfully) paw the ground” (KB p. 756). Almost all commentators view the verb this way. And this meaning is clearly deduced from the corresponding renderings of the LXX. In fact, the verb מָלַש only occurs three times in the Hebrew Bible (four times if one reads נְפָשָׁה of Na. 3.18 as the Niphal of the root. BHS suggests reading instead נְפָשָׁה.) In Jer. 50.11 the Q reads מָלַש = (27.11) διότι σκόπησατε ὑμεῖς βοιδία εν βοτάνῃ. The Hebrew means “for you pawed (or stomped) as a trampling (threshing) young heifer.” In this Hebrew sentence one would naturally assume the rough synonymity of מָלַש and מָלַש. And the emphasis of both verbs would be on the damage caused, rather than the exuberance of the heifer. The verb מָלַש is often used with reference to “a crushing military defeat.” So II Kings 13.7b “The king of
Syria had destroyed them, and had made them like the dust by threshing;

1 Amos 1.3 “For three transgressions of Damascus, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof; because they have threshed Gilead with threshing instruments of iron” and Hab. 3.12 “You marched through the land in indignation, you threshed the nations in anger.”

But it should be noted that BHS suggests reading instead "like heifers in new grass." This conjectured Hebrew would be quite naturally rendered by the Greek. However, one must reckon with the probability that the Greek reflects the translator’s lack of knowledge of the root (thus palaeographically tendentious translation) and/or that the translator is simply translating very freely. For the animal being compelled to thresh does not have much freedom to enjoy the . Thus upon release from the implicit confinement, the animal might be expected to “skip for joy in the grass.”

Furthermore, in Hab. 1.8 where is used to describe the “terrible and dreadful” horsemen of the Chaldeans, it is stated . This inane translation “the horsemen shall ride forth” does not demonstrate the translator’s knowledge of the root whatsoever. And there can be no doubt that the essential function of the warhorse in the ancient world was to trample down the foot-soldiers. Something of this nature is probably intended in the passage.

Thus, when one considers that in Mal. 4, verse 3 very unambiguously defines the meaning of in this context—“and you shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet”—one can only conclude that in 2b the Greek translator has gone his own way and taken most modern commentators of the Hebrew text along with him. In my estimate The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text does an excellent job of both Jer. 50.11 “You
stamped like a heifer treading grain" and of Mal. 3.20 "You shall go forth and stamp like stall-fed calves." Perhaps their rendering of Hab. 1.8 is less precise "Their steeds gallop—their steeds come flying from afar."

If as KB (p. 564) suggests this Hebrew word is derived from a root which means "to tie fast," then our translator simply demonstrates his knowledge of the fact. For although the derivative meaning of "fattened" was surely understood, the primary significance of being bound could not apply to this calf which has come forth and is threshing the ground. Thus the translator is simply making explicit what is implicit in the Hebrew. This suggests that Dingermann's proposed Vorlage is quite pointless. The other occurrences of the word are rendered: 1 Sam. 28.24 δαμαλίς νομίζας, Amos 6.4 καὶ μοσχαρία ἐκ μέσου βουκολίων γάλακτην, Jer. 46(26).21 = εν αὐτῇ ὁπέρ μοσχοὶ σίτευτοι πρέφομενοι εν αὐτῇ. This breakdown shows that the idea of confinement ranges from implicit (Jer. passage) to explicit (Amos and Mal.) The 1 Sam. rendering might rather suggest "free-ranging." But as is clear from that passage, the animal was in the house. Thus, νομίζας must not have its normal associations. The translator's tendency to make explicit verbal ideas (particularly of motion) which the Hebrew leaves implicit is seen in Mal. 1.12 καὶ τὰ ἐπιθέμενα ἐξουδενώνται ἑσώματα αὐτοῦ.

Surely Dingermann exaggerates when he states, "Hiß macht sehr stark den Eindruck einer späteren Ergänzung und ist daher w. mit LXX zu streichen (vgl. Sellin,
Komm. 564).” (p. 236) “The soles of the feet” is absolutely stock Hebrew idiom. But because the expression is not as common in Greek, the translators often rendered without ἰχνη. (Cf. Gen. 8.9, Deut. 28.56, Jos. 3.13, 4.18, Job 2.7, Isa. 1.6).

Translation: 4 And behold, I am sending to you Elijah the Thesbite before the great and glorious day of the Lord comes; 5 who will restore the heart of a father to the son and the heart of a man to his neighbor, lest I come and smite the earth utterly. 6 Remember the law of Moses My servant, just as I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel, even commandments and ordinances.

The dislocation of verse 6 should probably be understood to reflect a hesitance to end the book (and the Greek OT) with such a dire threat. The interest to tone down the passage might also be reflected in the deletion of the idea of the דָּרָם (“ban, utter annihilation”). The adverb ἀρδην lacks the concrete associations of דָּרָם. This softening of the final passage might be viewed as the antecedent to the instructions in the Massora to repeat the next to last verse of Malachi, Isaiah, Lamentations and Qoheleth. The harshness of the concluding verses of these books was judged an inappropriate conclusion for a synagogue reading.

Hλιαν τον Θεσβιτην Ἰλλίσα Ἰσαία N Dingermann rightly notes that "einen Hörfehler." (p. 237).
Yet, it is also possible that as Verhoef suggests the rendering of the LXX reflects the translator’s view “that the historical prophet Elijah will return in person.” (p. 340) Thus the Greek would be clarifying that it would not be a prophet like Elijah, but the actual historical Elijah the Thesbite who would come. It is also possible that the translator is simply assimilating toward the common designation (1 Kings 17.1; 21.17,28; II Kings 1.3,8; 9.36).

ος ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρός προς νον

This Greek clause reflects simple stylistic variations. The relative pronoun is smoother than a simple καί and the switch to distributive singulars accentuates the universal character of the restoration. And although the rendering βιβλίον (Hi.)/ἀποκαθιστήμι is very common outside the MP, it never elsewhere occurs within the MP and the verb has in several contexts explicit eschatological overtones. As H. -G. Link notes:

While apokathistemi is found but rarely in the preaching of the early prophets (e.g., Amos 5:15; Hos. 2:5[3]; 11:11), it has a special theological significance in the announcement of eschatological salvation in exilic and post-exilic prophecy. Yahweh will bring Israel back from exile into his own land (Jer. 16:15; 23:8; 24:6). Ezekiel draws a parallel between the eschatological restoration of Israel and his beginnings (Ezek. 16:55), and Mal 4:6 (3:24) prophesies of the »Elijah redivivus who will turn the hearts of fathers and sons towards each other again. Thus in the LXX apokathistemi becomes more and more the term for the eschatological, and in part messianic, hopes of Israel for restoration of her former state.96

Similarly, Glazier-McDonald states:

The influence of the LXX ἀποκαταστήσει gave rise to the further expectation that Elijah was to be an agent of restoration, in some sense, as well as repentance. This can be seen in the work of Ben Sira. In his ‘Praise of the Fathers,’ he gives one section to Elijah (48:1-12). Verses 1-9 are based on 1 Kgs 17f and v. 10 on Mal
3:23-24:
who are ready for the time, as it is written,
To still wrath before the fierce anger of God,
To turn the heart of the fathers unto his children,
And to restore the tribes to Israel.

In Ben Sira 48:10c, d the two explanations of 'בּשֶׁל' which have been noted in the MT and LXX are found side by side. The Hebrew of Ben Sira retains the 'בּשֶׁל' of the MT and translates the αποκαταστησει of the Greek back into Hebrew as בּוֹן, 'to (re)establish, (re)-constitute, restore.' This suggests that the idea of restoration, based on the LXX rendering, is already firmly established.97

καὶ καρδιὰν ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ. It is difficult to determine the precise intention of this gloss. It is possible that the translator judged the previous reference to fathers and sons to be insufficiently pertinent to the domestic problems mentioned in the book. Thus his intent might have been "and the heart of man toward his "lover, paramour." (Cf. Cant. 1.9 τὴν ἵππω μου ἐν ἁμαρτίαν Φαράω ὁμοίωσα σε, ἡ πλησίον μου and verse 15 θεῖοι εἰς καλὴ, ἡ πλησίον μου). However, this is admittedly a rare use of πλησίον. It is far more likely, as is suggested in 3.5 with the comprehensive list of offenses for which Yahweh will judge His people, that the translator wants to clarify that the future spiritual restoration will not merely alter things in the domestic/familial sphere but indeed in the general social order. Thus the scale of the restoration has been enlarged.

מַיָּלָה כִּי בוֹתֵא וּבָטֵא וְכַלְמָה יֵצֵא הַנֵּפֵר וְאִדוֹתָהוּ בְּרוֹדֶה. The Hebrew construction is elliptical. The instrumental force of בְּרוֹדֶה is simply deduced from the passage. Thus it is possible that it was the elliptical nature of the Hebrew which accounts for the adverbial rendering וְאִדוֹתָהוּ. In fact, BDB (p. 356) suggests that the adverbial sense
is virtually equivalent to the instrumental ("Mal 3:24 smite the land with a ban, i.e. utterly destroy it.") However, there is another reasonable explanation of the Greek. First, it should be noted that there is an almost stereotypical rendering of ἀναθεμα in ἀναθηματιν. In the MP, the renderings of ἀναθημα (verbal form, ἄναθημα 1 and ἄναθημα 2) are: Mi. 4.13 (Hiphil) ἀναθηματιν τω κυριω (It is possible that Lev. 27.28 & 29, where one also finds this rendering and in immediate proximity to the noun ἀναθημα, served as the precedent for the rendering. In Lev. 27.21 one also finds the unique rendering ἀναθημα/ἀφορίζω. ἀναθηματιν could also be a homoiophonic translation based on the similarity with ἀναθηματιν.). Zech. 14.11 και ἀναθημα οὐκ εσται ετί; Mic. 7.2 ἄναθημα ἀναθηματιν = εκβλημασιν εκβληθη

Glazier-McDonald draws attention to the remarkable similarity of Mic. 7.2, where as in Mal. 4 the instrumental force is deduced from the passage ἀναθηματιν. There is considerable debate among commentators concerning which root is represented in this passage. Yet it does seem probable that the translator read ἀναθηματιν as ἀναθηματιν. The Geminative root ἀναθηματιν is often rendered with εκβληθη or θλιβο. There is no instance of the verb rendering ἁλιβο "to hunt." Hab. 1.15 ἀμφιβληστρω, 16 σαγηνη, 17 ἀμφιβληστρον. This breakdown shows three things: 1. The translator knew the specific or technical significance of ἀναθημα (so Zech. 14.11). 2. The translator probably recalls the promise of Zech. 14.11 that in the eschatological future there would no longer be a threat of ἀναθημα. 3. The translator consistently renders unpredictably when ἀναθημα (whatever root) is involved in an non-explicit instrumental construction (so Mi. 7.2 and Mal. 4.5). Thus, the Greek of Mal. 4.5 is probably either a reflection of
the peculiar Hebrew syntax of the verse or an attempt to obscure a perceived contradiction between Zech. 14.11 and Mal. 4.5.
1 Thus argues Verhoef (p. 156), "Hence the LXX's rendering, 'his messenger,' may be only a different form of the Hebrew word, mal'ki yahū, in the sense of 'messenger of the Lord.' The yod is taken as a yod compaginis, as is the case in 'əḇdi' (1 Chr. 6:44), 'əḇdi'ēl (1 Chr. 5:15; cf. 'əḇdi'ēl, Jer. 36:26), and bugqi (Num. 34:22; Ezra 7:14) compared with bugqi yahū (1 Chr. 25:4, 13)." Cf. Rudolph pp. 247-8. However, J. Alberto Soggin, objects against this view, "A reconstruction of the name as a theophoric name compounded with a Yahwistic element (mal'aki-yahu*) is extremely dubious, quite apart from the fact that such a name is not attested in the Hebrew Bible." Introduction to the Old Testament: From its origins to the closing of the Alexandrian canon, 3rd ed. trans. by John Bowden (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1989), p. 401. It was the view of Theodore of Mopsuestia that Mal'akia was simply equivalent to aggelos. [Ωνομα δε τω προφητη, κατα μεν την Ελληνων γλωσσαν, Αγγελος· κατα δε την Εβραων, Μαλαχιας.] Migne P.G. LXVI (p. 597). This view is shared by Cyril of Alexandria, ...Malachiāς ος δη καλειται και Αγγελος, διερμηνευεται γαρ ωδε Μαλαχιας. Pusey (p. 546).

2 It can be argued that the reworking of Zech. 1 does not stop at the accentuation of the force of the prophetic message, but actually goes so far as to write out the people's repentance from verse 6. Although there is some question about who is being referred to in the verse, and while the plain sense of the Hebrew does create an apparent tension with verse 4, there are no substantial grounds for imagining that the Hebrew verb שׁוֹבֵע means anything other than that which it means in its other occurrences in the immediate context (vs. 3 שׁוֹבֵע נָּא אֶלֶּה = επιστρέψατε προς με, שׁוֹבֵע נָּא אֶלֶּה = καὶ επιστρέψομαι προς μας, vs. 4 שׁוֹבֵע נָּא אֶלֶּה = απεστρέψατε). Thus the Greek και επεκριθησαν και επαν probably represents a contextually-inspired, theologically-motivated change in the meaning of the text. שׁוֹבֵע in Qal does not mean to answer. In the Hiphil, it sometimes means to return a response. However, in these instances, it almost always has an object (מָרִים מֶלֶךְ רָדָר). In those instances where the object is not mentioned, the person receiving the address is always indicated (ל שָׁם). The only possible exception to this rule is Prov. 26.16 "a sluggard is wiser in his own eyes than ...". It is however, probably best to take the final noun as the object of the
participle ("seven who return a tasteful response") rather than as an attributive qualifier of the participle ("seven who respond tastefully").

3 Rudolph, p. 247 f.n. #1.

4 J. M. P. Smith, p. 19.

5 Stekhoven, p. 106. He also suggests homoiophony in the cases of Amos 7.9 [אְמוֹס 7:9] / βωμοί, Mi. 1.6 and Zech. 14.4 [זְכֹר] / Χαός, Nah. 1.6 [נָחַל] / τηκεί, Nah. 2.2 [טְפִיפִּים] / εμφυσών

6 On the nature of homoiophony see "Homoeophony in the Septuagint" by G. B. Caird in Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 74-88. Of the translator of the LXX of Isaiah, he states:

Pride of place, both for quantity and for quality, undoubtedly goes to the translator of Isaiah with his ten examples, which include several of the most striking ones (1, 3, 4, 12, 19, 24, 42, 45, 53, 55). This translator still remains the biggest enigma in the Septuagint, consistent only in being erratic. It is tempting to say of him that his sole qualification for the task he undertook was that his ignorance of Hebrew was nicely balanced by the poverty of his Greek. Yet this verdict is too severe. For though he constantly mistranslates, it must be said in defence of his scholarship that he frequently does so deliberately. Homoeophony is not with him, any more than it is with others, a symptom of incompetence, but a mark of enterprise, one of the tools by which he wrings from a difficult text a sense not only vivid but apposite for the times in which he himself is writing.” (p. 88)

7 Verhoef, p. 203.

8 See Thackeray p. 79, “The same preference for the short radical vowel appears in ποιμα (like ποισις: class. πωμα), δομα, χυμα (class. χυμμα), and so apparently κριμα κλιμα. Words in -μα and -σις had come to be used with little, if any, difference of meaning (e.g. δομα, δοσις), and it was natural that they should be formed on the same pattern.” Cf. LS p. 444.

9 Ralph Smith, p. 304 f.n. #3a

11 At the present time there is no widespread consensus concerning the best terminology in describing various types of figures of speech. If one were to use Bullinger’s massive study as the standard, then we are dealing with a zeugma or syllepsis. Under “Zeugma” in reference to Ex. 3.16 he states: It may be that the verb ἐπάθα (pachad), though used only once, should be repeated (by implication) in another sense, which it has, viz.: “I have surely visited (i.e., looked after or cared for) you, and [visited] (i.e., punished for) that which is done to you in Egypt.” The two senses being to go to with the view of helping; and to go for or against with the view of punishing, which would be the figure of Syllepsis (q.v.). (p. 132) Under “Syllepsis” he states, “This name is given to the figure when only one word is used, and yet it takes on two meanings at the same time. (p. 296) Figures of Speech Used in the Bible: Explained and Illustrated. E. W. Bullinger, D.D., 1898 (reprinted 1968 by Baker Book House Company). Bullinger’s study while certainly dated is still unsurpassed.


13 Both the Targums and the Peshitta reflect a Hebrew verb רWithEmail which means to be poor (See Gelston, p. 184). If the Hebrew root רWithEmail is established, then there is no reason to imagine as did Vollers that the Greek represents an Aramaicism. He argued, καταστραπται = לelahנוזן aramaisirend, da die hebr. Form wahrscheinlich zu רWithEmail ‘arm sein’ zu stellen ist.” (p. 74)

14 While there is no shortage of explicit “damn Edom” language in the Hebrew OT (see esp. Ralph Smith, pp. 305-306), there is some evidence of heightened bitterness in the Greek text of Obadiah. The Hebrew of vs. 13 is:
The Greek, on the other hand reads: μηδε εισελθης εις πυλας λαων εν
ημερα πονων αυτων μηδε επιδης και συ την συναγωγην αυτων εν ημερα
ολεθρου αυτων μηδε συνεπιθε επι την δυναμιν αυτων εν ημερα απωλειας
αυτων. While there are several interesting elements in the Greek of this
verse, of decisive significance is the rendering of the last clause. For
while the Hebrew very much allows one to imagine that Edom's crime was
to watch from a distance while Nebuchadrezzar sacked Jerusalem, and
then at a later time to steal away with some of the spoils, the Greek has
a very different idea. For μηδε συνεπιθε επι την δυναμιν αυτων surely
must be translated "you should not have joined forces against their army."
This statement implicates Edom in direct military complicity in the
sacking of Jerusalem.

There can be no doubt that in certain sections of the LXX, Edom is the
object of an intense vilification which exceeds all historical plausibility.
For it is surely very unlikely that it was the Edomites rather than the
Babylonians who burned the temple in Jerusalem as suggested in I Esdras
4.45 τον ναον εν ενεπυρισαν οι Ιδομαιοι, στις ηρημωθη η Ιουδαια υπο των
Χαλδαιων [For rabbinic parallels see Louis Ginsberg, The Legends of the
Jews Vol. 6 (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America,
1928), p. 405. Also cf. Judith 7: 8, 18]. There is, however, some evidence
of Edomite cooperation with Nebuchadrezzar. So Burton MacDonald states,
"Two Hebrew ostraca discovered by Y. Aharoni at Tell Arad in
southeastern Judah also testify to Edom's power ca. 700-600 B.C. One
ostracon, which may be associated with the campaign of Sennacherib in
701, refers to some sort of negotiations between Judahite and Edomite
authorities. The other deals with the urgency of gathering men in
anticipation of an Edomite attack, possibly associated with one of
Nebuchadrezzar's campaigns." In Geoffrey W. Bromiley, ed. The
International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: William
the intensified language of the LXX might reflect a genuine, albeit
exaggerated historical reminiscence.

15Verheof, p. 206.

22,36,51, 62,66,86 mg., Targ, Eth., Arm.; so Jer., Dort, Smend, We., Now.,
Marti, Siev., Bu., Dr., Or., van H., Hal., Du.Pro." (p. 42)

17So Rudolph, p. 259.
18Vollers, p. 74.

19Ephesians 2: 18 has the similar nominal clause τὴν προσαγωγὴν...πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. However, the implied verbal force behind προσαγωγὴ is probably intransitive.

20Verhoef, p. 216.

21"Dum enim sacramenta violantur, ipse cuius sunt sacramenta violatur." For a similar concept cf. Ezek. 20.9,14,22 [although a different Hebrew verb (םָתֻּ) is used].


23Rudolph p. 259, Verhoef p. 208 and Stekhoven p. 84.

24Nigel Turner states, "This represents a definite event as occurring only once in the future, and conceived as taking place before the time of the action of the main verb. It is expectation, but not fulfilment as yet. It is very near the meaning of ἐρωτ., and is often more than mere probability (see LXX Isa 24:13 when; Am 7:2). In the apodosis occurs fut. and pres. indic., or imper. or jussive." (p. 114). Cf. BAGD p. 211.


27Geist, p. 151.

28J. Alberto Soggin rightly cautions: Leonhard Rost (70. 101, 1976, 179)}
book does not devote enough attention to the problems of Hebrew metre (cf. below, 6.4). That is certainly true. However, I have to admit that I have never succeeded in understanding, far less in applying, the various methods proposed, foremost among which is that formulated at the beginning of this century by E. Sievers. The reasons are simple; what is involved here is studying the metre of a language which has been transmitted in a vocalization which is certainly not original, and derives from some centuries after the original writings, even if it is based on an authoritative tradition. Nor do we possess the original texts, but texts which have gone through many hands, manipulated and commented on to meet the needs of the believing community, and the product of many re-readings. And in addition to the vocalization, we know nothing about the original accentuation or about the division of words into syllables. Moreover even those responsible for the vocalization in the second half of the first millennium CE do not seem to have had any recollection of a metrical reading. And above all, it should be noted that we cannot even know whether there ever was such a reading, and the suspicion arises that the presupposition is based solely on the analogy of ancient Greek and Latin poetry; but here too, as is well known, we are in a phase of substantial revision... For all these reasons I reject conjectures and emendations for the sake of metre, which often appear in critical editions and commentaries. (Preface to his Intro pp. X-XI) Cf. pp. 71-72, esp. "There are even sound reasons for supposing that as early as the Hellenistic period Hebrew metre was no longer known: otherwise certain additions would be inexplicable."

29 Verhoef, pp. 220-1 fn.59.

30 Dingermann, p. 229.

31 Maurice Wiles states, "This prophecy of Malachi, so the Fathers believed, had been fulfilled in the spread of the Christian Church throughout the Gentile world. More particularly the pure offering of which Malachi had spoken was to be seen in the Christian eucharist now celebrated in different places all over the known world." The Christian Fathers, 2nd ed. (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1977), p. 129. But as Perowne cautions, this view did not necessarily imply that the material accoutrements of Christian worship were specifically in view. As he states:

It has been supposed that by the offering, or minchah, of this verse, the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper are intended. But if that be the case we have here a prophecy of the universal offering of literal
incense also; for by no sound canon of interpretation can we give a material sense to one (offering) and a figurative sense to the other (incense) of two words which are thus placed by a writer in the same category. And then it follows that incense is as necessary a part of Christian worship, as 'the bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.'

It has been too hastily assumed that the early Christian writers put this interpretation on the minchah here foretold. Justin Martyr, for example, affirms that Almighty God in this passage declares by anticipation His acceptance of those who offer the sacrifices prescribed by Christ, that is to say 'those sacrifices which in the eucharist of the bread and cup are offered by Christians in every part of the earth.' But he presently makes it clear that it is not the bread and cup themselves that he means: 'I too assert,' he says, 'that prayers and giving of thanks, offered by worthy worshippers, are the only sacrifices which are perfect and acceptable to God. And these alone moreover have Christians learned to offer even in the memorial of their dry and liquid sustenance, in which too the remembrance is made of the passion which for their sakes the Son of God endured.' (Dial. cum Tryp. §177) (pp. 20-21)

The earliest explicit Christian exposition of the passage is that found in the Didache 14:

Катас куриакην δε κυριου συναχθετες κλασατε αρτον και ευχαριστησατε, προεξομολογεσαμενοι τα παραπτωματα υμων, οπως καθαρα η θυσια υμων η. πεςς δε εχων την αμφιβολιαν μετα του εταγιου αυτου μη συνελθετω υμιν, εως ου διαλαγωσιν, ινα μη κοινωθη η θυσια υμων. αυτη γαρ εστιν η ηθελεσα υπο κυριου. Εν παντι τοιπω και χρονω προσφεραι μοι θυσιαν καθαραν. οτι βασιλευς μεγας ειμι, λεγει κυrios, και το ονομα μου θαυμαστον εν τοις θεους. This passage which conflates Mal. 1.11 & 14 reflects a rather sacrificial approach to the Eucharist. Yet, the ethical dimension is clearly stressed. The present infinitive προσφεραν, which has an imperatival force in this context, obscures the general present tense temporal orientation of the original passage and allows for the possibility of a non-historical reading.

Gelston, p. 146. He notes the omission of the word from the Targums but wrongly implies its presence in the Greek. Against Dingermann's suggestion that the form was wrongly read as a Niphal of נל, thus επιτιθημενα, it need only be mentioned that in the MP επιτιθημι is never used to render any form of נל and the translator has
a clear tendency to fill in such verbal ideas which the Hebrew leaves implicit. Cf. Mal. 4.2(3.20) ως μοσχαρία εκ δεσμών ανείμενα.

Concerning the difference of vocalization between the MT and the Peshitta, Gelston concludes:
It is clear also that the translator(s) vocalized the text in a number of passages in a way different from that of the traditional Masoretic vocalization. It is also probable that the Vorlage of the Peshitta or its ancestor contained rather less scriptio plena than M.T. This does not necessarily suggest that what was to become the traditional vocalization was not yet in existence, though it does suggest that it was not normative at the time when the Peshitta translation was made, at least in the circle of the Peshitta translator(s). Nevertheless it is possible that some of these apparent differences in reading or vocalization may be due to the translator's interpretative licence or to the influence of another ancient version (especially the LXX) rather than to an actual divergence of the Vorlage from MT." (p. 125).

As Verhoef notes, "The Vul. and Targ. concur with the MT. The LXX and Pesh. read the first person singular: 'And I will blow against it.' Thus they change the meaning: instead of the priests showing contempt for the offerings, it is the Lord who shows contempt for the offerings." (pp. 209-10).

Cf. MM (p. 217), "In P Petr II. 25 (α) εἰς ιππον ενοχλουμένον = 'for a sick horse.'"

Gelston, p. 165.

Baldwin, p. 231.

J. M. P. Smith, p. 45.

Dingermann states, "Dass diese Doppelungen vom Übersetzer selbst stammen, ist ausgeschlossen, da es sich um 2 Dubletten handelt, die ihre Vorlage nicht in einem durchlaufenden Text haben. Urspr. haben diese wohl am Rand gestanden, und ein späterer LXX-Bearbeiter hat sie vereint, durch καὶ verbunden und in den Text aufgenommen." (p. 231)

Perowne states: "The LXX. (reading רוח for רוח) render, αφορὲιον
It is curious that none of the passages dealing with the shoulder offering actually uses the word ωμος. Instead one finds βραχιων. ωμος usually refers to human shoulders. But the word does refer to the upper shoulder of an animal in Ezekiel 24.4 where the stress seems to be upon the delectable quality of the pieces. (και εμβάλε εις αυτον τα διατομήματα, παν διατομήμα καλον, ακελως και ωμον εκεσαρκισμένα απο των σατων) Furthermore, Moulton and Milligan provide two good examples from the papyri where ωμος refers to the shoulders of animals: "Cf. P Cairo Zen III. 59381 3 (iii/B.C.), where amongst other articles of meat we read of ---ωμος α ακελος α, and Syll. 633 (= 3 1042) 18 (ii/iiiA.D.) for the same combination in connexion with a sacrifice." (p. 701)

On the rendering of the verb ἔστω, Verhoef's judgment is interesting. He states, "The main problem with the reading of the LXX is the accompanying verb, αφορίζω, in the sense of 'set apart,' 'separate.' In the LXX this Greek verb is used as a translation of fifteen different Hebrew words, but never gada'. The Greek translators obviously conjectured the meaning of the Hebrew text, and consequently provided an inconsistent translation." (p. 242) If, however, our reconstruction of the thinking of the translator be correct, then αφορίζω is used entirely because of the shaping influence of Exodus 29. There is certainly no question about the translator's knowledge of the Hebrew verb ἔστω (Cf. Na. 1.4 απειλων, Zech. 3.2 επιτιμήμαι (2x)). On the surprising rendering of Mal. 3.11 διαστέλω, see below.

41 The expected κοπρος in every other instance of the Hebrew שׁוּב surely weakens the force of Stekhoven's suggestion that we are merely dealing with euphemism in Malachi 2 (p. 81. However, he quite correctly notes the euphemism of Na. 3.5 הָלִי "your skirts" = τα ὁμισω σου). Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion and the Syro-Hexapla reflect the expected κοπρον. Furthermore, they reflect an instrumental reading of "arm" which is quite different from the thought of the LXX. [ἰδου εγω επιτιμω υμιν σων τω βραχιονι]. Obviously they have retained the meaning of the Hebrew שׁוּב.

42 Compare: Am. 4.2 ομισως Κυριος κατα των αγιων αυτου διοι ημεραι ερχονται ....
Joel 3. 17 καὶ εἰπεν Κυριος ο θεος υμων
Jon. 1.12 (X*) διοτι εγνωκα εγω διοτι δε εμε ο κλυσων...
Zeph. 2.9 διατυμο τω εγω λεγει Κυριος των δυναμεων ο θεος Ισραηλ, διοτι Μωαβ ως Σοδωμα εσται...
Zech. 4.9 και ειπεν θι διοτι Κυριος παντοκρατωρ εξαπεσαλκε με προς σε.
6.15 και γνωσεθε διοτι Κυριος παντοκρατωρ απεσταλε και προς υμας.
8.6 ταδε λεγει κυριος παντοκρατωρ Διοτι ει αδυνατησει...
11.11 και γνωσσονται οι Χανααναιοι τα προβατα τα φυλασσομενα, διοτι λογος Κυριου εστι.

44 Verhoef's assessment of the argument of the Hebrew is very good. He states, "The subject of both parallel clauses is 'my covenant,' the content being, on the one hand, 'life and peace,' and on the other hand, 'fear,' 'reverence.' God's blessing to Levi consists of 'life and peace.' These he gave him. Levi's obligation was to comply with the 'fear' aspect of the covenant." (p. 246) It would certainly be wrong to imagine that there was any theological motive behind the Greek translation at this point. The differences appear to be the result of the translator's mistaken view of the Hebrew syntax. Yet, it must be stated that the results of the rather mistaken reading of the translator are absolutely brimming with theological possibilities. The construction of διδωμι + infinitive with the meaning "to grant to do something" is so common in Hellenistic Greek, that one should view any suggestions of an elided "commandment" with great suspicion. See esp. BAGD p. 193 #1β, Thayer p. 146 #III and Blass/Debrunner §392 1.e.


46 Cf. esp. MM who say:
(2) Hence "bring together," "make compact," as of setting or shortening the sails of a ship (Hom. II. i. 433, Od. iii. 11), from which it is a natural transition to the more general meaning "restrain," "check," and in the mid. "draw or shrink back from" anything, whether from fear (Hesych.: στελεθαι: φοβειται) or any other motive, as in Malachi 25 απο προσωπου ανοματος μου στελλεσθαι αυτον, 3 Macc 1119 αι δε και προσαρτησ εσταλμεναι ("die sich ganz zurückgezogen halten," Kautsch): cf. Hipp. Vet. med. 10 (ed. Foesius) ouτ αυν αποσχοιντω ων επιημενουσιν, ουτε στελαιντο, and the old gloss quoted in Steph. Theesaur. s.v. where στελλεσθαι is explained by αφιστασθαι αναχωρειν. (p. 587)
Kaminka has suggested that the translation of the MP reflects the mixed experience of the Jews of the Diaspora. He states:

Daß die Juden damals in der Diaspora eine hervorragende Stellung einnahmen, möchte man aus der Deutung von Am 6:1 apertvetaan archoi eβνων schließen; daß sie aber auch Schmähungen zu erdulden hatten, aus der Formulierung der Übersetzung Mal 2g von der Verachtung eis panta ta eβνη (st. ἔλλειπεν τα ἔθνη), auf die Stellung Israels unter den Völkern bezogen! (p. 45)

However, the precise meaning of the translation of Am. 6:1 is far from clear. Just what would it mean to gather as a cluster of grapes the rulers of the nations? And the translation might represent a simple misreading. For clearly, apertvetaan might be read as σφηματίζοντας ήλπις τα έθνη. For τρυγαω in the MP always represents a rendering of some form of ἠλπις. This is the only occurrence of apertvetaan.

Furthermore, the rendering of εβνων for έθνη is expected. However, the rendering of eis panta ta eβνη for the Hebrew ἔλλειπεν is very interesting. In every other instance in the MP, where εβνως renders ἔθνη, the Hebrew form is plural (Jl. 2.17, Zech. 12.3--And the only comparable constructions (with ἐλλεῖπεν) are rendered with λαος: Hag. 2.4 έλλεῖπεν άνθρωπος λαος της γης, Zech. 7.5 έλλεῖπεν λαος της γης. It does appear that the translator has allowed his perceptions of the experience of the Hellenistic Diaspora to influence his treatment of the Biblical text.

It is not impossible that the translator read the λαος of the previous line as the Niphal, noted that this line expects a masculine verb rather than the feminine and then concluded that the verbs had been wrongly interchanged and that in the process ἔλλειπεν had acquired an extra ἕ. This suggestion gains a little support from the definite rearrangement of 10a. The translator did imagine some displacement in his Vorlage.

Dingermann, p. 232.

On the general state of relations between Jews and Gentiles in the Diaspora see the very good discussion in Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C. - A.D. 135) Vol. 3.1 Revised ed. by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black and M. Goodman (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Ltd., 1986), pp. 150-176. A pertinent reference to the problem of the intermarriage of the Levites with Gentile women is found in the Testament of Levi (14:5-7): “You plunder the Lord’s offerings; from his share you steal choice parts, contumeliously eating them with whores. You teach the Lord’s commands out of greed for gain; married women you profane; you have intercourse with whores and adulteresses. You take gentile women for your wives and your sexual relations will become like Sodom and Gomorrah.” (James H. Charlesworth, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* Vol 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1983), p. 793.) Earlier in the same testament Isaac warned Levi, “Be on guard against the spirit of promiscuity, for it is constantly active and through your descendants it is about to defile the sanctuary. Therefore take for yourself a wife while you are still young, a wife who is free of blame or profanation, who is not from the race of alien nations.” (9:9-10) This type of rigoristic language, which is not uncommon in the literature of 2nd Temple Judaism, only betrays the extent of such intermarriage. (Cf. Jubilees 30.7,11 (Notice the place of Levi in the chapter!), Pseudo-Philo 9.5 (Amran of the tribe of Levi argues that Tamar’s incest was preferable to relations with a Gentile.), 21.1 Moses’ prediction that the people would soon commit idolatry (Deut. 31.16) is concretely interpreted to refer to their “intermingling with those inhabiting the land,” 30.1, 43.5, 45.3 (the Levite’s concubine had apparently had sexual relations with the Amalekites.), Joseph and Aseneth (This interesting romance couples a rigoristic view of intermarriage (Ch. 7.5-6) with the ultimate marriage of Joseph and the Egyptian Aseneth. The tension between these two is resolved in the dramatic conversion of the woman.)

Wellhausen ingeniously suggested that the Hebrew should be written as הַדָּוַעַל (so zu lesen) דַּעַל bezeichnet wohl, wie sonst הַדָּוַעַל, die beiden Parteien vor Gericht; דַּעַל is der Kläger (3,5) und בַּּדָּוַעַל heisst anklagen.” (p. 198) This suggestion is adopted by many of the older commentators and recently by BHS. However, as noted by Glazier-McDonald, “In the first place the definite technical meaning he claims for הַדָּוַעַל, "Kläger" and "Vertheidiger," cannot be deduced from...
actual Hebrew usage. דַּעְתָּא is a witness; whether for or against is always determined by the context. The verb דַּעְתָּא, as a legal term is also used both ways, and more frequently for accusing than for defending. Moreover, according to Torrey, it does not appear that the prophet is speaking of a legal tribunal. 'The 'ed and 'oneh are to be cut off, not from the judgment seat, but 'from dwellings of Jacob." (p. 94)

Commentators on the Hebrew are divided on the logical force of מָעַס. The Hebrew can quite naturally suggest either cause or result. If the resultative force is most natural, then we are either dealing with a bold metonymy where the weeping is representative of the cause of that weeping (treachery of the husbands?) or with some sort of pagan fertility rite. For an eloquent defense of the view that the text refers to "to syncretistic phenomena that have entered the Yahweh cult via intermarriage" see especially Glazier-McDonald (pp. 98-99). But if the cause of Yahweh’s disregard of their offerings has been clearly and specifically explained in terms of their syncretistic practices it is somewhat difficult to understand the question in 14a בִּלְוֹמַע. The interrogative force of the Greek of verse 13 completely alters the logical force of the passage.

53 Commentators on the Hebrew are divided on the logical force of מָעַס. The Hebrew can quite naturally suggest either cause or result. If the resultative force is most natural, then we are either dealing with a bold metonymy where the weeping is representative of the cause of that weeping (treachery of the husbands?) or with some sort of pagan fertility rite. For an eloquent defense of the view that the text refers to "to syncretistic phenomena that have entered the Yahweh cult via intermarriage" see especially Glazier-McDonald (pp. 98-99). But if the cause of Yahweh’s disregard of their offerings has been clearly and specifically explained in terms of their syncretistic practices it is somewhat difficult to understand the question in 14a בִּלְוֹמַע. The interrogative force of the Greek of verse 13 completely alters the logical force of the passage.

54 S. Schreiner, "Mischehen-Ehebruch-Ehehscheidung: Betrachtungen zu Malachi 2: 10-16" ZAW 91 (1979), 207-28. Rudolph vigorously objects to Schreiner’s treatment of the passage in his rejoinder "Zu Malachi 2: 10-16" ZAW (1981) 85-90. He regards מָעַשְׂנֵה as a verbal adjective with the force of a participle and מָעַשְׂנֵה as an infinitive used as a substantive. He suspects that מָעַשְׂנֵה fell out of the text because of the preceding מָעַשְׂנֵה. But Glazier-McDonald’s estimate of Rudolph’s treatment is sound: "Such an interpretation may be objected on the grounds that making Yahweh the subject is wholly arbitrary and requires too many inferences." (p. 110)

55 Baldwin p. 241. And compare van Hoonacker’s assessment of the significance of the MT’s pointing. He states, "מָעַשְׂנֵה a été compris 1° comme participe pour le verbe à la seconde personne (LXX); מָעַשְׂנֵה serait l’énoncé d’une condition, auquel מָעַשְׂנֵה serait suite comme impératif: Si tu hais (la femme), renvoie-la!" (p. 728) The Vulgate reads, "cum odio habueris dimitte." This reading reflects a Hebrew text virtually identical to the
It is difficult to imagine what might have motivated Jerome to write such a thing unless he felt compelled to follow the text and tradition of vocalisation he had inherited. On the targums' "But if you hate her, divorce her" see Cathcart and Gordon p.235 f.n. 29. They regard this as a "straightforward example of Targumic 'converse translation.'" However, it is difficult to imagine how their suggested meaning for the MT, "he hates divorce" is conceivable in view of the following.

Malachi 2:16 was taken by R. Johanani to mean, Hateful (to God) is the man who puts away his wife (cf. vs. 14); but the same words are interpreted by R. Judah, If you hate her, put her away. R. Hanina (ben Papa) deduced from the same passage ('the God of Israel,' vs. 16) that only in Israel has divorce a religious sanction. R. Eleazar, from vss. 14 and 16, that the very altar drops tears on every one who divorces his first wife ('the wife of his youth,' vs. 14). [Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim, Vol, 2 (Cambridge, 1927-1930; reprint New York: Schocken Books, 1971), p. 123.]

Cashdan, in his comments on this verse, notes that the Talmud is quoted by Rashi thus: "If thou hatest her, then put her away; but act not cruelly by retaining her in the home, if thou art estranged from her." [A. Cohen, ed., The Twelve Prophets: Hebrew Text, English Translation and Commentary (London: The Soncino Press, 1957), p. 348.]

Although virtually all commentators on the Hebrew feel compelled to rewrite the text to some extent, the MT can be regarded as possible and intelligible, albeit very difficult. If one is hesitant to abandon the pointing of the perfect and regard חֶסֶף as the infinitive, then it is best to follow GKC §155 a and to understand the clause as an independent relative clause. It is then possible to regard the whole of vs. 16 (contra GKC) as stating the following: "If he hates her, send her away, says the Lord God of Israel, even he who covers his garment with violence, says the Lord God Almighty. But take heed to your spirit and do not deal treacherously." This reading would mean that Yahweh commands the treacherous husband who is presently covering his wife or his own
person with the violence of his hatred and abuse to do that which is commanded in Deuteronomy 24—namely, to divorce formally and legally his wife and give her freedom from her hateful spouse.

57 The frequency with which the view that the Hebrew forbids divorce while the Greek commissions it is repeated is baffling. In fact, the opposite is true. Typical is the statement of Perowne who says, "The rendering of A. V. margin, which is also that of the LXX. and Targum, 'if he hate her, put her away;' makes the prophet call upon those whom he is rebuking to avail themselves of the provision of the Law, as the least of two evils...." (p. 27)

58 Vollers, pp. 75-6.

59 This is very close to what J. M. P. Smith thinks the Hebrew text should be regarded as saying. He translates, "For one who hates and sends away covers his clothing with violence, says Yahweh of hosts." (p. 55) However, he obtains this smooth reading only by altering the pointing from הָלַשְׁנָה to הָלַשְׁנָה.

60 So Vollers, p. 76.

61 Dingermann, p. 233.

62 The renderings of הָלַשְׁנָה (Qal) in the MP are consistent in using ἔπιβλεπω: Hos. 3.1, Hag. 1.9, Mal. 2.13. The Hosea passage would have been better served with ἐπιστρεφω. The noun הָלַשְׁנָה is elsewhere in the MP rendered: Zeph. 1.16 τας γυνιας (ἐν τῶν γυνιας), 3.6 γυνιαι αυτων (ἐν τῶν γυνιας), Zech. 14.10 εως της πολης των γυνιων (ἐν της πολης των γυνιων).

63 Dingermann has a helpful discussion of this verse on p. 234. However, it must be questioned whether the additions are, as he suggests, the product of a "Bearbeiter." He offers no argument in support of the suggestion. There is no reason to doubt that the verse is a unified, albeit expansive, product of the translator himself.

64 J. M. P. Smith (p. 68) offers a thorough, although overly-sympathetic, survey of the various proposed emendations. His statement about Mi. 2.2 is very confused. He states, "יִנְשַׁל cannot well be the object of קָלַת, for this verb everywhere else has a personal object. Mi. 22 is no true exception to this usage, for the real objects of קָלַת there
are and of secondary importance and attached to by zeugma. But surely a zeugmatic construction with the verb in question must be a relevant analogy to a similar zeugmatic construction with the same verb elsewhere!

65 Von Bulmerinck rightly notes that "of secondary importance and attached to by zeugma."


68 The Vulgate has a similar predicate construction with "ego enim Dominus et non mutor et vos filii Iacob non estis consumpti."

69 A plausible alternative explanation is that the translator of Job had no knowledge of the word assimilated in 11.15 toward the of verse 16, he arbitrarily guessed at the meaning in 31.7 and thus 36.18 demonstrates no association of ideas in his mind. The Hebrew word only occurs in 11.15 and 31.7 so we cannot be absolutely sure he knew the word.

70 Dingermann, p. 234.

71 So Verhoef p. 303.

72 It would certainly be possible to imagine an original which was corrupted to (behind and also revised to . Cf. J. M. P. Smith's mention of Schulte's emendation (p. 75). However, this reconstruction is probably overly complicated and thus unlikely. And the would not easily be misread as the . It is curious that Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion share the reading of the LXX.

73 This is perhaps the implication of Dingermann's statement: "hat der Übersetzer als Beute, Raub (διαρασμη) genommen. Im MT ist an 'Nahrung' gedacht, wie das Wort auch Ps. 111,5; Prov. 31, 15 und Job 24,5 gebraucht ist." (p. 235) Cf. Stekhoven, "Hij kende niet als 'spijze' Ma 3:10." (p. 103) This would certainly be an adequate explanation if this
strange rendering were in isolation and if it were the expected rendering of the majority meaning of הָלַח. But it is hardly adequate in view of the massive rewriting of the whole section and in view of the absence of the expected מַעֲשַׁה.

74J. M. P. Smith, p. 72.

75Verhoef, p. 307.

76Verhoef, p. 308.

77Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament, Vol. 2 (p. 69) states, "In the LXX, bhin is translated by dokimazein, 'to put to the text, examine' (12 times), etazein, 'to examine' (3 times), exetazein, 'to examine' (twice), krinein, 'to judge,' diakrinein, 'to separate, judge correctly, give a decision,' etc."

78It must be admitted that there are numerous instances of man "tempting or testing" Yahweh in the Greek OT. However, this idea is not found in the Greek MP. The principal synonyms of הָלַח are:

KeyId Passages which speak of man testing God include: Ex. 17: 2(пеирαξω), 7(пеирαξω); Nu. 14: 22(пеирαξω); Dt. 6: 16(екпсирαξω); 33: 6(пеирαξω); Ps. 78: 18(екпсирαξω), 41(пеирαξω), 56(пеирαξω); 95: 9(пеирαξω); 106: 14(пеирαξω); Is. 7: 12(пеирαξω)

79LS (p. 909) list the meaning "sluice" as found in Heliodorus 9.8. This is probably just another case of metonymy. It is peculiar that the cognate verb καταπρεω is used to translate the Hiphil verb בָּרֵךְ in 1 Sam. 2.33 "לְוַדְיוֹדָרֵע בָּעָרְךָ תַּנְת הַפּוֹחַן אֶפֶם. Did the translator imagine a corruption from or simply misread an original לְוַדְיוֹדָרֵע (hyp. root לְוַדְיוֹדָרֵע= "to flow")? The occurrences of לְוַדְיוֹדָרֵע are:

Gen. 7.11 οι καταρρακταὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ηνεωχῇσαν

Gen. 8.2 οι καταρρακταὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

2 Ki. 7.2 καταρρακτας εν οὐρανῷ

Koh. 12.3 ταίς οπαῖς ("a hole of opening")
See MM p. 154, particularly the mention of P Lond 4529 απος ανακλησαμενος τους προερημενους διαιτητας ταυτος μηκετι εισβαζεσθαι εις κτλ. Dingermann imagines that the clause means "und ich teile." (p. 235) He then speculates that because the root לֶעָל was unknown to the translator he read לֶעָל as רֶעָל which is a variant spelling of רֶעָל ("to cut"). However, the suggestion suffers from a narrow and unlikely view of διαιτητας, a Hebrew/Greek (לֶעָל /διαιτητας) correlation which is without parallel and an unattested variant spelling of רֶעָל for רֶעָל.


Verhoef, p. 309.

Cf. Job 35.16 εν αγνωσία ρηματα βαρυνει. Concerning the second person of the Greek, Dingermann states, "Die Übersetzung geht nicht auf eine andere Lesung zurück, sondern ist durch das folgende διαιτητας (καὶ ειπατε) veranlaßt worden." (p. 236)

Vollers, p. 78.

As Verheof states, "The 'arrogant' therefore were either the covenant people as such, or else those members of the nation who had already inwardly and publicly broken with the faith of the fathers, the agnostics, and the skeptics." (p. 318) Similarly, Deutsch states, "Verses 14 and 15 may thus well reflect actual social and religious conditions, and conflicts between rival viewpoints in that postexilic Jewish community to which Malachi also belonged." [Graham S. Ogden and Richard R. Deutsch, A Promise of Hope--A Call to Obedience: A Commentary on the Books of Joel and Malachi, International Theological Commentary, ed. Fredrick Carlson Holmgren and George A. F. Knight (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 1987), p. 108.]

It is possible to prefer the text of the MT while retaining the
essential logic of the LXX by assigning a conjunctive force to \( \mathfrak{N} \). As Ralph Smith notes:

Rudolph says that \( \mathfrak{N} \) must not be taken as an adverb here, but as a conjunction. He translates the sentence, "But since the God-fearers (so) spoke to one another Yahweh listened attentively." This interpretation implies that the God-fearers had been speaking in doubt and skepticism. Joyce Baldwin says that 'those who feared Yahweh are not necessarily a different group from those who had been complaining, but they are those who have taken the rebuke, and they begin to encourage each other to renewed faith' (Baldwin 249). (p. 338)

Furthermore, The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text surprises readers with the following translation: “In this vein have those who revere the LORD been talking to one another.” So it would not be quite fair to suggest that the Hebrew of the MT is unambiguous. Nevertheless, it is quite fair to say that the normal function of \( \mathfrak{N} \) is temporal, and if the temporal function be admitted then the Hebrew does indeed suggest a disjunction, perhaps even an “antithesis” between the speakers of vv. 14 & 15 and the speakers of v. 16. So Ralph Smith concludes, "But it is better to take \( \mathfrak{N} \) as an adverb ‘then,’ and make the God-fearers a separate group from the skeptics who spoke in vv 14-15." (p. 338)

87 Gelston states, “Ml iii 16 is explicable only as the result of the influence of LXX ταυτα, which itself may have arisen as a corruption of τοτε cf. Rudolph)” (p. 162) It is a curiosity that while a number of scholars decry the LXX and Peshitta on the grounds of their absurdity and impossibility, others read the Hebrew with the same essential logic as those versions while retaining the \( \mathfrak{N} \) of the MT. This well illustrates the difficulties inherent in the concept of lectio difficilior.

88 J.M.P. Smith, p. 78. Cathcart and Gordon argue against Smith and insist that in fact the Targums follow the MT. (p. 238)

89 One can with some justification refer to the “superficiality” of the smoothness of the MT because the text is totally uninstructive about such crucial matters as who, where and when. The switch from the first person of vv. 14 & 15 to the third person of v. 16a without any clarification about who it is that is being spoken of is simply incomprehensible.
Gelston, p. 151. The Peshitta agrees with the LXX in treating the verb as an active.

Vollers p. 78 and Dingermann p. 236

Giazzier-McDonald draws attention to the treatment of Halévy. She states, "Halévy circumvents the distance problem by connecting WAIT and translating 'le jour où je constituerai un trésor de choix.'" [J. Halévy, "Le prophète Malachie," RS 17 (1909) 42] (p. 225). She rejects this treatment of the syntax. I suspect most commentators would translate מיהו אנדרי יבשת יבשת the way Halévy and the LXX do were it not for the fact that elsewhere יבשת is typically used to refer to Yahweh's people. But this is not decisive. Perowne (p. 35) points out that the accentuation of the MT supports the translation of the LXX (also the reading of Dr. Scrivener "in that day when I make up my jewels" and the R.V. margin, "wherein I do make a peculiar treasure"). The conjunctive munah accent under the word יבשת would scarcely permit one to disconnect the following noun from its accentually linked participle. (Cf. C. F. Keil p. 467.)

Inasmuch as texts from Qumran (IQpHab) have instead מיהו יבשת, it is possible that the LXX reflects instead the Vorlage מיהו יבשת. But this is unlikely inasmuch as even the divergent text from Qumran represents מיהו יבשת and the reading probably represents nothing but a text corrupted by dittography which is not in any way related to the reading of the LXX. It is unlikely that in view of the next phrase that מיהו יבשת would have been translated as the Greek of the verse. For the context explicitly suggests the flight of a bird, thus מיהו יבשת would definitely mean "they spread out their wings." Some scholars emend Hab. 1 on the grounds of the unsuitability of the root מיהו. But the unsuitability of that root is known primarily from the judgment that somehow the LXX demonstrates that the root means "to paw playfully." It is much simpler to imagine that the LXX translators did not know the meaning of the root and that in fact there is nothing whatsoever playful about the pawing of מיהו. One might even speculate that there was a proverbial basis for the idea. The intense irony of a previously confined heifer being allowed access to a field and then in its impetuosity doing serious damage to that field is the stuff of which proverbs are made!

In that classic description of the warhorse in Job 39.19-25 it is
said he paws in the valley (חפרת בכרמל) and he swallows up the ground (כרמך) Surely one must imagine that the poor foot-soldier is being threshed by this awesome creature.

Dr. S. M. Lehman states, "The word marbek is derived from an Arabic root meaning 'to tie up,' and its use as stall comes from the practice of shutting up calves in a stall to be fattened." [in the Soncino edition of the Twelve Prophets, ed. by A. Cohen—on Amos 6.4 (p. 108).]


Glazier-McDonald pp. 268-9. Her suggestion that the Hebrew of Ben Sirah reflects with its בָּעָלָה and מַלְאָכָה a cognizance of the LXX's καταστασιματικεῖ is a serious challenge to the view that the בָּעָלָה/ἐπιστρέφεια of 10c "may suggest that the grandson knew a variant form of the Malachi passage." (So Benjamin G. Wright, No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text, Society of Biblical Literature, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series, 26. Claude E. Cox, ed. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), pp. 210-211. See also his note *183 on p. 303 concerning the citation of Mal. 3.23 in Luke 1.17.) For if Ben Sirah consciously derived both verbal ideas from his knowledge of both the Greek and Hebrew of Mal. 3.24, then it is fairly likely that his grandson chose the בָּעָלָה/ἐπιστρέφεια rendering only because the καταστασιματικεῖ needed to be reserved for the following בּוּרָה.

Glazier-McDonald, p. 258.

Giesen, in his discussion of הָרֶם (root 2) states, "In Mic. 7:2 herem is either deleted or emended to הַרְמ, 'nobles,' or הֵרִימְנו, 'lift the hands to do evil,' and linked to v. 3. in light of Aquila, Symmachus, the Syriac, the Targum, and CD 16:15, which also read herem—albeit with the meaning 'ban'—the MT should be retained." TDOT Vol. 5, p. 201. In the same volume on הָרֶם (root 1), Lohfink states, "In Mic. 7:2, the LXX, Vulg., Targum, Syriac, Aquila, and Symmachus find a further occurrence of herem I; but the metaphor of hunting and pursuit in v. 2b supports herem II. Only the LXX is consistent, presupposing a totally legal text by reading יָרְמה for יָרְמ and יָשֵׁר for יֵשֶׁר. But this Hebrew original for the LXX is probably secondary with respect to the MT (assimilation to v. 3)." (p. 182)
In Chapter 2 we examined the evidence which might have suggested the existence of a proto-septuagintal text-type in the early Hebrew tradition of the Minor Prophets. We found that agreements between variant Hebrew texts and the LXX were quite rare and that such agreements usually represented instances of non-genealogical agreement based on mundane matters of style. We concluded with Vegas-Montaner that with respect to the Minor Prophets the ancient textual situation looked like a "gran fluctuación textual, con frecuentes intercambios entre los textos." This conclusion then served as a cautionary consideration in the textual commentary of Haggai and Malachi. In light of the absence of any substantial evidence that differences between the LXX and MT corresponded in a systematic way with any putative Hebrew text-type, we were quite careful to consider other possible explanations of such differences before resorting to the differing Vortrage hypothesis. Frequently we found reason to suspect that the translator's sense of style or his perceptions of the significance of the passage were behind the differences between the LXX and MT. To put it baldly, the LXX of Haggai and Malachi reflects a very high degree of stylistic and hermeneutical intentionality. Furthermore, we have argued that in most instances where earlier scholars have posited a Hebrew Vortrage which was different from the MT, the suggested texts were unlikely in terms of Hebrew idiom and very often the divergent Greek could be explained with reference to analogous differences found elsewhere in the LXX of the Minor Prophets.

And yet, we are not really arguing against the literalism of the
translation. We noted numerous instances of extreme, almost wooden literalism in the text. And we are, of course, aware that virtually all previous studies of the LXX of the Minor Prophets have agreed that the translation is quite literal. So, for example, in 1962, Joseph Ziegler concluded that "Die Dodekapropheton--LXX bietet eine gute, ziemlich wörtliche Übersetzung (im Gegensatz zur freien Isaias--LXX) ihrer hebr. Vorlage." But, in recent years it has become increasingly clear that assessments of the literalism of a translation must be more carefully formulated than they used to be for there are different types and different measures of literalness. Indeed this is the precise point of Barr's important work, The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations. It is no longer adequate to position books of the LXX on a continuum of literalism or freedom. One must specify what aspects of literalism are being assessed. And when the question is approached in this way, it becomes clear that many texts are both highly literal by certain measures and yet quite free by others. So for example, in the very important article, "Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX" by E. Tov and B. G. Wright, the Minor Prophets were judged to be difficult to plot on a literal/free continuum. The authors conclude their interesting study with the following statement:

The preceding statistical information presents a picture of diversity of translation. On the basis of this information, the books can be divided into the categories of "literal", "relatively literal", "free" and "relatively free". Some books, however, are difficult to characterize because of the range of variation from one criterion to another, at least at this initial stage of the investigation. A good example are the Minor Prophets (MP) (taken both as individual books and as one translation unit). In the case of the rendering of ר and the third person singular masculine suffix, MP is very consistent and
represents a relatively literal translation technique, but a relative amount of freedom is shown in the treatment of \( \frac{3}{3} \) and the addition of prepositions. A relatively large number of post-position particles appear in MP as well.\(^3\)

Tov and Wright have suggested that the LXX of the Minor Prophets defies categorization on a unitary continuum of literalness. This is certainly true. But what is much more significant about the translation of these books is that the translation can reflect a very high degree of literalness while at the same time reflecting an extremely high degree of intentionality at the level of the hermeneutical decisions of the ancient translator. It could be said that the LXX of the MP is very literal and yet does not consistently partake of the passive or slavish dependence on the Hebrew Vorlage behind the Greek which is typically related to a high degree of literalism. In other words, there seems to be decisive proof in the LXX of the MP that there is no necessary connection between literalism and the degree of hermeneutical freedom exercised by the translator. This conclusion has several substantial implications.

First, it raises serious questions about the usefulness of various essentially mechanical measures of literalism in determining the probability that the translator of a given book of the Old Testament intentionally departed from his Vorlage in a particular instance. If there is substantial evidence that the translator did in fact on occasion depart from his Vorlage on hermeneutical grounds, then it is quite impossible to obtain much help in evaluating a specific difference between the LXX and the MT by employing generalizations derived from statistical analyses of various mechanical aspects of translation technique. If intentional hermeneutically-motivated differences are ever observed in a translation, then it becomes necessary to consider all of the differences in terms of what the translator might have had in mind if he
were responsible for a given difference. And there is no adequate way to approach that question except by detailed and comprehensive examinations of all of the analogous words or constructions in the translation. Furthermore, it is necessary that the change be viewed closely in its immediate context to see if that alteration is a part of a more sweeping rewriting of the passage. Few septuagintal studies have followed through with comprehensive assessments of relevant analogous passages within the same text. And yet the translator's method and thought are only perceived through more or less unambiguous clusters or patterns of like alterations which reflect the translator's interests. And few septuagintal studies have examined closely the possibility that individual differences in a given passage might coalesce into a thematically coherent rewriting. Most studies of the past approached the differences between the LXX and MT strictly atomistically. But there is no chance of confronting the mind of the translator in an atomistic approach. Takamitsu Muraoka, in the introductory discussion of his very important article "Hosea IV in the Septuagint Version," states concerning this problem:

Such an attitude towards OT textual criticism, the latter-day version of *hebraica veritas*, seems to affect some scholars whose primary interest is in the Septuagint itself. Apart from writers who are concerned with textcritical, grammatical or lexical studies of the Greek version, the approach taken by most Septuagint scholars seems to me to be generally atomistic, concerned with single words or phrases or part of them. The question is only rarely raised as to how the translator possibly understood his Hebrew *Vorlage*, not merely single words or phrases, but the whole sentence, let alone the whole paragraph, chapter or book concerned. Nor does one ask often how the translation that has resulted can be understood as Greek without regard to the Hebrew... It is our firm belief that full justice cannot be done to this important ancient version unless he supplements the traditional atomistic approach by studying it as an independent work in its own right, of course with constant reference to the original text. We further believe that not only the approach being advocated
here supplements the traditional one, but the latter alone could distort the relationship between the Hebrew and Greek forms of the text.4

But perhaps the most significant implication of our conclusion that the LXX of the MP (more particularly Haggai and Malachi) reflects frequent and substantial departures from the translator's Vorlage on the grounds of his particular theological and literary concerns pertains to our estimate of the essential nature of the translation. When a translation does not betray such a hermeneutical character it is quite possible to view it as simply a more or less defective witness to be used in the reconstruction of the translation's Vorlage. However, we have demonstrated that the LXX of Haggai and Malachi is a literary/theological work in its own right. We have illustrated repeatedly in the textual commentary that a close reading of the text brings us face to face with the very interesting thought of the translator himself. As Claude Cox, in "Methodological Issues in the Exegesis of LXX Job" states,

The case for the legitimacy of doing exegesis in the LXX, whether it be LXX Job, LXX Genesis, or the LXX translation of any other book, rests upon the correctness of the assertion that the LXX is a literary achievement in its own right. After all, except for the so-called Apocrypha, the LXX is literature in translation, and exegesis of literature in translation whose parent text is extant surely requires some defense. That defense must be that the LXX, as a collection of documents of Hellenistic Judaism, has had a life of its own, apart from its parent Hebrew text and, as such, gives us access to another world of literary, theological, sociological, and historical insights.5

It is a curious irony in the history of Septuagint scholarship that oftentimes those scholars who explained the differences between the LXX and the MT in terms of translation technique imagined that this explanation served as some sort of vindication of the MT against the rival claims of a usurper— the Vorlage of the LXX.6 But in fact, to the extent that the translation is not merely a more or less defective transmission
of its Vorlage, but actually a literary and theological creation itself, then an enlarged view of the freedom of the translator only accentuates the independent integrity of the Septuagintal books. Although it is outside the scope of this work to explore the theological implications of the authorial integrity of the LXX, it is obvious that viewing the LXX as having its own literary and theological integrity raises interesting questions both theological and historical concerning the place of the LXX as one of several authoritative scriptures among the believing communities which treasure(d) them as such. 7

Whereas the myriad of intentional alterations based apparently on stylistic considerations alone are of some interest and certainly must be understood if one wishes to be able to assess the probability of various suggestions made concerning a differing Vorlage, these modifications are common to virtually all ancient translation and are thus not particularly noteworthy. 8 Furthermore, J. Z. Schuurmans Stekhoven brilliantly discussed such stylistic matters in his excellent work over one hundred years ago. There is no need to rehearse his conclusions or to restate what we have already mentioned in the textual commentary. But inasmuch as few of the past studies of the LXX of the Minor Prophets have treated adequately the issue of the hermeneutical principles behind the oftentimes provocative alterations of meaning observed in the text, it is certainly in order to highlight a few of those principles. We have seen in our treatment of the LXX of Haggai and Malachi that the translator re-shaped the biblical text before him in light of certain interests. These interests include:

1. Eschatological concerns.
There are several evidences that the translator allowed his particular eschatological interests to influence substantially his translation. First,
there is a rather clear intensification of eschatological language in a few passages. Such an intensification seems the most likely explanation of the interesting rendering נָ ונָ as εκ φυλῆς יָוֹדָ (Hag. 1.1, 14; 2.1, 21; Cf. the Greek plus in Hag. 1.12). An interest in the messianic significance of Zerubbabel's relation to the tribe of Judah seems much more likely than a hesitance to refer to him as the "governor of Judah." And this type of typological expansion of Zerubbabel's significance is perhaps continued in the remarkable legend about the contest between the bodyguards of Darius which Zerubbabel wins with his speech about the superior strength of truth in I Esdras 3-4. Furthermore, both Zerubbabel and Joshua attain to a very high place of honor in Sirach 49.11-12, "How shall we magnify Zerubbabel? He was like a signet on the right hand, and so was Jeshua the son of Jozadak; in their days they built the house and raised a temple (some texts read people--ναον/λαον) holy to the Lord prepared for everlasting glory." And there can be no doubt that Joshua is the object of a typological idealization in the LXX of Jer. 23.5-6. For in this explicitly messianic passage the Greek text identifies the Branch not with the Hebrew as ירוהת צדיקנה "Yahweh Our Righteousness"--a word-play on the King's name, Zedekiah, but as Κυρίος Ἰωσεδεκ "Lord Josedek." This is no simple confused double reading. A comparison with the other Branch passages (Zech. 3.8 and Zech. 6.12) removes all doubt that the translator of Jeremiah is identifying the Branch in terms of the priestly line of Joshua's father Josedek. A similar intensification of language which might have eschatological significance is found in Malachi 1.10. There the Hebrew נְ לֵי מְמַכֵּס רָמוּר דֹּלְוִים means "O that someone among you would close the doors." This is merely a hyperbolic statement of wish. The force of the clause in the Greek is very different and suggests a future judgment in which God forcibly closes the doors to the
temple. It might be argued that the translator has interjected a prophetic prediction into the text.

Not only does the LXX of Haggai and Malachi reflect an intensification of language which accentuates certain eschatological interests, it is also the case that the translation reflects a particular interest in the timing of such events. I have argued in the textual commentary that the Hebrew text of Haggai unambiguously links the time of eschatological fulfillment with the reign of Zerubbabel. The Greek, on the other hand, equally unambiguously severs that historical connection and projects the time of fulfillment deep into the reaches of the unknown future. This is quite clearly the impact of the translator’s alteration of the temporal orientation of Hag. 1.9 and 2.6. Similarly, whereas the Hebrew text of Malachi 3.10α concretely relates the time of fulfillment with the bringing in of the tithes, the Greek text severs that link by altering the mood of the verb (Hebrew imperative rendered with a Greek indicative) and by rendering tendentiously ἐκφορεῖος and προθέτησις. Furthermore, 3.10β-11 betray subtle reductions of the eschatological benefits promised in the Hebrew text. Thus the translator has reshaped both the explicit condition of verse 10α and the explicit resulting eschatological blessing of vv. 10β-11. It is also possible that the translator’s view of the uncertainly of the timing of the great day of the Lord is suggested in the anarthrous ἡμέρα as a rendering of ἡμέρα in Mal. 4.1.

2. Historical perspective.

Although it should not be surprising, it is nevertheless interesting to notice that the translator on occasion allows issues or interests of his own day to filter into the ancient text. Evidently he made no sharp
distinction between Biblical history and his own history. Thus, for example, in Mal. 1.4 the Greek παρατετακταί as a rendering of לֶלֶךְ הָנָּה is quite likely a deliberate, albeit subtle intensification of the language against Edom reflecting the advantage of historical perspective on Edom's downfall. There is nothing whatsoever subtle about the vilification of Edom which one confronts in the LXX of Obadiah 13 or in 1 Esdras 4.45. As discussed in the textual commentary, the Greek of Obadiah 13 implicates Edom in direct military complicity in the sacking of Jerusalem. And the passage in 1 Esdras 4 directly states that it was the Edomites who burned the temple in Jerusalem.

There is perhaps a direct reference to the Diaspora in Mal. 1.9. A careful consideration of the typical renderings in the MP suggests that the εἰς παντα τα εθνη for the Hebrew לֶלֶךְ הָנָּה is tendentious. For as we pointed out in the textual commentary, in every other instance in the MP, where εθνος renders לֶלֶךְ, the Hebrew form is plural (Jl. 2.17, Zech. 12.3—And the only comparable constructions (with לֶלֶךְ) are rendered with λαος: Hag. 2.4 παντα τον λαον της γης, Zech. 7.5 = παντα τον λαον της γης). The interests of the translator are also revealed in the unusual rendering of παρειμενους for the Hebrew רָפָעְלוּם. Whereas the Hebrew would surely mean that the priests would be held in contempt by the people of Israel, the Greek would most naturally mean that the priests are neglected by Yahweh in their being scattered throughout the various Gentile nations. This general thought is understood and further intensified by the scribes responsible for the common corrections to various forms of παρειμω (παρα, απο) which stress the fact that Yahweh had cast them off into the various Gentile nations.
And while it is possible that εγκατελείψῃ ουδας for ἐμβρύων in Mal. 2.11 simply represents a breakdown in thought, that is to say nonsense, it is also quite possible that this curious rendering suggests that in the conditions of the Diaspora in which the Jews were dispersed throughout the Gentile nations, this separation from the holy land constituted an abandonment by the people. What is far less uncertain is that the unexpected rendering καὶ επετηθευσεν εἰς Θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους for ἔπελθεν ἄλλης νύν reflects the translator’s interest to distinguish between the foreign women whom many of the Jewish men of the Diaspora had married and the attendant but not necessarily overwhelming religious and philosophical dangers which those marriages might imply. The translator changes the focus through his deletion of the idea of women in Θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους and his deletion of the idea of marriage in επετηθευσεν.

3. Metaphorical language.

The translator demonstrates a bold freedom in his rendering of metaphorical language in his *Vorlage*. It is not particularly noteworthy that the translator altered metaphorical expressions which he found incomprehensible. So in Mal. 2.12 it is not surprising to find what must probably be regarded as the deletion of a curious figurative expression of totality from the text. The rendering εώς καὶ ταπεινωθῇ treats the Hebrew as though it were ἐνράση. Whereas many of the other ancient versions guessed at the meaning of the curious expression in the MT, the translator of the Minor Prophets simply removed the expression from the text with a phonologically and orthographically simple rereading. Clearly all that is involved in the rereading is the vocalization and the reading of
However, there are instances where there is no decisive evidence that the translator did not understand the Hebrew language, rather it appears that he understood it and felt it could be improved. So, for example, in Mal. 3.12 one encounters the unique rendering of καὶ οὐ μὴ σαθένηση ὡς ἡ αμπελός εἰς τῷ αἷμα apparently representing the Hebrew לְאַחַה-הֵשָּׁבֵל לְבָשָׁם בְּשָׁרֶה. Inasmuch as σαθένηση is the standard rendering of בְּשָׁל, it is very likely that the translator employed intentional metathesis and so treated the form as בְּשָׁל. Because this is the only context in the Hebrew Bible which applies the verb בְּשָׁל ("to miscarry") to inanimates, it is quite probable that the translator deemed the metaphorical expression clumsy and chose to rewrite it through metathesis.

In Mal. 4.2 (3.20) σκητήσατε ὡς μοιχαρία ἐκ δεσμῶν ανείμενα apparently renders the Hebrew πεταμός καταβί βρισκόμενον. The connotation of the Greek verb is distinctly different from that of the Hebrew verb. The idea of skipping playfully is not part of the meaning of the Hebrew at all. Thus, while we cannot entirely rule out the translator's ignorance of the Hebrew verb πεταμόν, nor can we absolutely dismiss the possibility of an unintentional confusion with the root דֶבֶשׁ, nevertheless it remains quite likely that the translator boldly focussed the attention of the text on the exuberance of the recently released heifer while the Hebrew firmly fixes the focus on the wicked who are (as it were) under the feet of this heifer. The fundamental force of the simile is entirely altered by the choice of rendering of the verb.

In Mal. 3.10 one finds that καὶ εἰκασώ ὡς τὴν εὐλογίαν μου ἐως ἱκανωθήσαι is apparently rendering ἰερείας ἱλασμὸς οἱ ἀνθρώποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων. A
straightforward reading of the Hebrew would suggest that Yahweh is promising that He would give to the very limits of His resources. The translator of the Greek entirely alters the bold expression by rendering the text as though there were no negative בֵּלַי. It seems very likely that the translator found the Hebrew expression excessively bold at a theological or philosophical level. Perhaps to his mind, what was lost in his translation in terms of rhetorical force was more than adequately compensated through what was gained by theological/philosophical precision. This change is closely related to a host of alterations which pertain to the translator’s reverential concerns.

4. Reverential concerns.

As was the case with metaphorical language, the sensibilities of the translator deeply influence his treatment of the text even in those instances where he is in less than full command of his Vorlage. So for example, in Mal. 3.9 it is very likely that the translator was not familiar with נָרַגְל in the Niphal, inasmuch as this is its only occurrence. Thus, suspecting that נָרַגְל did double-duty between 9a and 9b, he wrongly imagined that the text implied an affront to the divine majesty. Through intentional metathesis and the deletion of the י of נָרַגְל, he created a new text which instead of the דַּלְעַג נָרַגְל of his Vorlage (same as the MT) read בֵּסֶרָה נָרַגְל רַאִים = καὶ αποβλέποντες μὴις αποβλέπετε.

The translator's modification of the text on reverential grounds can occur not only when the specifics of the Hebrew are in question but also when the translator has perhaps a mistaken view of the general sense of a passage. In Mal. 2.10, the translator imagining that the "one father" is either Abraham or Jacob, deemed it more reverent to show preference to
God the creator through the alteration of the order of the clauses.

In Mal. 3.10 and again in 3.15 one observes tendentious translations away from the clear suggestion of the Hebrew that a man is able to "test" (נְצָמֵח) Yahweh. In 3.10 one finds επισκέψασθε δὲ ἐν τούτῳ which involves a substantial semantic shift and the deletion of the personal pronoun. In 3.15 we encounter the rather inexplicable καὶ αντεστησαν θεω for בּוֹ הַחַתֹּם אֶלְעָהוֹ.

In Mal. 1.7, the Greek question ἐν τίνι ἡλικιασμεν autous should be regarded as evidence of the translator's unwillingness to let the reading of his Vorlage stand. For the Hebrew בְּאֶלְעָהו quite clearly has Yahweh as the object of the verb. And the widespread versional support of the Hebrew plus the obvious greater difficulty of the MT tell against a reconstructed original בְּאֶלְעָהו (as recommended by BHS). In like manner the LXX reads with the MT against a supposed blasphemous original in the case of the altered text of verse 13 (Cf. the discussion of the Tiqqune Sopherim in Chapter 2).

5. Miscellaneous theological interests.

The translator reveals a number of other theological interests which seemed to function as hermeneutical lenses through which he read the ancient text. At times his shaping of the text seems to reflect his dissatisfaction with the sense of his Vorlage. At other times there is no evidence of his being at odds with the meaning of the Hebrew, rather he just seems to use certain passages as a platform from which he presents his views on the subject concerned. In certain contexts, the translator seems interested to expand the problem of sin. So for example, In Hag. 2.14, the Hebrew states that "everything which they offer there is
unclean” which the translator alters to state “and whoever draws near there, he will be defiled because of...” Whereas the הֶנְדָעַל might have represented a certain ambiguity, the rendering of the Hiphil הַכָּרִים with the usually intransitive יְעַקַּט clearly is tendentious and represents the translator’s view on the deadly contagion of uncleanness. In a similar way, one finds an extremely complicated and subtle rewriting of Mal. 3.6-7 which results in the Greek text actually juxtaposing and by implication comparing the changelessness of Yahweh with the persistent sin of the people (οὐκ ἀπέχεσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἁδικίων λατρεύειν). Although the Greek text departs from the meaning of the Hebrew completely, there is evidence that the whole reshaping of the passage derives quite directly from the translator’s interest not to contradict his reading of 3.9 τὸ εἷνος συνετέλεσθαι. (On the translator’s interest to accentuate the sinfulness of the people, compare the discussion of Mal. 1.1 and the references to Zech. 1 in f. n. *2). It is interesting to note that the translator is not content to accentuate the sinfulness of the people in general terms alone, but that he manages to interject his specific conjecture that certain women are probably very much behind the trouble referred to in Mal. 2. He makes this opinion known through his unparalleled feminine renderings of דְּנָו יְסֵפִים = τὰς φαρμάκους and דְּנָו יְסֵפִים = τὰς μακαλίδας in Mal. 3.6.

Although it is very difficult to determine precisely which Greek/Hebrew differences in Mal. 3.16 derive from the translator himself and which were in his Hebrew Vorlage, it does nevertheless seem likely that he had some part in the reshaping of the passage. And the Greek of the passage is completely recast by the statement ταῦτα κατελαλήσαν ὁ θεὸς φόβουμενοι τὸν κυρίον. This statement puts the previous verse in the
mouths of the faithful Jews (perhaps sharp irony ?) and thereby obliterates an innerjudische distinction implicit in the MT. And although we have marshalled a few arguments in favor of the position that taunt derives from ὡν ἱέρα from which the MT’s ἢν is a corruption, thus removing this critical MT/LXX difference beyond the translator to his Vorlage, nevertheless there are numerous other differences in the passage which probably represent the input of the translator. Clearly the general septuagintal slant of the passage is supported by the very interesting ὅτι / αλλοτριους, αλλογενεῖς renderings which do not likely derive from a different Vorlage. And there is a very similar passage in Zeph. 3.14-17 where it is quite clear that the translator is at pains to spiritualize and universalize the description of a coming restoration. The result once again is to obliterate an innerjudische distinction and to democratize the sinfulness of the people. Compare Zeph. 3.11 where instead of removing "those who proudly exalt themselves" ἡσιών άναιδες ἀνειλομένη, Yahweh removes "your arrogant acts of contempt" τα φαιλισματα της υβρεως σου. See my analysis of the passage under the discussion of the ἡμερείε of Hag. 2.5.

Notwithstanding the translator’s apparent interest to democratize the problem of sin, there is observed a contrary impulse to exempt the prophet Malachi from the sins of the people in a way which the Hebrew text does not support. So for example, in Mal. 1.9 the Greek text in addition to rendering tendentiously the verb as though it were in the Hithpael rather than the Qal stem also deletes the first person plural pronominal suffix. And once again, the general slant of the LXX is accentuated by later scribes in their introduction of a doublet which again emphasizes the second person-- ἵνα ελέησεν μοι. See Sf. L’ 407, 576, 613, 770, 233', Bo, Th., Tht. Furthermore, in Mal. 2.11 the Greek’s τι στι
eukateleipete ekastos tou adelphon auton appears to be a similarly-intentioned alteration of the Hebrew מְדוּזֵת נַבְנֵד אֵלִישֶׁבָּא הָדוֹrites. It is perhaps the case that the translator is involved in a subtle idealization of the prophet much like the idealization which we earlier mentioned concerning Zerubbabel and Joshua.

It must also be mentioned that the translator regularly introduces slight changes into the text which he imagines make minor logical or conceptual improvements to the text. So for example, in Hag. 1:8 ἀναβητε επι το ορος και κοιμητε ξυλα is surely a sharpening of the logic of τελευτα των θρων των βασιλεων των θρων. Inasmuch as the reconstructed Vorlage is unlikely both in terms of Hebrew idiom and in terms of Greek renderings of that verb, it is much more likely that the translator is simply clarifying that before one could bring wood it would have to be cut.

In Hag. 2:22 one finds the rather insubstantial metonymical shift from the idea of "kingdoms" to that of "kings". This type of shift is of course minor rather than substantial and can go either direction. Cf. Zephaniah 3:8 μεσανοτ/ βασιλεις.

In Mal. 2:5, the Greek και απο προσωπου ονοματος μου στελλεσθαι auton as a rendering of לְמֶלָּת יֶשׁפֵּית לְמָתָר אָמוֹר probably represents the translator’s interest to make concrete that which in the Hebrew is quite abstract. And this modification also nicely coheres with another idea in the text. For this standing aloof in reverential fear is a perfect contrast to the priests of Malachi’s day who are brazenly coming before Yahweh with all sorts of defective offerings. In the textual commentary I have suggested very many similar instances where it is quite probable that the translator makes subtle literary and logical modifications of this nature to the text.
6. The extensive use of tendentious palaeographical exegesis.

One of the most striking aspects of the translator's treatment of his text pertains not so much to the various ideas which he introduces into the text but rather to the method by which he introduces his modifications. The translator's dominant hermeneutical principle with respect to his modus operandi is that he regularly employs tendentious palaeographical exegesis. The realization of this method of translation is critical for a proper assessment of the text. For it was surely the inattentiveness of many previous scholars to this translational technique which led to their making a fantastic number of unconvincing suggestions about the LXX's supposed "differing Vorlage." For many text critics, the origin of the difference between the MT and the LXX was known and decisively demonstrated if one could reconstruct a Hebrew text which would be quite naturally translated as the Greek of the passage, especially when the suggested Vorlage bore some measure of palaeographical or phonological resemblance to the Hebrew of the MT. For this resemblance served as a proof of how easily such a variant might have come about in the transmission of the ancient Hebrew texts. However, there is mounting evidence that paronomastic concerns were a common feature of ancient exegesis and translation technique. The methodological significance of this dawning awareness and growing consensus could scarcely be exaggerated.

Paronomasia in ancient translation and exegesis.

The Samaritan Targum has recently been described as reflecting both an almost "slavish" devotion to the Hebrew text while yet betraying numerous "subtle midrashic interpretations beyond the apparently mechanical translations." Abraham Tal offers several suggestive
illustrations of instances where earlier scholars might have suspected that the text had fallen into grotesque blunders when in fact the text was highly yet subtly midrashic in character. He states:

Thus, in Gen 41:2 TO3 נזח , 'they feed in the reed grass', is translated by י as ח נ , 'brother' ( נ supra) in Aramaic: apparently, the targum has misunderstood the vocable ח נ , 'reed grass' and, ascribing it to ח נ , created a 'grotesque blunder', שלימד, which imitates the Hebrew model attaching a final ש to השלימד. On closer examination, the echo of a midrash can be detected, as the one formulated in Genesis Rabba 99:4 (p. 1090-91) מזח בנה נשה החסנה ימחח הרוח כנות נחלום יחלחלו... getName... getName -- love and fraternity reside in the world'. Consequently, the final ש is not an imitation of the Hebrew original but the well-known termination of the Aramaic nomine abstracta transforming ח נ , 'brother', into ח נ , according to the midrashic interpretation of ח נ . This kind of 'concealed' midrash is quite frequent in the various manuscripts of the Samaritan Targum.12

Tal also lists numerous fascinating instances where phonetic or morphological changes led to peculiar interpretations.13

On the translation technique of the Jewish Aramaic targums, Philip Alexander offers some interesting discussion of "treatment of anthropomorphism," "actualisation," "doublets," "associative translation," "complementary translation" and "converse translation."14 He also offers a detailed and fascinating discussion of the Targum's treatment of Canticles 5.16. He states:

At first sight the targum appears untrammeled. Closer analysis suggests that behind it lies a disciplined and exact exegesis of the biblical text. Each element in the original is taken as a symbol or cypher to be decoded and arranged in a coherent story, within the broad hermeneutical perspective that the text is an allegorical statement about God's relationship to Israel through Tora. Canticles 5:13 illustrates the method. 'Cheeks' (ן aupayim) in the Hebrew is interpreted, on the basis of similarity of sound, as alluding to the 'two tablets (נהות) of the Law'. But how can the tablets of the Law
be like 'a bed of spices'? The comparison must be between the orderly rows of plants in the herb-garden, and the lines of writing on the tablets. The meturgeman’s interpretation of the next word seems to turn on a repointing: for the masoretic *migdālot* he reads *mīgdālot* ‘producing’. *Merqāhîm* is then given a twofold sense: literally as ‘spices’, and allegorically as the ‘subtleties of the Law’. Hence: ‘The Law produces subtleties, just as a herb-garden produces spices’. God’s ‘lips’ are taken naturally as referring to his spokesmen, the Sages, and the ‘myrrh’ which flows from the lips as the pronouncements of the Sages on matters of Law.¹⁵

Concerning the Old Latin translations, Benjamin Kedar mentions several fascinating interpretational modifications of the text, and cautions that the perception of these alterations will depend on an almost microscopic reading of the text. As he states,

> Given the extreme literalism of the version under review, one must not expect any glaring instances of hermeneutics as are found e.g. in some of the Aramaic targums. One has to read between the line, so to speak, in order to perceive echoes of exegetical traditions; in other words, the minute details of lexical equivalents and idiomatic renderings in each single verse have to be scrutinized.¹⁶

Concerning the Vulgate, Kedar points out the intentionality of several of Jerome’s ”mistaken etymologies.” He states,

> What then shall we make of the alleged mistaken renderings and errors in Jerome’s translation? To begin with, most of the so-called mistakes, if not all, commonly adduced are definitely not blunders but conscientiously chosen renderings in agreement with philological notions current in his times. Indeed, it is easy to find support for his renderings in Jewish versions and commentaries. As we shall return to this question later, suffice it to adduce an example or two.

As is well known, Jerome derived the verb *qrn* (Exod 34:29) not from *qeren* ‘a ray’, but from *qeren* ‘horn’, and thus aided in creating the image of a ‘horned’ Moses: his face was horned *(cornuta)*. This, however, is not a haphazard rendering: Jerome could have copied the LXX (‘glorified’), had he wanted it. Yet his way of translating is a replica of Aquila’s etymologizing rendition and was meant as a glorification of Moses: horns are the insignia of might and majesty *(6, 321; 4, 68)*. Jerome overlooking the homonym presents the usual
costa ‘a rib’ for semblies’ (Job 18:12) instead of ‘a fall, ruin’ (calamity is ready for his ruin). Yet Jerome elsewhere knew how to translate the homonym correctly: *plaga* (Ps. 38:10).17

It seems that in general, textual scholars are now being more cautious in their assessments of textual diversity. It is now frequently judged to be precarious to decide that an unexpected or divergent reading is an unintentional error or reflects a differing Vorlage until one has seriously considered and decided against the possibility that there is some sort of intentional alteration or word-play involved. A very similar cautious attitude can now be found among some of the scrolls specialists. So, for example, we encounter an article like that recently written by George J. Brooke, entitled “The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?”18 In this article Dr. Brooke argues very persuasively that a very considerable number of variants found in the Qumran commentaries are by design and do not reflect real textual variants. He agrees with Talmon that the general textual picture is such that there is “a blurring of the distinctions between higher and lower criticism.” Brooke states,

Furthermore, as part of the dissolution of the boundaries between criticism, text critics must allow that to discern an example of homoioateleuton or letter-change or some other particular phenomenon which the handbooks usually label as scribal errors may be to miss the deliberate editing of a text in one tradition or another.19

Brooke has anticipated my conclusion. It is my contention that the numerous suggestions of old which explained the differences between the LXX and the MT of Haggai and Malachi in terms of a different Vorlage blinded scholars to the family likeness of said differences. Imagining that the differences were individual and accidental corruptions at different stages in the transmission of the ancient Hebrew text, scholars
did not see that the differences coalesced into a pattern and that this pattern revealed the particular interests of the Greek translator. There has been a long-lived resistance to the idea that the believing community might have handled its sacred texts with such freedom. Some have imagined that such an approach to the text would necessarily imply a low estimate of the text's worth or authority. And yet, we have observed in the LXX of Haggai and Malachi a painstaking reworking of the text. There is nothing casual or flippant about the treatment whatsoever. The text is the product of a careful, indeed scholarly theological process. Certainly the translator revered his inherited text (whatever its precise delimitations?). But to the ancient translator, the authoritative text could be none other than the inherited text as received and apprehended by the believing community. As Greer notes,

We tend to think of an original sense, understood historically, and to regard theological interpretation as a departure from the true meaning of the text. Nothing could be farther from the point of view of religious writers in late antiquity. Pagan, Jew, and Christian were united in assuming the general correlation of sacred texts with the beliefs and practices of religious communities. Scripture represented the authority for those beliefs and practices, but at the same time the religious convictions of the community unveiled the true meaning of Scripture. Far from supplying a new meaning, the transformations of sacred books disclosed their true significance.
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However, it must be stressed that the Greek of the Minor Prophets never
ties the time of fulfillment to any specific period. One looks in vain for
any evidence that the translator regarded his own day as the time of
fulfillment.

Tov's discussion of this issue, “Excursus 2: Tendentious
Palaeographical Exegesis” (pp. 155-58 in Text-Critical Use) is altogether
one-sided. It is surely misleading to focus only on difficulties involved
in viewing the text this way, and to offer no suggestive illustrations of
its clear existence. The serious deficiency of the treatment is nicely
remedied in his discussion of “Pseudo-variants” on pp. 228-240. Tov
defines what he means by “pseudo-variants” on p. 228. He states, “The
preceding sections describe deviations in the LXX which reflect either
variants or non-variants. The deviations to be discussed here reflect a
peculiar combination of a variant and a non-variant. They are variants
insofar as the deviations can easily be retroverted into Hebrew on the
basis of Greek-Hebrew equivalents occurring elsewhere. They are
non-variants insofar as the retroverted readings presumably were not
found in the translator’s Vorlage, but existed only in his mind.”

So Abraham Tal in “The Samaritan Targum” in Jan Mulder and
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In Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of
William Hugh Brownlee, ed. by Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring
It remains to be proved just how much of the Hebrew text the translator inherited. Was it a consonantal skeleton, or was it fleshed out with a learned full-blown system of vocalization? The distinction between the inherited text and the apprehended text has a concrete and graphic illustration in the ancient Hebrew OT if there was no accompanying system of vocalization. Tov has a very good discussion of the question and the scholarly debate. See esp. *Text-Critical Use* pp. 159-174. Concerning the translator's acquaintance with an inherited tradition of reading the text, he states,

They certainly were not acquainted with all the details of vocalization, but, apart from some significant exceptions to be discussed below, they recognized its main features. (p. 162)

I have not in this study made any assumptions concerning either the extent of an inherited system of vocalization or if there were one the extent of its agreement with the MT. I do not think there is enough evidence to warrant speculation in these matters at the present time. I have pointed out one detail of vocalization in Zech. 8 (pp. 63-5) which might be behind an abrupt (and contextually inappropriate shift change) and one possible illustration of mistranslation based on the MT's vocalization in Zeph. 2.14 (p. 66). Instances of mistranslation based on the vocalization are important as evidence that the translator felt responsible to deal with more than a consonantal skeleton. But of course it cannot simply be assumed nor is it at all likely that any vocalization system inherited was identical with the MT. But it is often imagined that the amount of apparent deviation from the MT with respect to vocalization is so much greater than the amount of deviation at the level of the consonants that it is fairly sure that the text either had no vocalization system or had one very different from the MT. But it is perhaps fair to raise the question, if a translation has been shown to betray extensive paronomastic liberty, would it not be likely that such liberty would be operative even more extensively in the known but unwritten vocalization system?
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