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PREFACE

The title of this dissertation may seem to be more comprehensive than its contents. If so, this has come about because the scope of the investigation of necessity has been narrowed (or restricted) progressively as the author proceeded in his study.

Many points of interest either have been omitted entirely or else have been alluded to very briefly. Some of these are: the intermediary agencies between God and man; phases of the cultic worship; the attitude of the adherents of Judaism toward the kingdoms of Israel and Judah and the surrounding nations; the Hebrew text used by the translators; the exegetical principles of the translators; the relationship to other Jewish writings of the period; the problem of the authorship, date, etc., of the translations; and the type of script found in the translators' documents.

The subjects and passages which are discussed in this thesis have been chosen from the numerous subjects and passages which the author compiled in making a comparison of the Greek and Aramaic translations, individually, with the Masoretic Text as found in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*¹. The Aramaic Text used, unless otherwise indicated, is the one

found in Lagarde's *Propheatae Chaldaicae*. The Greek text, usually, is taken from Ziegler's *Duodecim Prophetae*, although at times Swete's or Rahlfs' Septuagint are used. The references to Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus are usually from Ziegler or else from Field's *Origenis Hexapolorum*.

Not always have the subjects, and illustrative passages which follow, been discussed in full detail. In many instances an exhaustive investigation of all pertinent passages soon proved to be fruitless because it became apparent that no consistent theological bias could be established. In certain instances, however, all of the appropriate passages are discussed, either because a comprehensive investigation was warranted to establish or disprove the existence of a theological bias on the part of the translator(s) or else in order to illustrate the fruitlessness of such a complete investigation in every instance. A partial, yet fairly complete, list of passages which were

---


2Ziegler, Joseph: *Duodecim Prophetae (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum XIII)* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and nuprecht, 1943.


5Field, Fred: *Origenis Hexapolorum* Oxonii: E Typographoe Clarendoniano, 1875. 2 Vols.
considered at one time or another for discussion in this dissertation is found in the Introduction.

One more fact should be noted. The determination of possible anti-anthropomorphisms when comparing the Septuagint (or Targum) with the Masoretic Text is very subjective. In many instances this investigator has vacillated in his opinion whether certain translations should be considered as possible anti-anthropomorphisms or not. He also has varied his opinion from time to time as to how fully to treat every anthropomorphic concept discussed in this thesis. The practical limitations of space and this subjective element may have caused this investigator to treat too briefly a given concept or to omit entirely certain passages and anthropomorphic concepts.
SPECIAL NOTE ON PUNCTUATION, GRAMMAR, AND TRANSLATION

This investigator was taught punctuation and grammar in America in a period of transition during which the system of punctuation changed. Consequently, his punctuation seemingly is not consistent and does not agree with either the older system of punctuation or the present system. In a few places\(^1\) he has consulted American authorities to determine what is the correct current procedure. This was, of course, impossible to do in every instance.

The investigator realizes the disadvantage of the above situation, and he also recognizes the additional misfortune of being unfamiliar with the British system of grammar and punctuation. He hopes, nevertheless, that those who read this dissertation will not be inconvenienced too greatly because of this.

The investigator usually has used for his translation of the Masoretic Text, *The Holy Bible Revised Standard Version* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1952), and for his translation of the Septuagint, *Pells, S. F. (ed.), The Old Covenant Commonly Called the Old Testament Translated from the Septuagint by Charles Thomson* (London: Skeffington and Son, 1914). Unfortunately no English translation of the Targum was

\(^1\) For example, the quotations on pages 11, 52, 73, 97, 207, 229, and 316. An example of an instance where current American grammatical authorities were consulted occurs on page 44.
available. Hence the translations cited are at times based on those given by commentators\textsuperscript{1} or are at times his own compared with the Latin translation of the Aramaic\textsuperscript{2}. In the last instance his translation may be of an alternate text or may be a rather free rendering.

The investigator, moreover, has been compelled to utilize four Hebrew and three Greek typewriters to insert the Greek, Aramaic, and Hebrew characters. His language typists have been so slow and inaccurate that the typing has taken about a year and has necessitated his printing some characters by hand.

\textsuperscript{1}E.g., Jonah 3:9, page 319.

\textsuperscript{2}E.g., Zephaniah 3:7, page 315.
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Although this thesis is mainly concerned with the two earliest translations of the Hebrew Bible, the author fully recognizes that the nature, character, and reliability of our received text, i.e., the Masoretic Text, is of supreme importance. Fortunately, today, the essential reliability of the Masoretic Text is accepted by most scholars. Sometimes, however, this unquestioning acceptance has been pushed almost beyond the bounds of credibility. For the purpose of this investigation, however, there are very few instances where, as a starting point at least, the received Hebrew Text may not be accepted as it is for the basis of making comparison with the Greek and Aramaic Versions.

The basic concern of this thesis is with the anti-anthropomorphic tendencies which may be observed clearly in the Targum and which have long been assumed to be present also in the Septuagint. This anti-anthropomorphic tendency arose in Judaism as the Jewish people gained in knowledge and as their zealous devotion to the worship of the One Transcendent, Holy Being increased. The changes introduced, directly or indirectly, in the main were concerned with an attempt to avoid the ascription of the grosser anthropomorphic\(^1\) qualities to Deity.

\(^1\)Used here in the very broadest possible sense -- including the ascription to Deity of any physical or emotional likeness to any created thing, animate or inanimate.
1. DIRECT LIKENESS TO MANKIND

Frequently, in the Book of the Twelve, God is said to be like (רו) men. No passage occurs which precisely states that God is a man, and one passage clearly states that He is not man. Yet the characteristics of humanity are implied when God is likened to a farmer or is said to sow, plant, feed, or shepherd (tend).

This anthropomorphism is felt strongly when people call God "the husband" of Israel, when Israel is called His wife, and when He says that He will betroth Israel to Himself. This picturization also is seen in attributing a nephesh (personality) and a spirit to God, and to a lesser extent an anthropomorphic tendency is noted when He is described as

---

1 Malachi 3:17 (יהוה).
2 Hosea 11:9 (יהוה) -- an anti-anthropomorphism.
3 Hosea 11:4.
4 Hosea 2:25(23); Zechariah 10:9 (יהוה).
5 Amos 9:15 (יהוה).
6 Hosea 11:4 (יהוה); Hosea 4:16 (יהוה).
7 Micah 7:14 (יהוה).
8 Hosea 2:4(2),9(7),13(16) (יהוה).
9 Hosea 2:4(2), (יהוה).
10 Hosea 2:21(19)‡ (יהוה).
11 Amos 6:8; Zechariah 11:8 (יהוה).
12 Micah 2:7; 3:8; Haggai 2:5 (יהוה); cf. Joel 3:1(2:28); 2(2:29); Zechariah 4:6; 6:8; 7:12.
being a father\(^1\) (and disciplines\(^2\)), a judge\(^3\) (or that He judges\(^4\)), a master\(^5\), a king\(^6\) (or that He reigns\(^7\)), and a witness\(^8\) (or that he testifies\(^9\)).

Moreover, God is described as being wearied\(^10\), working\(^11\), fighting\(^12\), riding\(^13\), inheriting\(^14\) (and having an inheritance\(^15\)), refining\(^16\), trying\(^17\) (metal), and purify-

\(^1\)Malachi 1:6 ( הבש ).
\(^2\)Hosea 7:12,15(14); 10:10 ( המיס ). Hosea 5:2 ( ומית ).
\(^3\)Hosea 1:4; 2:15(13); 4:9,14; 12:3(2); Amos 3:2; 14; Zephaniah 1:8; 9,12; 3:7; Zechariah 10:3 ( לי舷 + ל = punish).
\(^4\)Micah 4:14(5:1) ( שלש ).
\(^5\)Joel 4(3); 2; 12; Micah 4:3 ( שלש ); cf. Micah 4:3; Habakkuk 1:12 ( יהושע ).
\(^6\)Hosea 12:15; Micah 4:13; Zechariah 4:14; 6:5; Malachi 1:6; 3:1 ( זכרונא ).
\(^7\)Zechariah 14:9,16,17; Malachi 1:14 ( מעלי ).
\(^8\)Micah 4:7 ( מלך ).
\(^9\)Micah 1:2; Malachi 3:5 ( עון ).
\(^10\)Malachi 2:14 ( רוד ).
\(^12\)Habakkuk 3:2 ( טל ).
\(^13\)Zechariah 14:3 (anan ).
\(^14\)Habakkuk 3:8 ( חרב ).
\(^16\)Zechariah 13:9; Malachi 3:2,3 ( זכר ).
\(^17\)Zechariah 13:9; Malachi 3:10,15 ( זכרא ).
2. ASCRIBING TO GOD PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

In the Twelve God is referred to as having many of the parts of the human body. He is described as having a mouth and, consequently, is able to eat, blow a trumpet, blow, and hiss (whistle). Moreover, He is said to possess a voice and, therefore, He speaks, answers, calls, declares, swears, curses, and the like (but at times

---

1Malachi 3:3 (יֵרָם).

2Here and hereafter the Twelve means the Minor Prophets or the Book of the Twelve Prophets.

3Hosea 6:5; Micah 4:4 (יָם).

4Hosea 13:8 (יֵאֵש).

5Zechariah 9:14 (עִקָּמ).

6Haggai 1:9 (יַעֲמ).

7Zechariah 10:8 (יַעֲש).

8Joel 2:11; 4(3):16; Amos 1:2; Micah 6:9; Haggai 1:12; Zechariah 6:15 (יָד).

9Hosea 12:11; Joel 4(3):8; Amos 3:1,8; Obadiah 18; Micah 4:4; Habakkuk 2:1 (יַד); cf. Habakkuk 9:2 (יַעֲש).

10Hosea 2:23(21); 14:9; Joel 2:19; Jonah 2:3; Micah 3:4; Habakkuk 2:2; Zechariah 1:13; 10:6; 13:9 (יָעַב); cf. Micah 3:7 (יָעַב).

11Hosea 11:1; Joel 3:5(2:32); Amos 5:8; 7:4; 9:6; Micah 6:9; Haggai 1:11; Zechariah 7:7,13 (יָרָד).

12Amos 4:13; Zechariah 9:12 (יִד, hiphil).

13Amos 4:2; 6:8; 8:7; Micah 7:20 (יָשָׁב).

14Malachi 2:2 (יָרָד).
may be silent\(^1\).  

In the Twelve, God is said to possess a face\(^2\) and eyes\(^3\). Therefore, He can see\(^4\). Moreover, the word for nose (ης) is used always with the metaphorical sense of anger to describe God, although the sense of smelling\(^5\) may not be denied to Him.

He also may have shoulders (or arms\(^6\)) and hands\(^7\). Hence, He can write\(^8\), strike (smite\(^9\) or pierce\(^10\)), hurl (cast\(^11\),

\(^1\) Habakkuk 1:13; Zephaniah 3:17 (ἦν).
\(^2\) Hosea 5:15; 6:2; 7:2; Jonah 1:2, 3, 10; Micah 3:4; Nahum 1:5; Habakkuk 2:20; 3:5; Zephaniah 1:7; Haggai 1:12; 2:14; Zechariah 2:17(13); 7:2; 8:21, 22; Malachi 1:9; 3:1, 14, 16 (ἦν).
\(^3\) Hosea 13:14; Amos 9:3, 4, 8; Jonah 2:5; Habakkuk 1:13; Zechariah 4:10; 8:6; 9:1, 8; 12:4; Malachi 2:17 (ἦν).
\(^4\) Hosea 6:10; 9:10; Jonah 3:10; Habakkuk 1:13; 3:6; Zechariah 9:8 (ἦν); Amos 5:22; Habakkuk 1:13 (ἦν); Zephaniah 3:15; Malachi 2:13 (ἦν); Hosea 13:7; 14:9(8) (ἦν).
\(^5\) Amos 5:21 (ἦν).
\(^6\) Hosea 11:3 (ἦν).
\(^7\) Hosea 2:12(10); Amos 1:8; 7:7; 9:2; Micah 5:9(8)?; Habakkuk 3:4; Zephaniah 1:4; 2:13; Zechariah 2:13(9); 13:7 (ἦν).
\(^8\) Hosea 8:12 (ἦν).
\(^9\) Hosea 6:1; Amos 3:15; 4:9; Zechariah 12:4 (ἦν); Zechariah 14:12, 18 (ἦν).
\(^10\) Habakkuk 3:14 (ἦν).
\(^11\) Jonah 1:4 (ἦν); Zechariah 7:14 (ἦν); Jonah 2:4; Micah 7:19; Nahum 3:6 (ἦν - hiphil).
touch\(^1\); and shake (one's hand)\(^2\). Likewise, He has feet\(^3\) and is capable of standing\(^4\) and treading\(^5\) (tramping). He also has a heart\(^6\).

In the Twelve God is not described specifically as having ears, but the Masoretic Text states that He can hear\(^7\). Likewise there is no direct statement that He has an intellect, but His possession of an intellect or mind certainly is assumed when it states that God knows\(^8\), remembers\(^9\), forgets\(^10\), thinks\(^11\), (and, therefore, has thoughts\(^12\) and a counsel\(^13\)), and the like.

3. ACTIONS OF GOD WHICH IMPLY HUMAN OR PHYSICAL FORM

---

\(^1\) Amos 9:5; Zechariah 2:12(8) (עמע ).

\(^2\) Zechariah 2:13(9) (🚻 ).

\(^3\) Nahum 1:3; Habakkuk 3:5; Zechariah 14:4 (יונא ).

\(^4\) For these, see under place.

\(^5\) Amos 4:13; Micah 1:3; Habakkuk 3:15; Zechariah 9:13 (יונא ).

\(^6\) Hosea 11:8 (בלי).

\(^7\) Amos 5:23; Jonah 2:3; Micah 7:7; Habakkuk 1:2; Zephaniah 2:8; Zechariah 7:13; Malachi 3:16 (מעש ); Malachi 3:16 (מעש ).

\(^8\) Hosea 5:3, 9; 8:4; 13:5; Amos 3:2; 5:12; Nahum 1:7 (מע ).

\(^9\) Hosea 7:2; 8:19; 9:9; Habakkuk 3:2 (ירבד).

\(^10\) Hosea 4:6; Amos 8:7 ( למשל).

\(^11\) Jonah 1:6 (מע ); Micah 2:3 (מע ).

\(^12\) Amos 4:13 (מע ); Micah 4:12 (מע ).

\(^13\) Micah 4:12 (מע ?).
In many places God is described as saving or delivering\(^1\), being a saviour\(^2\), producing salvation\(^3\), and defending\(^4\). He also spreads out\(^5\), hews\(^6\), breaks\(^7\), sells\(^8\), shows\(^9\), engraves\(^10\), hedges\(^11\), walls up\(^12\), heals\(^13\), gathers\(^14\), and finds\(^15\).

4. ACTIONS OF MEN TOWARDS GOD WHICH ARE ANTHROPOMORPHIC

IN THEIR IMPLICATIONS

---

1 Hosea 2:11(9); Zechariah 11:6 (יָנָה - hiphil); Hosea 1:7; 13:4; Habakkuk 1:2; Zephaniah 3:17, 19; Zechariah 8:7, 13; 9:9, 18; 10:6; 12:7 (יָנָה).

2 Micah 7:7; Habakkuk 3:18 (יָנָה).

3 Habakkuk 3:13 (יָנָה).


5 Hosea 7:12; Zechariah 2:10(6) (יָנָה); Zephaniah 1:4; 2:13; Zechariah 12:1; cf. Hosea 11:4 (incline) - (יָנָה).

6 Hosea 6:6(5) (סבנ).

7 Nahum 1:6 (יתנ); Hosea 10:2 (יתנ); Hosea 1:5; 2:20 (יתנ); Amos 1:5; Nahum 1:13 (סבנ); cf. Habakkuk 3:9 (סבנ = "cleave").

8 Joel 4(3):8 (סבנ).

9 Hosea 11:3 (וה - hiphil); Hosea 10:12; Micah 4:2; cf. Hosea 6:3 (סבנ); Amos 7:1, 4, 7; 8:1; Micah 7:15; Nahum 3:5; Habakkuk 1:3; Zechariah 2:3(1:20); 3:1 (יָנָה - hiphil).

10 Zechariah 3:9 (יָנָה).

11 Hosea 2:6(6) (יָנָה).

12 Hosea 2:8(6); Amos 9:11 (יָנָה).

13 Hosea 6:1; 7:1; 11:3; 14:5 (יָנָה).

14 Micah 2:12(11); 4:6; Zephaniah 3:8, 18; Zechariah 14:2 (יָנָה); Hosea 8:10; Joel 4(3):2; Micah 2:12; 4:6, 12; Zephaniah 3:8, 19, 20; Zechariah 10:8, 10 (יָנָה).

15 Hosea 9:10 (יָנָה).
Generally, these actions imply physical form, personality, and the like, but a few imply that God has certain parts of the human body. Thus, in order for men to hear God, the implication is that He possesses a mouth and/or a voice, and for man to be able to call or cry to God assumes that He has ears with which to hear their cries.

Usually these actions of men towards God ascribe a visible, physical form to Him. Thus to see God, to lean or take refuge in Him; to seek God; to meet Him; to approach Him, to depart from Him, to go after Him.

---

1. Zechariah 1:4; 7:11 (עֵד); Hosea 9:17; Amos 8:11; Micah 6:1; Habakkuk 3:2; Zechariah 1:4; 7:11 (וֹדֶשׁ).
2. Hosea 2:18(16); 7:7; Joel 1:19; 3:5(2:32); Jonah 1:6,14; 2:3; 3:8; Zechariah 7:13; 13:9 (עַלְפִּי).
3. Hosea 7:14; Joel 1:14; Jonah 1:5; Micah 3:4; Habakkuk 1:2 (פֵּדַע).
4. Zechariah 12:10 (עַלְפִּי); Amos 9:1; Habakkuk 3:10; Zechariah 9:14; Malachi 3:2 (מַעְלֶה); Micah 7:7 (מַעְלֶה).
7. Hosea 10:12; Amos 5:4,6; Zephaniah 1:6 (שָׁמַר); Hosea 3:5; 5:6,15; 7:10; Zephaniah 1:6; 2:3; Zechariah 9:21f; Malachi 3:1 (שָׁמַר).
8. Amos 4:12 (שָׁמַר).
10. Hosea 1:2 (מַעְלֶה); Hosea 7:13 (שָׁמַר); cf. Hosea 4:10 (עֵד); Hosea 12:1 (11:12 - שָׁמַר); Hosea 2:7(5)?; 3:37; 4:10?,12,13,14,15,16; 5:3; 9:1 (מַעְלֶה).
11. Hosea 2:9(7); 11:10; Micah 6:8 (לַעַת).
Kim, to rebel\textsuperscript{1}, transgress\textsuperscript{2}, be treacherous\textsuperscript{3} towards God, or be against God\textsuperscript{4} — all these imply that He is a person with a physical form. Furthermore, to know\textsuperscript{5} God, to test (try)\textsuperscript{6} Him, to weary\textsuperscript{7} or surround\textsuperscript{8} Him, to fear\textsuperscript{9} and serve\textsuperscript{10} God, and to return\textsuperscript{11} to God—all these actions of men have similar implications.

To a lesser extent the same implications are to be made when men are described as believing\textsuperscript{12}, rejoicing\textsuperscript{13}, and

---

\textsuperscript{1}Hosea 7:14; cf. Malachi 2:8; 3:7 (בָּשָׁר); Hosea 14:1 (בָּשָׁר).

\textsuperscript{2}Hosea 7:13; Zephaniah 3:11 (שָׁמָּא); cf. Hosea 8:1; 14:10; Amos 4:4.

\textsuperscript{3}Hosea 5:7; 6:7; cf. Habakkuk 1:13; Malachi 2:11,16 (בָּשָׁר).

\textsuperscript{4}Hosea 13:9.

\textsuperscript{5}Hosea 2:22(20); 4:1,6(?); 5:4; 6:3,7(6); 8:2; 13:4; Habakkuk 2:14? (שָׁמָּא).

\textsuperscript{6}See page xix, footnote 17.

\textsuperscript{7}See page xix, footnote 10.

\textsuperscript{8}Hosea 12:1 (11:12 - בָּשָׁר).

\textsuperscript{9}Hosea 10:3; Joel 2:21,22; Jonah 1:5,10,16; Micah 7:17; Habakkuk 3:2; Zephaniah 3:7; Haggai 1:12; Zechariah 8:13(?), 15(?); Malachi 2:5; 3:5 (בָּשָׁר) - cf. Zephaniah 3:16; Haggai 2:5 - Hosea 3:5; Micah 7:17 (בָּשָׁר).

\textsuperscript{10}Zephaniah 3:9; Malachi 3:14,17,18 (בָּשָׁר).

\textsuperscript{11}Hosea 3:5; 5:4; 6:1; 7:10; 12:7(6); 14:2,3; Amos 4:6, 8,9,10,11; Joel 2:12,13; Zechariah 1:3; Malachi 3:7,18 (בָּשָׁר); cf. Haggai 2:17.

\textsuperscript{12}Jonah 3:5 (בָּשָׁר - hiphil); Zephaniah 3:2 (בָּשָׁר).

\textsuperscript{13}Joel 2:23 (בָּשָׁר); Habakkuk 3:18 (בָּשָׁר); Joel 2:23; Habakkuk 3:18; Zechariah 10:7 (בָּשָׁר).
being strong\(^1\) in God, or are said to forget Him\(^2\), to remember\(^3\) God, and to hate\(^4\) God. Likewise, men scarcely could be said to speak\(^5\) against, to profane\(^6\), to devise\(^7\) evil, and to rise against\(^8\) God if God were not considered to have some sort of a tangible form.

5. ANIMISTIC\(^9\) DESCRIPTIONS OF DEITY

Infrequently God is compared to various forms of creation, and once the name, Rock\(^10\), is used as a Divine Name. Uncommonly, He is likened to dew\(^11\), light\(^12\), a fir\(^13\), a lion\(^14\),

\(^{1}\)Zechariah 10:12 (בְּנֵי - piel); Zechariah 12:5 (יָ日本の).

\(^{2}\)Hosea 2:15(13); 8:14; 13:6; cf. 4:6 (יָנוּּכָה).

\(^{3}\)Jonah 2:8; Zechariah 10:9 (עֵז) - cf. hiphil in Amos 6:10.

\(^{4}\)Zechariah 11:8 (עֵז).


\(^{6}\)Hosea 7:15; Nahum 1:9,11 (יִנְפָּה).

\(^{7}\)Micah 2:8 (יֵדְעָה - piel).

\(^{8}\)This section includes all the descriptions of God which liken Him unto animate or inanimate objects.

\(^{10}\)Habakkuk 1:12 (זָרָע).

\(^{11}\)Hosea 14:6 (נִמְצָא).

\(^{12}\)Micah 7:8 (נֶוֶר).

\(^{13}\)Hosea 14:9 (בָּרָה).

\(^{14}\)Hosea 5:14; 13:7 (תַּחְתָּה); Hosea 13:8 (יָנוּּכָה); Hosea 5:14 (יִנְפָּה); Hosea 11:10 (זָרָע).
a leopard\textsuperscript{1}, a bear\textsuperscript{2}, a moth\textsuperscript{3}, a wall\textsuperscript{4}, rottenness\textsuperscript{5}, fire\textsuperscript{6}, and the like. God also is described as roaring\textsuperscript{7}.

6. THE ASCRIPTION OF EMOTIONS TO DEITY

While the usual range of human emotions is applied to God, anthropopathisms are less frequent than anthropomorphisms. Thus, God exhibits the desirable emotions of compassion\textsuperscript{6} (especially that of repentance\textsuperscript{9}), which induces Him to spare\textsuperscript{10} and pity\textsuperscript{11} people, etc. He also, however, hates\textsuperscript{12},

---

\textsuperscript{1}Hosea 13:7 (יָבוֹר).
\textsuperscript{2}Hosea 13:8 (יֹרֶה).
\textsuperscript{3}Hosea 5:12 (שׁוּע).
\textsuperscript{4}Zechariah 2:9(5) (תֹומָח).
\textsuperscript{5}Hosea 5:12 (בֵרָד).
\textsuperscript{6}Amos 5:6 (שׁא).
\textsuperscript{7}Hosea 11:10; Joel 4(3); 16; Amos 1:2 (גָּשֶׂ).\textsuperscript{8}
\textsuperscript{8}Hosea 1:6,7; 2:6(4),25(23); 14:4; Micah 7:19; Habakkuk 3:2; Zechariah 1:12; 10:6 (בָּזֶר); Zechariah 1:16 (סֹסֶר).
\textsuperscript{9}Joel 2:13,14; Amos 7:3,6(5); Jonah 3:9,10; 4:2; Zechariah 1:17; 8:14 (שֹׁם); Hosea 11:8 (סֹסֶר).
\textsuperscript{10}Joel 2:18; Zechariah 11:6; Malachi 3:17 (בָּזֶר).
\textsuperscript{11}Joel 2:17; Jonah 4:11 (שֹׁם).
\textsuperscript{12}Amos 6:8 (בָּזֶר); Hosea 9:15; Amos 5:21; 6:8; Zechariah 8:17; Malachi 1:3; 2:16 (שֹׁם).
is jealous\(^1\), becomes angry\(^2\), has indignation\(^3\), and the like. He is at times pleased\(^4\) and shows delight\(^5\).

7. THE ASCRIPTION OF PLACE AND MOTION TO GOD

Like mankind, God at times is considered to have a particular place\(^6\) or habitation\(^7\), e.g., He has a particular temple\(^8\) which is His special dwelling-place. In other words, God is not strictly omnipresent and certainly not always transcendent when He is conceived as dwelling\(^9\).

---

\(^1\) Zephaniah 1:18; 3:8; Zechariah 1:14; 8:2 (דַם בָּיִת); Joel 2:18; Zechariah 1:14; 8:2 (דַם בָּיִת); Nahum 1:2 (דַם בָּיִת).

\(^2\) Habakkuk 3:8; Zechariah 10:3 (נר תָּה); Hosea 8:5 (נר תָּה); Zechariah 1:2, 15 (יִלּוּ ה); Zechariah 1:2, 15; 7:12 (יִלּוּ ה); Micah 5:15(14); Nahum 1:2, 6; Zechariah 8:2 (יִלּוּ ה); Hosea 5:10; 13:11; Habakkuk 3:8; Zephaniah 1:18 (יִלָּה מַעַל); Hosea 11:9; Jonah 3:9; Nahum 1:6; Zephaniah 2:2, 3:8 (יִלֶה מַעַל); Habakkuk 3:2 (יְסִיר תֹּר); Hosea 8:5; 11:9; 13:11; 14:5; Jonah 3:9; Micah 5:15(14); 7:18; Nahum 1:3, 6; Habakkuk 3:8, 12; Zephaniah 2:2, 3; 3:8; Zechariah 10:3 (יִלֶה מַעַל).

\(^3\) Zechariah 1:12; Malachi 1:4 (שֻׁר ה); Nahum 1:6; Habakkuk 3:12; Zephaniah 3:8 (שֻׁר ה); Micah 7:9 (שֻׁר ה).

\(^4\) Hosea 9:4; Malachi 3:4 (נָמַל); Hosea 8:13; Amos 5:22; Micah 6:7; Haggai 1:8; Malachi 1:10, 13 (נָמַל).

\(^5\) Malachi 1:10 (שֵׁם ה); Hosea 6:7(6); Jonah 1:14; Micah 7:18; Malachi 2:17 (שֵׁם ה).

\(^6\) Hosea 5:15; Micah 1:3 (לָבוֹן).

\(^7\) Zechariah 2:17(13) (לָבוֹן).

\(^8\) Jonah 2:8; Micah 1:2; Habakkuk 2:20; Malachi 3:1 (לוֹכַד).

\(^9\) Joel 4(3):17, 21; Zechariah 2:14(10), 15(11); 8:3 (לוֹכַד).
sitting\(^1\), standing\(^2\), visiting\(^3\), encamping\(^4\), and the like. God also lives on high\(^5\), has chambers\(^6\) of His own, and has a resting place\(^7\). He may at times be in the midst of\(^8\), or with\(^9\), a certain people or place. Finally, the idea of hiding\(^10\) from God is consistent with the concept of a Deity who is not everywhere present.

Frequently, in the Twelve, God also is referred to as moving from place to place. He is described as going (or walking)\(^11\), coming\(^12\), going forth\(^13\), going down\(^14\), coming

\(^1\)Joel 4(3):12; Malachi 3:37 (בש).  
\(^2\)Amos 7:7; 9:1 (בש); Habakkuk 3:6; Zechariah 14:4 (ר邢台).  
\(^3\)Hosea 8:13; 9:9; Amos 3:14; Zephaniah 2:7; Zechariah 10:3; 11:16 (ר邢台).  
\(^4\)Zechariah 9:8 (בש).  
\(^5\)Micah 6:6 (מרוח).  
\(^6\)Amos 9:6 (מרוח).  
\(^7\)Zechariah 9:1 (ה阚ית).  
\(^8\)Zechariah 2:9(8), 14(10), 15(11); 8:3 (לך); Hosea 11:9; Joel 2:27; Amos 5:17; Micah 3:11; Zephaniah 3:5,15,17 (ך邢台).  
\(^9\)Amos 5:14; Haggai 1:14; 2:5(4); Zechariah 8:23; 10:5 (ך邢台 or סע); cf., Micah 2:13 (ך邢台).  
\(^10\)Amos 9:3 (ך邢台); Hosea 5:3 (ך邢台); Hosea 13:14; Amos 9:3; Micah 3:4; Zephaniah 2:3 (ך邢台).  
\(^11\)Hosea 5:14f. (ך邢台); Habakkuk 3:6 (ך邢台).  
\(^12\)Hosea 6:4(8); 10:12; Habakkuk 3:3; Zechariah 2:14(10); 14:5; Malachi 3:1; 4:5(3:24) (ך邢台).  
\(^13\)Micah 1:8; Habakkuk 3:13; Zechariah 14:3 (ך邢台); Hosea 6:3 (ך邢台).  
\(^14\)Micah 1:8 (ך邢台).
near⁴, passing overⁱ, marching³, treading⁴, removing⁵, returning⁶, rising⁷, arousing⁸, taking⁹, bringing down¹⁰, bringing up¹¹, withdrawing¹², departing¹³, and the like.

The above group of anthropomorphic¹⁴ descriptive terms

¹Malachi 3:5 (حرف).
²Hosea 10:11; Amos 5:17; 7:8; 8:2; Micah 7:18 (벌).
³Habakkuk 3:12 (עזע).
⁴Micah 1:3 (דָּרֶך).  
⁵Zechariah 3:9 (משא).
⁶Hosea 2:11(9); 5:15; 6:12(11); Joel 2:14; 4(3):1; Amos 9:14; Jonah 3:9; Micah 7:19; Nahum 2:3(2); Zephaniah 2:7; 3:20; Zechariah 1:3,16; 8:3; Malachi 3:7 (בר).  
⁷Amos 7:9; Zephaniah 3:8 (נֵפָּה); cf. Hosea 6:2; Amos 2:11; 5:2; 6:15(14); 9:11; Habakkuk 1:8; Zechariah 11:16 (נפ, hiphil = "to raise").  
⁹Hosea 2:11(9); Amos 7:15; 9:3; Jonah 4:3; Haggai 2:23 (24 - נָפֵל); cf. Zechariah 11:7,10,13 (נפ).  
¹⁰Hosea 7:12; Joel 2:23; 4(3):2; Amos 9:2; Obadiah 4 (רָע - hiphil); Joel 4(3):11 (רָע - hiphil).  
¹¹Hosea 12:14(13); Amos 2:10; 3:1; 8:10; 9:7; Jonah 2:7(6); Micah 6:4 (על - hiphil).  
¹²Hosea 5:6 (רו).  
¹³Hosea 9:12 (רֹאש).  
¹⁴The term, "anti-anthropomorphic", is used here in the broader sense which includes both (1) strict or technical sense, i.e., the avoidance of the attributing of human form to God, and (2) the wider sense, i.e., the removal or moderation of anything "... connected with God which might lower his dignity, or degrade his honor or character." (Fritsch, Charles T., The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch [Princeton: Princeton University Press], 1943, p. 3).
which have been applied to Deity is not complete or all inclusive, but is typical of all such stated or implied attributes of Deity. As such they constitute the group of words which have been examined in this thesis.
SECTION I.

THE ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHIC TENDENCIES OF THE
MASORETIC TEXT OF THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE PROPHETS
CHAPTER I

THE ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHIC TENDENCIES OF THE MASORETIC TEXT

Rather early in Judaism there arose a group of people who objected to the crude anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms of the Hebrew Scriptures. Perhaps the corporality of the deities of the surrounding regions, their needs and passions, together with their inadequate knowledge, power, and justice, gradually began to impress unfavorably the more pious, thoughtful, and zealous members of the Jewish community.

This unfavorable impression may have been deepened, as Marmorstein suggests, by contact with the heathen world, especially with the Greeks who ridiculed gods who had human passions, faults, and forms. More likely, the growing realization of the essentially holy and righteous nature of Deity contributed more than other causes to the desire to "safeguard" the concept of Deity from the cruder anthropomorphic phrases. This probability is increased by the fact that long before the post-Biblical period and the time of the Greek and Aramaic translations, prophets arose within Judaism who protested against attributing human emotions to God and parts (or the whole) of the human body. The objec-

---

tion to the anthropomorphic description of God is at least as old as the second commandment (Exodus 20:4) in the E document written in the seventh or eighth century. This same anti-anthropomorphic tendency is seen in the denial that God is a man (Hosea 13:4; cf. Numbers 23:19 JE) and in the be-


2 The discussion of the documentary treatment of the Pentateuch is beyond the scope of this work. The terminology adopted for the sake of convenience in this chapter does not reflect necessarily this author's position and viewpoint in every detail or even on every major point.

3 Driver (op. cit., p. 125) considered both J and E to date from the early monarchical period. Today, however, the problem is not so simple; "... the history of any one of the 'documents' may well be as complicated as the history of the whole Pentateuch was conceived ..." in the time of S. R. Driver (or even later). "We can no longer use the figure of a single date-line, but must think rather of a dimensional area ... on the whole, we must be less confident of our datings than was once customary." (Rowley, H. H., editor, The Old Testament and Modern Study [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931], pp. 817. C. R. North's chapter on "Pentateuchal Criticism", pp. 48-83).

4 In connection with this statement, the following should be considered: "Wenn die Erwähnung der Körperteile Jahwes als Anthropomorphismen zu verstehen wären, hätten wir erwarten sollen, dass in der ältesten und primitivsten Zeit die Anthropomorphismen sich häufen sollten, um später mehr und mehr abzunehmen. Das Entgegengesetzte ist der Fall. Das vielleicht älteste Lied im Alten Testament ... schildert anfangs Jahwes Zorn und Gewalt über die Naturkräfte ohne irgendeinen Körperteil zu nennen. So sind auch die Propheten Amos und Hosea viel sparsamer und nüchterner in der Beschreibung Jahwes als Deutero-Jesaja." (Boyman, T., Das hebräische Denken im Vergleich mit dem Griechischen [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1952], p. 85). This book was received too late to be used by this investigator, but it contains much valuable material.

5 Driver, op. cit., p. 67.
lie that no one could see God and live (Exodus 33:20 J\(^1\)).

1. THE USE OF INTERMEDIARIES

Another way of expressing this anti-anthropomorphic tendency was through development of the idea that intermediaries were active between God and man. Through these intermediaries not only the conception of God was safeguarded from the idea that He had a visible form\(^2\), but also through them He became more transcendent and less immanent\(^3\). This "spiritualization of the Theophany"\(^4\) by the use of the intermediaries, the Angel of Yahweh\(^5\), the Glory of Yahweh, the Presence of Yahweh, and the Name of Yahweh, was established gradually and obtained its greatest Biblical emphasis in some of the later books.

These intermediaries, especially the Angel of Yahweh,

---

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 38.

\(^2\)Cf. Deuteronomy 4:15.

\(^3\)The use of intermediaries arose from the strong belief in the transcendence of God.


\(^5\)Many scholars would not classify the Angel of Yahweh as an intermediary, e.g., "These intermediary beings should not, however, be confused with 'the angel of Yahweh' to which repeated reference is made in the earlier part of the Old Testament. It is generally agreed that the mal'ak Yahweh was no angelic intermediary but a divine theophany, a manifestation of Yahweh Himself." (Rust, E.C., Nature and Man in Biblical Thought (Lutterworth Library, Vol. XL, London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 125).
originally were not anti-anthropomorphic, nor did they particularly spiritualize Deity. Rather, the Angel of Yahweh originally was a form of the appearance of Yahweh Himself which did not exhaust Yahweh's full being. The sudden changes of the Angel of Yahweh to the simple Yahweh are illustrative of its purpose. "The designation 'angel of Jahweh' is necessary wherever he comes (particularly in conversation) into direct contact with men, whereas the simple 'Jahweh' is sufficient when God is to be thought of as if by Himself, separate from men or at least unseen by them."¹ This concept was spiritualized as it occurred in J, E, and so on. As the concept of God grew deeper, the Angel of Yahweh was used in sharper contrast to Yahweh Himself until the distinction between the Angel of Yahweh, as a manifestation of Yahweh, and a created angel was obscured. In the pre-exilic prophets, the Angel of Yahweh, as an appearance of Yahweh, disappeared only to reappear in Zechariah where he was clearly a creature² and was separate from Yahweh Himself.

The Presence of Yahweh is related closely to the original meaning of the Angel of Yahweh. Likewise, this expression of Yahweh's manifestation does not exhaust His full

²According to Kautzsch (ibid., p. 639).
being but constitutes another step in the spiritualization of Deity and away from the anthropomorphic description of God. Once (in Micah 3:4) the expression (the Presence of Yahweh) is used, apparently, as the equivalent of an anthropopathism, namely, "... a graphic picture of [God's] aversion or displeasure." Similarly, the idea of conciliating God or obtaining His favor is conveyed by the expression, "to make God's face sweet," four times in the "Twelve." In the majority of instances the Presence of Yahweh is simply an emphatic way of expressing the personal pronoun, i.e., it is a form of denoting God's manifestation,

1Kautzsch, loc. cit.

2תֵּursed יְהֵה וּלְדָה" ("And He will hide His Face [Presence] from them").

3The Targum considered this verse to limit God to a given place and not as an anthropopathism (see page 234). Perhaps the Septuagint regarded it in the same way since it translated לֶבַד by ἀπόστρεφος but rendered יִלְדוֹ בָּהוּ מֵעֲשָׂה (see pages 128f.).


5Johnson, op. cit., p. 156; e.g., Zechariah 7:2 (גֶּהוֹלָה יָמִים נִיַּהַל).

6Zechariah 7:2; 8:21, 22; Malachi 1:9.

7Hereafter "the Twelve" will be used without quotation marks for the Minor Prophets (or the Book of the Twelve Prophets).

8Johnson, op. cit., p. 158.
e.g., to seek God, to live alongside God, etc. Probably, in the case of prepositional phrases ('לִֽבְּרוֹת,' בְּרֶ֠ד, סְּלֹא, סְּלֹא, and סְּלֹא) the original meaning of the Hebrew scarcely was felt by the Hebrew authors.

This conclusion is confirmed by the treatment of these expressions by the Septuagint. Even with regard to these prepositional phrases, it is possible that in certain instances they represent a form of the Presence of Yahweh, e.g., to come before Him. This is less certain with regard to the idea of being silent or fearing (worshipping)

---

1Hosea 5:15 ("and seek My Face").
2Hosea 6:2 ("that we may live in His Presence").
3Hosea 7:2 ("they are before Me").
4Hosea 6:2; Habakkuk 3:5; Malachi 3:16 ("לַֽבְּרֵ֠ו"); Jonah 1:2; Haggai 2:14 ("לַֽבְּרֵ֠ו").
5Hosea 7:2.
6Jonah 1:3 (twice), 10.
7Nahum 1:5 and Habakkuk 2:20 ("לַֽבְּרֵ֠ו"); Haggai 1:12; Zephaniah 1:7; Zechariah 2:13(17); and Malachi 3:14 ("לַֽבְּרֵ֠ו").
8Johnson, op. cit., p. 157; cf. Malachi 3:14 ("לַֽבְּרֵ֠ו הַיָּ֥הָה הַיֹּ֥בְּסָה") -- "Because of (before) Yahweh of Hosts").
9Hosea 6:2 ("לַֽבְּרֵ֠ו הַיָּ֥הָה הַיֹּ֥בְּסָה") -- "that we may live in His Presence"); Hosea 7:2 ("לַֽבְּרֵ֠ו הַיָּ֥הָה הַיֹּ֥בְּסָה") -- "they are before Me").
10Jonah 1:2 ("לַֽבְּרֵ֠ו הַיָּ֥הָה הַיֹּ֥בְּסָה") -- "Because their wickedness has come up into My Presence").
12Haggai 1:12 ("לַֽבְּרֵ֠ו הַיָּ֥הָה הַיֹּ֥בְּסָה").
before God. In Jonah 1:3 (twice), 10, and Haggai 2:14 it is unlikely that the actual manifestation is meant other than in the "vague, spiritual" sense that Yahweh was omnipresent in Palestine, etc. Nahum 1:5 is uncertain, but, in Habakkuk 3:5 and Malachi 3:16, the prepositional phrase certainly has reference to a form of the manifestation of Yahweh.

The Glory (טָהֳרָה) of Yahweh is another intermediary which occurs in the Twelve. It is used in the material or human sense in Haggai 2:7 and Malachi 1:6. The Glory is used as a term which denotes the character and being of God as He has revealed Himself. Not only in the pre-exilic prophets does it denote this form of manifestation, but also it especially denotes the brilliance which glows forth giving evidence of His presence. Perhaps this is the meaning of Glory in Hosea 4:7 where God says that the Israelites have changed His glory into shame. This is the meaning in Habakkuk 2:14 where it has been widened to include also "... the manifestations of the Divine majesty and omnipotence which are displayed..." in all the universe. After the

1So Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 639.
2See page 13.
3Cf. Isaiah 6:3.
4Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 640.
5Cf. Procksch, O., Jesaia I Kommentar zum alten Testament (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung D. Werner Scholl, 1930), Band IX, p. 55. On Isaiah 6:3, "In ṭahārah... ist die Majestät ausgedrückt, die als Macht, Übermacht,
exile the 'Glory of Yahweh' was used in a spiritual sense and was not pictured in human form, e.g., Zechariah 2:9(5).\(^1\)

In Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah\(^2\), and the Priestly Code\(^3\) the Glory of Yahweh has been developed until it has become the form by which God becomes visible\(^4\); it is "... not simply the temporarily assumed veiling of His real being."\(^5\) This may be the use in Zechariah 2:5(9) where God promises to protect Israel as a wall of fire and to be the glory in her midst. Certainly, the prophet here is speaking metaphorically, although the glory and fire are associated close-

Allmacht in der Schöpfung angeschaut wird. ... Gottes 'Herrlichkeit' wird in der Fülle des Weltalls angeschaut, durchleuchtet sie wie ein Transparent. ... doch ist bei Jesaia das Unaussprechbare, Überirdische, Übersinnliche viel geistiger als bei Hesekiel dargestellt." Morgenstern states that Isaiah, as also J and P, conceives of Yahweh as a Being of Light (cf. Micah 7:8) -- at least in His relationship with mankind. In Isaiah (as also in J) Yahweh is characterized by the Glory "... upon which no mortal can look and live." (Morgenstern, I, "Biblical Theophanies", Zeitschrift für Assyriologie, XXVIII (1913), pp. 38f.)

\(^1\) So Morgenstern, ibid., pp. 45f.

\(^2\) Isaiah 40 - 66.

\(^3\) The Glory here is closely associated with the Shekinah of later Judaism (Gray, G.B., "Glory (in O.T.)", Hastings, J., editor, A Dictionary of the Bible (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1905), II, p. 185.

\(^4\) Scholars are not agreed as to the priority in time of the use of the Glory of God to designate the physical phenomenon denoting the presence of Yahweh and to designate His revealed Being and character (Ramsey, A. M., The Glory of God and The Transfiguration of Christ (London: Longmans, Greens, and Co., 1949), p. 10).

\(^5\) Kautzsch, loc. cit.
ly in the latest development of this intermediary-concept 1.

Thus, the three intermediaries are progressive steps in the attempt to avoid the anthropomorphic concept that Yahweh had a physical (human) form. The Presence of Yahweh and the Glory of Yahweh represent a considerable advance over the earlier concept of the Angel of Yahweh. In the Presence of Yahweh and in the Glory of Yahweh the thought of a human form is relegated to the background as much as possible 2. The Name of Yahweh, however, constitutes a still further step by which all introduction of a bodily form is avoided. This concept is difficult for one to realize fully today. A name, to ancient man, meant "a something parallel to the man, relatively independent of its bearer, but of great importance for his weal or his woe, a something which at once describes and influences its bearer." 3 Because of this, in heathen cults the name of the deity was kept secret -- or at least its pronunciation -- to prevent the invocation by an improper party 4. A trace of this may be

---

2 Kautzsch, loc. cit.
4 Kautzsch, loc. cit.
seen in Amos 6:10. Although in Judaism the magical and superstitious use of "name" in connection with Deity is not entirely lacking, the Name of Yahweh, in many passages in the Twelve, apparently is identical with the person of Yahweh, e.g., Joel 2:26 (praise); Joel 2:32 (3:5), Zephaniah 3:9, and Zechariah 13:9 (call upon); Amos 2:7 (profane); Micah 6:9 (see); Zephaniah 3:12 (take refuge in); Zechariah 13:3 (speak lies in); Malachi 1:6 (despise); Malachi 1:11 (offer to); Malachi 1:14, and 2:5 (fear); perhaps Malachi 1:11 (be great); and Micah 4:5 and Zechariah 10:12 (walk in).

Although this spiritualization of the Theophany took place gradually and progressively until the Name of Yahweh, in place of the person of Yahweh, eliminated completely the physical form of Deity, and although E was less anthropomorphic than J, and P less anthropomorphic than either E or J, nevertheless, paradoxically, the most unrestricted use of

1Kautzsch (loc. cit.) states this more emphatically. "Amos 610 is best explained . . . as expressing a dread of provoking the fiercely enraged Deity still further by uttering his name (cf. also 83)."

2E.g.: Genesis 32:30; Judges 9:20, 57; 13:18; 17:1ff; 2 Kings 5:54; et al.

3Fritsch, op. cit., p. 4.

4Perhaps this paradox is reflected in the Greek translation (Septuagint) in the retention and even addition of anthropomorphic language (e.g., Hosea 9:12; 11:3; et al. [see Chapter V], where the Septuagint is more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text).
anthropomorphic language occurred in those passages which stressed most noticeably the transcendence of God, and which spiritualized, to the greatest extent, the concept of Deity. Even those works which lie outside the scope of this investigation, although jealously guarding the transcendence of God, nevertheless, employ anthropomorphisms. Moreover, it is not to be expected that the trend towards anti-anthropomorphic language and the spiritualization of Deity always should have developed uniformly in a straight line. This lack of uniform development may have been due partially to a conflict between two or more groups of Jews -- the Literalist, the Spiritualist, etc. -- as well as to the incapability of man to express his relationship to God in a satisfactory way without the use of some anthropomorphisms. After all, man is unable to "... worship or show reverence to an impersonal power ..."¹ which is "... nameless and impotent, without attributes of goodness or justice, not visible by deeds and unrecognizable by passions;"² -- no matter how much modern man may try. Hence, the dual concepts of a transcendent, Holy God and that of an immanent, personal Deity developed parallel to each other and are to be found in every portion of the Old Testament.

¹Marmorstein, op. cit., p. 1.
²Loc. cit.
Perhaps this stage in the history of our current Masoretic Text was the most crucial and important one. Ginsburg treated the emendations made by the Sopherim which removed the "Indelicate Expressions, Anthropomorphisms

\[1\] Whether the Sopherim emended the Hebrew text or not has been a matter of controversy. [W. E. Barnes, for example, opposes the more generally accepted view. See his article, "Ancient Corrections in the Text of the Old Testament (Tikkun Sopherim)", in The Journal of Theological Studies, 1(1900); 387-414.] The Tannaitic writings, when citing certain verses, elsewhere described as corrections of the Sopherim, state that the Scriptures (דַּיִן הַמּוֹל) used euphemistic expressions. Probably these passages which the Sopherim are said to have altered were changed either by them or some other scribal school. The principle for such emendations is stated clearly in the Babylonian Talmud (Yebamoth 79a) which reads, "R. Hiyya b. Abba reported in the name of R. Johanan: It is better that one letter be removed [uprooted] from the Torah than that the Divine name be publicly profaned... R. Johanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozodak: It is preferable to have one letter removed from the Torah so that the Divine name may be publicly hallowed." [Translation of the Talmud is from Liberman, Saul, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), chapter entitled, "Corrections of the Soferim", pp. 28-37, especially p. 35.] This translation emphasizes that the Sopherim altered only passages which concerned the honor of Deity -- in fact, in certain instances the expressions which they changed are almost blasphemous. On the other hand, the Sopherim were not consistent -- they did not make alterations in every appropriate place.


\[3\] That the Sopherim were not merely copyists but were also revisers of the Text is recognized more generally today; cf. also Robertson, Ewald, "Points of Interest in the Masoretic Text", The Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 2(1943): 35-39, etc.
etc. from the Text\textsuperscript{1} as if there was little doubt as to the reason for such changes. He collated from the Masorah lists some eighteen such emendations, four of which occurred in the Twelve. To this a fifth one has been added from Kittel's \textit{Biblia Hebraica}, third edition.

(1) In Hosea 4:7 the clause, \textit{כבודי בקולוים ממיר} ("I will change their glory into shame\textsuperscript{2}",) occurs. Originally, according to the Masorah lists, \textit{כבודי} ("My glory") was read. As Ginsburg\textsuperscript{5} observed, however, this reading would require also an alteration of the verb from the first person to the third\textsuperscript{6}. Thus the text originally read:

\begin{align*}
\textit{כבודי בקולוים ממיר (_heapir) מימין} \quad ("My Glory they have changed to shame") .
\end{align*}

This was altered either because it was inconceivable that anyone could change God's glory to shame or else because it was considered to be too

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Ginsburg, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 345.
\item \textsuperscript{2}The Septuagint support the Masoretic Text.
\item \textsuperscript{3}The \textit{Holy Bible Revised Standard Version} (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952) is used generally for the translation of the Hebrew text for the "longer" quotations. This procedure is not carried out so consistently in the footnotes.
\item \textsuperscript{4}A change of final \textsuperscript{ד} and \textsuperscript{ה}.
\item \textsuperscript{5}Ginsburg, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 357.
\item \textsuperscript{7}This is the only example in the Twelve.
\end{itemize}
offensive, or for both reasons. The original reading fits the context better.

(2) A portion of Habakkuk 1:12 reads

"Art thou not from everlasting, O Lord my God, my Holy One? We shall not die,")

According to the Masorah lists, this should have read: "Are You not from everlasting, O Yahweh, my Holy One? You die not,"). Obviously the context favors the last reading, but this reading has been altered because it contained the offensive, negative implication that it was possible that God could die. The Targum retained the original idea by the anti-anthropomorphistic paraphrase: "Your word endures forever".

(3) In Zechariah 2:13

"Because he who touches you touches the apple of his eye,") is found. The original text was altered

\[ \text{only appropriate instance in the Twelve.} \]
\[ \text{The Septuagint supports the Masoretic Text.} \]
\[ \text{sGinsburg, op. cit., p. 358; Procksch, op. cit., p. 947, footnote.} \]
\[ \text{A change of } n \text{ and } j \text{.} \]
\[ \text{Cf. Lieberman, op. cit., p. 28.} \]
\[ \text{The Septuagint and Targum support the Masoretic Text.} \]
by the Sopherim\(^1\) to avoid the anthropomorphic description of Deity in a statement made by God: יִכְּנֶn\(^2\) ("Because he who touches you, touches the apple of My eye\(^3\).").

(4) The original of Malachi 1:13 contained a statement which was regarded as being too derogatory of God. Therefore, the Sopherim\(^4\) altered the text from בַּמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁm\) ("And you sniff at me,\(^5\) -- preserved in several manuscripts) to בַּמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁm\) ("And you sniff at it,\(^6\)).

(5) In Malachi 1:12 בַּמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁמְשָׁm\) ("But you profane it . . ., "יִכְּנֶנֶn, God's Name) occurs. This passage\(^7\) read originally בַּמְשָׁמְשָׁm\) ("But

\(^1\)Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 359; Procksch, op. cit., p. 960, footnote.

\(^2\)A change of י and י.

\(^3\)W Tert. III 539 = Vulg. These support the Sopherim; cf. Iust., 534.

\(^4\)Ginsburg, op. cit., pp. 359f.

\(^5\)Only appropriate instance in the Twelve of snuffing at God. This translation follows the Revised Standard Version, p. 995.

\(^6\)A change of י and י. The Septuagint and Targum support the Masoretic Text.

\(^7\)Revised Standard Version, footnote d, p. 995.

\(^8\)The Septuagint and Targum support the Masoretic Text.

\(^9\)Procksch, op. cit., p. 973, footnote.

\(^10\)A change of י and י.
you profane Me."\(^1\)). Apparently, it was considered too derogatory for God to say that anyone profaned Him; thus it was softened to the idea of profanation of His Name\(^2\).

These last three examples are of particular interest since the emendation involves only the interchange of yodh (י) and a waw (י).

The protection\(^3\) of the Tetragrammaton and other

\(^1\)The statement that God is profaned (יהוה) may occur also in Zephaniah 3:4 and Malachi 2:11. In these two passages the context permits the reference to be interpreted as applying to the cult objects -- in fact, the Septuagint makes this interpretation in both instances:

(1) Zephaniah 3:4

הכֶּנֶנֶנֶגֶנ הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּל הַלֵּл הַלֵּל H

oi iereis atex bebebousoi

her priests have profaned what is sacred [the Holy One],

τα αγια
er priests profane the holies

(2) Malachi 2:11

בֵּין הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל H

וֵיֶהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּה יָהוָּH

בֵּין הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל H

חֹדֶשׁ הָלָל הָלָל הָלָל H

בֵּין הָלָל הָלָל H

for Judah has profaned the sanctuary of the Lord [the Holy One, Yahweh],

which he loves,

because Judah profaned the holy things of the Lord in which he delighted.

In Amos 2:7 God's Name is said to be profaned, "... so that my holy name is profaned;". Perhaps this text may have suggested the alteration in Malachi 1:12 to the Sopherim.

Divine names shows a similar tendency. Thus within the Hebrew Text itself are found two forms of certain names which are compounded with Deity, although in certain cases one form has been standardized throughout the Old Testament.

The Tetragrammaton has been compounded as a prefix in two forms: (1) a longer one יהוה and (2) a shorter one יה. Examples of the former are: יהוהosophus נונב and יהוהשופע, and of the latter: יהוה. An instance of the complete eradication of the longer form is יהוה.

The one hundred forty-one proper names which involve the Tetragrammaton as a suffix have been treated in like manner. Examples of the shorter form (יהוה) are: יהוה אֱלֹהִי 5, יהוה אלוקים 6, יהוה כוריה 8, יהוה אלakens 7, יהוה קרמה 10, יהוה אֱלֹהִים 11, יהוה קרמה 9, יהוה כוריה 8.

---

1 Haggai 1:1,12,14; 2:2,4; Zechariah 6:11.
2 Joel 4:2,12.
3 Hosea 1:1; Amos 1:1; cf. the Septuagint.
4 Hosea 1:1; Micah 1:1.
5 Malachi 3:23.
6 Amos 7:10,12,14.
7 Zephaniah 1:1.
8 Zephaniah 1:1.
9 Zechariah 1:1,7; 7:1,8.
10 Zephaniah 1:1.
11 Hosea 1:1; Micah 1:1.
The term בהר פּלֶבֶל ("Betharbel") in Hosea 10:14 most likely disguises an original pointing of בהר פּלֶבֶל ("The house of the ambush of God,""). This was altered to its present form because it was considered to be offensive "to ascribe to God the laying of an ambush," i.e., it was too offensive an anthropomorphism.

3. THE EDITORIAL ALTERATIONS

In addition to the changes which were introduced into the Hebrew Text by the Sopherim, most scholars agree that the various early editors of the Book of the Twelve, who were responsible for the combination of the Twelve into a single unit and for its subsequent transmission, introduced other alterations into the Hebrew Text. Oort, Marti, Duhm, Budde, Pfeiffer, Cheyne, Arnold, Volz, Haupt, Welch, just to mention a few -- have all contributed to the investigation of these editorial changes. One of the best

1 Zechariah 6:10, 14.
2 Hosea 1:1; Amos 1:1; Zechariah 14:5.
3 Zephaniah 1:1; Zechariah 6:10, 14.
4 Zephaniah 1:1.
5 Ginsburg, op. cit., p. 397; cf. the Septuagint corresponding to a Hebrew שַׁעִידָד ה' , according to Ginsburg.
summaries of the contributions made by the investigators in this field up to 1934 is the article by Dr. Rolland Emerson Wolfe. He considers that there were some thirteen editors or editorial schools, and his classification and summary of these different editorial schools, whether they existed or not as he views them, are of considerable interest in view of the alterations which are found in the Septuagint and Targum.

(1) "THE JUDAISTIC EDITOR OF HOSEA"

This editor, in order to make this prophecy more forceful to the Jewish reader, made certain alterations: (1) the substitution of נָזַרְיָה ("Judah") for an original נָזַרְיָהשׁ ("Israel"), (2) certain additions which included the name נָזַרְיָה ("Judah"), and, (3) a group of interpolations in which נָזַרְיָה ("Judah") did not occur. Thus, the

---


2 This number is not exact. It is not inconceivable that the same editor (or editorial school) introduced more than one kind of alteration into the Text. See footnote 2, page 2.

3 The classification followed is that of Wolfe, and the comments under each editor or editorial school substantially summarize the views of Wolfe.

4 Hosea 5:10,12,13,14; 6:4; 10:11 (Wolfe, op. cit., p. 91).

5 5:5c fromنسך; 6:11a to יִֽהְיֶה; 8:14; 12:1b from נָֽזַרְיָה; 12:3 (loc. cit.).
editor emphasized the vile character of the religious apostasy of Israel as a severe warning to the reader in Jerusalem and Judea. He revealed the fact that Israel was already in exile to warn Judah who was following in the footsteps of Israel. One group of alterations apparently was addressed specifically to Judah. Moreover, not all the references to Judah are due to this editor. Those found in Chapters I - III were inserted by later hands.

(2) "THE ANTI-HIGH PLACE EDITOR"

This editor made certain insertions in order to harmonize the prophecies with the Deuteronomic movement. Thus, he denounced the shrines in Israel and the multiplicity of altars in general. He condemned the shrines as such (Hosea and Amos did so because of the abominations). Moreover, "it is evident, from Hosea 9:4-5, that the temple at Jerusalem is

1Loc. cit.: Hosea 14:1b (ך יתכלה), 4:16a (ך יתכלה); 11:15c (last clause); 4:10c (last clause); 4:12b (ך יתכלה); 6:10b (ך יתכלה); 9:1cd (ך יתכלה); 4:18; 7:8 (last half); 13:13b (ך יתכלה); 5:3-4, 6-7.

2Loc. cit.: Hosea 10:15ab (ך יתכלה); 9:3a (ך יתכלה); 9:3a (ך יתכלה); 13:9, 9:17; 8:9-9 (except ך יתכלה).

3Loc. cit.: Hosea 4:1b (ך יתכלה); 4:9bc (ך יתכלה); 10:13b (ך יתכלה).

4Ibid., p. 93; cf. Hosea 4:15, 19b (ך יתכלה); 8:11-13a (ך יתכלה); 9:4-5; 10:1b (ך יתכלה) - 2,4e (ך יתכלה), 8ab (ך יתכלה), except ך יתכלה which is late scribal); 12:12 (except second clause); cf. Amos 8:13-14; 5:4b (ך יתכלה) - 5c (ך יתכלה), 6:13-15; 7:9 (ibid., p. 92).
the sole place of legitimate worship . . . In Amos 5.4 'Seek Me' is equivalent to 'Worship at Jerusalem'. 

(3) "THE LATE EXILIC EDITOR"

This editor made the additions of hope to the prophecies in five of the twelve books which otherwise contained forebodings of the deepest gloom. He made the following insertions: Micah 1:2-4; 2:12-13; 4:1-4; 5:6; Hosea 1:6c (from דנ ) - 7a (to ידנ ); 2:1b (from לִנּוּ ) - 3; 3:1-5; 2:16-17c (to לִנּוּ ), 19, 21-22, 25; 4:16b (from לִנּוּ ); 5:15-6:3; 6:11b (from רָבָה ) - 7:1a (to לִנּוּ ); 7:13c ( רָבָה לְאֶלְעָזָא ), 7:15b ( יְדוֹתֵי ); 8:10a (to יְדוֹתֵי ); 10:12; 11:8-11; 12:7; 13:14 (to לִנּוּ ); 14:2-4b (to לִנּוּ ), 5ab (to לִנּוּ ), 6-8; Zephaniah 3:14-15b (to לִנּוּ ), 16b (from לִנּוּ ), 17 (except יְדוֹתֵי רָבָה ); Amos 9:8c (from דנ ) - 10; Nahum 1:12c (from ידנ ) - 13; 2:1,3.

This editor was familiar with Deutero-Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah. He portrayed the triumphant return of the exiles, and the return of Yahweh to Jerusalem. Then an era of universal peace would come, and Yahweh would be worshipped everywhere. The heathen would make pilgrimages to Jerusalem. 

\(^{1}\text{Ibid.}, p. 93.\)

\(^{2}\text{Loc. cit.}\)
The redeemed Israel -- her returned exiles -- and Jerusalem would be blessed and exalted. Good-will is extended even towards the heathen.

(4) "THE ANTI-NEIGHBOR EDITOR"

This editor made the alterations expressing the great anger which Yahweh would exert against the heathen. His alterations also indicated seal for a Zion which would be victorious over the heathen. His anger was directed principally against Edom and the Mediterranean Coastal area, e.g., Tyre and Sidon, but he also included Moab, Ammon, and Damascus. The remnant of the nation of Judah he called to wage war, and, if they did so, then Yahweh with His heavenly host would come to their rescue. With His assistance, the heathen neighbors would be destroyed, and the Jews then would dwell securely. Finally, all the exiles would be able to return.

---

1Ibid., pp. 96f.

4His additions are: Amos 1:6-12; Joel 4:4-11,13; Zephaniah 2:4-9; Zechariah 9:1 (to ""min""), 2-8.

5Wolfe, op. cit., p. 97.

6Only, apparently, when the neighboring nations were destroyed would it be possible for perpetual peace to come to pass (loc. cit.).
He made three additions. These included the peaceful conquest of the heathen neighbors by the Messiah, the gradual destruction of all weapons of warfare, the peaceful and universal reign of the Messiah, and the return of the exiles at the dawn of the age. The Messiah was to be a Judean.

"THE NATIONALISTIC SCHOOL OF EDITORS"

One very early addition was made by a rabid anti-Persian. Another such addition was made in the prophecy of Zechariah, following the shepherd motif of the addition found in Micah. Another addition attacked Greece, and others attacked Egypt and Assyria.

---

1 Zechariah 9:9f; Micah 5:1,2b (from נוהו = 3; and 7:11f. These are of equal length and have similar poetic structure (ibid., p. 98).

2 This arose from a belief that the heathen nations had exceeded their function as the instruments of Divine punishment, e.g., Habakkuk 1:11,12b,17; 2:6ff; Zechariah 1:15; cf. Isaiah 10:5-15; 40:2b (ibid., p. 99).

3 Three groups: (1) Micah 4:9-13; (2) Micah 4:14; 5:4f; (3) Micah 5:7f,14 (ibid., p. 100).

4 Zechariah 11:1-3,17; 13:7 "was probably originally a single poem". In contrast the prose fragment in Zechariah 11:4-16 shows the greatest development of the theme of the shepherd (ibid., p. 101). The prose fragment was apparently anti-Persian.


6 Zechariah 10:3-10, 11b (from נוהו), 12; Zephaniah 2:12-15 (ibid., p. 102).
(7) "THE DAY OF YAHWEH EDITOR"

This editorial school made the descriptive additions of the cosmic phenomena which were to accompany the Day of Yahweh. They followed Amos' theme (cf. Amos 5:18f) that the Day of Yahweh was not a joyous day but a day of calamity and destruction.

(8) "THE ESCHATOLOGISTS"

Although this school adopted certain ideas from the Twelve, Deutero-Isaiah, and Ezekiel, they mainly followed the Day of Yahweh School and used the characteristic phrase "in that day".

They described a time in which there was to be complete mourning in Palestine including all the living.

1Wolfe, reads Jahwe.

2Ibid., p. 103. Amos 4:12b (from קֹדֶשֶׁ); 5:13, 18c (from נַחֲלָה), 20; Obadiah 1:15a (to נֶ學院); Joel 1:15; 2:1d (from לָבָא) - 2b (to תִּבָּרָה), 10-11; 3:1-5; 4:1-3, 12, 14-17; Zephaniah 1:7-8a (to נֶ없), 14-16, 18c (from נַחֲלָה) - 2:3; 3:8b-e (from נַחֲלָה).

3Ibid., p. 105. Hosea 1:5, 7bc (from לֵבָא), 2:16, 20, 23-24; 4:3; Joel 4:18-19, 21a (to נֶ娩); Amos 2:14-16; 6:9-10; 7:1-6; 8:3, 8-11c (to נַחֲלָה), 12 (except זַעַב פַּקֵד); נַחֲלָה - נַחֲלָה ), 13, 14d (from נֵטָר); 9:1, 5cde (from לֵבָא), 11-15; Obadiah 8a (to נֶ娩), 9, 16-18; Micah 2:3b (from לָבָא) - 5; 4:6-8; 5:9-11; Zephaniah 1:2c (from נֶ娩 ) - 3 (except פֵּרָה) נֶ娩 - פֵּרָה, 9c ( נֶ娩 - פֵּרָה), 10-12a (to נֶ娩); 2:11; 3:9-11b (to נֶ娩), 15cd (from לָבָא) - 16a (to תִּבָּרָה), 18-20; Zechariah 9:16-17; 12:2-14; 13:1-6, 8-9; 14:1-21.
creatures and even the ground itself. All the nations were to be gathered to wage war against Jerusalem. Then Yahweh would come and completely annihilate them. The remaining part of Judah would gather the heathens' wealth, and the heathen nations would be possessed by Judah. Then the exiles would return, and Yahweh from Mount Zion would rule forever. Palestine would be extremely fertile. The entire land of Judah would be especially holy ground, and Jerusalem would be the world center of worship for all nations. Annihilation by plague and famine would be reserved for those who refuse. An entirely new order would be established — even prophecy would be a thing of the past.

(9) "THE DOXOLOGIST"

He pictured God as the almighty Creator, and condemned idolatry. He described idols as "lies". His additions occur only in Amos (4:13; 5:8; 9:5a,b to 6). They may have constituted originally a single poem.

(10) "THE ANTI-IDOL POLEMIST"

This editor inserted a polemic against all idols, but especially against the golden calves of Samaria. He discussed idols, graven images, molten images, etc. He de

\[^{1}\text{Ibid.}, \text{ pp.} \ 108f.\]
scribed idols as nonentities¹.

(11) "THE PSALM EDITOR"

This editor inserted psalms and proverbs into the prophecies. Those insertions are: Nahum 1:2-10,12b (from ̈ to ḫa'va); Jonah 2:3-10; Micah 6:6-8; 7:1-10,13-14, 16-20 (except ḫa'va ́l n̄a ́va ́ in verse 17); Habakkuk 1:2-4,12a (to ḫa'va), 13-14; 2:4-5d (to ḫa'va), 13b ( ḫa'va ́l n̄a ́va ́l n̄a ́va ́), 14,20; 3:1-19; Amos 1:2; 9:2-3; Zephaniah 3:5; Hosea 4:11,12c ( ḫa'va to ḫa'va), 14e (last clause); 14:10; Joel 4:20,21b (last clause)².

(12) "THE EARLY Scribes"

Traditionally these scribes have been traced back to Ezra and were interested particularly in the Pentateuch. Consequently, the material of the Pentateuch influenced all of their subsequent work which might be described almost as

¹Ibid., pp. 109f. Hosea 2:10c (from ́n meddling); 4:17, 19a (to ́n ́n med.); 5:11b (from ́n); 8:4c (from ́n ́n med.); 5a (to ́n med.); 5c (from ́n); 7a (to ́n med.); 9:10cd (from ́n med.); 10:5-6b (to ́n med.); 10; 11:2,7; 12:2abc (to ́n med.); 13:1-2; 14:4c ( ḫa'va to ́n med.); 9; Micah 1:5ab (to ́n med.); 6-7; 5:12-13; Amos 5:5de (from ́n); 6:13; 8:14abc (to ́n med.); Habakkuk 1:11b ( ́n med. to ́n med.); 2:18-19; Nahum 1:14c (from ́n med. to ́n med.); Zephaniah 1:3c ( the ́n med.); 4d ( the ́n med.); Zechariah 10:1-2.

²Ibid., p. 112.
a pentateuchal redaction. "Or it might be called a concordance since the interpolations serve the same purpose as cross references to the books of the law and the so-called 'former prophets'." Although they did make some general references to the Pentateuch, they usually made specific references to it. They constantly referred to the Exodus, predicted a return to Egypt, referred to the Covenant with Abraham, and the like.

(13) "THE LATER SCRIBAL SCHOOLS"

These scribes made editorial changes which included the usual unintentional textual changes which are to be expected in the course of the transmission of any text, e.g., rearrangements, consonantal change, and the like. They also introduced changes when they separated the long lines of uninterrupted consonants into individual words. Occasionally in such separations wrong divisions were made.

---

1Ibid., p. 115. Hosea 2:1a (to רומא), 17d (from אֹב), 6:5ab (to מ), 6-7; 8:1-2; 9:7c (from לְרָּאָה) - 9; 10:9, 14cd (from רֹאֶשׁ); 12:4, 5-6, 8-9, 10-11, 13-14; 13:4-6; 13:10c (from דָּוָא); Amos 1:5d (from וָלֵלֲוַּלָּו to חָרָה); 2:9-12; 3:1b (from לְעָה), 7; 4:10b (from מְדוּרִים מֵאָמוּרִים); 5:3, 17, 25; 6:1d (from יַעַל, to be read as imperative) - 2:5b (from מְדוּר); 6c (from יָלַל) - 7; 7:11b (from מַעְבַּרִים); 17f (from מַעְבַּרִים); 9:4, 7bc (from second שָׁב); Micah 4:5; 5:2a (to מְדוּר); 6:3-5, 16abc (to מְדוּר); 7:13; Zechariah 10:11a (to מְדוּר); 14:5b (from מַעְבַּרִים); Haggai 1:13; 2:5a (to מַעְבַּרִים); Malachi 2:7; 3:22-24.

2Loc. cit. Could these constitute the earliest Haptaroth?
Interpretative alterations were made for purposes of clarification. Probably these changes were marginal at first and later were introduced by a copyist into the text. Moreover, as there were then no commentaries and dictionaries, some of this work was lexical and exegetical. These schools also supplied material which they felt had been omitted.

A third type of alteration was motivated by the readings in the synagogue. In this way cultic changes were introduced: e.g., (1) magnification of the vileness of idols or things reminiscent of idolatry, such as the alteration of Beth-El into Beth-Awen (house of wickedness, iniquity), and (2) the substitution of harmless words for names found in an embarrassing context, e.g., יִבְיָי for יְבִי in Hosea 7:16 and יִבְיָיַּו for יִבְיָי in Hosea 11:7.

These editors also made the changes in the pronunciation of the Divine Name. Thus יְהֹוָא was read יְהֹהֶנָא, as in the synagogue.

From this discussion of editorial changes it readily is seen that certain motives were responsible for the alterations made by the various editorial schools. These motives may be classified as follows: (1) to make the prophecies more valid and emphatic for the readers; (2) cultic alter-
ations to make the text more in harmony with the current cultic and theological beliefs (These changes constituted a protection of the cult and to a certain extent of the idea of God Himself. These alterations may be seen in the denunciation of shrines, altars, the description of idols as "lies" or "nonentities", and the like.); (3) messianic and eschatological alterations; (4) pro-Israel and anti-heathen alterations; and (5) protective alterations regarding God and His Name.

4. THE MASORETIC CHANGES

There is no certainty as to which changes in the Masoretic Text were introduced by the Masoretes, i.e., by the scribes who followed the Sopherim and the Editors of the Book of the Twelve. It may well be that some of the alterations which usually have been assigned to the Sopherim and the Editorial Schools (of Wolfe), really may have been changes introduced by the Masoretes. Certainly the group of changes which Wolfe has classified as the work of the later editorial school may have been made by the Masoretes.

This group of Masoretic alterations is concerned with the protection of God's Name. In several places in Hosea (4:15; 5:8; 10:5) Bethel originally occurred in the text.

---

1Ibid., p. 121. See pages 27f.
2Cf. page 28.
In each such instance, Bethel occurred in a context which reflected badly on the cultus and upon God. Consequently, the substitution of הַנִּיר ("House of Iniquity") was introduced into the Hebrew Text. In the Septuagint the protective device, ὁ οἰκός οὖν was employed. This word (οὖν) also occurred in the Septuagint of Hosea 12:5 where God (or at least His Angel) was said to be found at Bethel. Probably the translation followed the already established method in order to safeguard Jerusalem as the true center of worship and the only acceptable place to find God. Bethel occurs in the Targum of Hosea 4:15; 10:5; and 12:5. In Hosea 5:8, the Targum considerably differs from the Masoretic Text although the Hebrew Text used for the Aramaic translation probably did not differ substantially from the one possessed by the Masoretes and the translator of the Septuagint.

The Targum may retain the original text in Hosea 10:8 where, for הַנִּיר ("high places of iniquity"), it apparently translates a text reading בֵּית נִיר ("the high places of Bethel"). This is consistent with the translation of the Septuagint, ὁ οἰκός οὖν ("altars of On"). The reason for the alteration is obvious from the context.

Much less certain is the text of Amos 1:5 where God stated that He would break the bar of Damascus and cut off the inhabitant from בֵּית נִיר ("the plain of iniquity").

1 Could ὁ οὖν be a transliteration of הַנִּיר?
This has been retained by the Targum. The translation of the Septuagint as παδιον ὄν ("plain of On") suggests that the text originally may have been מבקעת-יב_deposit ("plain of Bethel"). If the Hebrew 'Vorlage', which the Septuagint translator possessed, read מבקעת-יב_deposit, the translator may have selected this translation because of the pattern already found in Hosea 10:8. He may have been motivated by a strong pro-Israel bias and/or a strong anti-heathen bias. An alternate explanation for the translation is the suggestion that the Hebrew 'Vorlage' was מבקעת-איל, where יָא represented one of the heathen deities. If this was the case, the translation may illustrate an instance of the protection of God's Name by the substitution of יא, a term which is applied frequently to heathen deities (idols).

A similar change, the substitution of נפש ("shame") for יָע ("Baal"), has been made several times in the Masoretic Text. Only one fairly certain instance is found in the Twelve, namely Hosea 9:10. The Septuagint reading of αἰσχυνη ("shame") and the Targum's ἀπορᾶ ("to shame") do not support this hypothesis of an alteration in the Masoretic Text here. The remaining occurrences of נפש in the Twelve have left no traces of any possible substitution in either the Aramaic or Greek Versions.

---

2Loc. cit.
The preceding discussion reveals clearly that even prior to the period of the Greek and Aramaic translations of the Old Testament, there existed within Judaism a veneration for Deity which affected the use of anthropomorphic language in the portrayal of God, and in other ways.

This fact is established clearly by the progressive development of thought shown in the religious ideas of the different periods as revealed by the various books of the Old Testament. Moreover, the changes in the consonantal text made by the Sopherim and the Masoretes demonstrate that the transmitters of our received text did not hesitate to alter certain passages which offended their theological beliefs. This fact supports the theory held by Wolfe and most modern scholars that there were still other editors and/or editorial schools who also, through alterations, additions, and omissions resulting from their theological bias, did not hesitate to change the text received by them. Even if the last mentioned theory is not accepted, the conclusion must be reached that certain attitudes and theological beliefs of the transmitters of the Hebrew text may be observed in our Masoretic Text.

This conclusion naturally leads to the expectation that the earliest two translations of the Hebrew text would
exhibit even more of these theological changes in their renderings. The results of this investigation of the Septuagint are found in the next section and of the Targum in the following section.
SECTION II.

CHAPTER II

THE THEOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS OF THE SEPTUAGINT:
THE GROSSER ANTHROPOMORPHISMS

In the preceding chapter are considered the alterations made to the Hebrew text. Some of the earliest changes of the Hebrew text were introduced by the Sopherim to eliminate statements concerning God which they considered to be the most derogatory to Deity. These changes also affected certain anthropomorphic descriptions of Deity. The motives of the Sopherim, which induced them to make these alterations, arose from their veneration of God and their theological beliefs concerning Him.

Earlier still, perhaps, the use of intermediaries had produced the conception of God as being less immanent and more transcendent and so resulted in a reduction of the number of expressions which had described Deity in anthropomorphic language.

The various editors, scribes, et al., also introduced changes and additions to the Hebrew text because of their theological concepts.

---

1The titles and sub-titles of this dissertation, unless otherwise indicated, are limited to the Book of the Twelve Prophets.

2See pages 12ff.

3See pages 3ff.
Therefore, the early translators of the Hebrew text into Greek and into Aramaic naturally would be expected to avoid literal translations of certain passages and to employ paraphrastic translations in order to avoid statements concerning Deity which they would consider to be derogatory of God. In fact, a priori, investigators might anticipate finding more alterations in these translations than the Sopherim, the Masoretes, the scribes, editors, et al., introduced into our received Hebrew text. Consequently, it is not at all surprising that most scholars assume that the Septuagint, as well as the Targums, exhibits an anti-anthropomorphic tendency. Examples of statements made by the investigators are:

The LXX... avoids completely the bold anthropomorphisms and the striking haïvétê of the original text, and shows in this particular an evident relationship with the other old Bible translations of the Jews.2

A dogmatic interest has been detected in some of these paraphrastic renderings, chiefly where the LXX have endeavoured to avoid the anthropomorphisms of the original; examples are most frequent in the Pentateuch,3

... both anthropomorphisms and anti-anthropomorphisms are found in the Greek Pentateuch,4

1See page xxx, footnote 14.

2Buhl, F., Canon and Text of the Old Testament, J. MacPherson, translator (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1892), p. 120.


A prominent characteristic common to the Alexandrian and Palestinian scholars is their avoidance of anthropomorphisms and of phrases which seemed derogatory to the Deity. Practically all scholars agree . . . that it was primarily for reasons of anthropomorphism, anthropopathism, euphemism, denial of resurrection, etc., that the numerous acts of omission were perpetrated [in Job]. And so the fact that the LXX translator has been made responsible by practically every scholar . . . is not to be wondered at. 

... the Greek translators, like the Targumists, sometimes followed the interpretation current in the schools of the time, so that a different translation does not always imply a different text, more especially in prophetic passages. 

Over some expressions the LXX avoids being literal, apparently from reverence or delicacy.

The translators did not set out to rewrite the text of the O T, but their theology left its marks on the final product.

---


The translators never scruple to introduce their favourite euphemisms, or to indulge their national susceptibilities.¹

The first² systematical approach to the study and classification of the anti-anthropomorphisms of any portion of the Septuagint was made by an American³ in 1943. Unfortunately Fritsch does not attempt to prove that anti-anthropomorphisms existed in the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. He assumes that the Septuagint in the Pentateuch had anti-anthropomorphic translations and so proceeds to classify them. Although he is conscious of certain difficulties connected with the assumption that the Septuagint avoided some anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew text⁴,


²The earlier works of Frankel, Lagarde, et al., were (and are) valuable, but, in so far as this investigator knows, the work by Fritsch is the first systematical, thorough investigation of its kind made of any portion of the Greek Old Testament. That it was not even more comprehensive is, of course, to be regretted.


⁴E.g., he (Fritsch, op. cit., pp. 62ff) mentions that there exist exceptions to both the anti-anthropomorphic and the anthropomorphic translations in the Septuagint. He also observes that in some passages the Septuagint is more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew. Although he seems to be aware of these facts, apparently he does not appreciate fully their significance.
he only briefly mentions these difficulties\(^1\). This failure to investigate thoroughly the entire problem robs his otherwise very useful work of much of its value. Moreover, a few examples of anti-anthropomorphism which he cites are in reality attempts made by the translator "... to render the Hebrew into intelligible Greek."\(^2\), and other examples which he cites are more likely due to a different "Vorlage", a misread text, or the like\(^3\).

From a perusal of Fritsch's investigation three facts emerge: (1) "... the necessity for the greatest caution [to be exercised] in stating conclusions."\(^4\); (2) the need for a re-investigation of the seeming anti-anthropomorphisms\(^5\); and finally, (3) the realization that an alteration which relieves God of some human quality, physical form or feature, or the like, is not necessarily an anti-anthropomorphism. A

\(^1\)Fritsch, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 68ff. (After Fritsch has stated that there exists at least one exception to every literal or anti-anthropomorphic translation, he continues, "The Seventy accordingly seem to have followed a definite system in these cases." -- a statement far from established!). Cf. Reider (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 204) who states: "Evidently the translators were not consistent, nor were they guided by a definite principle."

\(^2\)Reider, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 205.

\(^3\)E.g., "... the omission of the possessive pronoun 'his' with reference to God (p. 10, n. 6):" (\textit{loc. cit.}), etc.


\(^5\)This has been accomplished partially for the Twelve in the course of this investigation.
comparison should be made with those passages in which the usage is non-theological. Whenever similar changes occur in both theological and non-theological passages, the reason for the change must be other than an anti-anthropomorphic bias.

1. THE DESCRIPTION OF GOD IN TERMS WHICH IMPLY THAT HE HAS A COMPLETE HUMAN (OR PHYSICAL) FORM

1 An example of this principle: בְּבֵית הַפָּנָי ("to the face of") is translated as ἐν ψυχῇ where the Face is God's (Hosea 6:2; Haggai 2:14; Malachi 3:16), but it is also translated as ἐν ψυχῇ when the faces are those of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Therefore, this translation of בְּבֵית in Hosea 6:2; Haggai 2:14; and Malachi 3:16 is not an anti-anthropomorphism (see pp. 51ff). Another example is the translation of בְּבֵית as ἐν ψυχῇ both when the eyes (לְאֵי) are God's and man's. Consequently, this translation of בְּבֵית as ἐν ψυχῇ when the eyes are God's is not an anti-anthropomorphism.

2 The word ψυχή . . . is seldom specifically mentioned in the Old Testament in connection with God, but, when it is, it is probably a conscious anthropomorphism. (Knight, George A. F., From Moses to Paul [London: Lutterworth Press, 1949], p. 42.) This is not, however, to say that ψυχή denotes "soul" in the modern sense of that word, but rather it denotes the totality of God's personality which must also include the concept of "spiritual flesh" (loc. cit.). In two passages ψυχή is used of God in the Twelve. Zechariah 11:8 reads in the Hebrew בְּבֵית בְּבֵית ("And my soul was impatient with them" -- a literal translation). This is reproduced adequately by καὶ βαρυθησέται: η ψυχή μου επ αυτούς ("And my soul will be weighed down against them"). Note that certain Greek translations vary the verb βαρυθησέται slightly, and also the preposition επί: (α' = εκολοαθήτη, σ' = ωλίγοφυκασα ["to be faint, discouraged, worried"], and θ' = ωλίγοφυκασεν ["to be faint", etc.]); α' = εν; θ' = επί. Note also that ψυχή is rendered as ψυχή and that, if anything, the Septuagint is slightly more anthropomorphic here than the Masoretic Text. The Greek manuscript Ω reads χειρ ("hand") for ψυχή ("soul") here. The Targum (see page 203) avoids the anthropomorphism by the substitution of בְּבֵית ("By My Word") for בְּבֵית. In Amos 6:8, on the other hand, בְּבֵית is rendered accurately as καθ εαυτοῦ. Aquila translates literally as ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ.
The Septuagint, like the Masoretic Text, avoids the direct statement that God is a man. It, however, does picture God as (אֱלֹהִים = θεός τοπον) man ( ανθρώπος). The Septuagint also retains the description of God as a husband (ανήρ), possessing a wife (γυνή), being

αυτοῦ ("with His Soul"). The Hebrew here is נַעֲבַשׁ בְּנִשְׁפָּת ("The Lord Yahweh has sworn by His Soul" -- a more literal translation). The Septuagint and Procksch delete θεός (so Procksch, op. cit., p. 923 footnote). The Greek translation renders the Hebrew as οτι ἀμώσε κυρίος καθ' εαυτοῦ ("For the Lord hath sworn by himself"). It gives the meaning of the Hebrew here. The Targum avoids by substituting נָעֲבַשׁ מִבִּי ("By His Word") for נַעֲבַשׁ בְּנִשְׁפָּת ("By His Soul") -- see page 203.

1Cf. in Hosea 11:9 where נַעֲבַשׁ בְּנִשְׁפָּת ("... for I am God and not man") is translated literally in the Septuagint as διότι θεός εγώ ειμί καὶ οὐκ ανθρώπος ("For I am God and not a man --"). The Targum here makes a considerable change in its translation (see page 192).

In Malachi 3:17 the clause נַעֲבַשׁ ("... and I will spare them as a man spares his son who serves him") is translated as καὶ εἰρήνευσαί αὐτοὺς ὁ τρόπον αἰρετὸς αὐτῆς ανθρώπως τὸν μιὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν δουλευόντα αὐτῷ ("And I will make choice of them, as a man maketh choice of a son who serveth him"). Cf. the Targum which is also "literal" (see page 192, footnote 1).

3This idea occurs three times: (1) in Hosea 2:4(2) where נַעֲבַשׁ ("... and I am not her husband") is rendered faithfully as καὶ εἰρήνευσαί αὐτῆς ("And I am not her Husband"); (2) in Hosea 2:9(7) where the Targum becomes καὶ εἰρήνευσαί πρὸς τὸν αὐτὰρ μου τὸν πρώτον ("... and [let me] return to my first husband"); and (3) in Hosea 2:18(16) where נַעֲבַשׁ ("... you will call me, 'My husband'") is carried over adequately as נַעֲבַשׁ מִבִּי ("... that she will call Me My husband"). The Targum here avoids this anthropomorphic description of God; see pages 192 - 200.

4In Hosea 2:4(2) נַעֲבַשׁ מִבִּי ("... for she is not my wife") is rendered literally in the Septuagint as οτι αὐτὴ οὐ γυνὴ μου ("... for she is not My wife") but not in the Targum (see page 202).
betrothed (μνηστεύω), etc.

Furthermore, not only may the Greek retain at times an anthropomorphism but actually may heighten this description of Deity as a human being. Thus, for example, in Hosea 11:4 the Greek translation adds the word "man" (ἀνθρώπος) which increases slightly the anthropomorphic simile although altering the comparison used:

καὶ εσομαι αὐτοῖς οὕς ῥοπίζων ἀνθρώπος ἐπὶ τὰς σιαγόνας αὐτοῦ
καὶ εσομαι αὐτοῖς ὡς τρέχων ἀνθρώπος ἐπὶ τὰς σιαγόνας αὐτοῦ

...and I became to them as one who eases the yoke on their jaws,

Now I will be to them as a man who slappeth his cheeks.

The Septuagint here reduces God more to the level of a man than the Hebrew which, moreover, keeps Israel in a very subordinate position in relation to Deity. The

---

1In Hosea 2:21(19)f., the phrase "וְלָבְנַה ("And I will betroth you to me . . .") occurs three times and is reproduced faithfully each time in the Septuagint as καὶ μνησθεύω σε εμαυτῷ ("And I will betroth you to Me"). In the Targum this anthropomorphism is avoided; see page 202.

2See page 13, footnote 3.

3Cf. Symmachus, [καὶ] εὐνοιαζην αὐτοῖς ὡς ὁ ἐπίθεις ἱματος ἐπὶ τὰς σιαγόνας ἑαυτοῦ ("I was esteemed to them as one placing a yoke on their cheeks"), and Aquila, ὡς εἰρων ἱματος ("as one bearing a yoke").

4Pell's edition of Thompson's translation of the Septuagint is used throughout for the translation of Septuagint unless otherwise noted. This procedure has not been fully carried out in the footnotes.

5The Greek translation is obviously more derogatory of Deity than the Hebrew.
Targum⁴ is clearly anti-anthropomorphic here, but its Hebrew 'Vorlage' was very similar, if not identical, to our present Masoretic text. On the other hand, the text which the Greek translator(s)² possessed possibly varied slightly from our received text, e.g.,

\[
\text{And I will be to them as one making smooth }^{5} \text{ [a man] upon his (their) cheeks,}^{6}
\]

or,

---

¹See pages 193f.

²Hereafter referred to in the singular.


⁶A free translation.
... and I will be to them as one smiting a man upon his (their) cheeks.

These texts differ from the Masoretic Text essentially in only two particulars. The final ἀντίοα ("his") need not point to a different text (יוו) but probably is a harmonization arising from ἀνθρωπος. Likewise the ἀνθρωπος ("man") does not require necessarily a ἄνθρωπος ("man") in the translator's Hebrew text. This passage illustrates both the very strong anthropomorphic nature of the Septuagint and the uncertainty of the Hebrew text which the translator possessed.

There exist very few examples in the Septuagint which even at first glance appear to avoid describing God as a man.

---


2See page 40, footnote 4.

3See Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 645 for the verb ηδων.

4A free translation.

5It may have been added merely to express more clearly the idea of the Hebrew (according to the translator's view).

6See pages 161f.

7Cf. in Zechariah 10:9 where cod. mg reads επεγερω ("I will raise up") for στερω ("I will sow"); perhaps that is an anti-anthropomorphism.
Hardly an example of a real anti-anthropomorphism occurs in the Septuagint\(^1\) anywhere. A translation which might appear at first to be anti-anthropomorphich occurs in another clause in Hosea 11:4. The rendering of the preceding clause\(^2\), however, makes it very unlikely that the translation of "I fed (him)" by δυνησομαι \(\text{αὐτῷ}^3\) (= ἔλησε, "I will prevail over him") is an anti-anthropomorphism. The portrayal of God as prevailing over a person is scarcely less anthropomorphic than the original picture of feeding. Moreover, the translator's Hebrew text may have been deficient in the yodh (י) and the waw (ו). If his text was deficient, then the יָדָם ("I fed") would have appeared in his text as יַדָם, which he easily could have vocalized as a first person singular qal (hophal) imperfect of יָדָם ("to prevail") instead of as a first person singular Hiphil imperfect of יַדָם ("to feed"). The \(\text{αὐτῷ}^3\), moreover, does not require either

\(^1\)I.e., the Septuagint translation of the Minor Prophets. Cf. page 32, footnote 1.

\(^2\)See pages 39ff.

\(^3\) \(\text{αὖτῷ} = \text{βρωματα}\) ("food, meat") and \(\text{αὐτῷ} = \text{βρωσιν} \) ("meat").

\(^4\)Cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 906, footnote; Nyberg, H.S., (Studien zum Hoseabuch, [Uppsala: A.B. Lundequistaka Bokhandeln, 1935], p. 85); Wutz, F., (Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus [Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1935], II, p. 335); and Ruben (op. cit., p. 19). Wutz (loc. cit.) considers that the Septuagint is here correct ("... denn G liest richtig ἔλησε δυνησομαι ἀντὶ). If this is correct, then perhaps the Septuagint is more anthropomorphic since these words "... indicate most clearly, that if Israel would wrangle again with God, he shall be conquered...". (Ruben, loc. cit.)
an original, or but was added possibly to supply the necessary object for the verb in Greek. The Targum and the Syriac ("they might feed") clearly are based upon a text similar to the Masoretic text. Possibly they go back, like the Septuagint, to a text, such as, e.g., ἀποκορυφα, although their translation could result from a different vocalization of the same consonantal text as the Masoretic text.

Likewise, it is very uncertain whether the rendering of τὰς φυλὰς ("the tribes") in Micah 4:14(5:1) reflects either a different consonantal text or

1See page 199.

3τὰς φυλὰς in B - 68, CyrP; τὸν κριτὴν ("the judge") in Ach. α, ι, η, ι — Masoretic Text. The Syriac ("shepherd") = (ibid., p. 100).

4The Masoretic Text = "With a rod they strike upon the cheek the judge of Israel." The Septuagint = ("With a rod they will smite on the cheek the tribes of Israel.").

5Vollers, K. ("Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner", Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 4 (1884) (thereafter referred to as Vollers, II, op. cit.), p. 87) van Hoonacker (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 100), Wütz (op. cit., p. 248), and Taylor, J. (The Masoretic Text and the Ancient Versions of the Book of Micah, [London: Williams and Norgate, 1890], p. 110) consider that the Septuagint read a different text.
a theological bias. The Targum\(^1\) and one codex\(^2\) read "judges". This reading avoids the anthropomorphism\(^3\). Since all the descriptions of God as judging are reproduced faithfully elsewhere by the translator, he probably misread the \(\text{שָׁבָע}\) as a \(\text{יְהוֹ}\). This confusion of \(\text{יְהוֹ}\) and \(\text{יָהֲוָא}\) is common in the Septuagint, especially the confusion of \(\text{שָׁבָע}\) and \(\text{יָהֲוָא}\).

Although the rendering of \(\text{יְהוֹ}\) ("I chastise them")\(^5\) in Hosea 10:10 as \(\text{παίδευσαι} \, \alpha\upsilon\omega\upsilon\) \(^6\) ("to chastise them") avoids the anthropomorphic description, it does not necessarily reflect a change because of a theological belief upon the part of the translator. Moreover, since the idea of correction and instruction by God is maintained in the

\(^1\)The Targum reads "judges" which is the equivalent of the Hebrew "judges".

\(^2\)De Rossi, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 198 (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 100).

\(^3\)They are followed by Dathe and Graetz (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 100).


\(^5\)A literal translation.

\(^6\)\(\text{α} \, \text{σ} \, \text{ι} \, \text{I} \, \text{γ} \, \text{θ} \), Th. = \text{παίδεσω} ("I chastise"). The Syriac = \(\text{יָהֲוָא}\) (Harper, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 349). Oert \(\text{op. cit.}\), Martin \(\text{op. cit.}\), Dathe, Oettili, Graetz \(\text{op. cit.}, p. 14\), Nowack, and Harper (so Harper, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 350) emend following the Syriac to \(\text{יָהֲוָא}\). Cf. also Driver ("Linguistic and Textual Problems: Minor Prophets", \textit{The Journal of Theological Studies}, 39 (1938), p. 160) who retains the same consonantal form and meaning as the Masoretic Text but with a different vocalization. The Septuagint = \(\text{יָהֲוָא}\) (Vollers, [I, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 254]; so Harper \(\text{op. cit.}, p. 349\).
Septuagint of Hosea 7:12 (cf. 15(14) and 5:29), the reason for the Septuagint's rendering may be that the translator understood the root to be ḫṣ ("to bind, tie") but assumed that it had the same meaning as ḫס has in Biblical Hebrew.

---

1 In Hosea 7:12 ḫס "I will chastise them..."

is rendered literally as παιδεύω αὐτοὺς ("I will chastise them..." -- a literal translation); cf. the Targum which softens slightly. See page 207.

2 In Hosea 7:15 the reason for the Septuagint's translation of ἐπιαιδεύσαν ἐν εἷς ("They were corrected by Me" -- a literal translation) for ἤτακα ("And I chastise..." -- a literal translation) is uncertain. Probably, as Procksc (op. cit., p. 908, footnote), Harper (op. cit., p. 300), et al., the Septuagint omitted the ἤτακα as a dittograph, and the Greek here represents the translation of ἐπιαιδεύσαν ("... they rebel against me") of verse 14 (see page 1008). If the ἐπιαιδεύσαν ἐν εἷς here is the translation of ἤτακα, then the Septuagint represents a slight softening of the anthropomorphism of the Masoretic Text. Perhaps it is best, however, to delete ἤτακα with the Septuagint as Procksc (loc. cit.); Robinson, T.H. (Robinson and Horst, Die Zwelf Kleinen Propheten, [ O. Eissfeldt, ed., Handbuck zum alten Testament, Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1938], p. 90); Ruben (op. cit., p. 14); and Cheyne, T.K., [Critica Biblica (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1904), p. 124] and connect (considered as a passive) with verse fifteen. "The usual meaning of ἤτακα, chasten, punish, ... gives no sense. If MT is retained it must mean trained, or disciplined," (Harper, op. cit., p. 808). The Targum retains ἤτακα and slightly softens it; see pages 207f.

3 The Septuagint (ἐγὼ ὑπὲρ παιδευμὸς ὑμῶν = "But I am your corrector," comparatively literally translates the Hebrew ἐπιαιδεύσας ἐν εἷς ("... but I will chastise [or am a corrector of] all of them."). For ἐπιαιδεύσας the Septuagint may have read (or altered to) ἐπιαιδεύσας (so Procksc, op. cit., p. 699, footnote).

4 Driver, G.R., (op. cit., p. 160), states "Perhaps ἐπιαιδεύσας that I may chastise them and ἐπιαιδεύσας may be read on the assumption ἐπιαιδεύσας as a by form of ἤτακα, just as the Aram. ᶜעזר and ᶘ may exist side by side." His footnote to this reads: "Op. Hos. vii 15 and Jb, iv 3 (s. Driver in J.T.S. xxxvi 295-296)."
Alternatively, the Hebrew text which he was translating may have had 7 instead of the 8 in the Masoretic Text.

The remaining translations which possibly may exhibit anti-anthropomorphic changes are of a more lexical nature. In Micah 1:2, for instance, the Greek states that God will be among the people for a testimony5 (eic μαρτυριον 4). This is more probably an attempt to translate γνωμα ("witness") freely than for the translation to have resulted from anti-anthropomorphic prejudices, especially since in Malachi 3:5 and 2:14 the noun and verb, respectively, are translated literally.

1 Or the text may have been misread.

2 The Hebrew ידע עבко בנהי יינתון ("... and let the Lord God be a witness against you,"), is translated as και εσται κυριος εν μιν εις μαρτυριον ("And the Lord will be among (against) you for a testimony." -- a free translation). This translation more likely results from a pro-Israel bias than from any anti-anthropomorphic tendency. Procksch (op. cit., p. 933 footnote) deletes יתון with A, Q.

3 The abstract for the concrete (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 34).

4 α', eic μαρτυρα ("witness"); πε' testificans = διαμαρτυρομενος ("protest, bear witness").

5 Cf. Targum, page 211.

6 The Hebrew יתון יתון יתון ("I will be a swift witness . . . "), is rendered literally as και εσωμαι μαρτυς παχυς ("and I will be a swift witness. . . "); cf. the Targum (see page 211, footnote 1) which avoids the anthropomorphism by the use of Memra.

7 The Hebrew יתון יתון יתון ("Because the Lord was witness . . . between you. . . "), is reproduced faithfully as oti κυριος διεμαρτυρηκεν ανα μεσον σου ("Because God was a witness between thee. . . "). The Targum here is also literal, see page 210.
The translation of the verb, "τραπεζαντομαι" ("to visit"; "punish") in the Septuagint presents a difficulty. This verb occurs eighteen times in the Twelve and usually means "to punish" when it is used in conjunction with the preposition "επί" ("upon, against"). This combination ("επί τραπεζαντομαι") is translated normally by "εκδικεω" ("to avenge, punish") and "επισκεπτομαι" ("to look at, inspect, visit"), a translation which is appropriate for the alternate meaning of visiting. In Hosea 4:14 and Zechariah 10:3 the influence of other Greek manuscripts may be seen because in Hosea 1:4 Aquila uses "επισκεπτομαι" ("visit") and in Hosea 2:13(15); 4:9; and Zephaniah 1:8 the other manuscripts (οι λόγοι) use "επισκεπτομαι" where "εκδικεω" ("punish") might have been anticipated. The remaining seven passages in which "τραπεζαντομαι" ("punish, visit") occurs without "επί" ("upon") are translated four times by "εκδικεω" ("punish") and three times by "επισκεπτομαι" ("visit"). These translations cannot be considered, therefore, to result from theological motives; they probably, however, reflect the

---

1 This verb occurs always in the Twelve in a theological passage.

2 Hosea 2:13(15); 4:9; Amos 3:2,14 (2nd); Zephaniah 1:8,9,12; 3:7; cf. Hosea 12:2(3) where "εκδικεω" ("avenge") occurs without the "επί" ("upon").

3 Hosea 1:14; 8:13; 9:9; Amos 3:14 (first).

4 Zephaniah 2:7; Zechariah 10:3 (second); 11:16. That the idea of motion was evident in Zechariah 11:16 is clear from the translation "επιστρεψω" ("to turn about") in 130'.
translator's exegesis (or understanding) of these passages.

A translation which is probably anti-anthropomorphic occurs in Malachi 2:17\(^1\) (twice). Apparently the gross anthropomorphism of wearying God (\(\text{יַ֖ל חָ֣בָ֑ר} \text{hihil}\)\(^2\) was too offensive, and, therefore, the translator softened the idea by the use of \(\text{παρακατω} \text{?} \) ("to urge, irritate, provoke, excite", etc.). This translation is still anthropomorphic, but the idea of making God weary is avoided. The possibility that this is an anti-anthropomorphism is increased by the secular use in Habakkuk 2:13\(^4\), where the qal stem occurs and is translated by \(\text{ἐκλέπω} \) ("to pass over, omit, forsake, cease, depart, fail, die", \textit{et al.}). In the latter instance, \(\text{הָל} \) was apparently understood to be from the root, \(\text{לד} \) ("to expire, die")\(^5\). There exist, however, so few instances

---

\(^1\)The Targum is \textit{closer to the Masoretic Text than to the Septuagint}. See page 211.

\(^2\)The Hebrew, \(\text{הָל אֲדֹנֵי} \) ("You have wearied the Lord with your words. Yet you say, 'How have we wearied him?'"), is translated as \(\text{οὶ παρακατώντες στὸν θεόν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ὑμῶν καὶ εἶπατε ἐν τινὶ παρακατώνυμεν ('You have provoked God with your sayings. And do you ask, by what have we provoked him?')

\(^3\)Prockach (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 975, footnote) adds here \textit{ὅ} ("him") with the Septuagint (according to Procksch). Only a few Septuagint manuscripts, rel. (W. Clem. Chr. II 462 VI 44 Lucif. Spec.), add \textit{αὐτόν} or even \textit{σε} (C, Hi\(P\)); cf. one. Hebrew manuscript = \(\text{תניא} \) (Kennicott, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 304).

\(^4\)Only occurs four times in the Twelve; in the other two instances it translates \(\text{אָמַ֑ר} \). Ziegler considers it = Masoretic Text here (Ziegler, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 334, notes).

\(^5\)The only other instance in the Twelve.

\(^6\)Could this be the case in Malachi 2:17? Cf. one manuscript which reads \(\text{תניא} \) (Kennicot, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 304).
of this verb (טול) — only three times in the Twelve — that no certain conclusion can be reached.

Similarly, the reason for the variation in the translations of נצר ("to smelt, refine, test") in Zechariah 13:91 as πυρω ("to burn up, test by fire") and in Malachi 3:2f2 as a form of χωνευω (= "to cast, smelt") is uncertain. The first translation probably was influenced by the close proximity of the preceding πυρ ("fire"), yet both Greek verbs are fairly literal reproductions of the Hebrew verb.

Finally, the verb, נב ("to test, try"), occurs three times and is translated differently each time. In one passage, Zechariah 13:93 the translation is fairly literal. The anthropomorphic idea of God trying or testing metal is retained. The situation is different in the other two passages which refer to men trying or testing God. These two are discussed in a later place4.

---

1The Hebrew, אַלֵהַ-ֵה מָצַרְתְוּ בְּרְפֵּאָה ("... and I, [i.e., God, will] refine them as one refines silver"), is translated καὶ πυρασχά αὐτούς ὡς πυρασχαί τὸ αἰχμήριον ("... and [I have] tried them as silver is tried,").

2The Hebrew, ζηλοῦ· ὅταν ὁ θεὸς ἐστιν ὁ λύτρον ("For he is like a refiner's fire ... he will sit as a refiner ..."), is translated as διότι αὐτος εἰπώρευται ὡς πυρ χωνευτηριον ... καὶ καθιεται χωνευων ("Since he is coming like the fire of a refiner's furnace; ... He will sit refining ...").

3The Hebrew, διάνοιξεν πάντας ἐναντίον τοῦ κόσμου ("... and [I will] test them as gold is tested"), is reproduced faithfully as καὶ δοκιμῶν αὐτούς ὡς δοκιμήθηκα τῷ χρυσίν ("... and [I have] proved them as gold is proved.")

4See pages 275f,
In this first section several passages which, in the Septuagint, may reflect an anti-anthropomorphic bias on the part of the translator have been considered; however, in not one passage is there a specific example which unquestionably must be due to this motive. Other passages containing the same idea (expressed by verbs or substantives) were found to be translated literally (or accurately), to retain or increase\(^1\) the anthropomorphic coloring, etc.

In several passages, moreover, the translation easily may represent a different (or misread) 'Vorlage' rather than a theological translation. This may be the situation in Hosea 11:4. Twice in the passages examined the Greek translation involves only the mistaking of one Hebrew consonant for another similar one.

The translation which is most probably anti-anthropomorphic occurs in Malachi 2:17 (twice), but this cannot be definitely established because of the infrequency of the occurrences of yh and because of the anthropopathic nature of the translation. Therefore, the conclusion cannot yet be reached that the translator of the Twelve was motivated by a spiritual concept of God which required him to avoid or soften the grosser anthropomorphisms of Deity.

\(^1\)E.g., Hosea 11:4. See pages 39ff.
2. THE POSSESSION BY GOD OF PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

The conclusion reached in the preceding section\(^1\) remains valid for the passages in the Masoretic Text which describe God as having parts of the human body (i.e., possessing eyes, nose, mouth, face, etc.) when compared with the Septuagint renderings. In general the anthropomorphific coloring is retained, and once is even increased\(^2\).

(1) THE FACE OF GOD

Generally speaking, the Hebrew \(ש"ב ("faces")\) is translated by προσώπον ("a face"), the exact Greek equivalent -- in fact, προσώπον ("face") almost always translates \(ש"ב ("faces")\) except when the word, \(ש"ב ("faces")\), is found in conjunction with a preposition (e.g., προσφέρων = "before the face") of", whether the reference is to the face of man or of God\(^3\). Possibly the "Face(or Presence) of God" was used so generally at this time as an intermediary that ", . . . the original significance of the Hebrew [i.e., of a literal, physical face] was hardly [if at all] felt."\(^4\). Hence, the translator may have considered the expression, the 'Face of God' to refer to the Intermediary, the 'Presence of God', and,

\(^1\) Pages 37 - 50 inclusive.

\(^2\) See page 151.

\(^3\) In a few instances the simple \(ש"ב \) is not translated by προσώπον in the Septuagint, e.g., in Zechariah 7:2 where the Septuagint does not translate \(ש"ב ; see page 58 footnote 4.

\(^4\) Johnson, op. cit., p. 157.
consequently, to have no need to render it other than literally.

Professor Johnson's observation is especially true of the derived prepositional phrases ("to the face[s] of"). Unlike the Pentateuch, however, these prepositional phrases are not... consistently translated in the Septuagint by ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον, ἀπεναντί, and ἐναντί (before); e.g., ἐνώπιον is translated three times by ἐνώπιον, once πρὸς µέ, and twice literally. The phrases ἐνώπιον and ἐναντί always are rendered literally. Therefore, the derived prepositional phrases signified to the translator the presence of God, i.e., being before God. Hence to the translator the Greek expressions, ἐνώπιον θεοῦ

---

1Loc. cit.; He used the preceding quotation when he had reference to the prepositional phrases which contain ἐνώπιον.

2See pages 4-7.

3Fritsch, Op. cit., p. 12, footnote 8. There the reference is to ἐνώπιον and its variants. He maintains that in the Pentateuch the Septuagint consistently translates these prepositional phrases by ἐνώπιον, etc.

4Hosea 6:2 (V, Q L - 613 - 764, C 538 - 68 Th. Tht. Thph. [ = III 1197] read ἐναντίον for ἐνώπιον); Haggai 2:14; Malachi 3:16; cf. the non-theological use in Zechariah 12:8. The Targum translates using οὐτος "before" (see pages 233f.).

5Jonah 1:2.


7Jonah 1:3 (twice), 10.

8Nahum 1:5; Habakkuk 2:20; Zephaniah 1:7; Haggai 1:12; Zechariah 2:13(17); Malachi 3:14.
("before God") and "pro prosowioj theou" ("before the face of God") would convey exactly the same idea, i.e., in the presence of God.

Even the very strong anthropomorphic expression, "πριν ἐπὶ θεοῦ φάσθαι" ("to make the Face of Deity sweet [or pleasant]")\(^1\), is translated accurately. The πριν is rendered with its metaphorical meaning\(^2\), and the oμα ("faces") is translated three\(^3\) times literally and omitted once\(^4\).

---

\(^1\) A literal translation.

\(^2\) In Zechariah 7:2; 8:22; and Malachi 1:9 πριν ("to propitiate") is translated by εὐλαβομαι with its ordinary classical meaning of "to propitiate"; but in Zechariah 8:21 the verb used is δεομαι ("to beg" or "pray"). The translation of πριν ("to propitiate") by εὐλαβομαι is so unusual that there may be a reason for its use here. In Zechariah 7:2 and Malachi 1:9 there is a tone of contempt present in the context, and it may have been used to indicate the translator's contempt for anyone who would consider it possible to placate Yahweh — a concept unworthy of Him. In Zechariah 8:22 the heathen are coming to Yahweh, and the translator may have selected deliberately, therefore, εὐλαβομαι. The choice of δεομαι for πριν in the preceding verse when the reference is to the Israelites indicates that the translator has changed, probably deliberately, the Greek verb in Zechariah 8:22 (cf. Dodd, C.H., op. cit., p. 87).

\(^3\) In Zechariah 8:21 πριν ἐπὶ θεοῦ φάσθαι ("... to entreat the favor of the Lord") is translated as δηθὺν τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου ("... to pray before the Lord ..."); in 8:22 it is rendered as καὶ τῷ εὐλαβομένῳ τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου ("... and to conciliate the favor of the Lord"); and in Malachi 1:9 ἐν τῷ θεῷ προσώπω ("And now entreat the favour of God") becomes καὶ νῦν εὐλαβομένῳ τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ ("And now you propitiate your God" — a free translation).

\(^4\) In Zechariah 7:2 πριν ἐπὶ θεοῦ φάσθαι ("... to entreat the favour of the Lord") is translated adequately as τοῦ εὐλαβομένου τοῦ κυρίου ("... to conciliate ... the Lord").
Therefore, the Septuagint does not alter the expression, "the face of God", and the translator may have understood it as the Intermediary, the Presence of Yahweh.

(2) THE EYES OF GOD

In the Masoretic Text of the Twelve, God is said about a dozen times, to have eyes. Only twice does the Septuagint render ἐνώπιον (apart from prepositional phrases) seemingly other than literal. Moreover, the prepositional phrase, ἐν οφθαλμοῖς ("by the eyes of"), referring to God's eyes, twice is translated ἐνώπιον ("before").

The two passages in which the Septuagint may have softened or avoided the statement that God possesses eyes

1See G.H. Dix's article "The Seven Archangels and the Seven Spirits" in the Journal of Theological Studies, 28 (1927): 233-50. Especially note pages 237ff where he points out that, when the term 'the Angel of the Presence' (and the earlier term, 'the Angel of Yahweh') was difficult or impossible to use (ibid., p. 238), the Septuagint translators of the later books called the Angel, 'the Presence of God'. Although the translator of the Twelve did not go this far, this fact concerning the later translators supports the probability that the translator of the Twelve regarded 'the Presence of God' as an intermediary device.

2In Amos 9:4 in א" 49 ( murderous) occurs for ὄφθαλμοι ("the eyes") in Jonah 2:5, a facie tua ("from your face") -- so Ach. Sa.

3Zechariah 4:10; 9:1.

4Zechariah 8:6; Malachi 2:17 -- in the former V reads ἐνώπιον ("before"); cf. also 4491.

5The same situation occurs non-theologically in Haggai 2:3; Zechariah 8:6.
(יְיִשָּׁר) are found in Zechariah — 9:1 and 4:10. In
Zechariah 9:1 the Greek is as anthropomorphic¹ as the Hebrew:

For to Yahweh belongs the eye of a man.

Because the Lord looks upon men.

Obviously the Greek translation conveys essentially
the same idea as the Hebrew, especially if the Hebrew means
that "Yahweh has an eye on mankind"⁶. If the meaning of the

¹Cf. Amos 9:8 where the expression, the "eyes of
Yahweh", is translated literally.

²The meaning of the Hebrew here is uncertain.

³This is a possible translation. The Revised Standard
Version translates, "For to the Lord belong the cities of
Aram," thus emending the text as Klosterman (according to
Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary
on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah (Edinburgh: T and T
Clark, 1912), p. 270), Mitchell (loc. cit.), Hörst (Robinson
and Hörst, op. cit., p. 238), Marti (op. cit., p. 427), and
Procksch (op. cit., p. 965, footnote) emend the text to יי
בְּנֵי הָאֲרָם ("cities of Aram"). Other suggested emendations also
involve the substitution of י for י (as one codex does),
E.g., יי by Michaelis (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op.
cit., p. 270), Drake (so Wright, C.H.H., Zechariah and His
Prophecies, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1879), p. 566),
and Graetz (op. cit., p. 24); and יי by Ball (so

⁴The Syriac and Targum use a passive construction for
the Septuagint's active construction (Jansma, T., "Inquiry
into the Hebrew Text and Ancient Versions of Zechariah ix
-xiv", Oudtestamentische Studiën, P.A.H. De Boer, editor,

⁵A free translation.

⁶The Hebrew may mean that "Yahweh has an eye on man-
kind" (as the Septuagint, the Targum [see page 213 ], the
Syriac, Cyril of Alexandria, Grotius, de Dieu, Drusius, Marck,
Pemble, Newcome, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Hitzig, Ewald, Burger;
(so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 270), Drake (so
Wright, C.H.H., op. cit., p. 566), et al.
Hebrew is that "Yahweh possesses a human eye"\(^1\), then the translation into Greek represents a softening of the anthropomorphic expression of the Hebrew.

Certain Greek manuscripts\(^2\) omit χυριος in their translation of Zechariah 4:10:

```
These seven are the eyes of the Lord,
οφθαλμοι εισιν

... those seven eyes.

```

Probably Ziegler and Kittel are correct in inserting χυριος following the οφθαλμοι ("eye")\(^3\). Certain Septuagint manuscripts\(^4\) insert the χυριος ("of the Lord") after the εισιν ("are").

Hence it is uncertain whether there was an omission of χυριος ("of the Lord") at this point in the original.

---

\(^1\) Alternatively, the Hebrew may mean that "towards Yahweh the eye of mankind is directed" (so Jerome, Aben Ezra, Rashi, Kimchi [McGaul, A., Rabbi David Kimchi's Commentary upon the Prophecies of Zechariah, (London: James Duncan, 1837), p. 83], Calvin, Blayney, de Ribera, Henderson, Kliefoth, Brenenkamp, Pusey (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 270), Wright (op. cit., pp. 206f., 566), Lowe, W.R., (The Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zechariah (London: Macmillan and Co., 1882), p. 70), Cohen, A., editor, (The Twelve Prophets (Bournemouth: The Soncino Press, 1949), p. 303), et al.). The Hebrew may mean merely, thus, the bare statement, "Yahweh possesses a human eye" -- a very gross anthropomorphism. If this is the meaning of the Hebrew, then the Septuagint, Syriac, and Targum are clearly anthropomorphic softening.

\(^2\) B, 147\(^{x}\), 233\(^{\prime}\), Arm., Hi\(^{P}\).

\(^3\) So also W.

\(^4\) A\(^{s}\), 763, Bo.
Septuagint manuscript. The other versions are not much help because, on the whole, the Syriac follows the Septuagint ("Seven are these eyes of the Lord which gaze upon the whole earth"\(^1\)), and the Targum translates as סְנַיִּים כְּחוֹלֵלִים נַעֲבֵרִים בְּנַיִּים ("seven rows [of stones] as these. Before Yahweh have been revealed all the words of the children of men"\(^3\)). Since the Syriac, as well as many Greek manuscripts, supports the originality of ὀφθαλμοί κυρίου ("the eyes of the Lord"), it is improbable that any passage occurs in the Septuagint which denies eyes to God.

Several verbs occur in the Masoretic Text which state that God can see and, therefore, possesses eyes. One of these verbs occurs in Malachi 2:13\(^4\):

---

\(^1\)Rignell's translation, "Diese sind die sieben Augen des Herrn, die über die ganze Erde schauen." (Rignell, L.G., Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja (Lund: C. W. K., Gleerups, 1950), p. 163.)

\(^2\)See page 219.

\(^3\)The Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate, Targum, leading Jewish commentators, Calvin, Grotius, Pemble, Dathe, Lowth, Newcome, Theiner, Ewald, Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, et al., connect the words מִיִּי נִפְעַת with the words which follow, against the Masoretic Text which makes them the subject of מַעֲבֵרִים נַעֲבֵרִים -- so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 167.

\(^4\)Of, in Zephaniah 3:15; מַעֲבֵרִים נַעֲבֵרִים ("He [God] has cast out your enemy") is translated as ἔλυσεν τοὺς σὺν τῷ χείρος ἐχθρῶν ("... he hath redeemed thee out of the hand of thine enemies"). See page 97. The Targum alters slightly (see page 222).
because he no longer regards [looks on] the offering.

... is it still proper to look upon a sacrifice.

The reason for this translation is uncertain, although it may soften the picture given in the Hebrew, of God as looking on (or accepting) sacrifices, from a statement to a question with an impersonal subject. It may represent also an attempt to render the Hebrew into a corresponding idiomatic but literal Greek. If so, the translator probably did regard God as the One Who was observing the sacrifices.

Another verb which conveys the implication that God possesses eyes is רָאָה ("behold, regard"). This verb occurs in Hosea 13:7 and 14:8(9). The Septuagint, however, does not translate the verb by the same Greek word in both instances. The first passage is:

The Targum: מִנֵּה עֹז יִשְֹרָאֵל לְכַרְבִּים ("further I do not look back at the offering") = Masoretic Text. The Targum may have translated מִנֵּה according to the meaning of the Aramaic verb מִנֵּה (see page 222).

1

... I [God] will lurk [watch] beside the way.

in the way to the Assyrians.

... in the way to the Assyrians.

2

This translation involves only a vocalization\(^1\) change from יִרְשָׁא to יִרְשָׁא. The second passage is:

\[
\text{kai } στρατισχόω \quad \ldots \quad \text{and I will strengthen him,}^3
\]

The latter translation is almost as anthropomorphic as the Masoretic Text. Moreover, it may rest upon a different or misread text\(^4\). Therefore, these two renderings hardly can be anti-anthropomorphic; it is just as probable that they represent different or misread texts.

The idea of not being hidden may suggest the possibility of sight and also of eyes. In Hosea 5:3 the Septuagint avoids the statement that Israel was not hidden from God:

represents only a change of vocalization. Certainly some Hebrew manuscripts must be the original of Septuagint (cf. Nyberg, op. cit., p. 102). Ewald (op. cit., I, p. 303) says that the reference to the Assyrians would be out of place here since only the final punishment of the whole nation was intended. The Targum avoids any anthropomorphic implication; see pages 222f.

\(^1\)Scott, Melville, The Message of Hosea (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1921), p. 150, prefers the Septuagint to the Masoretic Text.

\(^2\)American Jewish Translation.

\(^3\)Cf. Targum, see page 223; Syriac = ܐܸܓܒܳܓܵܐ (so Sebk, according to Harper, op. cit., p. 410) or = ܐ݂ܓܒܳܓܵܐ (Nyberg, op. cit., p. 112). Graetz (op. cit., p. 14), according to Harper (op. cit., p. 410), emends to ܐ݂ܓܒܳܓܵܐ.

\(^4\)The Septuagint = ܐܸܓܒܳܓܵܐ so Vollers [op. cit., I, p. 280] according to Harper (op. cit., p. 410); cf. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 112). Mutz (op. cit., p. 276) considers that the Septuagint is equivalent to ܐ݂ܓܒܳܓܵܐ.

\[\text{The} \quad \text{Hosea 5:3 the Septuagint avoids the statement} \quad \text{that Israel was not hidden from God:} \]

\[\text{represents only a change of vocalization. Certainly some Hebrew manuscripts must be the original of Septuagint (cf. Nyberg, op. cit., p. 102). Ewald (op. cit., I, p. 303) says that the reference to the Assyrians would be out of place here since only the final punishment of the whole nation was intended. The Targum avoids any anthropomorphic implication; see pages 222f.}\]

\[\text{\(^1\)Scott, Melville, The Message of Hosea (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1921), p. 150, prefers the Septuagint to the Masoretic Text.}\]

\[\text{\(^2\)American Jewish Translation.}\]

\[\text{\(^3\)Cf. Targum, see page 223; Syriac = ܐܸܓܒܳܓܵܐ (so Sebk, according to Harper, op. cit., p. 410) or = ܐ݂ܓܒܳܓܵܐ (Nyberg, op. cit., p. 112). Graetz (op. cit., p. 14), according to Harper (op. cit., p. 410), emends to ܐ݂ܓܒܳܓܵܐ.}\]

\[\text{\(^4\)The Septuagint = ܐܸܓܒܳܓܵܐ so Vollers [op. cit., I, p. 280] according to Harper (op. cit., p. 410); cf. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 112). Mutz (op. cit., p. 276) considers that the Septuagint is equivalent to ܐ݂ܓܒܳܓܵܐ.}\]
... and Israel is not hid from me;

... when Israel did not withdraw from me.

The reason for this alteration hardly can be an objection to the anthropomorphic implication of sight by the Hebrew since the Greek translation is equally, if not more, anthropomorphic. The Hebrew, however, may have been offensive for other reasons, namely, the indirect implication that God is not omniscient or omnipresent, or the Greek may represent a pro-Israel alteration. On the other hand, since the idea of one hiding from God is reproduced faithfully by the Septuagint elsewhere, these suggested reasons do not seem too probable. The most likely possibility is the suggestion that the translator either possessed a different text or misread his text. The Greek verb, ἀπεξῆμι ("to be away, distant") occurs in the Septuagint in only three passages for which a Hebrew original exists. In one of the remaining passages (Proverbs 25:10) the Hebrew verb which it translates is uncertain, but in the other passage (Job 6:13) it translates ἀπολύω ("to impel, thrust, banish"). Perhaps the translator here read the niphal perfect of ἀπολύω which he understood to have the meaning of 'to be banished' or 'exiled'. If so, then

---

1 The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See page 326, footnote 2.

2 ὅ = Septuagint; Ach (latuit) = Masoretic Text. α ἐπεκαλαυθὴ ("was covered over, veiled"); σ ελαβεν.

3 See pages 128ff.
his translation would reproduce the essential idea of the Hebrew (as he understood it), i.e., "Israel is not banished from God", and also would soften it slightly. An alternate suggestion is that he may have read הָנַּת (the niphal perfect of הָנַת ("to push/thrust aside"). Thus, he may have been offended by the suggestion (negative) that God might push Israel aside, and so he softened it to say that Israel is not away from God.

The expression, "the eyes of God", is carried over literally into the Greek (or at least the concept of sight is). The prepositional phrase, ἐν ἀλλή ("by the eyes of"), is translated by ἐν ἐκείνοις ("before") both with reference to man and to God. The idea of God seeing is softened in Malachi 2:13 (יָרְדָה). Both occurrences of יָרְדָה, however, are changed. The change in Hosea 5:3, concerning Israel being hidden from God, probably arises from a different or misread text and a pro-Israel bias on the part of the translator. Hence, there exists no positive example of anti-anthropomorphism here.

(3) THE MOUTH OF GOD

Several expressions which involve the idea of God using or possessing a mouth have been altered at times in the Greek. One of the most interesting of these alterations involves the use of the verb, מָנַע, "to answer, respond".
In only three occurrences, when this verb refers to God, does the Greek appropriately translate it by \( \text{ἀποκρίνω} \) ("to answer"). Of the remaining instances, once the Septuagint interprets the root meaning to be from another verb, \( \text{πάπω} \) (root III = "to put down, become low"), and so translates it by \( \text{ταπεινώω} \), ("to make low, humble, abase"). Five times:

1Joel 2:19; Habakkuk 2:2; Zechariah 1:13.

Hosea 14:9(8); could this be an anti-Ephraim alteration? Cf. Hosea 2:15(17) with respect to Israel. See also Hosea 5:5; 7:10; Malachi 2:12.

The translator reserves the simple \( \text{ἀκούω} \) ("to hear") always for \( \text{γω} \) ("to hear") in the Twelve. [Twice (Jonah 2:3 \text{ἐκκοίμησαν} ("He heard"); 62 \text{ἐπικοίμησεν} ("He heard, perceived") and Micah 3:4 \text{ἀπε} ("answer", etc.,) is translated by \( \text{εἰσακούω} \) ("to hearken" or "give ear to, hear, perceive"); cf. also Micah 3:7 in some Greek manuscripts.

This verb, \( \text{εἰσακούω} \), elsewhere in Twelve always translates \( \text{γω} \) except once, namely, Zechariah 1:4, where it is the rendering of \text{σωρ} ("to give attention to"). Since, however, in the Twelve \( \text{ἐπακούω} \) ("to hear, listen, perceive") translates only \( \text{σωρ} \), perhaps the reading of manuscript 62 of \( \text{ἐπακούω} \) in Jonah 2:3 for \( \text{εἰσακούω} \) is original. Moreover, because \( \text{ἐπακούω} \) translates \( \text{σωρ} \) both in theological passages (Hosea 2:21(23); Zechariah 10:6; 13:9 [cf. cod. 130 which reads \text{ἐπικάλεσαμαι αὐτὸν}] and in non-theological passages (Hosea 2:21(23)); cf. also Micah 3:7 in certain manuscripts), this translation cannot have been selected because of theological reasons. Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R. (A Greek-English Lexicon, revised and augmented by H.S. Jones, [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951], I, p. 605) give the meaning of 'to answer' for the verb (\( \text{ἐπακούω} \)); cf. Marti's statement in footnote 1, page 63. The translation of \( \text{δι' αὐτοῦ} \) ("for there is no answer from God") as \( \text{διότι οὐχ ἦσαν αἱ εἰσακούσια} \) ("... for none will hearken to them") may represent a softening of a statement considered to be derogatory of the character of God. Certain Septuagint manuscripts do not read \( \text{εἰσακούσια} \). Other readings are:

\( \text{ἐπακούων} \) (V, L', \text{56} - 764 C' - 68 \text{οδ.} 233 Th. Thph.);
\( \text{ἐπικούσιον} \) (rel.); \( \text{υπακούσιον} \) (86 \text{οδ.} 198 233 \text{Cyp.});
\( \text{υπακούσιον} \) (1 II (86) Th.). \( \sigma' = \text{διότι οὐχ ἦσαν αἱ εἰσακούσια τοῦ θεοῦ} \) ("Because there was not an answer of God."); and \( \theta' = \text{διότι οὐχ ἦσαν αἱ εἰσακούσια τοῦ θεοῦ} \) ("Because there is not an answer of Elohim \[i.e., God\]."
the translator interprets it to be the equivalent of יְעַשׁ ("to listen to, to hear"). This is fully as anthropomorphic as "to answer", if not more so, and might better suggest that the Hebrew represents a softening of the implication of ears to the idea of answering, which would not suggest a mouth as much as יְעַשׁ ("to listen, hear") because the idea of saying, speaking, word, etc., was accepted generally without seeming to give offence in Judaism.

The concept of speaking, and of a mouth, also is implied by the verb, יָנַי ("to declare"). In the Greek rendering of Zechariah 9:12 the anthropomorphism of God declaring is avoided:

\[
\text{יָנַי יִרְאֶהַנָּה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹנֵלָה יִנְתָּהוֹn ייִנְתָּhוֹn ייִנְתָּhוֹn ייִnְתָּhוֹn ייִnְתָּhוֹn ייִnְתָּhוֹn ייִנְתָּhוֹn ייִnְt
This translation avoids the statement that God declares anything by changing the whole reference from God to Israel's captivity. Therefore, the translation may have been selected because of a pro-Israel bias instead of being the result of an anti-anthropomorphic prejudice. Moreover, it may reflect a different or misread text.

The final verb of speaking, which suggests that God may have possessed a mouth, to be considered is אַלפּ ("to call"). This verb occurs in Haggai 1:11:

\[
\text{And I have called for a drought upon the land.} \\
\text{...}
\]


\[
\text{καὶ εἰπάξω ῥομφαίαν} \quad \text{... and I will bring a sword upon this land.}
\]

This translation scarcely can be an anti-anthropomorphic, but the Septuagint may represent the original Hebrew text. In this case the Masoretic Text would represent a denial of motion to God. Both possibilities, however, are not as likely as is the assumption that the Greek translation represents a different or misread text. This suggestion is strengthened by the fact that the Septuagint elsewhere freely speaks of God as calling while the Masoretic Text does not hesitate to ascribe motion to God. A suggested misread text or

---

1. The Targum supports the Masoretic Text (see page 232).

2. The Septuagint represents a change of pointing only.

3. This is at least as anthropomorphic as the Masoretic Text.
Hebrew 'Vorlage' for the Septuagint is:

\[ \text{יָדַּם} \] for the Septuagint is:  

\[ \text{καλεῖ} \] And I will raise a sword upon the land...  

This last suggestion gains support from the fact that elsewhere, with two exceptions, the translator used a derivative of \( καλεῖ \) to translate \( που \) when it refers to Deity. In each passage he selected a derivative which he considered to be the most adequate to convey the exact shade of meaning of the Hebrew. Thus in Hosea 11:1 he recalls or summons (\( μετακαλέω \)) His children from Egypt; in Joel 3:5(2:32)\(^4\), Amos 5:8\(^5\) and 9:6\(^6\) he summons (\( προσκαλέω \)) the remnant or the sea-waters; in Micah 6:9\(^7\) His voice appeals (\( επικαλέω \)) to the city. Yet in Amos 7:4\(^8\) it is simply \( καλεῖ \), "the Lord God was calling for a judgment by fire,"  

Even the two other exceptions retain the idea of calling or speaking. Thus in Zechariah 7:7\(^9\) God has spoken (\( λαλῶ \)) by the prophets, but in verse 13\(^10\) there is a possible pro-Israel

---

\(^1\) One manuscript reads \( πορνα \) (so Kennicott, *op. cit.*, p. 289).

\(^2\) A free translation.

\(^3\) See page 232.

\(^4\) See page 232.

\(^5\) See page 232.

\(^6\) See page 232.

\(^7\) See page 232.

\(^8\) See page 232.

\(^9\) See page 232.

\(^10\) See page 232.
softening to εἰπον. These translations of נָאַה ("to call"), therefore, minimize the possibility that the change in Haggai 1:11 was due to accident or a theological bias and supports the more probable suggestion that the translator either possessed a different Hebrew text or else misread the text which he had.

Two other verbs which imply the existence of a mouth are not translated literally in two passages. In one passage, Zephaniah 3:17, the concept of God being silent (םְעַרוּ) after

The Hebrew here reads מְעַרְוָה מְעַרְוָה ("... he [God] will be silent in his love;" -- following the Revised Standard Version, footnote i, p. 982); this is translated as καὶ καλύπτει τοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀγάπη οὐκ ἔχειν ("And [he will] renew thee in his love;").

The Septuagint (also Syriac and Arabic) apparently read (or misread) the text as מְעַרְוָה a change of 'י to 'י. Smith (J.M.P.), Buhl, Smith (G.A.), Driver (S.R.), Rothstein, Duhm (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 262) and Procksch [op. cit., p. 954, footnote] emend, following the Septuagint and Syriac, to מְעַרְוָה. Houbigant, Newcome, Ewald, and Hitzig emend to מְעַרְוָה (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 262). Müller and van Hoonacker take מְעַרְוָה as "he roars, effervesces, boils over"; cf. Psalms 45:2 (loc. cit.). The Septuagint, however, may have (mis)read the text as מְעַרְוָה; the final מ arises from the initial מ of the following word "Nutz" [op. cit., p. 964]. Horst [Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 192], Nowack [Smith, Ward, Bewer, loc. cit.], and Graetz [op. cit., p. 22] so emend. Another change may lie behind the Septuagint's translation מ with מ and מ with מ, i.e., מְעַרְוָה as Kennedy op. cit., p. 19, Schwalley [F., "Das Buch Secharja, eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung", Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 10 (1890), pp. 208f.], and Oort [op. cit., p. 147] -- so Smith, Bewer, Ward, loc. cit. -- emend.].
the anthropomorphic implication, but it more likely reflects a pro-Israel bias\(^1\) -- especially since the verb is literally translated in Habakkuk 1:13 by \(\text{παρασιώπησι}^2\) ("to keep silence"); cf. \(\text{παρασιώπας}\) in Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion. In a non-theological passage (Micah 7:16) it is rendered by \(\text{αποκωφόμαι}\) ("to become deaf").

The verb, \(\text{בָּאָה}\) ("to eat"), usually is translated literally, but in Hosea 13:9\(^3\) the statement made by God that He would devour them (\(\text{בָּאָה} = \ldots\text{and} \ldots\text{I will devour them.}\ldots\)) is translated as \(\text{καταφαγόνται}\) ("\ldots\text{they will devour them.}\ldots") which apparently avoids the anthropomorphism. The translator, probably was not attempting to avoid an anthropomorphism here because he leaves the other anthropomorphisms in the same verse unaltered. Therefore, the translator more likely vocalized his text differently, misread\(^4\) his text, or possessed a different text.

\(^{1}\)Cf. the alterations of the Targum; see page 231.

\(^{2}\)The Targum alters this also; see pages 230f.

\(^{3}\)The Hebrew, \(\text{כִּי יִבְדַּל הָעָם חַיֵּיתָא(} \ldots\text{and there I will devour them as a lion [es].} \ldots\)) is translated as \(\text{καὶ καταφαγόνται αὐτούς ἐκεῖ σκίμνῳ ὕπατον}\) ("\ldots\text{and the young lions of the forest shall there devour them;}"). The Targum supports the Masoretic Text here against the Septuagint (see pages 240f.).

\(^{4}\)He may have read, of course, a different text, e.g., \(\text{נָלַסַה}\) as Procksch (op. cit., p. 909 footnote) and Vollers (op. cit., I, p. 258) considers him to have done; cf. Harper, Oort [op. cit., p. 139], Guthe, Marti [op. cit., p. 101] and Nowack (according to Harper, op. cit., p. 392). Driver (G.R.) and Sellin emend to \(\text{יָהשָּׁר}^1\) (so Driver, G.R., op. cit., p. 164; cf. the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic).
Therefore, the Septuagint freely pictures God as speaking, etc.—actions which imply the existence of a mouth. Moreover, since the "mouth of God" is reproduced faithfully in the Greek, the translator cannot be said to avoid describing God as having a mouth.

(4) THE HANDS AND ARMS OF GOD

The Septuagint not only describes God as the possessor of arms but also of hands. In fact, in one passage the Greek translation is stronger in its anthropomorphic description than is the Hebrew. This occurs in Hosea 11:3:

\[\text{תְּנִיָּהוּ} \text{שָׁמָלָה} \text{הָנָּה} \text{לְהַקָּרֵב} \text{הַיָּרֹץ} \text{לְיוֹנָה} \text{לְיַעֲקוֹב} \]

taking by his arm.

1 Cf. Malachi 2:3; see pages 155f.

2 This form is uncertain; Sharpe, John (Notes and Dissertation Upon the Prophecy of Hosea [Cambridge: Deighton Bell and Co., 1884], p. 215; cf. Ezekiel 17:5) considers it to be an apocopated third masculine singular qal perfect of \( \text{נָהָי} \) ("take"). Others consider it to be a participle or the infinitive absolute. Probably the text should read \( \text{נָהָי} \) with the Septuagint, Ewald[ op. cit., I, p. 290], Steiner, Harper, Olshausen, Umbreit, Crelli, Cheyne [op. cit., p. 127], Oort [op. cit., p. 139], Wellhausen, Ruben [op. cit., p. 19], Guthe, Nowack, Loftman, Oettili, Marti [op. cit., p. 86], (so Harper, op. cit., p. 360), Procksch [op. cit., p. 908, footnote with Targum and Syriac), and Robinson (T.H.), (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 42). Nyberg (op. cit., p. 85) considers that the Septuagint = \( \text{נָהָי} \) here.

3 The Revised Standard Version here follows the Septuagint, Syriac, and Vulgate in its translation, ("I took them up in my arms;").
I took him up in my arms.

Here the Hebrew text probably intended to convey the same idea as expressed in the Greek translation. Therefore, this translation may not represent necessarily a heightening of the anthropomorphic picturization, but in any case the Septuagint is very specific here in its anthropomorphic description.

Elsewhere the translator renders literally all passages which state that God has a hand or hands. There may be, however, an anti-anthropomorphic softening in the translation of Jonah 1:4. Here the statement that God hurls (νέφος) a wind is altered so that God raises (ἐξηγείρει) a wind. It

1Vollers considers the Septuagint to have read ἀναπήρος (Vollers, I., op. cit., p. 255).

2Vollers (loc. cit.) and Nyberg (op. cit., p. 85) consider that the Septuagint read ἀναπήρος. Several Hebrew manuscripts read υπήρισσος (Aennicott, op. cit., p. 255; De-Rossi (op. cit., III, p. 179).

3Since the Targum supports the Septuagint here, the probability that this statement is correct is increased; see pages 216f. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 85) disagrees. He states, "Die Lesarten von GS sind Konjekturen auf Grund der verstümmelten LA ὀνπ....".

4Cf. the Syriac and Targum which translates ἐπίστευσαν with the same meaning as the Septuagint, e.g., υπήρισσος ("raise"); cf. Vulgate's misit (so Kalisch, M.H., Bible Studies (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1879), II, p. 151).

5The Hebrew יָנָה נַפְס הָאָדָם ("But the Lord hurled a great wind..."), is translated as καὶ κυρίος ἐξηγείρει πνεῦμα ("But the Lord raised a wind..."). Several manuscripts (L' - 239C - 349 87C - 68. Sa. Bo. Aeth. Arab. Cyr.P. Thph. Hi.) add μεγά ("great"). Symmachus also adds μεγά ("great").
is difficult to determine precisely whether this is an anti-anthropomorphism because in the Twelve ἀιων is found only in this passage. Possibly the Greek translation is not an anti-anthropomorphism but only represents an attempt at a "literal" translation -- especially since the translator may have understood ἀιων to be from the root ἄιω with the Aramaic meaning of "to raise".

The picture of God storming or raging ( ἀιων ), i.e., hurling them by means of a storm-wind, is retained essentially in Zechariah 7:14 by εκβάλλω ("to cast off")3. In Hosea 13:3, however, the basic idea is conveyed more clearly by the Greek verb, ἀποφυγω ("to breathe, blow").

Finally, in Zechariah 2:9(13) God states that He will shake ( ἀιων ) His hand. This the Septuagint softens to bringing ( ἐπρφρω ) His hand. Notice that ἀιων is translated literally by χειρ and that the Septuagint retains the essential picture of the Hebrew.

Although two alterations and a softening, which may be anti-anthropomorphic, exist, not one of these examples

---

1Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 704.

2This is still anthropomorphic and, therefore, may have originated from a desire to give the best possible translation.

3The full force of the Hebrew is retained in the Targum. See pages 215f.
present any change which positively has originated from a theological bias.

(5) **THE FEET OF GOD**

The only remaining instances, in which translations possibly suggest a desire on the part of the translator to avoid describing Deity as possessing the various parts of the human body, imply that God has feet. In Habakkuk 3:15\(^1\) God is described as treading (τᾶρα)\(^2\) upon the sea with (by means of) His horses. This has been softened by the use of ἐπεβίβασας\(^3\), a causal form of ἐπιβαίνω ("to ascend"), which is used correctly to translate the hiphil of the Hebrew verb later on in the same chapter. The Greek thus runs: "You have caused Your horses to ride into (ἐξ) the sea."\(^4\)

Of course, this may mean either that the translator had a different text before him or that he may have been influenced by the hiphil form of the same verb which occurs nearby, thus correcting the text here to what he thought it should have

---

\(^1\)The Hebrew reads: יִבְּשֵׁבָה הַיָּבָר ("Thou hast trampled the sea with thy horses, ").

\(^2\)Elsewhere this verb when it refers to God is translated by ἐπιβαίνω ("ascend"), except once where it is rendered by ἐντεινω.

\(^3\)"The versions, however, support the present M.T." (Stonehouse, G.G.V., The Book of Habakkuk (London: Rivingtons, 1911), p. 249); cf. the Targum's alterations (see page 226).

\(^4\)A free translation. This is still anthropomorphic and may have arisen, therefore, from the desire to translate as well as possible the Hebrew. The Greek is: καὶ ἐπιβαίνω ἐξ θαλάσσαν τοις ἔποιοις σου.
been originally. Moreover, the translation of ἐπιβαίνω ("ascend") for ἡ ἐρία ("tread") in Amos 4:13 and Micah 1:3 cannot be an anti-anthropomorphic softening because the same translation is used non-theologically in Micah 5:4(5), 5(6).  

Again no conclusive examples of a genuine anti-anthropomorphic trend are found.

This investigation demonstrates that the Septuagint usually describes, both with verbs and nouns, God as the possessor of eyes, ears, and the like. In this section many examples of alterations which might have resulted from theological prejudices have been considered. In each instance either that motive has proved not to be the reason or else it has been seen that there is some other equally probable cause for the change.

A few of these passages may represent either a different text or the same text misread by the translator. Different vocalization may be the reason for other renderings.

The passage which possibly is anti-anthropomorphic occurs in Jonah 1:4. Here, the anti-anthropomorphic

---

1In this case note the selection of the verbs in Zechariah 9:13 and Micah 6:15 which adequately translate the Hebrew. Also note that the Septuagint translator was not bound by a stereotyped translation.
possibility is decreased by the consistency of the Versions in softening the statement. This consistently indicates the likelihood that they all understood the root to have the Aramaic meaning of "to raise".

3. ANTI-ANIMISTIC ALTERATIONS

The application of the simile, שמות ("as fire"), in Amos 5:6 may refer either to the house of Joseph (Israel) or to God in the Hebrew. Hence, the Septuagint's selection of the house of Joseph as the subject is not necessarily anti-animistic. A similar uncertainty is felt in Hosea 5:13 where moth (ץוע) is translated ταραχη ("disorder, confusion") and rottenness (בפר) as

1See page xxvi, footnote 9.


3The Hebrew, לִפְעוֹד עָנָא אֵשׁ בֵּית יְהוָה ("Therefore I [God] am like a moth to Ephraim, and like dry rot to the house of Judah") is translated as και εγω ως ταραχη τω Εφραιμ και ως κεντρον τω οικος Ιωσήφ ("And I am as confusion to Ephraim, and as a spur to the house of Judah," — a free translation).

4το and οι ετεροι = βρωση ("moth"); σοι = ευρως ("mold, decay"); θορος = ερωσις ("rust"); cf. also Micah 7:4 where God in the Greek is compared to a moth or bookworm (σοι).

5Cf. Targum, page 240; the Septuagint = סומס so Vollers [op. cit., I, p. 248], or שמש, so Sebok (both according to Harper, op. cit., p. 273). Nyberg (op. cit., p. 38) considers the Septuagint to have read the root of the Hebrew as שמש. The Syriac, incorrectly, = "pavor" (Nyberg, loc. cit.).
κεντρον 1 ("spike, spur, or incentive"). This uncertainty is increased in Hosea 13:8 which compares God to an animal in every clause but one. There 2, the subject is switched in the Greek from God to an animal. This change probably does not reflect a theological motive 3. Likewise, the translations of the verb, ιννω ("to roar"), as ἐρευξεται 4 and ὠρυξεται 5 ("to howl") in Hosea 11:10 6 probably do not represent alterations of an anti-animistic nature. These verbs convey almost exactly the meaning of the Hebrew.

Finally, two very interesting alterations occur in connection with the names of God. These changes are considered here because one of them gives God definitely an animistic description in the Hebrew, namely ζης ("Rock"):

HABAKKUK 1:12

1 The Septuagint read here either ζψυ or ζψτ with the meaning of the Aramaic (Vollers [loc. cit.] and Harper [op. cit., p. 273]). The Syriac = leprosy, elephantiasis (so Harper, loc. cit.).

2 See page 67, footnote 3.

3 See page 67.

4 ἐρευξεται ("to howl, bellow, roar").

5 ὠρυξεται ("to spit, spew"; in aorist, "to roar") in L-36 - 784; cf. 62 l 1 - 86 o.

6 Likewise in Joel 4(3):16 and Amos 1:2, the Septuagint may soften the concept of Yahweh roaring (ιννω) by the translation of αναχαρακω ("to cry out") and θεγγομα ("to utter a sound of voice"), respectively.

7 Rock, as a name of God, occurs only here in the Twelve.
... and thou, O Rock, has established them for chastisement.

... and he has formed me to chasten with his correction.

This change may have arisen from objections to describing God as a Rock -- especially to say that His name is "Rock" --, or the translator may have been offended at the idea of God establishing anyone for purposes of correction. More likely he unintentionally misread his text as וַיֶּהָּסֶר הוֹדֶךָ לַעֲשׂוֹת . If so, his translation naturally follows.

In Joel 1:15, the alteration concerning the name of God (יַֽיִלְלָה ) may not, however, reflect so much a theological bias of the translator as the desire to preserve in the Greek the play on words noticeable in the Hebrew. Thus, the Hebrew, מָגוּב וְיִלְלָה רַצָּה ("... and as destruction

---

1The Targum omits the יִלְלָה ; see pages 239f., footnote 2.

2א" = כְּאֶפְּרֵה יִרְכָּא תַּחְתָּא וְלַעֲשַׂוֹת נָעַם וְלַעֲשַׂוֹת וְלַעֲשַׂוֹת אָמוֹמָם;

3Bagster, op. cit., p. 1106.

4Of course, the translator may have possessed a Hebrew text which differed from the Masoretic Text.

5The first word may not have contained the second י, and so the root, יַֽיִלְלָה ("to form, fashion") was easily suggested. Likewise the final word could easily have been mistaken for יִלְלָה . Cf. Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 160.

6This word is inconsistently translated in the Septuagint; perhaps it was a puzzle to the translator (so Dodd, C.H., op. cit., p. 14).
from the Almighty it comes." which refers to the Day of Yahweh, is translated as καὶ ὁ θαλαπτόριος ἐκ θαλαπτόριας ἥξει ("... and it will come as trouble upon trouble.")

The animistic comparisons are usually retained. Moreover, since there are no clear examples of an anti-animistic nature, it becomes very doubtful whether this translator had any real anti-animistic bias, especially as the changes in the passages considered above may have arisen either from a different text (or vocalization) or misreading the Hebrew text.

The conclusion must be reached that the grosser anthropomorphisms found in the Hebrew are retained in the Greek either unaltered or with the anthropomorphic feeling and picture remaining in a paraphrase of the Hebrew. This inference agrees with Orlinsky's finding on the Pentateuch and Job. This does not necessarily deny that the Greek translation contains embryonic anti-anthropomorphisms, although it suggests that the Septuagint of the Twelve probably does not contain any anti-anthropomorphisms. This

1 Bagster, op. cit., p. 1061.

2 "... whatever theological beliefs the LXX translators of the Pentateuch and Job held, they did not resort to antianthropomorphic or euphemistic tricks, but reproduced their Hebrew manuscripts faithfully." — Orlinsky, H.M., "The Septuagint — It's use in Textual Criticism", The Biblical Archaeologist, 9 (1946), p. 33.
conclusion is corroborated by the fact that the Targum usually supports the Masoretic Text against the Septuagint. Even when the Targum supports the Greek, it translates the Hebrew in a manner which suggests that the Hebrew text of the Septuagint and that of the Targum varied in some respect from the Masoretic Text rather than that a common (or similar) anti-anthropomorphic device was used. In the remaining instances the Targum differed with both the Septuagint and the Masoretic Text.

In several instances the Septuagint may have possessed a different text, misread the text, or vocalized the consonantal text differently.

Up to this point the conclusion must be that the case for anti-anthropomorphism in the Septuagint Book of the Twelve is, at best, the Scottish Verdict of "NOT PROVEN".

---

1About three out of four.

2Hosea 11:3; Jonah 1:4?

3Gerleman considers it is not prima facie probable that the variations in the Septuagint are due to the translators but it is probable that their Hebrew text varied from the Masoretic Text (so Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament [Lund: C.W.K. Gleerups, 1948], p. 29), cf. Gehmen, H.S., (op. cit., I Samuel, p. 292), who states that "As we read the footnotes of the Kittel Biblia Hebraica or the observations in the various commentaries, we have to agree with the commentators that in a number of passages the Greek translator used a Hebrew Text different from that of the Masoretes."
CHAPTER III

THE THEOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS OF THE SEPTUAGINT:
THE LESSER ANTHROPOMORPHISMS

There are several groups of anthropomorphic expressions which do not convey to the human mind the resemblance of Deity to humanity as clearly as do those discussed in the last chapter. Perhaps the group which conveys the greatest anthropomorphic picture is composed of anthropopathisms, i.e., expressions which attribute to God the emotions of jealousy, love, etc.

Another group describes certain actions of God which more vaguely suggest certain likenesses of God to mankind. Likewise, the ascription to Deity of certain possessions implies that He possesses a form in order that He may profit from possessing such things. Finally, certain stated relationships between God and man are difficult to imagine unless God has a personality and some type of physical form or manifestation.

1. THE ANTI-ANTHROPOPATHISMS OF THE SEPTUAGINT

The tendency to avoid use of anthropopathic language in the Septuagint in connection with God is even less noticeable than the apparent avoidance of the grosser anthropomorphisms. The translator of the Minor Prophets, unlike the translator(s) of the Pentateuch\(^1\) into Greek, apparently is

not disturbed greatly by anthropopathic language and, there¬
fore, usually does not trouble to alter the Hebrew. The
ascription of grief, anger, wrath, fear, repentance, et al.,
to Deity is retained. This literal translation of anthropo¬
pathisms is, perhaps, to be expected, for even the Targums
are somewhat highly anthropopathic and deny very few human
passions to God.

(1) THE INDIGNATION OF GOD

One of the few possible instances of an anti-anthropo¬
pathic alteration is found in connection with the word בָּז. This verb occurs three times (once as a pual participle) and
the corresponding noun occurs four times. The basic idea of
the root is to "be indignant, have indignation"\(^2\), and of the
noun, "indignation"\(^3\).

In two passages where this verb, בָּז ("be indignant")
occurring, there are alterations which may have resulted from
an anti-anthropopathic bias.

[1] ZECHARIAH 1:12

הָנָה הָנָה הָנָה הָנָה

ם וָיֵה רֶה

... against which [the
cities of Judah] thou
[God] hast had indignation
these seventy years?

---

\(^{1}\)See pages 243ff.

\(^{2}\)Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 276.

\(^{3}\)Loc. cit.

\(^{4}\)The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See pages

253f.
This translation of "thou hast had indignation" by υπερείδες ("thou hast overlooked") probably is not an anti-anthropopathism, although it may be a "softening".

MALACHI 1:42

... the people [Edom] with whom the Lord is angry forever.

... and 'A people to whom the Lord hath ever been opposed'.

This translation is at least as anthropomorphic as the Hebrew to which it corresponds. In fact, the verb παρατάσσω ("to set in battle") is probably more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew "thou hast been indignant". Therefore,

1Cf. Lowe (op. cit., p. 15) who considers this to be an euphemistic translation, and Rignell (op. cit., p. 45), "milder".

2The remaining passage in Micah 6:10 has a peculiar translation for the Hebrew clause, "And the scant measure that is abominable?" -- American Jewish Translation, is rendered as καὶ μετέρων υπερήφανος αδίκια; ("And the uprighteous a measure of pride?" -- a literal translation). Certain Septuagint manuscripts (WV, L'-711 - 497 C - 534 Ach Syh Arab. CyrP. Th. Tht. Thph. HiP) read αδίκιας. Probably this change is to make the meaning more intelligible. Taylor (op. cit., p. 143) considers that נָשִׁי is translated by αδίκιας "because the αδ. is the cause of the curse." See also the Targum, page 254.

3The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See page 254.
these two passages may reflect not an anti-anthropopathic tendency but an alteration to prevent the implication that God could be eternally indignant, or for a long period (seventy years). Had an anti-anthropopathic bias been the motive, a different and more consistent type of change would have been expected. It is very questionable whether these translations really would be satisfactory to anyone motivated by anti-anthropopathic zeal.

The passages in which the noun (σύν = "indignation") occurs are rendered twice appropriately, once in Hosea 7:16 by δια απαίδευσιαν γλώσσης αυτών ("... by reason of the unbridled state of their tongue") for οὐκ ἔχει σύν 3 ("... because of the insolence of their tongue") and once in Nahum 1:6 by ὄργης αὐτοῦ ("His wrath") for ἀλήθεια 5 ("His indignation"). In one passage (Zephaniah 3:8) two other Hebrew words ( msm = "anger" and ἁρπαζω = "burning"),

1See page 153.

2Aquila's ἀπὸ εμβριμησεως ("from indignation") and Symmachus' δια εμβριμησιν ("because of indignation") represent literal translations. Theodotion agrees with the Septuagint. The quinta editio (δια ματων ["fury"]) represents another literal translation. The Targum (page 255) also translates paraphrastically.

3The translation of σύν ("indignation") by απαίδευσιαν may be only an attempt to render the meaning of the Hebrew into idiomatic Greek. This contention is especially weighty if the Septuagint was made primarily for Gentile readers. Cf. in Habakkuk 3:12, the rendering, ἁπειλὴ ("threat, boast").

4This word translates msm ("anger") most frequently in the Septuagint.

5See page 255.
which are almost synonymous, are found closely associated with ἀνείλητος ("indignation"). Here, apparently, the translator felt that there was too much duplication of ideas and, therefore, he did not translate the ἀνείλητος ("indignation"). The remaining passage, Habakkuk 3:12, contains γῆν-γην ἀνείλητος ("Thou marchest through the earth in indignation,"4) which is rendered as ἐν αἰτίας ολίγωσεις γῆν ("with a threat (boast)"7 You will bring the earth low,"8). Since the Greek translation (ἀείλητος = "threat") is as anthropomorphic as the Hebrew (ἀνείλητος = "indignation"), it is unlikely that

1Some manuscripts, etc. (lI7-613, Sca(vid.), V, L', 613, C'-633 - 68 - 239 Syh Arm Eus. Dem. Cypr. (?), Hi.) add τὴν οργήν μου ("My Wrath"). Cf. the Targum; see page 255.

2 ὶρων γῆν ἐπὶ ἀνείλητος γῆν ("to pour out upon them my indignation, all the heat of my anger;") = τοῦ εὐχεία; επ' αὐτούς πάσαν οργήν θυμοῦ μου ("to pour out all the fury of my wrath on them.")

3See page 255.

4American Jewish Translation.

5This word is found twenty-one times, twelve of which are in III and IV Maccabees. In the remaining nine times, it translates ἀνείλητος once, ἐπὶ (πᾶσα) four times, ἀνείλητος once, and ἀνείλητος once. Twice the word translated is uncertain. In the Minor Prophets it is found elsewhere only in Zechariah 9:14 πορευομαι; εν σαλω αἰτιας αυτού ("And [God] shall proceed with the tumult of his threatening." -- Bagster's translation) for τᾶν ποταῖς τῇ ἱδρυί ("And [God] will go with whirlwinds of the south." -- American Jewish Translation).

6ὁ* ολίγωσεις; L', 35 (96tnt) συμπανατσεις ("You will trample underfoot")

7ὁ* αἰτίας; et al.

8A free translation.
this translation attempts to avoid the anthropopathic description here. The reason for the Greek translation may have arisen from translating τῆςν ("You march") by ὄλιγωσελς ¹ ("You will bring low"). The translator may have misread a τ as a η, or he may have possessed a different text.

The above examples clearly show the lack of consistency in the method of translation of τηςν. Lowe² considers Zechariah 1:12 to be an euphemistic translation, but Malachi 1:4 can hardly be so regarded. If anything, it is a change of an anthropopathism to an anthropomorphism. The motive, however, which produced the alteration may be an anti-heathen bias on the translator's part. Probably Micah 6:10, Habakkuk 3:12, and Hosea 7:16 are due to the requirements of translation, i.e., to render the Hebrew into readily comprehensible Greek. Nahum 1:6 and Zephaniah 3:8 remain anthropopathic in the Septuagint. In one passage τηςν ("indignation") is omitted, and in the other it is translated by a synonym. Therefore, since only one fairly clear instance (Zechariah 1:12) of an anti-anthropopathic softening exists, this example cannot establish conclusively an anti-anthropopathic tendency — especially since the motive for the change may have been an objection to the duration of the

¹Perhaps this is a denial of motion to God; it is the only occurrence of τηςν ("march") in the Twelve. See page 318.

²Lowe, op. cit., p. 15.
indignation rather than the mere fact that God was indignant.

Likewise, in Nahum 1:2 God is described as a master of wrath (נָאֲמָן יָדוֹ - "And a master of wrath", i.e., "full of wrath"). This is translated by μετὰ θυμοῦ ¹ ("with wrath") in the Septuagint. The translation of יָדוֹ ("master") by μετὰ ("with") may be a slight softening of an anthropopathism, or it may represent an attempt to avoid any possible connection of God with the heathen deity Baal (יָדוֹ). Even more likely, however, this translation was selected in order to change the idiomatic Hebrew expression into a Greek idiom which conveys essentially the same idea. The last two suggestions are supported by the translations of both Aquila and Symmachus; they translated the phrase as εξων θυμον ("having wrath").

Therefore, no conclusive evidence of an anti-anthropopathic tendency may be deduced from an examination of passages which describe God as indignant, angry, and the like. Most of these are translated literally in the Greek.

(2) COMPASSIONATE EXPRESSIONS APPLIED TO DEITY

In Micah 1:8, following two verses in which the first person pronoun refers to God², the prophet continues "On

¹The Targum avoids by stating that there is power before Yahweh, see page 252.
²The reference is to Samaria in the Septuagint (according to Taylor, op. cit., p. 15).
account of this let me (or I will) wail and howl, go stripped and naked, make a wailing . . . .

Either this was offensive to the translator who considered God to be the speaker, or, more likely, (as Cohen, Smith, et al., think) the translator considered that the speaker was now not God but the prophet. Therefore, he translated the verbs by appropriate third person singular forms for purposes of clarity. That this was the case may be seen, perhaps, in the use of the cohortatives.

Other changes of interest include the translation of ἁπαξ ("to have compassion") by αὐλαω ("to love") in Zechariah 10:6. This word usually is translated by ἐλεέω ("to have put on" or "show mercy to") or its synonym, οἰκτείρω ("to pity, have pity [on]"). Another interesting

1A free translation.


3"This is one of several instances in which the man as patriot bewails most grievously the event which as prophet he is bound to announce." (So Smith [J.M.P.] in Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 38).

4Cf. the Targum which translates the forms as third person plurals; see pages 250f.

5The translator apparently understood ᾧν to have the meaning of Aramaic שְׁנֵה. Moreover, the translation remains equally anthropopathic and is not very far from the Hebrew picture. The Targum translates literally by שְׁנֵה.

6ἐπιδιδωμι ἅρων ("... because [God] have compassion on them") = ὁτι ηγαμηκα αὐτους ("... because I have loved them").

7Cf. Micah 7:19; see also Zechariah 1:16.
change is the translation of ἀειν ("to spare, have compassion") by αἰρεῖν ὁ ("to choose") in Malachi 3:17. This choice of αἰρεῖν ὁ may be an attempt to avoid ascribing compassion to Deity, but it is more likely an attempt to emphasize the close relationship between God and Israel.

Again the evidence is lacking for anti-anthropopathisms which relate to God’s compassion.

(3) THE EMOTIONS OF PLEASURE AND DESIRE ASCRIBED TO DEITY

The verb, ἀνὴν ("to be pleased with, accept, be favorable"), occurs in Hosea 8:13, Amos 5:22, Micah 6:7 and Malachi 1:10,13 where the Septuagint interprets the verb in the sense of accepting favorably. In Haggai 1:8, however, the anthropomorphic coloring of pleasure is fully retained in the Septuagint by the use of εὐδοκέω ("to be well pleased, content"). Thus the treatment of this verb cannot be regarded as anti-anthropomorphic, especially since, e.g., in Amos 5:22, the anthropomorphic color of the parallel verb, οἶς ("to look"), is retained fully by the translation, εἰδέλεω ("to look upon").

1The usual translation is φειδομαι ("to spare"). Aquila so translates here.

2 ἵνα ἐξελεύσῃ ("And I will spare them . . .") = καὶ αἰρεῖν αὐτοὺς ("And I will choose them"). The Targum translates literally.

3The Targum usually translates literally, but in these two passages it translates impersonally. See pages 255f.

4The Septuagint uses προσδέχομαι.
Another verbal change of interest concerns the translations of רְּדֵּנָה ("to be sweet, pleasing") in Hosea 9:4 by ἡδονὴ ("to sweeten") and in Malachi 3:4 by ἀρεσκέω ("to be pleasing")\(^1\). These two Greek verbs (ἡδονῆ and ἀρεσκέω) literally translate רְּדֵּנָה, but each gives this verb רְּדֵּנָה a slightly different meaning.

The passage in the Septuagint which seems most likely to reflect an anti-anthropopathic bias of the translator, regarding the emotion of desire, is Hosea 10:10\(^4\):

```
In my God's desire\(^5\)
(or) When it is My desire.
ηλθόν \(^7\) I (they) came.
```

---

\(^1\) רְּדֵּנָה מִלְחָץ ("... and they [Israel] shall not please him [God]...") = καὶ οὖν ἡδονὴ ὀμωσθ [αι] θυσίαι ομοπαν = "nor offer him sweet incense;". The Targum here = Masoretic Text. See page 256.

\(^2\) אַשָּׂרְתּוֹת תַּכְנוּת הַגּוֹיִם ("Then the offering of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasing to the Lord...") = καὶ ἀρεσκέτω τῶν κυρίων θυσίων Ιουδα καὶ Ιερουσαλήμ ("...and the sacrifice of Juda and Jerusalem will please the Lord..."), The Targum here softens. See page 256.

\(^3\) Only two appropriate instances in the Twelve.

\(^4\) Only place in the Twelve where the emotion of desire seemingly is denied to Deity.

\(^5\) The Targum probably here supports the Masoretic Text. It translates רְּדֵּנָה by ἄρεσκέω ("By My Word"); see pages 208f.

\(^6\) The Revised Standard Version translates "I will come" in the body proper; their footnote\(^8\) (page 943) states that this is a correction and that the Hebrew reads "in my desire".

\(^7\) ηλθόν ("He came") - codd. gr. et verss. (›B La\(^8\)) [Ziegler, op. cit., p. 170].
This translation, however, may have resulted from a different or misread Hebrew text. The root of the Hebrew נֵי ("in my desire"), is the verb, נָא ("to desire"). The text which the translator had may have read נָא 1 (= ηλθον, "I came"), or else he may have misread his text in this manner. If so, the translation of ηλθον ("I came") would be appropriate for the form, נָא 2. These suggestions also are supported by the fact that the Greek translation is still anthropomorphic, although to a lesser degree, perhaps.

Therefore the description of God as possessing the human emotions of pleasure, desire, and the like is retained in the Greek. Even those passages where changes occur are unlikely to be anti-anthropopathic.

(4) GOD'S HATRED

Finally, one more concept must be considered, i.e., the idea of God hating.

MALACHI 2:16

נַעַפ נַעַפ רָע For he hates3 [hating] divorce.

1 So Procksch (op. cit., p. 905 footnote); Harper (op. cit., p. 349) says that the Septuagint manuscript A = יִהְיָה. Oort (op. cit., p. 139), Marti (op. cit., p. 82), Dathe, and Oettli (so Harper, op. cit., p. 349), and Robinson, T.R. (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 40) emend to נָא. Ruben (op. cit., p. 18) considers that Septuagint = נָא, and Vollers (op. cit., I, p. 242), that the Septuagint omits.

2 Several commentators (e.g., Scott, op. cit., p. 144) follow the Septuagint in reading נָא.

3 Revised Standard Version, footnote 1, p. 996.
But if thou having hated shalt put away—

Most commentators emend the Hebrew text either to רָעַתָא ("I hate") or to רָעַת ("I hate") and interpret the clause to mean that God hates divorce.

Sellin\(^5\), moreover, retains the Masoretic Text without emendation. He translates, "Denn es hatst Entlassung 'Jahwe' ['Wie' sein Gewand mit Gewalttat bedecken.']\(^6\). Thus, he also still considers Yahweh\(^7\) to be the subject of the verb, 'to hate'.

The translator of the Septuagint\(^8\), therefore, probably considered that God was the subject of ἐπικαλέσατο ("to hate") and resorted to an artificial compromise in the translation which reconciled the bold prophetic statement of Malachi with the

\(^1\) The Septuagint may represent a slightly different text, such as: ἐπικαλέσατο [ι]υν[ι]αν [ι]ς [ι]. This requires only the addition of a ι and a ι. Could the translator have misread ιυν as ιν?

\(^2\) Bagster (op. cit., p. 1129) renders as "But if thou shouldest hate thy wife and put her away,"

\(^3\) E.g., Procksch, op. cit., p. 975, footnote. He emends to ἐπικαλέσατο ("I hate")

\(^4\) So also the Revised Standard Version, "For I hate divorce;"


\(^6\) "For Jahwe hates putting away [as He does the covering of a garment with violence]."

\(^7\) Sellin (op. cit., p. 605) states: "Subjekt ist natürlich Jahwe,"

\(^8\) The Targum avoids this completely. See page 247.

If this conclusion is correct, then the translation reflects not an anthropopathic bias but is a softening of Malachi's statement to reconcile it with the Mosaic divorce law2. The rendering, in this case, was made on dogmatic grounds. In any case too much can not be inferred from a single example.

Therefore out of all the possible alterations which may have been introduced into the Septuagint to avoid describing God in anthropopathic language not one passage exists in which an anti-anthropopathic bias clearly is evident. A few times the translator may have possessed a different text or else misread his text3, and in a few passages the change may have been caused by a pro-Israel bias4, a desire to protect God's character, etc. In several passages the seeming change has been produced by a sincere attempt to translate the idea of the Hebrew as accurately as possible into Greek5. Moreover, the translator at times seems to have

---

1Sellin, op. cit., p. 606.
2Loc. cit.
3E.g., Malachi 2:16, see page 88. Cf. Hosea 10:10, see page 87; and Micah 1:8 (shift in speakers), see page 84.
4E.g., Malachi 3:17, see page 86.
5E.g., Zechariah 1:12; Malachi 1:4, see pages 79f.
6E.g., Nahum 1:2, see page 84.
translated words in accordance with their later meaning in Hebrew or Aramaic\(^1\) but not in the sense they had in Biblical Hebrew.

2. **ANTHROPOMORPHIC ACTIONS OF DEITY WHICH ARE ALTERED**

There are several actions\(^2\) of Deity which may be considered to describe Deity in anthropomorphomorphic terms. Certain of these actions have undergone some change in the Greek. Here again, however, the evidence is far from conclusive that this is due to an anti-anthropomorphomorphic bias. Certainly, the change in Habakkuk 3:9 from "Thou (God) didst cleave (\(\pi\rho\zeta\mu\))\(^3\) the earth with rivers,"\(^4\) to "The land of rivers shall be torn asunder,"\(^5\) (\(\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\) \(\gamma\eta\)) is not necessarily anti-anthropomorphomorphic even though God is no longer portrayed...
as cleaving, nor does it have to involve a change of the consonantal text. Possibly the translator read γράπτω (second masculine singular piel imperfect) as a third feminine singular niphal or pual imperfect -- a difference of vocalization only.

Likewise, in Micah 2:12 the change in the Greek translation of συνάχησεται (“will be gathered”), which represents γράπτω ("I will gather"), may be understood easily as an anti-anthropomorphism or may be considered as representing a different text and vocalization. This assumption, that the translator read a different text (or else misread the text), is made more probable by the fact that the remaining first person (common) singular verbs are translated without change in person and by the fact that γράπτω, consistently and correctly, is translated by συνάγω 5 else-

1A frequent variation in the Septuagint; Horst (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 180) and Stonehouse (op. cit., p. 238) emend following Septuagint, Old Latin, Syriac.

2 γὰν ἐπεξέργασεν γράπτω ("I surely will gather all of you, O Jacob," = συνάγωμεν συνάχησεται Ἰακώβ σὺν πᾶσιν ("Jacob with all his sons shall be gathered together"). Here the Targum = the Masoretic Text.

3The Hebrew γράπτω is translated as συνάχησεται with Jacob as subject.

4So Vollers, (op. cit., II, p. 5) = γράπτω. Rysell (so Smith [J.M.P.]) in Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 67) considered the Septuagint to be a free translation, and Taylor (op. cit., pp. 69f) considered that συνάγησις was used for the sake of variety.

5In Zephaniah 3:8 the infinite is rendered as εἰς συνάγωγας.
where (but in Zechariah 14:3 by ἐπισύναγω, a cognate form). The verb, ἀπεραίων ("to gather, collect"), usually is translated by εἰσδέχομαι ("to take into, admit, receive"). In the Septuagint of Micah 2:12, however, ἀπεραίων is rendered by εἰσδέχομαι ("to take or receive from") and in Joel 4(3):2 and Micah 4:12, by συναγω ("to gather"). All these Greek verbs mean almost the same as the Hebrew word and, therefore, probably have been chosen to convey the exact shade of thought desired by the translator.

The verb, σφάλλω ("to spread") is not rendered consistently in the Septuagint. Therefore, the reason for the Greek translation in Zechariah 2:10(6) is not obvious:

\[
\text{διότι ἐκ τῶν τεσσαρῶν}
\]
\[
\text{ανεμῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ}
\]
\[
\text{συνάξω ὑμᾶς}
\]

... for I have spread you abroad as the four winds of the heavens,

\[
\text{διότι ἐκ τῶν τεσσαρῶν}
\]
\[
\text{ανεμῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ}
\]
\[
\text{συνάξω ὑμᾶς}
\]

... for from the four winds of heaven I will gather you.

In this verse apparently συναγω ("to gather") is the Greek rendering of σφάλλω ("to spread"). In Hosea

\[
\text{καὶ πταίρει γραφής ὕψιστος}
\]

\[
\text{μεθυπνάσαμεν}
\]

... for I have spread you abroad as the four winds of the heavens,

\[
\text{διότι ἐκ τῶν τεσσαρῶν}
\]
\[
\text{ανεμῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ}
\]
\[
\text{συνάξω ὑμᾶς}
\]

... for from the four winds of heaven I will gather you.

\[
\text{καὶ πταίρει γραφής ὕψιστος}
\]

\[
\text{μεθυπνάσαμεν}
\]

... for I have spread you abroad as the four winds of the heavens,

\[
\text{διότι ἐκ τῶν τεσσαρῶν}
\]
\[
\text{ανεμῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ}
\]
\[
\text{συνάξω ὑμᾶς}
\]

... for from the four winds of heaven I will gather you.

---

1 Procksch (op. cit., footnote, p. 959) emends to σφάλλω with the Septuagint.

2 Kennedy (op. cit., p. 52) emends to ἐξαφάνισα ("I have driven out"). The Targum alters but supports Masoretic Text; cf. pages 268f.

3 The Septuagint = ἐπισύναγε (Wutz, op. cit., p. 231); = ἐπισύναγε (so Marti [op. cit., p. 408], Cheyne [op. cit., p. 182], and Procksch [op. cit., p. 959, footnote]); = ἐπισύναγε (Wellhausen, so Mitchell in Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 145). Wright (op. cit., p. 539) says that the Septuagint is incorrect.
the same verb is translated by ἐπιβάλλω ("to cast upon"). In the latter passage the verb may have been chosen because of the context. On the other hand the change in the former passage may have arisen from a pro-Israel bias as well as from an anti-anthropomorphic tendency.

The changes, one involving the hiphil of יָהַל ("to show") and the other of יָה (hiphil = "to show"), probably do not reflect any real theological bias. The latter verb occurs in Micah 4:2 as יָהַל ("... that he [God] may teach us ... "

This in the Septuagint becomes καὶ διεξουσίν την (= יָהַל 

"... that they may point out to us ... ")

a reading which involves only the omission or addition of a ה in the Hebrew text — a very common occurrence. Moreover, if, as Procksch suggests, the

---

1 The Targum = Masoretic Text here; see page 268.

2 "They seem to have understood περάστη in a bad sense 'I will scatter'; then, feeling the difficulty of such an expression being made use of to the people on their return from captivity, they deliberately altered the passage . . . " (Lowe, op. cit., p. 26).

3 The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See page 262.


5 Or a different vocalization.

6 Procksch (op. cit., p. 941 footnote); so also Smith (J.M.P.), Wellhausen, Taylor (op. cit., p. 184), Elhorst, Pont, Smith (G.A.), Nowack, Cheyne, Urt (op. cit., p. 145), Marti (op. cit., p. 301), Halséy, Sievers, Van Hoonacker, Duhr, Haupt, Graetz (op. cit., p. 20) (according to Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 182); cf. Robinson's רַמְי (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 150).
Hebrew text of Micah 7:15, which contains the verb נָּהָר, originally read נָּהָר הַנֶּהְרָה, then both the Hebrew נָּהָר ("... I will show them...") and the Greek φανέρω are understood without difficulty. The Masoretic Text would represent only the alteration of an ה to an ש and the Septuagint of an ה to a ν — both of which are common alterations. In addition, the translation of נָּהָר (hiphil) here in the Septuagint is difficult to understand if the variation is an anti-anthropomorphism because the hiphil of נָּהָר is reproduced literally by εἰλήφω ("to show") in other passages of the Septuagint, e.g., Amos 7:1; Nahum 3:5; et al. The situation is not the same, however, in Hosea 10:12. The Septuagint here departs from its usual practice.

"... until He come and teach righteousness to you."

---

1 Cf. Roorda and Guthe (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 152), and Kautzsch (so Marti, op. cit., p. 301) who vocalize differently.

2 "... vielleicht ist aber das ν am Anfang von ηαινo als das aramische Aphel-Präfix anzusehen..." (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 150). Ewald (so Taylor, op. cit., p. 184) considers this form to be original.

3 Revised Standard Version, footnote 2, p. 971.

4 σ' (?), V, O, L* (SCTXT) - 407Mg - 513, C* - 239, Ach, Sa, Arm, Th, Thp, Thph, Cypr, Hi read διήλω ("I will show") = Masoretic Text.

5 The Targum apparently read this as הַנֶּהְרָה (hiphil imperfect third masculine singular of הַנֶּהְרָה, "to go down"). See pages 270f.

6 Following Sharpe (op. cit., p. 208) here.
Apparently γενηματα ("fruits") is the translation of הָרִיִּים ("and he teaches"). This may reflect a theological bias to avoid the anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew by avoiding both the motion of God and instruction by Him. On the other hand the translation may depend upon a different or misread Hebrew Vorlage. The letters (1) could be easily read as a  or  and the final n as a . Thus, the translator could have had either a text which read or , or else he could have misread his text in this manner. Wutz¹ and Nyberg², however, maintain that the Septuagint could not have read הָרִיִּים as . Therefore, the reason for this translation is most uncertain.

One verse in the Hebrew describes God as selling ( רכמ) people into slavery³. In the Septuagint this has been softened slightly to "deliver, hand over" ( αποδιδωμι ⁴),

¹Wutz, op. cit., p. 323.
²Nyberg, op. cit., p. 80) states, " ...kann nicht in seinem Text gestanden haben, denn das gibt er mit καρπος wieder." Nyberg considers that the Septuagint read a form of מַח ("to conceive") here.
³Joel 4(3):8; מַח נַתַּן ("I [God] will sell your sons, ..") = και αποδοθομαι τους υιους υμων ("And I will deliver [give over] your sons, ..")
⁴Compare the Targum which softens מַח in the same way in the first half of the verse but translates it literally in the second half where Judah is described as doing the selling. See page 272.
but, since this conveys the same sense as the Hebrew, it cannot definitely be cited as an example of any protective softening.

In Zephaniah 3:15 the change from ... he [God] has cast out [πιλ] your enemies, to ... he hath redeemed [λευτρωτης = πιλ] thee out of the hand [a pro-Israel addition] of thine enemies, in the Septuagint may be anti-anthropomorphic. It, however, more probably represents a change of 1 and 7 or an instance of translating πιλ as if it were the pael of 'י (Aramaic). In either case, the translator possibly objected to the favorable reference to the enemies of Israel and, therefore, added a suffix (σου) and a word (χειρος) to alter a seemingly favorable action of God toward the heathen to be applicable to Israel instead.

Another alteration which may be due to a theological bias is the change of person (a common enough change in the

1Moreover, ἀποδίωμι is used secularly in the same verse with reference to Judah's selling these people into bondage.

2The Targum and Syraic support the Masoretic Text.

3Πιλ. Procksch (op. cit., p. 954 footnote) emends to Πιλ with the Septuagint, Targum, and Syriac.

4So Schwalley (op. cit., p. 206). This, however, is not so certain since in Aramaic the pael of 'י may mean "to deliver" (so Gerleman, Gillis, Zephanja [Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1942], p. 61).

5λευτρωτης σε κα τιρος εκθρων σου.

6Cf. Schwalley, loc. cit.

7Gerleman, op. cit., p. 61.
Septuagint) in Zechariah 9:10 from יָדַע ("I \[God\] will cut off. . .") to καὶ εξολοθρεύσει: 2 ("He \[the Messiah\] will destroy. . ."). This change involves the use of an intermediary to avoid ascribing to God actions which might seem unsuitable to be ascribed to Him. Therefore, this change perhaps is classified more properly as a Messianic alteration. The Septuagint translation may represent, however, a different text, e.g., חדורפ for הָלַע. This same verb (דוע) occurs also in Zechariah 9:6. There יָדַע 5 (". . . and I will make an end. . .") is softened to καὶ καθέλω (". . . and I will bring down. . . 6. In the latter passage the translation may be due to a theological bias or to a different text. 7.

---

1The Targum and Th. lem (εξολοθρεύσω) support the Masoretic Text. Cf. Syriac (= חדורפ -- Jansma, op. cit., p. 71).

2Procksch (op. cit., p. 966 footnote) considers the Septuagint to be correct and so emends to חדורפ along with Marti (op. cit., p. 430); Cheyne (op. cit., p. 186); Houbignat, Newcome, Stade, Wellhausen, Nowack, van Hoonacker, Mitchell (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 277); and Horst (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 238).

3Cf. Syriac (Jansma, op. cit., p. 71).

4See Procksch, op. cit., p. 966 footnote.

5Targum: חדורפ. This usually translates חדורפ (according to Jansma, op. cit., p. 66).

6Bagster, op. cit., p. 1121.

7Kennedy, (op. cit., p. 139) emends to חדורפ ("bring low"); after the Septuagint?
These seemingly anti-anthropomorphically changes, therefore, are caused just as probably by different (or misread) texts and/or different vocalization, by interpreting the word according to the Aramaic meaning, or by other theological biases. Hence they do not result necessarily from an anti-anthropomorphically bias.

3. ALTERATIONS OF PASSAGES WHICH GIVE GOD CERTAIN ANTHROPOMORPHIC POSSESSIONS

Changes which are least likely to be anti-anthropomorphic, or conversely are likely to be anthropomorphic, are those which involve the addition or subtraction of pronominal suffixes to animate and inanimate possessions. This subject is only noted in passing because these alterations are encountered so frequently in passages which cannot have any theological motivation that it would be difficult to establish a definite theological motivation here. Moreover, the Septuagint is just as apt as not to be more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text in these passages.

4. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MEN AND GOD WHICH IMPLY PHYSICAL FORM TO DEITY

There are many actions ascribed by man to God and many attitudes of men towards God in the Hebrew which imply He has a physical form. Some of these actions (or attitudes) do not as strongly imply physical form as others, but still they are difficult for the human mind to conceive as occurring
if God has no form. An example occurs in Hosea 12:1(11:12):

This translation hardly can be regarded as being less anthropomorphic than the Hebrew, and, therefore, we must conclude that the difference between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint is due to the latter having a different text which reads... in the Septuagint, or else the translator has

(1) ACTIONS DIRECTED AGAINST GOD.

Hosea 7:14 is the only passage in the Twelve where Israel is said to rebel against God. Here ירו כה נב either is omitted in the Septuagint, or else the translator has

1Following the Revised Standard Version, footnote e, p. 944.

2The Revised Standard Version essentially follows the Septuagint here, "... but Judah is still known by God,"

3So Procksch (op. cit., p. 907, footnote) and Vollers (op. cit., I, p. 256), Harper (op. cit., p. 374) reads... in Hosea 7:15.

4Scott (op. cit., p. 147) considers the Septuagint to have read יר not ירה; so also Procksch (loc. cit.).

5The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See page 290.

6"... they rebel against me."; cf. the Septuagint επαιδευήσαν ἐν ἐμοί. ("They were instructed by Me.") in Hosea 7:15.

7So the Arabic and the Septuagint (De-Rossi, op. cit., III, p. 176).
misread his text. He may have avoided translating this clause either because he objected to the anthropomorphic implications or because he wished to avoid the statement that Israel could ever rebel against his God. Most probably, however, he either misread his text or possessed one differing from the Masoretic Text.

Moreover, the implication that Israel is against God is avoided by the Septuagint in Hosea 13:9.

It is thy destruction, O Israel. That thou art against Me, against thy help.

In thy destruction, O Israel, who can give succour?

1Or else, more likely, he read "ו יִהְיָה ("And they were chastised by Me") and regarded "יוֹרַד ("I chastised") of the next verse as a doublet which he deleted (so also Prochsch, op. cit., p. 902 footnote). See page 45. Cf. Malachi 2:8; 3:7 where the basic idea is retained.

2I.e., this omission may have arisen from a pro-Israel bias.

3The Targum avoids, see pages 291f.

4One manuscript omits (see Kennicott, op. cit., p. 257 and De-Rossi, op. cit., III, p. 181).

5So the American Jewish Translation, The Revised Standard Version translates, "I will destroy you, O Israel; who can help you?", following in part the Syriac and Greek translations.

6L-49, 26, 198, 233', 534 Bo Cyr. Th et P and Thph read διασφορά for διασφόρα. These manuscripts, etc., make a more vivid allusion to the historical event of Israel's captivity than do the other Greek manuscripts.

7V II-66 91 c b Co Syh Aeth Arab Arm Th. and Th. add σοι. The original manuscript very possibly may have contained this word.
The Masoretic Text itself is difficult as it stands. Although the Septuagint avoids both the anthropomorphic implications and the objectionable idea that Israel would be against Yahweh, the translator easily may have read a different text, e.g., יִרְעַשׁ כָּלָהָּ וְיִנְחָשׁ.

Likewise גָּעַד ("to rebel, transgress") usually is translated adequately by ἀσέβεω ² ("to act profanely, sin against"). In Amos 4:4, however, גָּעַד occurs twice ³. The first time it is rendered by ἀνομεω ³ ("to act lawlessly"); the second time, by ἀσέβεω. The translation, ἀνομεω may be an attempt to soften the idea of rebellion, but it also may be caused by the desire to avoid repetition of the same word in the same verse. If the latter is the reason, then ἀνομεω may have been considered to be a synonym of ἀσέβεω. In certain translations and one codex⁴ of Hosea


2The translators, having ignored the etymological meaning of גָּעַד "... have found a felicitous rendering for the idea." (Dodd, C.H., op. cit., p. 77).

3W (vid), Ziegler; cf. B-V 1L ⁵ 613 C’ - 613 G' - 68 - 239; these manuscripts retain ἀσέβεω.

4In 49 and the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.
8:1, however, the translation of גָּאוֹן as ἀφετεῖον ("to set aside, disregard") may represent a softening of the idea of rebelling against God. The context suggests the possibility of a pro-Israel bias on the part of the translator.

The translation of the verb "to be treacherous"

when it describes man's relation to God, presents a problem. It is translated in both non-theological and theological passages by ἐγκαταλείπω 1 ("to leave behind, forsake") in Hosea 5:7; Jonah 2:9; Malachi 2:10, 11, 14, 15, and 16. Therefore, the occurrence of ἐγκαταλείπω ("to forsake") for "to be treacherous" in the theological passages (in Hosea 5:7 and possibly in Malachi 2:11 and 16) cannot be regarded as a softening arising because of a theological bias 2 unless it can be established that the translator regarded the occurrences in Malachi 2:10, 14 and 15 as having theological application. Moreover, this is not the entire problem. In the remaining two 3 verses in the Twelve in which "to be treacherous" occurs, the translator uses the verb, καταφρονεῖ ("to think slightly of, despise"), for " to think slightly of, despise" in both theological and non-theological passages. This verb (καταφρονεῖ ) does not translate consistently any particular Hebrew verb,

1In the Twelve, however, ἐγκαταλείπω ("to leave behind, forsake") regularly translates גָּאוֹן ("to leave, forsake, loose").

2Anti-anthropomorphic or pro-Israel.

3Hosea 6:7; Habakkuk 1:13; cf. also Habakkuk 2:5.
although it would be an adequate equivalent of *πιελ*¹ ("to despise"). The simplest explanation is that the Septuagint, in these last two passages, was translated from a text in which either *πιελ* ("to despise") occurred or *πιελ* was mis-read as *πιελ*. A translator having a defective text easily could read a *γ* and *ι* respectively, as a *η* and *τ*. Another possibility would be that Alexandrian Judaism considered the act of despising God as less offensive to the idea of God than the act of treachery towards Him² -- or at least less anthropomorphic -- but, if this is the case, why was Hosea 5:7 (and Malachi 2:11,16) not similarly treated?

Another verb whose translation in the Septuagint is very interesting is *γιπ* ("to rob?"³). This verb occurs some four times in Malachi 3:8f and invariably is translated by *περπιν*⁴ ("to strike with the heel, trip"⁵). The Hebrew reads:

> וַיִּקְלֹּף אֶת־אֱלֹהִיםֵךְ "Will a man rob God? Yet you are robbing me. But you say, 'How are we robbing thee?'... for you are robbing me;"

---

¹Cf. Proverbs 19:16 where Septuagint translates *πιελ* by *καταφρονεω*.

²One would think the opposite to be more probable.

³Brown, Driver and Briggs, op. cit., p. 867.

⁴α', σ', θ' = αποστερεω ("to rob, despoil"), interpreting *γιπ* in the later Jewish meaning (Ziegler, J, "Beitrage zum griechischen Dodekapropheton", Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Gottingen, Nr. 10 (1943), p. 379).

⁵Liddel, Scott, Jones, op. cit., II, p. 1546.

⁶The Vulgate supports Masoretic Text and the Syraic = the Septuagint (according to Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 74).
et TCTepvtet1
avGpwrcoc Geov 6ioti upeti
xai eoeite Ev tin evterni-
kamenv se...xai eme umeiς
tepniżete 4

Will a man strike God?
Because you are striking
Me! And you say: In what
have we stricken you...
And Me you are striking!!

This rendering of the Septuagint is unusual and may
reflect the difficulty of deciding how to translate this verb,
yap, the meaning of which is uncertain. In later Hebrew it
means "to rob", and this is the meaning found in the trans-
lations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion who all render
it by ἀποστερέω 6 ("to rob, despoil"). These translations
are anthropomorphic, and, therefore, the Septuagint may
represent: (1) the original meaning of yap; (2) a softening
of the Masoretic Text, or (3) a different or misread text.
Most likely, the Septuagint possessed a different 'Vorlage'

1Procksch (op. cit., p. 975, footnote) emends with
Septuagint to yapý. So also Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti
[op. cit., p. 475], Sievers, Isopescul, Duhm; Riessler,
(so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 74); and Horst
(Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 264).

2Procksch (loc. cit.) emends with Septuagint to

3Procksch (loc. cit.) emends with Septuagint to

4Procksch (loc. cit.) emends with Septuagint to

5A free translation.

6Cf. footnote 4, page 104.

7According to Brown, Driver, and Briggs (op. cit.,
p. 867) the Septuagint read here yap εἰρήνη (so
also Wellhausen according to Brown, Driver and Briggs,
loc. cit.).
in which a form of הָניָה 1 ("to assail insidiously, circumvent, overreach") was found.

Equally dubious is the Septuagint's translation of Malachi 3:13:

הָניָה עָלָי בַּרְיָסמִי Your words have been stout against me,

בַּרְיוֹנַתְּךָ וְאֵמֶם You have brought heavy accusations against me.

tובּוֹסַתָּהּ וְעַלָּנָהּ This translation of מָתַתְּךָ ("to be strong") by בַּרְיוֹנַתְּךָ ("to be heavy, weigh down") may be paraphrasic rather than a softening of more offensive language.

Possibly the command of God in Malachi 3:10 to try (test) Him was considered to be too offensive, and, therefore, the translator softened its anthropomorphic description:

וַיִּבָּשֵׂסָתְךָ ... and thereby put me to the test,

וַיִּתְכַּעֲשָׂבָתְךָּ δְּנָהּ Turn [pay attention] now in this respect.

The conclusion that this translation is an anti-anthropomorphism is by no means certain since the same verb (יָנָה) occurs in Malachi 3:15 where the wicked were described

---

1Cf. footnotes 1,2,3,4, page 105. Koehler, L., Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1952), II, p. 820, considers הָניָה to mean "deceive". He considers that, in Malachi, הָניָה is substituted for הָניָה, probably as an "intended metathesis ... to avoid assonance to הָניָה" (loc. cit.).

2The Targum supports the Masoretic Text, see page 293.

3א" ת, כyr X. 909 = בוקמַסָאתָה ("assay, test"); cf. Cyr. X. 909; א" ת = פֵּירַמָאתָה ("attempt, endeavor, try").
as trying (or testing) God:

\[
\text{אֶתָּלָ֑הּ רָעָֽהוּ֙ אָ֣בְיָ֔הוּ יֶ֥שֶׁ֛הָיָ֔ו נֶ֥שֶׁר יֶ֖שֶׁר}
\]

... but when they put God to the test...

\[
\text{kai αντεστησαν}^{2} 
\]

Though they opposed God;

This translation of \( \text{πα ου} \) ("to test") by \( \text{αντεστησαν} \) ("to resist") retains the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew, although it may soften slightly the concept of the original text. Therefore, these translations may have been motivated by a desire to avoid unsuitable expressions in connection with the concept of God.

(2) THE VISIBLE APPEARANCE OF GOD

In Zechariah 9:14 the statement occurs that God can be seen, presumably by man.

\[
\text{καὶ κύριος εσται}^{5} 
\]

Let but the Lord be against them. ... 

---

1Cf. the use in Zechariah 13:9, see pages 49f. Both the non-theological reference and the one to Deity are translated by the verb \( \text{δοκιμάσω} \) ("assay, test") in Zechariah 13:9 which is very appropriate there.

2\( a^{1}, \text{εδοκιμασαν} \) ("they tested"); \( σ^{1}, \text{επειρασαν} \) ("they tempted").

3The Targum supports Masoretic Text yet avoids the anthropomorphism (see pages 279f.); cf. the Syraic.

4\( \text{I.e., "The Lord shall fight for them."} \) (Kimchi -- so M'Caul, op. cit., p. 90).

5A "solecism" (Jansma, op. cit., p. 76); perhaps a text with \( \text{πα ου} \) (Vollers [K.A., Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner Erste Hälfte, Berlin: Mayer und Mueller, 1880, p. 63] and Jansma -- so Jansma, op. cit., p. 76).

6Or "And the Lord will be over them ... ."
This translation conveys much the same idea as the Hebrew, but the suggestion readily presents itself that the translator was seeking to avoid stating that God could be seen. This motive for the translation, however, appears less certain when it is noted that elsewhere in the Twelve the statements that God can be seen always are translated literally\(^1\). Therefore, more probably, either the translator had a 'Vorlage' which lacked the παρέσκευα ("will be seen") or else he misread\(^3\) theわ in his text as わ\(^4\).

(3) SEEKING REFUGE IN GOD

The explanation of the Greek translation of Nahum 1:7 is most uncertain. The interpretation of ἄνθρωπος\(^5\) ("... those who take refuge in him," as τοὺς εὐλαβομένους αὐτον ("... them who reverence him") is understood easily. It is probably not a theological change\(^6\). Instead

\(^1\)Cf. Habakkuk 3:10 where מרים תְּלֵה עַל הָאָרֶץ ("The mountains saw thee, and were writhed;") is translated as οὐφόρται σε ὄλῳν ἐν τοῖς λαοῖς ("the nations shall see thee and be in pain," -- Bagster, op. cit., p. 1108).

\(^2\)His 'Vorlage' may have had a form of מַנְי instead of מַרְי.

\(^3\)Or his text may have been defective.

\(^4\)Cf. Vollers (op. cit., p. 76) and Jansma (loc. cit.).

\(^5\)The Targum avoids the anthropomorphism yet does not support the Septuagint.

\(^6\)Of course, the translator may have interpreted the idea of seeking refuge in God to be equivalent to reverencing or worshipping God.
the Septuagint may have read ᾽ByTexta ("kind, pious") in place of ʾeṣon. This suggestion involves only an assumption that the Septuagint had a defective 3 in their text or that the 3 was misread as a 7.

If the translator read ʾBytxt in Nahum 1:7b, that may have influenced his interpretation of the first half of the verse, "The Lord is good, a stronghold [1�yv] in the day of trouble;"4. This portion he translated as, "The Lord is kind to them who wait for [support — τούς
υπομενοσίν] him in a day of distress;"5. His Vorlage here may have contained (or have been misread as) ʾynytn6 or some similar form; this, however, is not too likely7.

---

1One manuscript reads παρ (De-Rossi, op. cit., III, p. 202).

2Haldar (Studies in the Book of Nahum [Uppsala: A-B Lundequistska Bokhandelen, 1947], p. 26) considers the root ṣnym may have existed somewhere with the meaning "to be fearful".


4 ἄγαν ποιον ἡβυξ ἡμέρας εὐθος.

5 ἔχθαυς κυρίος τοῖς υπομενοσίν αυτον ἐν ἡμέρα θλίψεως.

6With the meaning of abiding, enduring, persisting, etc.

7The Syriac has considered ἡβυξ as a hiphil infinitive while the Vulgate has translated it as a hiphil participle. Haldar considers that no emendation is necessary since every version supports the Hebrew consonantal text (Haldar, op. cit., p. 25).
The last word (יִחוּשָׁא), however, occurs also in Joel 3(4):16. Here the Septuagint renders it as ἐνίσχυσει ("to strengthen, confirm"). The translator apparently considered it to be a hiphil participle from יָיָיו ("to be strong")². The other word does not occur in Joel 3(4):16, although a derivative מָצוּג is found. Perhaps the Septuagint considered this word (מָצוּג) here to be derived from מַעֲנָה.³ If so, the Septuagint may represent a slight pro-Israel strengthening. Nevertheless, the translation of Nahum 1:7 in the Septuagint is puzzling if the differences from the Masoretic Text are considered to have arisen because of a theological bias.

(4) BEING STRONG IN GOD

This concept seldom appears in the Twelve. In one passage (Zechariah 12:5) the Septuagint seems to have softened or avoided the concept;

The inhabitants of Jerusalem have strength through the Lord of hosts, their God.

We will find those for us who inhabit Jerusalem by the Lord Almighty their God.

---

¹ Only two appropriate occurrences.

² Cf. יָיָיו (Vollers, op. cit., II, p. 15); Bewer (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 144), et al.).

³ θείσαται ("[the Lord] will spare").

⁴ α' = καρτηρησεν.
Probably the translator was not avoiding an anthropomorphism, but, more likely, he read ΝΥΔΗ as a form of the verb ΝΥΔ, perhaps ΝΥΔΗ, which he translated as a plural because of the χιλιάρχοι.

Some of the passages considered in this section have been translated literally or paraphrastically. In other passages the Septuagint translator may have read a different text (or misread his text). Occasionally a theological bias may be indicated as, for example, a pro-Israel bias.

Therefore, the relationships existing between God and man which are portrayed in the Hebrew, and which thus imply an anthropomorphic nature to God, usually are carried literally over into the Greek. Moreover, even when changes occur in the Septuagint, an anti-anthropomorphic bias upon the part of the translator cannot be established beyond reasonable doubt.

These lesser anthropomorphisms which have been considered in this chapter, therefore, were not altered by the translator any more than were the grosser anthropomorphisms

---


2So Jansma, op. cit., p. 114; Wright, loc. cit.; Lowe, loc. cit.
of Chapter II. There is no passage which clearly shows that its translation must have resulted from an anti-anthropomorphic tendency. The fact that the Targum (usually with one or more other versions) is based on the Masoretic Text (or one very similar to it) increases the possibility that reasons other than a theological bias caused changes in translation.

This does not mean that some theological bias, either an anti-anthropomorphic bias or some other theological belief, may not have consciously or unconsciously influenced these translations. It does mean, however, that such theological beliefs have not yet been definitely proven to have been the primary motive for changes made. If the translator did have these beliefs, and if he also had a defectively written text, such differences of translation naturally would be expected.
CHAPTER IV

FURTHER ALTERATIONS CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF GOD IN THE SEPTUAGINT

In the preceding two chapters the discussion has been limited to passages which, in the Hebrew, may be classified as the more obvious anthropomorphic and anthropopathic expressions. Certain other expressions, statements, and passages, which are anthropomorphic in the broader sense, also occur. These passages involve certain other concepts of Deity and, therefore, have been reserved for discussion here. Some translations of the passages which present these other concepts of Deity may reveal some of the translator's theological beliefs concerning Deity.

1. THE OMNIPRESENCE OF GOD

The belief that God is everywhere present is, of course, anti-anthropomorphic. This conception of Deity insists that God cannot be confined to a given place and that He does not need to move about since He is already present everywhere. Therefore, if the translator of the Greek Book of the Twelve believed that God was omnipresent, the influence of this belief, consciously or otherwise, may have been reflected in his translation of those passages which, in the Hebrew, describe God as moving about or being in a certain place. Of course, the absence of any change which can be traced to the influence of this theological
concept does not prove that the translator did not believe in the omnipresence of God.

(1) THE DENIAL OF MOTION TO DEITY

Usually the Septuagint follows the Masoretic Text in permitting God to move about freely. In a few places, however, the Greek translation substantially differs from the Hebrew.

[1] JONAH 2:7(6)

1 Yet thou didst bring up my life from the Pit,
καὶ αναβήστως φόρα 
ζωὴς μον

... let my soul now, corrupt as it is, ascend,

The ἀναβήστως ("ascend") may be vocalized so that it may have either God as the subject or ἀπειθεῖν ("destruction, pit"). Apparently the Masoretes vocalized it one way, and the Septuagint vocalized it another way. Hence, this translation may not have resulted from the translator's belief in the omnipresence of God. Possibly the translator was puzzled by the

1 The Targum rests upon a text similar to the Masoretic Text.

2 This verb ( ἀναβαίνω ) is the usual Greek equivalent for ἁλλ (hi.) except in Amos 8:10 which reads καὶ ἀναβήστως εἰπ τακαν σφίν σακκον ("And I will bring sackcloth to go on every loin") for ὑπελεύσεις λείπ μον ("I will bring sackcloth upon all loins,"). The Greek here literally translates the Hebrew.

3 Or ex φόρας with SC - V 86 mg, Wc, Sa, 407, οτ λ', σ', ο', α' = ex διαφόρας.

4 Or "And let the destruction of my life ascend."
fact that Jonah was praising God for having raised him up already from the pit, i.e., from the inside of the fish, while he was still inside of the fish. This difficulty could be avoided easily by vocalizing ᾧν as a jussive and by taking θνὲς ("destruction") to be its subject. Then Jonah's statement would be an appropriate petition for him to be making at that time. Against this suggestion is the translation of the rest of the prayer, but it is as reasonable to accept this suggestion as it is to assume that the translation was made to avoid the concept that God moves about -- especially as this is an isolated example of such a change in connection with this verb. An alternate possibility is that the Septuagint and Masoretic Text preserve two traditional vocalizations of this passage without any other signification.


Bring down thy warriors, O Lord.

Let the man of peace become a soldier.

1This verb ἀναβαίνω ("ascend") is the usual Greek translation of the hiphil form of ἦλθ ("to go up"). The only exception is in Amos 8:10 where the causative Greek verb corresponding to ἀναβαίνω is used. See page 114, footnote 2.

2The Septuagint = ἦλθεν ἀναβαίνων (Procksch, op. cit., p. 915, footnotes).

3or "Let the soft (or faint) -hearted become a mighty one (or warrior)." Cf. Wade, op. cit., p. 116.
The reason for this translation is uncertain. Apparently, the translator considered ָּי ָה to be an imperfect, ָּי ָה, and connected the first word (יִּנַּה) with the preceding word. He also seemingly omitted the suffix of the final word and regarded ָּי ָה ("bring down") as a substantive with the article (ָּ) prefixed.

The principal problem in this passage concerns ָּי ָה ("bring down") since the verb ָּי ָה ("go down") does not occur elsewhere in the hiphil form. Therefore, several scholars (e.g., Graetz, Scholz, Credner) have followed the Targum, Syriac, and Vulgate in deriving ָּי ָה from ָּי ("to be dismayed, shattered"). Others (e.g., Marti, Sievers, Duhm, Mowinckel) describe it as "a gloss" or as "meaningless". Still others consider that the Septuagint

1This amounts only to the reading of a ָּי (defective?) as a ָּי.

2Apparently the Revised Standard Version does this also.

3Cheyne (op. cit., p. 131) emends to ָּי ָה ("Lead thou, O Yahwe...").


5Graetz, op. cit., p. 15.

6Bewer states that all three do as stated above (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 139).

7Loc. cit.


9So Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 139.

had a different text, "let the peaceful one become a hero!". Even though this suggestion does not require so many emendations, yet it necessitates a change in every word. Moreover, it also requires that "to rest" must have meaning different from its usual one of 'rest'.

Perhaps the best suggestion is made by G. R. Driver who considers that the Septuagint represents the original text, i.e., "the timid one will be as the mighty one"). This emendation necessitates only three changes in the text itself -- the omission of , the shift of the final 7 to an initial 6 in the last word, and the

1According to Kapelrud (loc. cit.), so Bewer, Sellin, Robinson, and Mowinckel. Yet Robinson (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 66) actually suggests , and Bewer (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 139) considers the Septuagint to have read . Bewer (loc. cit.), moreover, emends to . Procksch (op. cit., p. 915, footnote) essentially agrees with this. He suggests for . Vollers (op. cit., II, p. 15) agrees with Bewer and takes the to have been read with an Aramaic meaning.

2Following Bewer (op. cit., pp. 134, 135, 139) and Kapelrud (op. cit., p. 161).

3Consequently Kapelrud (op. cit., p. 162) and Marti (op. cit., p. 140) consider the Hebrew to be a hiphil imperative of , an Aramaic word meaning 'to go down' (i.e., = Biblical Hebrew ). Hence Kapelrud (op. cit., p. 161) still considers the Masoretic Text to be correct.

4Driver, op. cit., p. 401.

5Loc. cit.; cf. Sellin (see Kapelrud, op. cit., p. 161), Robinson (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 66), etc.

6The Septuagint does not indicate this preposition ( = as).
common change of and . The is then considered as a niphal of . This text would thus have some support from the Targum and Syriac, both of which also derive their roots from . The sense then would be "... he who is frightened," i.e., a timid one. From this standpoint the Septuagint would not represent a theological alteration made by the translator.

[3] HOSEA 6:3

... his going forth is sure as the dawn;
... sure as the morning we shall find him.

Although this translation may reflect a desire to avoid the ascription of motion to Deity, two facts make this assumption unlikely: (1) the other occurrences of the root in appropriate theological passages are translated literally; and (2) the translation itself is anthropomorphic and also would be offensive to a translator with an anti-anthropomorphic bias. A more probable suggestion is that the translator possessed a different text or else misread his text. Procksch suggests that perhaps

---

1 Only elsewhere found in Malachi 2:5 (so Driver, loc. cit.)
2 *i.e.* = *οτι ος οφθαλμ οπερ φεβησε η επιφανεια αυτου* (*Because His manifestation is certain as the dawn, . . .*).
3 See Introduction, pages xxixf. for a list of such passages.
4 Procksch, op. cit., p. 900, footnote.
the Masoretic Text should be emended to: ַָּּיִּלְּךָ וּכְּרָמָר ("As we seek eagerly, so shall we be found. . . "). A more probable text for the 'Vorlage' of the Septuagint would be ַָּּיִּלְּךָ וּכְּרָמָר (". . . as the dawn is certain, we will find Him,"). This text involves only the doubling of the final ֶפֶל of the ַָּּיִּלְּךָ, the transposition of the first ֶפֶל in the last word, and the reading of ֶפֶל as a ֶפֶל. Consequently, this text would be an instance of haplography-dittography. Moreover, this text easily could be read either as it is given in the Masoretic Text or as translated in the Septuagint -- especially if the consonants were written together without any word divisions. Therefore, although the reason for the translation may not be established definitely, a different 'Vorlage' or a misread text constitutes a more probable reason for the Septuagint's rendering than does the assumption of a theological bias.

HABBAKKUK 3:12

Thou didst bestride the earth in fury,

1So Oettli (according to Harper, op. cit., p. 281). An emendation which is closer to the Septuagint is ַָּּיִּלְּךָ ("We will find Him. . . ") as Harper (loc. cit.), Giesebrrecht, Wellhausen, Valeton, Smith (G.A.), Nowack, Marti (op. cit., p. 54), and Oort (loc. cit., p. 137), emend (so Harper, loc. cit.). Marti (op. cit., p. 54) believes that the Septuagint read either ַָּּיִּלְּךָ (as Procksch) or ַָּּיִּלְּךָ (as Giesebrrecht, et al.).

Although this passage is the most likely example of a translation which denies motion to Deity, the translation may depend just as easily upon a misread text, a defectively written text, or a different text.


"... and I will remove...
and I will feel."

This rendering may be a softening of the Hebrew, or the translator may have considered "... to be from the root " ("to grope after, touch, examine"). If the latter was the case (and it essentially requires a different

\[\text{\footnotesize \text{1.W. αγγελίης καὶ συμπατήςεις } "You will trample underfoot" in L - 36 (8text) Tht.}
\]

\[\text{\footnotesize \text{2. or "With a threat you will bring the earth low."}}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize \text{3. The Septuagint may have read the as a which would also agree with the consonants implied by the Syriac, Vulgate (so Driver, op. cit., pp. 396f), L - 36 (8text) Tht, and two Hebrew manuscripts (cf. Driver, loc. cit.); so also Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 243; cf. Reinke.}}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize \text{4. See page 82.}}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize \text{5. The Targum supports the Masoretic Text.}}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize \text{6. So Mitchell (Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 161), Stekhoven (Stekhoven, J.K. Schuurmans, De Alexandrijn-
\text{\footnotesize \text{sche Vertaling van het Dodekapropheton [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1897], p. 103]}, Lowe (op. cit., p. 38), and Rignell (op. cit., p. 130). Graetz (op. cit., p. 23) and Kennedy (op. cit., p. 22) emend to }\]
vocalization), then the translator rendered the Hebrew accurately according to his understanding.

These apparent alterations in translation which may deny (or soften) the portrayal of God as moving from place to place are not likely to be even embryonic denials of motion to God. The probabilities are just as great that they have resulted from some other causes; e.g., some may have arisen from a different or misread (defective) text. Therefore, the Septuagint translator cannot be said to have believed so strongly in the omnipresence of God that he was compelled, as were the Targums, to deny motion to Deity.

(2) THE DENIAL OF PLACE TO GOD

[1] ZECHARIAH 2:15(11)

The numerous instances in the Masoretic Text which represent God as being in the midst of Israel, in His house, in the Temple, and having a particular place of His own, etc., are retained in the Greek translation with one possible exception:

And I will dwell in the midst of you,

The Targum supports the Masoretic Text but is anti-anthropomorphic. See page 306, footnote 2. "T zeigt, dass er MT richtig verstanden hat, auch wenn die Übersetzung frei ist: 'וָשֹּׁכַה הַחַוִּית 'מעב[And I will place My Shekinah in your midst'], und ich will meine Schechina in deiner Mitte wohnen lassen." (Rignell, op. cit., p. 95).
This rendering is strongly pro-heathen and may translate accurately the original text, or a variant one, to which some scribal group objected and altered to our present Masoretic Text. The translation, of course, indicates a text involving only the change of a "nto 1, unless a defectively written 1 gave rise to the "n. It is highly improbable that any Jew of the period in which the Septuagint text was written ever would have made such an unnecessary alteration as was required to yield the Greek text.

[HABAKKUK 3:6]

1 [Iust. Dial. 1151 (non 1193) Eus. dem. p. 246.273 (non. p. 58.394) Cyr. X 877 Thl. IV 977 read "κατασκηνωσου" ("I will dwell") = Masoretic Text.]


3 Cf. Procksch (op. cit., p. 960, footnote), says, "l prb "ιππi G. C." Cf. Marti (op. cit., p. 407) and Lowe (op. cit., p. 29) who also consider that the Septuagint read "κατασκηνωσου.

4 Perhaps they were influenced by the "And I will dwell in your midst..." of the preceding verse.
The concept of the Lord as standing usually is translated literally, e.g.:

γῆ ἐστήκετο τὸν χῶρον

He stood and measured the earth;

ἐστή καὶ ἐσαλέυθη

He stood and the earth was shaken:

This passage, however, may be understood differently. Bagster's translation of the Septuagint considers the ἡ γῆ ("the earth") to be the subject of both verbs and translates, accordingly, as "The earth ... and trembled." Moreover, certain Septuagint manuscripts translate the ἐστήκετο ("He stood") as ἐστήκαν ("they stood"). Hence, there may have been an attempt in this passage to avoid portraying Deity as standing, but the possibility is remote. In Amos 7:7, however, the Septuagint's translation may be anti-anthropomorphic:

Behold, the Lord was standing ...

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐστήκαν ... and lo! he was standing ...

Here the Septuagint avoids the anthropomorphism of the Masoretic Text by not translating "יְהוָה" ("the Lord"). Certain Greek manuscripts translate "יְהוָה" ("the Lord") by

---

1See pages 47f concerning "יָד" ("to visit").

2Procksch (op. cit., p. 949, footnote) emends to ἔστηκεν ("and shook") following the Septuagint.

3Bagster, op. cit., p. 1108.

4So וּ- 410 Cant.

ανήρ¹ ("man, one"). Hirsch considers that the Septuagint's translation of ἼΝ is "... due to the influence of the similar form in vs.¹ 4 and 8¹, and perhaps also to a desire to avoid the anthropomorphisms of ..."² the Masoretic Text.

Cripps³ considers the Septuagint to be preferable, since the picture is that of a workman. In Amos 9:1, however, the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew is retained.

Although this translation of υφιστημι. ("I will

---

¹So rel. (W Or. III 314 Or. lat VIII 304); cf. Zechariah 1:8; 2:5(1).

²Harper (loc. cit.).

³Cripps, op. cit., p. 224; cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 924, footnote.

⁴The Targum supports the Masoretic Text. See page 306.

⁵The American Jewish Translation is: "And I will encamp about My House against the Army."

⁶This verb, υφιστημι ("to set up", etc.) is used to translate three Hebrew verbs: (1) יהי (piel = "to await, wait"), יָזְג ("to stand"), and נָפָל ("to arise"). On the other hand עַרְבּ ("to encamp") is translated by eight other Greek verbs, including παρατάσσω ("to set oneself in battle"). See Jansma, op. cit., p. 69.

⁷Syriac = "And I will cause a commander ... to encamp about my house." (Wright, op. cit., p. 569).

⁸So Bagster, op. cit., p. 1121.
station") for נָסָנִים ("I will encamp") may be a softening
of the Hebrew, it also may suggest that the translator had a
different text or misread his text, e.g., נָסָנִים
for נָסָנִים. Alternatively, he may have understood the Hebrew to mean
that an army was going to be sent against the Temple. This
idea may have been both offensive to him and seemingly out
of harmony with the context. Hence his translation may have
been an "emendation" which would give the meaning of the
"original" text. This suggestion is supported by the transla-
tion of נוּס ("guard, army") as αὐστημᾶ ("building,
structure; height") since this could explain why he vocalized
these consonants differently than the Masoretic Text.

[4] ZECHARIAH 2:17(13)

בַּיָּמָה יִרְאֶה יִרְאֶה . . . for he has roused
himself from his holy
dwelling.

1The Septuagint and Syriac (so Mitchell, in Mitchell,
Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 272) apparently vocalized נוּס
("a guard") differently from the Masoretic Text, perhaps to
mean a "column" (so Lowe, op. cit., p. 82; Mitchell, Smith,
Bewer, op. cit., p. 272; et al.). Jansma, however, points
out that its vocalization is translated in the Septuagint by
other Greek words (see Jansma, op. cit., p. 69; cf. footnote
24). He (loc. cit.) apparently considers that the Septuagint
here translates the Masoretic Text. In any case Mitchell
(op. cit., p. 272), Böttcher, Oort, Köhler, Bredenkamp, Stade,
Smith (U.A.), Nowack (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, loc. cit.),
Martí (op. cit., p. 429), et al. consider a vocalization
which differs both from the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint
to be preferable.

2Perhaps the Septuagint avoids or softens the concept
that God has a place of His own in Micah 6:6 and Amos 9:6. In
Micah 6:6 the Septuagint makes the reference to be to the
most High God instead of to the God who is "on high". In
Amos 9:6 God builds "his ascent" instead of "his chambers".
... for he is risen up from his holy clouds.

This translation scarcely can be an attempt to avoid describing Deity as being confined to some place or places, although the concept may have been slightly softened. More likely the rendering of ἡμερὰς ("dwellings") by ἀγίων ("clouds") represents a different, a misread, or a defective text in which ἡμερὰς ("clouds") was read (stood) for ἡμέρα ("dwellings").

[5] ZECHARIAH 9:1

καὶ ἰσραήλ ἐπηρεάται καὶ ἐξεγερομένην εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα αὐτοῦ. And in Damascus shall be his resting-place.

καὶ Δαμασκοῦ τόσοια . . . and Damascus is his sacrifice,

1σ' - κατοικήσεως ("dwellings, habitation").

2Apparently the Septuagint read ἡμέρα (Lowe, op. cit., p. 30), Wutz [op. cit., p. 224], Rignell [op. cit., p. 98] or ἡμέρα (Mitchell, in Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 147]). Rignell (op. cit., p. 98) continues "The Fehllesung, denn um etwas anderes dürfte es sich nicht handeln, ist auf Grund der Ähnlichkeit der Buchstaben leicht zu erklären. Möglicherweise schwebte dem Übersetzer die Wolkenssäule der Wüstenwanderung vor. Es verdient jedoch hervorgehoben zu werden, dass LXX eventuell nicht falsch gelesen hat, wenn es ihm klar gewesen ist, dass der Ausdruck ἡμέρα zur traditionellen Terminologie der Wüstentzeit gehört." Against Rignell is the fact that the Septuagint elsewhere seems to understand ἡμέρα correctly (so Lowe, op. cit., p. 30).

3The Targum (see page 307) translates a text similar to the Masoretic Text.

4American Jewish Translation. The Revised Standard Version translates, "The word of the Lord . . . and will rest upon Damascus."

5α', 147c, 198, 534, Cyr. read αναπαυσις = Masoretic Text.
Since the translation of הָרֹתא ("His resting place") as θυσία αὐτοῦ ("his sacrifice") requires only a change of vocalization\(^1\), a translator who was prejudiced against the heathen nations and/or one who wished to stress the doctrine of God's omnipresence\(^2\) might easily read an unvocalized text differently than in accordance with the tradition preserved in the Masoretic vocalization. Either explanation is questionable because the idea of Damascus being God's sacrifice would be at least as anthropomorphic as the Masoretic Text and still would exalt the heathen.

\[6\] MIGAH 2:13

וְלַאֹו יְהֹוָה וּלּוֹ וְאֵנִיהָו יְהֹוָה . . . the Lord at their head.

ο ἐν κυρίῳ ἃνθρωποι . . . and the Lord will be their leader.

This translation is still anthropomorphic and conveys essentially the same concept as the Hebrew. Consequently,

\(^1\)So Wutz (op. cit., p. 321), Mitchell, Smith, Bewer (op. cit., p. 270); \(\text{S}2 \text{Codices, the Syriac and Arabic (Davidson, op. cit., p. 135). Cf. 2 Samuel 14:17; Psalms 132:8,11 (cf. Wright, op. cit., p. 566). This is "a serious but natural error," (Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 270).}

\(^2\)"The LXX, render here θυσία αὐτοῦ . This rendering may possibly be an interpretation like that of the Targum." (Wright, op. cit., p. 566).

\(^3\)The Targum avoids by using Memra; see page 316.

\(^4\)Cf. Marti's statement (op. cit., p. 277), "... er ist ihr König." This refers to the preceding clause. If this statement is true, then the Septuagint here interprets and paraphrases the Hebrew.
the translator probably was not attempting to avoid the implication that Deity could be confined to space.

[7] HOSEA 5:3

... and Israel is not hid from me;

καὶ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἀπεστίν απ' ἐμον
... when Israel did not withdraw from me.

In this last passage the concept of being hidden from God is involved. This concept is opposed to the theological belief that Deity is omniscient and omnipresent. The concept implies the anthropomorphic ascription of eyes to Deity. Moreover, in the other pertinent passages, this verb is translated literally. Hence, the translation of ἡσυχ ("is hidden") by ἀπεστίν ("be away from, withdrawn") probably does not arise from a theological bias.

[8] MICAH 3:4

... he will hide his face from them at that time,

καὶ ἀποστρέψει το πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ απ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ ἔξελω
... but [he] will turn away his face from them at that time,

---

1 So also 6; Bc 22c - 11 - 88 - 410 - 764 c-239 26
LaW Cyr. P Hi. = ἀπεστίη ("(he) did remove"); Cmgb 46
87 Thph. = ἀπεστίσα ("I removed"); Ach. = lattuit = M.T.;
ατ = ἑπεκαλυφθη ("(he) is obscured"); στ = ἐλαθεν
[- θεσαν] ("he did escape notice").

2 See pages 59f.

3 στ = ἀποκρυψει ("he hid").
The translation of ἰναπτία ("he will hide") by καὶ ἀποστρέψει ("but [he] will turn away") avoids the anthropomorphism of the Masoretic Text. Taylor considers that the Syriac and Septuagint made this translation in order to avoid the anthropomorphism. Perhaps Taylor is correct, but the Septuagint accurately translates this verb (ὥπο) by χρυπτω ("to hide") in Hosea 13:14, by καταδω ("to go down, sink, set", then "to slink away, lie hid") in Amos 9:3b, and by σκέπαζω ("to cover, shelter") in Zephaniah 2:3. The variety in the verbs selected in the Septuagint probably is due to the translator's exegesis of these passages.

Micah 3:4 states that God will separate Himself from certain people. Hence, he selected an appropriate verb, αποστρεφω. Zephaniah 2:3, on the other hand, indicates a desire for certain people to obtain protection in the day of Yahweh's anger; the translator's selection of σκέπαζω clarifies this fact.

In Amos 9:3b, however, the selection of καταδω probably arises from the selection of εγχρυπτω to translate μαν in the earlier part of the verse. The selection of χρυπτω in Hosea 13:14 is a natural one.

---

1Taylor, op. cit., pp. 79f.
2Liddel and Scott, op. cit., II, p. 880.
3In Amos 9:3a the verb μαν is translated by εγχρυπτω.
Several passages whose Greek translations avoid stating that Deity may be found in a particular place(s), cannot be shown positively, to be a denial of place to Deity. Each of these translations may have resulted from other causes, e.g., one translation may reflect a liberal, universalistic outlook on the part of the Septuagint translator or an alteration made in the Masoretic Text because of a pro-Israel bias. Moreover in Zechariah 2:15(11) the translator may have possessed a different text (or one which he misread). The other passages also do not establish definitely that the translator sought to avoid limiting Deity to a single place. In two passages (Micah 3:4 and Amos 7:7) the translation may have been made in order to avoid implying that God was not omnipresent.

2. THE OMNISCIENCE OF GOD

This concept of Deity assumes that God cannot have a mind which has limitations like the minds of men. A belief in the omniscience of God would result in certain alterations of the Masoretic Text. Therefore, such a belief may have produced the translations found in several passages in the Twelve.

(1) JONAH 1:6

Arise, call upon your god! Perhaps the god will give a thought to us, that we do not perish.

1The Targum supports the Masoretic Text.
Arise and call on thy God, that thy God may save us, and that we may not perish.

The selection of διασώσῃ ("may save") for ἐπιστρέφονται ("will give a thought") may indicate that the translator considered that the Hebrew suggested that God was not omniscient, i.e., that He was not aware always of what was happening to one of his servants. The Hebrew text also may have implied to the translator that God was capricious like the heathen deities -- a thought highly offensive! Alternatively, the translator, influenced by the context, may have translated the Hebrew freely rather than literally. The Greek rendering gives the reason why God should be thinking of the men, i.e., in order that He might deliver them out of their peril.

(2) HOSEA 8:4

... but without my knowledge.

---

1The Septuagint = ἐπιστρέφονται (so Voller, op. cit., II, p. 13), Bewer (in Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 34), the Syriac (so Bewer, loc. cit.), and the Arabic.

2Or, in other words, God was the possessor of a mind with limited capacity.

3This is the only place in the Twelve where this statement occurs.
καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώρισαν μοι:¹ . . . but they did not make it known to me:²

Although the Greek translation gives the essential meaning of the Hebrew Text, the thought has been softened in that God now no longer declares that something exists outside His knowledge. Moreover, the translator may have interpreted the Hebrew passage to mean, not that anything existed which God did not know, but only that the situation was without God's knowledge in the sense that Israel had established princes without first consulting God³. If so, the Greek translation avoids the implication of the Hebrew that God's knowledge was imperfect and, at the same time, carries the essential thought over into the Greek language. Since this is almost certainly the case, the translation here indicates a theological bias even though it accurately renders the Hebrew.

(3) HOSEA 13:5

זֵדַע... It was I who knew you . . .

---
¹The Septuagint and Syriac may represent only a change of pointing (so Nyberg, op. cit., p. 62). Vollers (op. cit., I, p. 251) considers the Septuagint to be a free translation. The Targum avoids the difficulties in another manner (see page 236).

²Bagster, op. cit., p. 1075.

³Cf. Pell's translation, "... and did not consult me;".
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It was I who fed thee.

This rendering is more anthropomorphic than the original. Probably this is an instance of an original anthropomorphism being preserved in the Septuagint rather than an indication that the translator was influenced by any theological bias.

(4) AMOS 8:7

Surely I will never forget any of their deeds.

1 The Septuagint = ייִּיהָּ, according to the Syriac, Procksch (op. cit., p. 908, footnote), Sebøk, Wellhausen, Graetz [op. cit., p. 14], Guthe, Loftman, Smith (G.A.), Marti [op. cit., p. 101], Harper (so Harper, op. cit., p. 392), Drake (op. cit., p. 171), and Robinson (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 50); cf. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 102); "[Septuagint, Syriac] ייִּיהָּּ, was sicher wegen der Paronomasie mit ייִּיהָּּ).

2 The Targum may be a softened version of the Septuagint.

3 See page 151.

4 Drake (op. cit., p. 171) suggests that the Septuagint and Targum read ייִּיהָּּ . . . though their renderings would both be free translations of the word in the text and expressive of the same metaphor. For the care of the shepherd may be as well expressed by ייִּיהָּּ in Hebrew as by γνώσειν in Greek; see John x,10," . . . Most scholars follow the Septuagint here, e.g., Drake (loc. cit.), Sebøk, Harper, Wellhausen, Graetz, Loftman, Smith (G.A.), Marti (so Harper, op. cit., p. 392), et al. Scott (op. cit., pp. 149f) considers that the Septuagint Read ייִּיהָּּ, the dropping of the initial yodh being explained as a doubling of the final yodh of the preceding word. Scott considers the Septuagint reading is to be preferred to the Masoretic Text ייִּיהָּּ because (1) It explains the stress laid upon the privations of the wilderness. (2) The choice of God (יִּיהָּּ) took place not in the wilderness but in Egypt. (3) The word 'pastures' in the next verse is from the root יִּיהָּּ."
... that none of these works of yours shall ever be forgotten.

The translation avoids the idea that God could forget, i.e., the implication that God is not omniscient, and at the same time it retained the essential meaning of the Hebrew. The Greek verb, ἐπιληφθήσεται ("will be forgotten"), corresponds to the Hebrew verbal form, פֹּלֵא . This form requires that a 3 be substituted for an ש . In connection with this passage, Hosea 4:6 should be considered:

γάρ σε ἐπιληφθήσεται 1 I also will forget your children.
καὶ ἐπιληφθήσεται 1 2 I also will forget 3 thy children.

In this second passage the middle form of the verb may mean "to neglect" 4 and, consequently, the Septuagint may mean, "I also will neglect your children". This meaning is appropriate to the context, i.e., "And as you have neglected the law of your God, even so I will forget your children." 5 On the other hand, the question arises as to why, if Amos

---

1The Targum supports the Septuagint here. See page 324.
2This verb in the active means, "to cause to forget"; in the middle it means, "to forget (willfully or otherwise); to escape note, leave disregarded, neglect"; etc. . . .
3Or neglect.
4See footnote 2, page 134.
5The Targum, "I will drive out", see page 324.
8:7 is an example of a translational alteration which reflects a theological bias, the translator did not render Hosea 4:6 as, "Your children also will be forgotten", instead of using the ambiguous future middle form of the verb. Because of the difference in the treatment of these two passages in the Septuagint, the conclusion cannot be definitely reached that the translation of Amos 8:7 reflects a theological bias.

(5) AMOS 4:13

This passage states that God declares His thoughts (τον χρηστον αυτου) to mankind. The Septuagint interprets the words as τον χρηστον αυτου 1 ("His Christ") which corresponds to τον [ων] αυτου 2 ("His Messiah"). There are several possible explanations for the differences between the Greek translation and the Hebrew: (1) that the Septuagint alters the Hebrew to avoid the implication that God is limited in knowledge, (2) that the Septuagint reflects a pro-Christian alteration, (3) that the Masoretic Text reflects an anti-Christian alteration, or (4) that the Septuagint translator possessed a different text or else misread his (defective?) text.

---

1 α' = ομιλία αυτου ("His instruction") σ' = το φωνήμα αυτου ("His utterance"); τον χρηστον αυτου ("His Christ"); τον λόγον αυτου ("His Word"); ε' = την αδολεσχιαν αυτου ("His prating").

2 So Harper, op. cit., p. 103; see page 366.

3 The Septuagint requires only the deletion of a η and the interchange of η and υ.
The alterations of these passages, in which the translation seemingly excludes any possible limitation of God's knowledge, also may have arisen from other motives, from other texts, from misread texts, or the like. Therefore, not one of them may be accepted as an absolutely certain example of a theological change, especially when the numerous instances are considered in the Septuagint, which faithfully reproduce the Hebrew concepts of God as being able to forget, able to remember, and the like — concepts which limit God's mental capacity.

3. THE UNCHANGEABLENESS OF GOD

The suggestion that God was changeable undoubtedly was very offensive to the Hebrew people, just as it is to Christians of all ages. Earlier, when Jonah 1:6 was discussed, the possibility was mentioned that this verse may have been offensive because of its implication that God might be fickle and capricious. Translations of several other passages in the Septuagint of the Twelve may indicate that the translator wished to protect his concept of a constant, unchangeable Deity.

1See pages 130f.

2Cf. Micah 2:7 where רותם ("Do I change," — American Jewish Translation) is translated by o λέγων ("who saith"). See also the Targum (page 323). The meaning of the text is very uncertain. Most commentators translate רותם as being from the verb דיבר ("to say") as the Septuagint, e.g., "Should this be said," — Revised Standard Version.
The Hebrew here could be interpreted as meaning that God told Jonah to proclaim to Ninevah the message that He then was speaking to him — perhaps a message different from the one Jonah originally, in 1:2, had been instructed to deliver. If the two messages were different, the implication would be that God was changeable. In a translation which Gentiles might read, that conception of Deity would be intolerable! It must be recalled that the Hebrew perfect usually is translated in the Septuagint as an aorist. In spite of this, however, the fact that the translators added εμπροσθεν ("the former") makes probable the assumption that he deliberately selected this translation to avoid any offensive suggestions.

Likewise, the translation of נסוח ("what is sure") as...
κισικα ("faithful") in Hosea 5:9 may have been made in order to emphasize God's faithfulness and unchangeableness.

A change which might have been expected, however, does not occur. The verb ονα ("to repent, be compassionate") is rendered consistently by an appropriate Greek verb, μετανοεω ("repent")1. This Greek verb means, "change one's mind" -- a concept present in the idea of repentance. Therefore, if the above alterations were due to offense at any implied suggestion that God was changeable, why did the translator not alter the passages which state that God repents?

4. THE IMPLICATION OF DIVINITY TO A CREATED BEING

This concept could not be tolerated, even in so exalted a family as the house of David.

(1) ZECHARIAH 12:8

This translation softens3 the statement of the Hebrew by the addition of the second οικος ("house") before the

---

1The only exception occurs when ονα means "to be compassionate". In this instance, the Septuagint renders by ελεω, e.g., Zechariah 1:17.

2Thi. = κυριον; W = αγγελου.

3So Dodd, op. cit., p. 20.
(2) HOSEA 12:5(4)

... he wept and sought his favor.

Possibly the translator understood ("he wept and implored him") to mean that Jacob, as the representative of the Hebrew peoples, prayed to an angel — an act reserved only for God. Consequently, he may have translated the verse to make it more acceptable to his readers and also to eliminate any suggestion that prayer could be made to a created being.

5. THE PROTECTION OF GOD AND HIS CHARACTER

Certain actions and attitudes of men towards God set forth in the text were apparently too derogatory of Him and/or His character to be literally rendered.

(1) ZECHARIAH 11:8

... and they also detested me.

---

1α', σ', θ', οι λ', L-36(22) ἐκλαυσαν καὶ εὐδεήσαν μου
(He wept and prayed to him.).

2 Cf. the Targum's, "Hated My Worship"; see pages 303f.

3This verb occurs here only in the Twelve and only once more in the Old Testament (Proverbs 20:21). Hence no definite conclusion may be reached from the translation here.
For as their souls\(^1\) roared against me,

This translation softens the offensive statement that anyone could detest (or abhor) God, but it also may spring from a different or a misread text. Geiger\(^3\) emends מְלָוָה to מְלַעָה\(^6\) ("to rule, possess") and Horst\(^5\) and Graetz\(^6\), to מְלָעָה\(^7\) ("to abhor, detest, reject")\(^8\). The meaning of מְלָוָה is uncertain\(^9\), and hence, no definite conclusion can be reached.

(2) MALACHI 1:7

תָּמָם הַנּּאָסָרִים How have we polluted thee?\(^10\)

---

\(1\) This translation is anthropomorphic.

\(2\) α = επερκασεν ; σ = ημασεν.

\(3\) So Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 312.

\(4\) Cf. Frocksch, op. cit., p. 968, footnote.

\(5\) Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 244.

\(6\) So Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 312.

\(7\) Cf. Frocksch, op. cit., p. 968, footnote.

\(8\) Cf. the Syriac, "barked against me" (Wright, op. cit., p. 580) which preserves a derivative of מְלָוָה (according to Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 312).


\(10\) The Revised Standard Version translates, "How have we polluted it?"; following the Septuagint. Its footnote b reads "thee".
How have we polluted them?

This translation protects Deity by transforming the object of pollution, by the Israelites, from God to the cult objects. Procksch³ emends the text to ἡπιστευσαμεν ("we polluted it", i.e., the altar), following the Septuagint, apparently considering that the Greek translation accurately translates the original Hebrew text.

This protective motive may explain also the translation in Habakkuk 2:4.

(3) HABAKKUK 2:4

καὶ εἰς τίνι ηλισσαμεν εἰς τίνι ηλισσαμεν
ο δὲ δικαιος ἐκ πιστεως μου ἔσεται

... but the righteous shall live by his faith (faithfulness).

But the just shall live by faith in me.

¹This verb usually translates ἐπιστευσαμεν ("pollute"). In Zephaniah 3:1 (secular use) the niphal participle is rendered αποκατεκατεμενη ("redeemed").

²α ' , σ ' , θ ' = εμολυνομεν ("to stain, sully, defile"). The Ethiopic substitutes nomen tua for αυτους. This is also protective of Deity.

³Procksch, op. cit., p. 979, footnote.

⁴Cf. Hosea 2:22(20) where ποιμην is translated εν πιστει ("in faith").

⁵The Septuagint, Old Latin, and one codex = ἡπιστευσαμεν ("by my faith") according to Ward (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 14), et al. This is probably "a later change due to a different interpretation of the verse." (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 194).

⁶α ' = εν πιστει αυτου ("in his faith"); σ ' = τη εσωτερικη πιστει ("in his own faith").
The Hebrew passage suggests that a righteous man is self-sufficient enough to live by his own faithfulness (presumably directed towards God). Possibly the translator was offended by this implication and avoided it by altering the pronoun to refer to God. Alternatively, he may have possessed a different text or misread the one he had.

(4) MICAH 2:9

םעָלָה עֶלְלֵי הָיוֹם הָדוֹרֵי... from their young children you take away my glory forever.

דִּבְּטַח הָנֵאָרָה... for their wicked devices they have been expelled; draw ye near to the everlasting mountains.

The Septuagint avoids the concept of removing God's glory from His people, but, since it incorporates so many deviations, a very corrupt text may have been used by the translator, e.g.,

1The Targum and Vulgate support the Masoretic Text (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 194).

2The translation involves only the substitution of an, for a ।.

3The Targum changes "My Glory" to "their glory", etc., but it is clearly based upon the Masoretic Text. Probably it was influenced by the Targum on I Samuel 4:22 (Taylor, op. cit., p. 64).
Because of their maltreatment they are removed; they draw near to the eternal hills.

The commentators differ considerably as to what Hebrew text the Septuagint may have possessed, and, therefore, no conclusion may be reached as to the translator's motive(s) for this particular rendering.

(5) MALACHI 1:14

... and my name is feared among the nations.

---

1Following Taylor (op. cit., p. 63).

2According to Stekhoven (op. cit., p. 83). Stekhoven (loc. cit.) apparently omits this word; he considers מִעֲלֵי הַיָּמִים to have been read by the Septuagint for the Masoretic Text's מִעֲלֵי הַיָּמִים. Taylor (op. cit., p. 63) considers the Septuagint's Text to be מִעֲלֵי הַיָּמִים ("his maltreatment") and Wutz (op. cit., p. 218), מִעֲלֵי הַיָּמִים. Smith, Graetz, Rueben (op. cit., p. 20), Marti, Nowack, Sievers, Guthe, Haupt, Duhm (according to Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 56) emend following the Syriac, Septuagint, and Vulgate to מִעֲלֵי הַיָּמִים; cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 935, footnote.

3Smith (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 56) considers the εξωσάτασιν ("they have been expelled") and εὐχήσατε ("draw near") both to be translations of הָלַךְ ("you take away"). Rueben (op. cit., p. 20) considers that the Septuagint read מַעֲרֹר for הָלַךְ. The above reading of מַעֲרֹר follows Taylor (op. cit., p. 63); cf. Stekhoven, op. cit., p. 83.

4So Taylor (loc. cit.), but Rueben (op. cit., p. 20).

5So Rueben (loc. cit.), Taylor (op. cit., pp. 63f); cf. Smith (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 56).

6Cf. also Zephaniah 3:2; Malachi 1:12; 2:11.
and my name is illustrious [manifest] among the nations.

This translation may have been chosen in order to protect the Name (ονόμα) of Deity, but, more probably, it arises from poor knowledge of Hebrew on the part of the translator who mistook the root of the niphal participle, גלה, to be גלה instead of גלה. The consistency of the translation in the Twelve, however, as opposed to its translation in other parts of the Old Testament both where no theological implication exists and even where such implications do exist, would seem to indicate that this consistent translation may be a protective alteration to avoid the offensive suggestion that God is ever terrible --- even to the heathen. Perhaps his text may have read גלה.

He also could have mistaken an מ for an ב --- especially if he took offense at the Hebrew Text. This motivation may, perhaps, be seen even more clearly in Hosea 3:5 (and also Micah 7:17) where גלה גלה ("And they will come in fear to the Lord") has been softened to גלה גלה ("And will be amazed at the Lord"), although, of course, this alteration may be due, wholly or partly, to an error in the Hebrew.

1α' = επιφοβον ("feared").

2"The Lord will be terrible against them;" is translated επιφανησε κυριος επ αυτους ("The Lord will display himself illustriously [be manifested] against them.

3Perhaps the translator read מנה (cf. Procksh, op. cit., p. 953, footnote on Zephaniah 2:11).

4α' (και) πτοηηηδονται (ἐπι κυριον), σ' = και επανεσωσι τον κυριον.
in part, to a pro-Israel bias.

Moreover, certain actions of God were considered too derogatory of His Character to remain unchanged. Thus the idea of the complete destruction by God of the living creatures upon the earth, man and beast alike, and even the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, was too offensive, and so the main verb, θάνατος ("to make an end"), was translated in Zephaniah 1:2f by ἐκλείπω ("to remove, cease, end").

The verb also has been changed into an impersonal form which leaves unstated who or what is the agency producing the action. The next verse (3b), quite consistently, has been softened to: "I will take away (εξαιρεῖν for θάνατος) the lawless (ἀνόμοις 2 for θάνατος) from the face of the earth."

This verb (θάνατος) occurs elsewhere in Amos 3:15 where the qal perfect is translated προστέθησανται (or ἀφαιρέσθησανται) as in L' -- 407 Syhmg Arm. Th. Tht.).

(6) HOSEA 4:5

(ליילך) רדשתחי יפּם מוסק... (by night;) and I will destroy your mother.

νυκτι ωμοιωσα3 την μητερα σου I have compared thy mother to the night:

---

1 Represents only a change of pointing to a pual (Gerleman, op. cit., p. 2).

2 So rel., Swete; ἀνόμους 46 Θ.

3 α', θ' = νυκτος ἐσιμπησα ("by night I kept silence"); σ' = νυκτος σιμπησω ("by night I will keep silence").
The Septuagint may have softened the Hebrew to protect the translator’s conception of Deity, but also the translator may have been unfamiliar with the two different Hebrew roots of נָדַע. Root I means "to compare, be like" and root II, "to destroy". Since, however, in four\(^1\) of the six occurrences of this root נָדַע (root II) the Greek translation is ἀπορρίπτω ("to throw or put away, cast forth"), and in the remaining two\(^2\) passages the verb נָדַע (root II) is translated by ὑμοίοις ("to be like"), the translator indicates that he was familiar with both roots. Perhaps his text\(^3\) did not contain a נ before נָדַע ("and I will destroy"). If so, then a different word division and the use of the meaning of root I would suggest itself naturally to a translator wishing to avoid a statement which was offensive both to his conception of Deity and to his love of Israel.

(7) HOSEA 9:12\(^4\)

\(^1\)Hosea 10:7, 15 (twice); Obadiah 5.

\(^2\)Hosea 4:6; Zephaniah 1:11. The only other instance of נָדַע, which is root I, occurs in Hosea 12:10(11). There the Greek verb is also ὑμοίοις.

\(^3\)Procksch (op. cit., p. 898 footnote) emends to יְנָשָׁמָה יִרְשָׁהְ וּינָדַע יְנָדַע יִרְשָׁהְ וּיֶנָדַע יְנָדַע.

\(^4\)This verb (לִבְנַ) occurs elsewhere in the Twelve only in Hosea 9:14 and Malachi 3:4. In the former passage the Septuagint translates it by ἀτεκνέω but in latter by ἀσεβέστω ("to be weak"). In both passages the usage is not theological.
I will bereave them till none is left.

...they shall be bereaved of them from among men:

The suggestion that God deliberately makes anyone childless may have been considered too offensive. Thus the translator, following a common procedure, may have considered the verb to be a pual form and translated it as if the text had been μακάριους ἀπεκκενδρώσεται, ("they will be bereaved") — a textual difference of a τ for a μ and the omission of a ἀ. Of course, he may have possessed a different text or misread his text.

(8) MICAH 6:14

I will give to the sword.

...to the sword they shall be delivered up.

Like the preceding passage the Septuagint uses a passive verb for the Hebrew's active verb. This translation likewise avoids a statement considered unworthy of Deity. Could the Septuagint translator have read μακάριος or μακάριον for μακάριος?

---

1The Targum supports the Masoretic Text.

2Cf. Nyberg, op. cit., p. 70.

3The Septuagint alone "avoided ascribing the calamity to God," (Taylor, op. cit., p. 150).
The translations in Amos 4:10 of \( \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \alpha \tau \alpha \varsigma \) \(^1\) ("death") for \( \tau \tau \tau \) ("pestilence") and in Habakkuk 3:5 of \( \lambda \omega \gamma \varsigma \varsigma \) \(^2\) ("word")\(^3\) for \( \tau \tau \tau \) ("pestilence") also may reflect a theological bias.

Another group of translations which may reflect this desire of protecting the concept of Deity consists in alterations of passages containing indecent language. In Hosea 2:12(10) \( \alpha \kappa \alpha \theta \alpha \rho \alpha \varsigma \alpha \) \(^4\) ("uncleanness") translates \( \eta \nu \lambda \zeta \nu \) ("the parts of shame") and in Nahum 3:5 \( \alpha \iota \chi \chi \nu \eta \eta \nu \) \(^5\) ("shame"), \( \eta \gamma \eta \) ("nakedness").

Several passages whose translation may show that the translator attempted to safeguard his concept of Deity from derogatory actions have been considered. Certain ones of these softened translations involve verbs (Hebrew) which occur only once in the Twelve. Other translations may have arisen from Hebrew texts which are different (or read differently) from the Masoretic Text. Certain translations, however, may well have resulted from a desire to safeguard the

\(^1\) \( \alpha \iota \) = \( \lambda \omicron \omicron \omicron \) ("plague"); \( \delta ' \) = \( \pi \lambda \gamma \gamma \nu \) ("blow, stroke").

\(^2\) \( \alpha \iota \) = \( \lambda \omicron \omicron \omicron \) ("plague"); \( \theta ' \) = \( \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \alpha \tau \alpha \varsigma \) ("death").

\(^3\) Cf. also Haggai 1:11.

\(^4\) \( \alpha \mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha \varsigma \gamma \gamma \nu \) ("sins") in S\( ^1 \) O.

\(^5\) \( \alpha \sigma \chi \mu \omicron \omicron \omicron \nu \nu \nu \) ("disgrace") in A\( ^1 \) r - 49 Cyr\( ^1 \) Bas.
6. MONOTHEISTIC ELEMENTS

The monotheistic belief of the translator is best seen in his uniform renderings of the plural אָנָא by the singular אֶלֶךָ whenever it refers to Yahweh. The plural is used for the heathen deities even at times when a singular form is found in the Hebrew. The Septuagint translator misses an opportunity to reveal his monotheistic belief in Hosea 12:4(3) by the retention of אֶלֶךָ ("God"). Aquila, however, seizes upon this to translate it by ἄγγελος ("angel") following the procedure of the Hebrew in the same context.

Although adequate evidence does not exist to prove that the translator consciously or unconsciously avoided or softened statements in the Hebrew which would indicate that God was not omnipresent, transcendent, omniscient, and unchangeable, the likelihood persists that the translator sought to safeguard Deity from derogatory actions and attitudes of men towards God, from derogatory action by God Himself, and the like.

---

1"In many of the passages... the LXX has the character of a sort of monotheistic Targum on the Hebrew text, rather than a strict translation. It laid before the Greek-speaking public a body of religious teachings from which practically every concession to polytheism had been eliminated, and presented the Jewish religion as a monotheistic faith in a sense which was not true of any other religion of the Hellenistic World." (Dodd, op. cit., p. 23f)
CHAPTER V

THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC TENDENCY1 OF THE SEPTUAGINT

Although allusions have been made to the fact that in certain instances the Septuagint is more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text, the large number of such examples have been generally overlooked. Perhaps translations which are more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew exceeds the number of translations which may reflect an anti-anthropomorphic bias.

These anthropomorphisms include minor changes. Examples of these slight alterations are: (1) the addition of the pronoun implied in the Masoretic Text, e.g., ωτον ("him") in Hosea 5:6; (2) a slight change of meaning in translation, e.g., in Micah 7:7 where ϐυ ραβαζων ("for the God of my salvation") is translated as το θεου τω σωτηρι ("for the God who is my saviour"); and (3)2 a strengthening

1Not only is the increased anthropomorphic coloring to be seen in the attributing of human form, actions, etc., to God, but in one passage (Micah 7:4) the Septuagint alters the animistic description of Deity from comparing Him to a brier (ῥαοτ = "as a brier") to likening Him to a devouring moth (ως στομειως εκπρωγον; α', ως βολις; σ', θ', ως ανανθα; Syriac, "like a rag"; Targum, "as from a thornbush" (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 139)] = "like a consuming moth"). Taylor (op. cit., p. 165), Smith (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 139), Vollers (op. cit., II, p. 10), and Ryssel (so Taylor, op. cit., p. 165) consider the Septuagint read here πην ("moth") for πην ("brier"), a change of a 7 and a 7. This was translated appropriately by στομα ("moth"). Ruben (op. cit., p. 22) considers the Septuagint to have read πην στομα.

2Another slight change which occurs in the Septuagint is the translation of πυ ("to be afraid") as θαρσεω ("to be of good courage") in Joel 2:12f; Zephaniah 3:16; Haggai 2:5; Zechariah 8:13,15. It translates the meaning of the Hebrew in positive term instead of the negative language of the Masoretic Text.
of the anthropomorphism as in Hosea 13:5 where "It was I who knew you" is translated as εγώ εποιμαίνον σε ("It was I who fed you"). This rendition is the equivalent of יָהוּד ("I fed you")

1. THE DESCRIPTION OF GOD AS A HUMAN BEING

Although there are several passages in which the Septuagint more strongly describes God in anthropomorphic terms than the Masoretic Text does, it still does not state that God is a man.

(1) HOSEA 1:6

... that I should in any wise pardon them.

---

1 So Procksch (op. cit., p. 392); Harper (op. cit., p. 392) emends thus with the Septuagint and the Syriac, following Sebök, Wellhausen, Graetz [op. cit., p. 14]; Guthe Loftman, Smith (G.A.) (so Harper, loc. cit.); Marti (op. cit., p. 101); Robinson (T.A.) (op. cit., p. 50); cf. Nowack and Oettli. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 102) adds "... was sicher wegen der Paronomasie mit יָהוּד. Thus the translator may have considered the initial as a dittograph (or was it lacking?) and read the as a

2 The Masoretic Text here may be a softening of the original Hebrew Text which the Septuagint translated. See pages 132f, especially footnote 1, page 133.

3 Although it does compare God more definitely to a man by the addition of ανθρώπος ("man"). See pages 39f.

4 Procksch (op. cit., p. 895, footnote) emends to יָתוֹם [יָתוֹם].

5 The Masoretic Text here has been variously understood. Apparently the Targum and Aquila understood יָתוֹם in the sense of 'to forgive' (Harper, op. cit., p. 206), and the Syriac is "sklavisch wörtlich" (so Nyberg, op. cit., p. 21). How the Septuagint understood the text is not absolutely certain.

6 Following the American Jewish Translation.
By the rendering of "to forgive" by the translator pictures God as in battle against men, a concept which is considerably more anthropomorphic than the received Hebrew text. The Septuagint may have had a different text (or misread one). Drake suggests their text may have been "I will make ruler". Vollers considers that the translator read a form of "to be like" but Wünsche comments, "Offenbar ganz unrichtig Übersetzung die LXX: den so kommt nur im Hitp. vor."

Although the Targum, Syriac, Vulgate, et al., essentially reflect the Masoretic Text, this investigator suggests that here the Septuagint may translate the original Hebrew text. He feels that the context favors the rendering of the Septuagint because (1) it would intensify the preceding statement, "for I will no more have pity on the

---

1 α' = επιλησαμαι αυτων ("I forgot them").

2 As in I Kings 11:34 (Drake, op. cit., p. 52).

3 Vollers, I, op. cit., p. 243.

4In Proverbs 3:15 αντιασω "to set in battle" translates "can compare" and in Obadiah 7 of αντιασω -- so Vollers, loc. cit.


6 E.g., Wünsche (loc. cit.), "Es [Targum] kommt nun wieter aber auch die Bedeutung an, die man "gibbt."
house of Judah," and (2) it would more closely parallel the last half of the following verse (referring to Judah), ". . . and I will deliver them. . . ; I will not deliver them by bow, nor by sword. . ."

Probably nothing conclusive may be established from the use of ἀντιπαλομαῖ ("to set in battle") in the Septuagint. Twice it occurs in passages where it has no Hebrew equivalent; twice the Hebrew equivalent is uncertain. Twice the Hebrew equivalent is נשא ("to lift up"), once, מ"ן (hiphil = "to mock, scorn"), once, נַח ("to be like"), and once, נַש ("to place"). This varied usage lends little support to either Voller's or Drake's supposition. Moreover, it serves to illustrate the difficulty of establishing any positive conclusions.

(2) MALACHI 1:4

... the people with whom the Lord is angry forever.

A people to whom the Lord hath ever been opposed.

This translation may represent an attempt to avoid the offensive thought that God could be eternally angry², but it also may represent more accurately the original Hebrew text which has been softened to avoid its anthropomorphistic implications.

¹See pages 80f.

²Cf. also Zechariah 1:12; see pages 79f.
(3) HABAKKUK 2:4

he whose soul is not upright in him...

my soul has no pleasure in him...

Procksch\(^2\) emends to \(\text{לְאָרְרַת דַּבָּרְנָה} \text{אָל} \) ("my soul has no pleasure in him") following the Septuagint. Graetz\(^3\) also emends to \(\text{יֵשׁ} \) ("my soul"). Since the text here is so corrupt\(^4\), no final conclusion may be reached except that the translation is anthropopathic (and anthropomorphic) whereas the Masoretic Text is neither.

(4) ZEPHANIAH 3:8

Until the day that I rise up to the prey;\(^6\)

until the day when I rise up for a witness:\(^8\)

---

\(^1\) Procksch, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 947, footnote.

\(^2\) Procksch, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 947, footnote.

\(^3\) Graetz (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 21) follows here one manuscript (so Kennicott, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 283), Aquila, and the Septuagint.

\(^4\) "The first member of this couplet [Habakkuk 2:4] is corrupt past safe reconstruction," (Smith, Ward Bewer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 14).

\(^5\) Procksch (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 954, footnote) emends the vocalization to "as a witness" following the Septuagint and Syriac.

\(^6\) The American Jewish Translation.

\(^7\) Procksch, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 954, footnote.

\(^8\) Bagster, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 1111; cf. the Revised Standard Version, "for the day when I arise as a witness."

---
This translation may have been selected to safeguard the translator's concept of Deity. The Syriac, Targum, and Arabic follow the Septuagint, as do many commentators¹, perhaps substituting an anthropomorphism for an animism.

2. THE POSSESSION BY GOD OF PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

There are also an increased number of anthropomorphisms in the Septuagint where the translation ascribes a portion of the human body to God, whereas the Hebrew does not describe God in the same terms.

(1) MALACHI 2:3

Behold, I will rebuke your offspring,
Behold I set apart for you the shoulder,

The Greek rendition changes the meaning both of the verb and of its object, although the object (τὸν ἄρμον "the shoulder") requires only a change of vocalization³. The Greek verb, αφοιτεῖ μοι ("I set apart"), requires only the interchange in position of the σ and ι⁴. These slight


²α'(σ') ιδον εγαν οφοιτει μοι μιν συν τω βραχιονι.

³Procksch (op. cit., p. 974, footnote) emends to ἴτιπτι following the Syriac and Septuagint.

⁴So Smith (Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 45).
changes make it at least as probable that the Masoretes (or some earlier scribal group) changed the vocalization and interchanged some consonants as is the likelihood that the Septuagint made these anthropomorphic changes unnecessarily. Therefore, probably the Septuagint translated a Hebrew text which differed slightly from our Masoretic Text.

(2) HOSEA 9:12

Woe to them when I depart from them!

... for (and alas for them! my flesh is of them).

The translation of ""my departure" or "when I depart") by σαρξ μου ("my flesh") cannot have arisen because of belief in a transcendent, non-spatial Deity since the translation is more offensive than the Hebrew itself. The translations of the Septuagint and of Theodotion require only a change of vocalization and a text without an ِ, namely ُ. Aquila's translation requires either the equation, ُ = ُ, or a different reading ُ.

---

1αφ̄ = εκκλιναντος μου απ αυτων ("my turning away from them"); θ = νας εις σαρξ μου εξ αυτων ("my flesh (is) of them").

2So Procksch (op. cit., p. 904 footnote), Scott (op. cit., p. 141), and Harper (op. cit., p. 335).

3See footnote 1 above.

4So also the Vulgate, Targum, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Keil, Wellhausen, Orelli, Nowack, et al., (according to Harper, op. cit., p. 341). Against this view "is the fact that Hosea regularly writes ُ;" (Harper, loc. cit.).
The latter is supported by several manuscripts and by the Vulgate.

Several factors support the view that the translations of the Septuagint and of Theodotion represent the original Hebrew text and vocalization. First, it is extremely unlikely that the Septuagint would interpret יָשָׁב (or even more so יָשָׁב) as referring to God's flesh unless the Alexandrian theologians really believed flesh to represent the true vocalization of the correct consonantal text. Secondly, this assumption would explain why the Jews have been charged with altering this text. Thirdly, others have claimed that the original text should be either יָשָׁב ("My flesh") or יָשָׁב ("My incarnation") but that the Jews had interpreted it as if it had been spelled with an ה and were derived from יַּשָּׁב ("to turn"). Fourthly, the Targums translation need not require a text containing יָשָׁב or


2Could Scott's (op. cit., pp. 141f) suggestion that Israel as circumcised bore in the flesh the token of their adoption, and thus might be called 'the flesh of God' be correct? "Cf. Jer. xi.15: 'The holy flesh is passed from thee.'" (Scott, loc. cit.). In this connection, Knight (op. cit., p. 42) states, "This totality of the nephesh of God must therefore include within it that which must correspond with what man knows as bāsār (flesh)."

3Cf. Robinson (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 36), Nyberg (op. cit., p. 70), Harper (op. cit., p. 335), Hitzig, Simson, Ewald, and Guthe read יָשָׁב (so Harper, loc. cit.).

4See footnote 4, page 156.

5See page 312.
On the contrary, the translator of the Targum may have considered יִתְנֵּשׁ ("My flesh is of them") as limiting to space the non-spatial Deity. If he made this interpretation, then the use of Shekinah is readily understood. Finally, the reason that the Masoretes altered their text and vocalization is easier to understand than to assume that the Septuagint translator misunderstood or altered his text in giving this translation.

Another interesting suggestion is made by Scott that Israel might be called "the flesh of God." He believed that this interpretation should deserve more consideration. The interpretation is interesting, yet the best solution still is to say with Nyberg, "G is ganz türicht;".

(3) Hosea 11:3

Taking them by their arms;

I took him up in my arms.

The Greek translation alters the verb and the pro-

---

1See footnote 4, page 156.

2The Targum more likely interpreted as the Masoretes did.

3Scott, op. cit., pp. 141f.

4Nyberg, op. cit., p. 70.

5American Jewish Translation.

6The Revised Standard Version, following the Septuagint, translates, "I took them up in my arms;".

---
nominal suffix of the Hebrew. It would translate adequately a text like "ל וּרְוֹתִית ("I took him up in my arms"). Such a text differs from the Masoretic Text in only three particulars. The support of the other versions, e.g., Targum, Syriac, etc., has led many commentators to follow them in considering that the original Hebrew text was more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text. On the other hand, Nyberg considers that the Syriac and Septuagint are only conjectures dependent upon the mutilated reading מַנְפָּר. Perhaps Nyberg is too cautious here, and the versions may depend not so much upon a mutilated reading as upon the preservation of a Hebrew text which the context favors more readily than it does the Masoretic Text. If this assumption is correct, the reading of אֲעוֹת ("him") does not require that the final כ of מַנְפָּר be read (or misread) as a הפ. This translation may refer back only to the antecedent, Ephraim. Certainly if the Masoretic Text is considered as being mutilated (deliberately or otherwise), the translation is explained more easily than if the assumption is made that the Septuagint was translated from a mutilated Hebrew text.

(4) MALACHI 3:16

1So Procksch (op. cit., p. 906, footnote) emends to ל וּרְוֹתִית מַנְפָּר ("I took them up in my arms"). He follows the Targum, Vulgate, Syriac, and Septuagint; see also pages 68f.

2E.g., Robinson, Ewald, Harper, etc. See Harper (op. cit., p. 380) for an impressive list.

and a book of remembrance was written before him.

καὶ εἶγας βιβλίον μνήμης—
μοσανοῦ εὐωκίου αὐτοῦ

... and [the Lord] wrote a book of remembrance before him.

The translation of ἔγραψα ("and was written") as καὶ εἶγας ("and he wrote") requires only a change of vocalization, yet the fact that the translator would vocalize ἔγραψα as an active voice is strange indeed if he was opposed to anthropomorphisms! This suggestion that God possessed a hand and could write is avoided in the Masoretic Text. Could the Septuagint (and Syriac²) represent the original Hebrew traditional vocalization? Nowack³ emends here, following the Septuagint.

(5) AMOS 8:3

ἐπιγράψω σιωπήν ἄκοι—

I will bring on silence.

The rendering of ἄκοι ("shall be cast out") as ἐπιγράψω ("I will cast forth") = ἐπιγράψα ἄκοι ("I will cast out") is slightly more anthropomorphic in its suggestion

---

¹See pages 51ff. for a discussion of the anthropomorphism, 'the face of God'.
²So Bewer (Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 84).
³According to Bewer (loc. cit.).
⁴So Procksch, op. cit., p. 925, footnote.
that God possesses a hand. Unlike the preceding example, the Greek translation requires a different Hebrew Vorlage than our Masoretic Text, yet the only alteration needed in the consonantal text is the substitution of \( \text{u} \) for \( \text{v} \) — an interchange which is not unusual in the Septuagint. The Masoretes (or some earlier scribal group) could have made this substitution as readily as the Greek translator.

\[ (6) \text{HOSEA 11:4}^1 \]

The concept of sight is involved in the Greek translation of this passage.

\[ \text{καὶ ἐπιβλέψαμαι πρὸς αὐτὸν δυνησμαί αὐτῷ} \]

... and I will keep an eye upon him, and exercise authority over him.

The translation of \( \omega \eta \) ("and I inclined") by \( \kappaαι \varepsilon\pi\beta\lambda\varepsilon\varphi\omicron\alpha \omicron \) ("and I looked upon") increases the anthropo-

---

\(^1\) See pages 42f.

\(^2\) A hiphil imperfect (so Brown, Driver, Briggs, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 640). Manger, Hesselberg, Umbreit, Keil, Cheyne, Smith (G,A,) — so Harper (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 364) — the American Jewish Translation, and Ewald consider it to be an adjective, meaning gently. Ewald (\textit{op. cit.}, I, p. 290) says it can be from \( \nuβ\), to incline.

\(^3\) A hiphil (?), so Brown, Driver, Briggs (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 37).

\(^4\) \( \zeta^4 \) — \( \kappaαι \varphiλινα \piρος \alphaυτον \varphiρωματα \[\betaρωσιν\] \) ("and I leaned to him food [meat]"); \( \sigma^\eta \) — \( \kappaαι \varepsilon\varepsilon\kappaλινα \piρος \alphaυτον \tauροφην \) ("and I bent towards him nourishment").
morphic picture. Perhaps the translator here followed a different text in which הָנָּנָּה ("and I looked") occurred. The Targum² apparently supports the Septuagint while the Syriac³ follows the Masoretic Text. Perhaps here, too, the Greek translation may have preserved the meaning of the original text.

(7) ZEPHANIAH 3:16

ינָהוּ... it shall be said...

אֶפְקָא הָעִיר... the Lord will say...

The translation here again is more anthropomorphic, but the text which the Septuagint used could have been read (or misread) easily as נָהוּ... ("the Lord will say") -- a doubling only of the ה. The form נָהוּ (= the Lord) is quite frequent in the Targum. Gerleman suggests an alternative but similar proposal: "LXX dürfte eine erklärende, freie Übertragung bieten. Möglich ist aber, dass der Übersetzer das נ-Präfix als eine Verkürzung des נ- aufgefasst habe: נָהוּ."⁴ On the other hand, the Masoretic Text here may have softened the traditional Hebrew text.

---

¹So Procksch (op. cit., p. 906 footnote) and Rueben (op. cit., p. 19); cf. וְנָהוּ (so Harper [op. cit., p. 361]), Houtsma, Oort, Valeton [according to Harper, loc. cit.]. See also Nyberg (op. cit., p. 85).

²The Targum = יִנְשׁ וְנָהוּ (so Rueben, op. cit., p. 19).

³So Harper (op. cit., p. 361), Nyberg (op. cit., p. 85), and Procksch (op. cit., p. 906, footnote).

⁴Gerleman, op. cit., p. 61.
(8) HAGGAI 2:1

This rendering requires only a change of vocalization, and both the translation and the Hebrew convey almost the same picture. This example is illustrative of many passages which have been omitted by this investigator.

(9) HOSEA 11:2

18* = ελπίσαν.

2Following the Revised Standard Version footnotes γ and ζ, p. 944.

3The Septuagint = ἡμριον according to Harper (op. cit., p. 360). Oort, Winckler, Valeton, Guthe, Ruben (op. cit.; p. 191), Loftman, Smith (G.A.), Oettli, Halévy, Cheyne (op. cit., p. 127), Marti (op. cit., p. 86) (so Harper, op. cit., p. 360), Volland (op. cit., I, p. 255), and Wutz (op. cit., p. 405). Robinson (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 42), Harper (op. cit., p. 360), and Wellhausen (so Harper, loc. cit.) emends to ἡμριον (ῥησιμά) with the ῶριον from verse one. Graetz (op. cit., p. 14) emends to ῶριον ῶριον (so Harper, op. cit., p. 360). Oort (op. cit., p. 139; so Harper op. cit., p. 360) and Nyberg (op. cit., p. 84) considered that the Septuagint = ἡμριον (ῥησιμά).

4The Revised Standard Version follows the Septuagint here.
This translation of ἔρχων ("they called") by καθως μετεκάλεσα ("the more I called") is perhaps the most striking of this group of anthropomorphic translations. The context certainly favors the Septuagint here and suggests that the Masoretes1 (or some earlier group), motivated perhaps by a burning pro-Israel zeal or by an anti-anthropomorphic bias (or both), altered a text like יְהִי יִם מַדְוּי חַיָּֽה.2 והם מְדִינָּֽה ("the more I called to them, the more they went away from Me; they..."). Thus the Israelites were no longer said to flee from God but from the Egyptians. Thus, with two simple changes, an objectionable anthropomorphism and an objectionable religious action on the part of Israel were removed, and a favorable action by Israel was substituted. The Targum's translation of מְלַכְת ("I sent") supports the Septuagint's translation of the verb in the first person singular.

(10) ZECHARIAH 8:22

1For an alternate suggestion, see Nyberg, op. cit., pp. 84f.

2This was connected with the next clause; cf. the Septuagint's ἀντὶ: ("they").


4Following Procksch (op. cit., p. 906, footnotes).

... to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem, ... 
... will come to seek the face of the Lord Almighty at Jerusalem, ... 

The Greek translation here is more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew because of the addition of το προσωπον ("the face"). Could the Septuagint translator have added it to employ the intermediary of the 'Presence of the Lord' to soften the concept of seeking the Lord?

3. ACTIONS OF MEN TOWARD DEITY WHICH CONVEY ANTHROPOMORPHIC IMPLICATIONS

Certain actions of men towards Deity in the Septuagint convey the idea that God has a human (or at least physical) form. Many of these passages in the Masoretic Text do not convey the same anthropomorphic implications.

(1) MICAH 6:6

With what shall I come before the Lord,
By what means shall I gain over [seize hold of] the Lord?

Both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint are

1 36, 410 = ονομα ("name").

2 Marti. (op. cit., p. 293) says, "Das Verb θηρ ist in der vordeuteronomischen Litteratur nicht gebracht ausser + α/ + ι Sam. 20*28, wenn dort in der üblichen Weise nach LXX korrigiert wird. . .".
anthropomorphic, but the latter has heightened the anthropomorphism.

(2) ZEPHANIAH 1:6

καὶ τοὺς μη ἀντεχομένους τοῦ κυρίου or inquire of him.

and them who cleave not to him.

The rendering of ἔρχομαι ("inquire") by ἀντεχομένους ("those cleaving") certainly intensifies the anthropomorphism. While inquiry could be made of a spirit (and a spirit could even be sought), a person scarcely could cleave to a spirit without a physical form.

(3) JOEL 1:20

καὶ τὰ κτήνη τοῦ πεδίου 

Even the wild beasts cry to thee ...

To thee indeed the cattle in the plain have looked up,

The meaning of the verb, κρίνω, is uncertain.

Usually, as by Brown, Driver, and Briggs⁴, it is derived from

---

¹Gerleman (op. cit., p. 7) states, "Die symonymen Ausdrücke ἀνακαίνεις ἡμῶν und ἔρχομαι sind wahrscheinlich Varianten."

²Schwalley (op. cit., p. 171) states, "Hier liegt natürlich nichts als eine glättende Übersetzung des M. T. vor."

³α' = ἐξαραγμόν ("be divided into beds" -- so Liddell, Scott, Jones, op. cit., II, p. 1460).

⁴Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 788; Bewer (Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 92).
Apparently Aquila connected it also with the root יַנִּבָּה . Bewer¹ (as also the Revised Standard Version) considers the interpretation of the Rabbis, the Syriac, et al. to be more acceptable — i.e., that the meaning of the verb is "to cry, cry aloud".

This uncertainty of meaning may explain the Septuagint's translation of ἀναβλέπω ("to look up"), but in any case both translations are anthropomorphic. Perhaps the Greek translation implies a more definite physical form to Deity than the Masoretic Text.

(4) MICAH 2:1

Because it is in the power of their hand.

... for they did not lift up their hands to God.

The interpretation which the Septuagint translator gave to the Hebrew text is uncertain. Geiger³ considered it to mean "the God of my hand", and Kuenen⁴, to mean "because their might is their God". Probably the translator con-

¹Smith, Ward, Bewer, loc. cit.
²The Syriac follows the Septuagint but omits the negative (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 54). a' = ὁ τι ἵσχυσιν χεῖρ αὐτῶν, σ' = μή ἵσχυν ἡ χείρ αὐτῶν, 6' = δίοικε ἔχοισιν ἵσχυν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῶν.
³Taylor, op. cit., p. 42.
⁴Loc. cit.
sidered his text to mean, "their hand is against God"\(^1\) — an offensive, anthropomorphic statement which he softened slightly. Although "there can be no doubt of the correctness of the M.T."\(^2\), yet the Masoretic Text could represent a softening of an offensive, anthropomorphic text which differs only in vocalization from our present Masoretic Text.

4. ANTHROPOMORPHIC ACTIONS OF DEITY

Several passages in the Septuagint ascribe to Deity certain anthropomorphic actions\(^3\) which are absent in the Masoretic Text.

(1) MICAH 4:10

\[ \text{\textit{ἐκεῖθεν ρυσεται σε}} \]  

There you shall be rescued,

Thence he will deliver thee;

Although the Greek translation gives the same sense as the Masoretic Text, it is slightly anthropomorphic whereas, the Masoretic is not. Perhaps the translation may depend upon a different (or misread) text, as, e.g., \( \text{\textit{ἐκεῖθεν ἀν}} \) ("there he will rescue you"). This suggested text involves

---

\(^1\) Smith, Ward, Bewer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 54.

\(^2\) Taylor, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 42.

\(^3\) In the Septuagint of Zechariah 3:9 the concept of God as engraving (\( \text{νῦν} \)) is altered to that of God as digging (\( \text{ορουσω} \)). Both concepts are anthropomorphic. Aquila uses \( \text{διαγλυφω} \) and Symmachus, \( \text{γλυφω} \).
a substitution of \( \text{יָ} \) for • and of • for \( \text{נ} \). The passive voice of the Hebrew, however, is frequently rendered as an active voice in the Greek translation.

(2) ZEPHANIAH 1:17

The translations of Nahum 2:13(14), Zephaniah 1:17, and Haggai 2:7 may indicate an original anthropomorphism or

---

\( ^1L^o \) - 407 233 1 La^8 Cyr P Th. Tht. Spec. Or\lat VI 78 Lo. Gild.
may only illustrate the difficulties of the translator in rendering the Hebrew hiphil stem. In these passages the causative force softens considerably the anthropomorphism which is apparent in the Greek translation. The Hebrew clauses of these verses respectively are: יָרֵאתָ ("and I will [cause to] burn"), מְדָאָלְתָה ("I bring distress on men,"), and יָשָׁר דָּעָה ("And I will [cause to] shake"). The translator has appropriately rendered them as καὶ ἐκκαύσω ("and I will burn out"), καὶ ἐκθλίψω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ("And I will bring distress upon [afflict] the men"), and καὶ συσσείσω ("and I will convulse"), respectively.¹

(4) MALACHI 3:11

καὶ οὐ μὴ διαφθείρω . . . so that it will not destroy . . .
καὶ οὐ μὴ διαφθείρω . . . and [I will] no more destroy . . .

The translator may have had (or misread) a text in which an † occurred for the † of the Masoretic Text. Perhaps the Hebrew text may have been altered to soften an offensive statement regarding Deity.

(5) HOSEA 2:4(2)

γάρ κυρίω . . . that she put away her harlotry from her face,

¹The same is true of the translation of מִרְעַשְׁי ("I am about [or causing] to shake") in Haggai 2:21 as γωστέω ("I will shake").
Therefore I will remove her fornication from before me.

The rendering of \( \text{νομι} \) ("that she put away") by \( \text{καὶ εὔφωο} \) ("and I will remove") may depend upon a different text, e.g., (\( \text{πομι} \))\(^{2}\) ("and I put away"), but the translation of \( \text{πνεύμα} \) ("from her face") by \( \text{ἐκ προσωπου μου} \) ("from my face") probably depends upon a text in which the final \( \text{n} \) was missing. Moreover, both the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint\(^{3}\) require essentially the same consonants but in different order. The Septuagint has placed the final \( \text{n} \) as the second consonant and has transposed the second consonant (\( \text{n} \)) to become the fifth consonant.

An alternate suggestion is that the Masoretic (or an earlier scribal group) possessed a text such as, e.g.,

\[ \text{πνεύμα πνεύμα πνεύμα} \], which they considered either to be too derogatory of Deity (interpreting it as the Septuagint to mean that God would remove Israel's harlotries from His presence) or else thought it too difficult to understand. Nyberg\(^{4}\) considers that the Septuagint's reading is inferior

---

\(^{1}\) \( \text{πομι} \) = \( \text{αποστρα} \) ("let her remove"); the Ethiopic = the Septuagint (so Harper, \text{op. cit.}, p. 225).

\(^{2}\) Cf. Nyberg, \text{op. cit.}, p. 22.

\(^{3}\) The Septuagint perhaps has an additional \( \text{μου} \). Nyberg (\text{loc. cit.}) does not consider that the extra \( \text{μου} \) necessary.

\(^{4}\) Cf. "... eine schlechte LA, die im Zusammenhange keinen erträglichen Sinn ergibt" (Nyberg, \text{op. cit.}, p. 22).
to the Masoretic Text, but Harper\textsuperscript{1} considers the Septuagint to be noteworthy. Moreover, Vollah\textsuperscript{2} and Lofthouse\textsuperscript{3} consider that the Masoretic Text emended \textit{εκ προσώπου μου} \text{=} \textit{יוֹם} ("from my face") to \textit{נְתִּיָּה} ("from her face") on theological grounds. If the Masoretic Text was altered by this addition (or transposition) of an \textit{n}, the transposition of the \textit{n} by the same group is made more probable.

\textbf{(6) MALACHI 2:15}\textsuperscript{4}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textit{יוֹרָה שֹׁפַּטְנָה הָנָּהָלָה} & And what does he desire?  \\
\textit{סְדֶרִי} & Godly offspring.  \\
\textit{אַלּוֹ אָלָל הַסְּפֶרָה} & What does God seek but  \\
\textit{לֵחָה} \textit{מְרוֹעַ עַל} & a seed?\textsuperscript{5}  \\
\end{tabular}

Apparently the Septuagint read (or interpreted) the Hebrew text as \textit{בָּשָׁם שֶׁפֶר הַשָּׁרָה (-)תּוֹ} \textsuperscript{6} ("What other than a seed is God seeking?"). This text requires the interchange of two words ( \textit{יוֹרָה} and \textit{שֶׁפֶר} ) and the regrouping of the initial \textit{n} with the \textit{יוֹרָה} ("seed") instead of \textit{שֶׁפֶר} ("to seek"). Moreover, it also requires the deletion of a \textit{n}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1}Harper, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 227.
\item \textsuperscript{2}Vollah, \textit{op. cit.}, I, p. 243, "MT wurde vermutlich aus ästhetisch-theologischen Gründen geändert."
\item \textsuperscript{3}So Harper, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 226.
\item \textsuperscript{4}"This is unquestionably the most difficult v. in Mal;" (Smith, Ward, Bewer, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 59).
\item \textsuperscript{5}Bagster, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 1129.
\item \textsuperscript{6}C.R. Driver (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 399) suggests this emended text which follows both the Arabic V and the Septuagint.
\end{itemize}
(and a َ́?َ) as a dittograph and the substitution (or misreading) of an اَََ for اَََ.

The evidence is just as strong that the Masoretic Text was altered as that the Septuagint was changed. Riesseler\(^1\) proposed the text: 

\[
אִמִּן עַם בְּיַרְדָּם דַּעְתּוּן-נִי́
\]

("What other than a seed is God seeking?). This proposal also requires that an extra د to be added. This textual emendation and G. R. Driver's\(^3\) emendation both assume that the Septuagint here represents the original Hebrew text. If this assumption is correct, then it is likely that the Masoretic Text has been altered on theological grounds\(^4\).

\((7)\) HABAKKUK 1:5

\[
כִּי עָשָׂה עַל בֵּיתְךָ לָעִם
\]

For, behold, a work shall be wrought in your days,\(^5\)

---

\(^1\)According to Driver (loc. cit.).

\(^2\)Follows the Septuagint and Arabic V (so Driver, loc. cit.).

\(^3\)The investigator’s suggested text for the Septuagint is the same text as Driver’s suggested emendation; see footnote 6, page 172.

\(^4\)Driver (op. cit., pp. 399f.) suggests that the "seeking" arose from an original scribal omission of a َ́ث which then was added incorrectly after the verb. This could be true, and the theological motive could explain why the scribe (or scribal group) did not correct his text. This unintentional alteration would easily suggest the change of اَََ into اَََ and the doubling, if necessary, of the اَ in َ́ث ("and what").

\(^5\)American Jewish Translation.
διοτι εργον εγω εργαζομαι
εν ταις ημεραις υμων
For in your days I am doing a work. . .

The translation of έμπορο (“working”) by εργαζομαι (“I am working”) suggests the possibility that the Septuagint translator read a text in which έμπορο (“I am working”) occurred. This reading requires the addition of an η. The context indicates, according to Stonehouse⁴, that the subject of the participle έμπορο (“working”) should be the first person singular pronoun expressed or implicitly understood. Other scholars⁵ consider that a third person singular noun or pronoun, expressed or implicitly understood, is the subject of έμπορο (“working”). If the latter assumption is correct, this investigator agrees with the American Jewish Translator(s) that the subject, he (she, it), cannot refer to Deity in this context. Since the speaker of this verse is probably God Himself⁵, the subject of έμπορο (“working”) must be either God, i.e., a first person singular subject, or the

1οι = quia opus fiet in diebus vestris.

2Apparently the Revised Standard Version followed the Septuagint here because its translation reads: “For I am doing a work in your days”.

3ν., 6α as it now stands would point to the 1st pers. sing. as the subject of έμπορο; some scholars, however, would understand the 3rd pers. sing. as subject, ‘He worketh’, viz. Jehovah; or the subject might possibly be indefinite, ‘one worketh’ (so R. Vm.), but the indefinite use of the participle in the singular is quite exceptional.” (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 166).

4E.g., Ewald, Nowack, (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 166), the translators of the American Jewish Translation, et al.

5Wade, op. cit., p. 174.
noun, υπό ("work"), a third person singular subject.

The former assumption is more probable, and consequently, the א in the Masoretic Text perhaps was omitted because of a theological bias. Of course, the Greek translation may represent only an attempt made by the translator in his rendering to restore the original text (or meaning).

5. ANTHROPOPATHISMS IN THE SEPTUAGINT

In the Greek translation of the Twelve at least four passages are more anthropopathic than the Masoretic Text.

(1) MALACHI 2:17

The translation of this passage may be anti-anthropomorphic; the translator may have softened the anthropomorphism to an anthropopathism. This passage has been discussed earlier (see pages 48f.).

(2) HABAKKUK 2:4

Behold, his soul is puffed up, it is not upright in him; If any one draw back my soul hath no pleasure in him.

1Occurs only here (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 191).
2American Jewish Translation.
3α' = ἵδου νωχελευομένου οὐχ ἐνθεία η ψυχή μου εν αὐτῷ.
The translation of "his soul is not upright in him" by οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐν αὐτῷ ("My soul has no pleasure in him") is of particular interest because the Septuagint has changed a statement which did not refer to God into one which does refer to God and is both anthropomorphic (ἡ ψυχή μου — "my soul") and anthropopathic (εὐδοκεῖ — "has pleasure").

Several commentators consider that the Masoretic Text does not represent the original Hebrew. Therefore, some delete certain words; others emend the text, following the Septuagint which may translate a text like, e.g., ἡ οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου. Probably the translator had (or read) a text differing little from the Masoretic Text, e.g., "οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου", in which the ἡ οὐκ was understood to introduce the protasis of a conditional sentence and the ψυχή was (mis-)understood to have the figurative meaning of "be pleasing with". This text would explain easily both the difficult Masoretic Text and the translation of the Septuagint.

1 E.g., Stonehouse (op. cit., p. 193), Procksch (op. cit., p. 947, footnote), et al.
2 E.g., Stonehouse (op. cit., p. 192).
3 E.g., Procksch (op. cit., p. 947, footnote).
4 So Procksch (loc. cit.) and Marti (according to Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 191).
5 Stonehouse, loc. cit.
6 The construction must be different (Stonehouse, op. cit., pp. 191f).
7 A textual difference only of an " for a †.
(3) HOSEA 11:7

And though they call them upwards,¹

... will God be provoked against his honours. ²

"The meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain,"³ and the Targum is not helpful, although it probably translates a text similar to the Masoretic Text. The other versions are not too helpful. The only certain fact is that the Septuagint⁴ is anthropopathic, whereas the Masoretic Text is not. Perhaps this may be a "splendid example of a miserable text and a defenseless exegesis"⁵.

(4) MALACHI 2:13

And this again you do.

---

¹American Jewish Translation.
²Procksch (op. cit., p. 907 footnote) suggests that the Septuagint read הָלַךְ הַיָּדָה; Harper (op. cit., p. 365) suggests that the Septuagint read הָלַךְ הַיָּדָה. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 89) suggests, הָלַךְ הַיָּדָה.
³"It is clear that the LXX. had a quite different text" from the Masoretic Text (Scott, op. cit., p. 146).
⁴Nyberg (op. cit., p. 89), "... prachtvolle Beispiele eines elenden Texts und einer hilflosen Exegese."
⁵The Targum supports the Masoretic Text.
Moreover you have done those things which I hate.

The translation of ἀλλάς ("secondly") by α ἐμισοὺν ("which I hate") may suggest that the translator had (or misread) a text with two υ, and the ι as following the η. The translation is anthropopathic, as opposed to the Masoretic Text which avoids the anthropopathism and also softens the complaint against Israel.

The Septuagint seemingly translates the original Hebrew text accurately in many instances. In several passages it is uncertain whether the Masoretic Text or the Septuagint represents the original Hebrew text. In a few passages the Masoretic Text is preferable to the Septuagint.

6. PASSAGES WHICH, IN THE MASORETIC TEXT, AVOID DESCRIBING GOD AS MOVING BUT WHICH, IN THE SEPTUAGINT, ASCRIBE MOTION TO DEITY

There are a few places where the Septuagint describes God as moving about and the Masoretic Text does not.

(1) AMOS 2:13

---

1 I.e., ἀλλάς ("Which I hate") according to Horst (Robinson and Horst, op. cit., p. 260); Procksch (op. cit., p. 974, footnote); cf. Marti (op. cit., p. 470); Wutz. (op. cit., p. 344); Cheyne (op. cit., p. 195f), Smith (J.M.P.J, Winkler; Budde (so Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., pp. 56f), et al.

ε', σ', θ', ταυτα και τουτο ("And this further").

I will press you down...

I will roll under you,

Both the Hebrew and the Greek passages are anthropomorphic, but the Greek translation describes God in motion, whereas the Hebrew does not. No final conclusion, however, may be reached concerning this text and its translation by the Septuagint.

(2) MICAH 5:12

And I will [cause to be] cut off...

And I will carry off...

This translation is uncertain since many manuscripts and versions translate in a way which does not impute motion to Deity. Since the Septuagint (or a Greek trans-

---

1See Harper (op. cit., pp. 62f) for a discussion of the difficulties connected with the meanings of this verb. Hence, no conclusion can be reached from the Greek translation.

2The Targum's "I will afflict you" supports the Masoretic Text.

3א' = תָּרִיקְשָׁו וְּפֹקָתָו וְּפֹּּונָּא.

4Cf. Hosea 2:4(2); see pages 170ff.

5Another hiphil.


7A free translation.

8See footnote 6 above.
lation) originally may have translated the Hebrew "and I will cause to be cut off" as καὶ εξαρὼν ("and I will carry off"), the rendering is especially significant because in the preceding verse the same Hebrew word is rendered in the same manuscripts as καὶ εξολοθρεύσω ("And I will destroy").

(3) MICAH 7:3

Thus they weave it together.

καὶ εξελονυμαῖ (τὰ αγαθὰ αὐτῶν) ... therefore I will take away (their good things).

The Septuagint represents a Hebrew text such as, 1 (or רזוענ 2). Taylor, however, considers that the use of the first person singular by the Septuagint "... can only be looked on as a conscious correction made in order to harmonize with the following part of the translation."3 The Targum here is a translation of בַּעַל 4; the other versions differ considerably in their translation of הַנִּירָא. G. R. Driver5 emends the Masoretic Text to בַּעַל בָּשָׂר סֵרוֹא 6 ("but he loathes their goodness as a

---

1Taylor, op. cit., p. 163.
2Loc. cit., footnote †.
3Loc. cit.
4Loc. cit.
5Driver, op. cit., p. 268.
6Septuagint: τὰ αγαθὰ αὐτῶν ("their good things"); cf. the Syriac and Arabic V.
brier,"). No final conclusions may be drawn from a situation like this.

(4) HABAKKUK 3:13

[Hebrew text]

... laying him bare from thigh to neck.

... thou hast raised chains up to the neck.

The Greek translation corresponds to a Hebrew text, such as, יְרֵד מִשְׁפָּרְךָ דֶּשֶׁנֶּךָ וְאָנָּה תַּרַּא חַלּוֹן, which differs little from the Masoretic Text. Therefore, the translator may have misread his text or possessed one which differed from the Masoretic Text.

In the first example (Amos 2:13) the Septuagint clearly depicts God as moving, but in the last three (especially the last one) the concept of motion is not so clearly evident. "To carry off" implies motion, but the idea of motion is not as pronounced in "to take away" and "to raise up".

1 Procksch (op. cit., p. 949, footnote) emends following the Septuagint.

2 The Hebrew is obscure (Revised Standard Version, p. 977, footnote 1).

3 ' = ornasti fundamentum usque ad collum.

4 So Procksch, op. cit., p. 949, footnote.
7. PASSAGES IN WHICH THE MASORETIC TEXT, MORE THAN THE SEPTUAGINT, SAFEGUARDS THE CONCEPT OF GOD'S CHARACTER, ETC.

In these passages the Septuagint is more derogatory of the character of Deity than the Masoretic Text.

(1) HOSEA 10:15

So hath Beth-el done unto you... 1

In this manner I will deal with you, 0 house of Israel,

The Septuagint represents a text as "Thus I will do to you, 0 house of Israel".

Procksch 2 considers that here the Septuagint translates the original Hebrew text. This statement easily may be true since the Septuagint’s translation would be objectionable for two reasons: (1) the translation in this context is derogatory of God’s character and (2) it would be objectionable to the pride of an Israelite. The Masoretic Text could represent easily an attempt to soften the statement.

(2) JOEL 4(3):4

If you are paying me back,

---

1American Jewish Translation; cf. the Revised Standard Version’s, “Thus it will be done to you, 0 house of Israel,” (p. 943).

2Procksch, op. cit., p. 906, footnotes.
Or are you venting your spite against me?

Although the Masoretic Text is anthropomorphic, the Septuagint is more offensive because Israel is depicted as bearing malice against God. Either the Masoretic Text or the Septuagint may represent the original Hebrew text.

(3) ZEPHANIAH 1:9

... and those who fill their master's house with violence and fraud.

tous pluralouc ton oikou kurion1 tou theou auton2 asbeia3 kai dolou

... them who fill the house of the Lord their God with impiety and deceit.

The Septuagint by the addition of kurion ("Lord") makes an offensive statement. Certainly if the Masoretes (or an earlier scribal school) found a text like "house of the Lord their God", the omission of "would be suggested readily as a means of eliminating the offensive statement. On the other hand the Septuagint does not necessarily require a different text. The Greek translator may have translated "their master" by

1V L136 - 86 - 407 106 Cyr. comm Th. Tht. omit kurion.
246' C-68 Syh. et al. omit all or a portion of tou theou auton.
3A6 - 49 Bas. N. read anomias.
1 ("Lord") because he considered their real master to be Yahweh and, therefore, added τεου αυτων ("their God") for clarity. Alternatively, he may have considered that deceitful and violent action against rulers and masters is in reality directed against God Himself.

(4) JOEL 3(4):21

I will hold innocent their blood which I have not held innocent
και εξελίπτησον το αιμα αυτων και ου μη αθωσω

... and I will seek out [make inquisition] for their blood, and will not pass over it unrevened;

The Septuagint softens this statement of God. Procksch considers the Syriac and Septuagint to represent the original text and emends the Masoretic Text to: ἀναζητησων. On the other hand, one must note that elsewhere the Septuagint does not translate ἴησον ("to hold innocent") by either εξελίπτησον ("to seek out") or εξαλειπτω ("to punish") 6. Moreover, the Syriac and the Septuagint

---

1 The Septuagint of the Twelve always translates ἰησον ("lord, master") by χυριος ("lord").

2 Revised Standard Version footnote 5, p. 951; cf. the American Jewish Translation.

3 Against Ziegler; following B-S-V Qc L17 - 407mg Co - 68 - 239 - 534 La Th. Th. Th. Hi.

4 Translating the εξελίπτησον.

5 Procksch, op. cit., p. 916, footnotes.

6 So Driver, op. cit., pp. 401 f.
support the Masoretic Text in the second npi. Hence G. R. Driver's\(^1\) suggestion that npi is used here in an original meaning of pouring out, especially of sacrificial libations. The root could have developed easily the meaning of "to sacrifice" and, finally, "to be right, pure". Hence, Driver suggests the meaning of the Hebrew to be, "and I will pour out their blood (which) I have not poured out", i.e. I will destroy those whom I have hitherto not destroyed. . . The renderings of the Vss. will then be due partly to ignorance of this meaning of the root and partly to misunderstanding the rather strong anthropomorphism;\(^2\).

\(5\) NAHUM 1:9

\begin{align*}
\text{ουκ ἐκδίκησει} & = \text{σὺρ}^6 \text{ (so Procksch, op. cit., p. 942 footnote).} \\
\text{επὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν ὑλίσει} & = \text{κυρίος} \text{ is added by L II Or. lat VI 451.}
\end{align*}

\(^1\)Driver, op. cit., p. 402.

\(^2\)Loc. cit.

\(^3\)G. R. Driver (op. cit., p. 269) follows the Masoretic Text but rearranges the text considerably.

\(^4\)Following Revised Standard Version, p. 972 footnote b.

\(^5\)Following Revised Standard Version, p. 972, footnote c.

\(^6\)ἐκδίκησει = σὺρ (so Procksch, op. cit., p. 942 footnote). Ἐντὸν is added by L II Or. lat VI 451.

\(^7\)ἐντὸν = οὐκ ὕπομενον τὴν ἐπαναστάσιν δευτέρας ὑλίσεως; Θε = οὐκ ἀναστησεται δευτερον ὑλίσεις.
The Septuagint implies that God might perform an action which would reflect unfavorably on His character, and the Masoretic Text may represent an attempt to avoid this offensive implication.

Only in Hosea 10:15 is the Septuagint more probably a translation of the original Hebrew text, although this likewise may be true of the translation of Joel 4(3):4 (and 21?). In the other passages, the Masoretic translation seems to represent the original text as accurately as does the Septuagint.

Quite a few passages have been considered in which the Septuagint is more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text, passages in which the Septuagint ascribes motion to Deity, or in some way is more derogatory of God's character, etc.

In several instances, the Septuagint version is definitely to be preferred to the Masoretic Text; in others it is possibly preferable. In a few passages there seems to be no choice between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint, and, in the remaining, the Masoretic Text is to be preferred to the Septuagint.

6. CONCLUSION

In Section II, "The Anti-anthropomorphisms of the
Septuagint", (Chapters II, III and IV), more than one hundred instances of possible anthropomorphisms in the Septuagint have been discussed. In about nineteen percent\(^1\) of the passages discussed, this investigator considers that the Septuagint translation is either probably or possibly\(^2\) anti-anthropomorphic. In respect to about twenty-four percent\(^1\) of the Septuagint passages under consideration the conclusion was reached that very probably the Septuagint is not anthropomorphic. The Septuagint translations of approximately another forty-two percent\(^1\) of the passages considered were, in the opinion of this investigator, dependent upon different or misread texts\(^3\) or else upon texts which were vocalized\(^4\) differently from the Masoretic Text. The remaining approximately seventeen percent\(^1\) of the passages considered include passages in which the translator used the wrong Hebrew root (about two percent), passages where the Septuagint translation is considered to represent the original Hebrew text (four percent), and passages concerning whose translation no fairly certain conclusions could be reached (about eleven percent).

\(^1\)These percentages are accurate only to the closest whole figure. Consequently, they total one hundred two percent.

\(^2\)About half were considered probable and half only possible.

\(^3\)Approximately thirty-seven percent.

\(^4\)Approximately five percent.
In Chapter V of Section II passages have been considered in which the Septuagint translation appears to be more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text. In forty-five percent\(^1\) of these passages it seems possible, or even probable\(^2\), that the Septuagint translates the original Hebrew text. In seventeen percent\(^1\) of the forty-two passages the original Hebrew seems to have been as faithfully preserved in the Masoretic Text as in the Septuagint. As to twenty-two percent\(^1\) of these forty-two passages the conclusion was reached that the Septuagint translation did not represent an anthropomorphism in the original Hebrew Text. Regarding the remaining nineteen percent\(^1\) of these passages no final conclusion could be reached.

These figures prove conclusively the impossibility of demonstrating that the Septuagint translation of the Book of the Twelve exhibits an anti-anthropomorphic tendency. In fact, it might be easier to establish an anthropomorphic tendency rather than the reverse. Only if Kahle's\(^3\) theory can be established, \textit{viz.} that the Septuagint was translated in segments like the Targums, would it be reasonable to maintain that the Septuagint of the Twelve has an anti-

---

\(^1\)These percentages are computed to the closest whole numbers; they total one hundred three percent.

\(^2\)About one-half were considered to be probable and one half, possible.

\(^3\)And others.
anthropomorphic tendency. Otherwise, the results of this investigation are opposed to this assumption.

Of course, this examination of the possible anti-anthropomorphisms of the Septuagint translation of the Twelve does not establish conclusively that there are no anti-anthropomorphisms in this section of the Septuagint. The conclusion, however, has been reached by this investigator that neither the existence nor the non-existence of anti-anthropomorphisms, in the portion of the Septuagint examined, can be proved.

---

1After this dissertation was in final form, an article appeared which stated that a Greek text of the Minor Prophets has recently been discovered "which deftly solves some of the most baffling problems in the history of the Greek Text of the Old Testament." (Frank M. Cross, Jr., "The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea Caves", The Biblical Archaeologist XVII (1954), p. 12). This find, according to Frank Cross, supports the Proto-Septuagint school and opposes the school that considers the "Septuagint" merely to be one of many Greek translations which floated about. Apparently, it also raises difficulties for those who adhere to the segment-theory because he concludes with the statement: "In short the new Greek version solves many problems for the 'Proto-Septuagint' school of thought, and raises grave difficulties for defenders of alternate views." (ibid., p. 13).
SECTION III.

THE THEOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS OF THE
TARGUM TO THE TWELVE
CHAPTER VI

THE THEOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS OF THE TARGUM1 TO THE TWELVE2: THE GROSSER ANTHROPOMORPHISMS

Investigators have assumed that the Targums3 (and the Septuagint) exhibit an anti-anthropomorphic tendency. Certainly this is a very plausible assumption, yet, apparently, no one has investigated this field thoroughly enough to prove such statements as, for example, Thackeray's. "The Targums, . . . emphasize the transcendence of the Deity; everything in the text that implies direct communion between God and man or attributes human action or properties to God is eliminated, toned down or explained away; an intermediary

1The Targum of Jonathan to the Prophets.
2Unless otherwise indicated by the context or mentioned, "The Targum" alone, will mean "The Targum of Jonathan to the Twelve Prophets".
3"... in the Targums a very pronounced transcendentalism is taught; so much so that the thought of divine working in the hearts of men directly seems to be almost entirely eliminated. Moreover, this one-sided doctrine of God is in so far antagonistic to the Old Testament teaching in that it altogether does away with the belief in God as the God of history; . . . In accordance with this teaching the Targums avoid everything that appears to savour of anthropomorphism and implies any direct personal communion between God and man;" (Oesterley, W. O. E., and Box, G. H., A Short Survey of the Literature of Rabbinical and Mediaeval Judaism (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1920), pp. 46f.); "Jonathan umgehet wie Onkelos und zuweilen weiter als Onkelos jede Aussage, die dem Gottesbegriffe nicht angemessen." (Frankel, Z., "Zu dem Targum der Propheten" Jahresbericht des jüdischtheologischen Seminar (Breslau: F. W. Jungfer's Buchdruckerei, 1872), p. 21); see also Deutsch, E., Literary Remains of the Late Emanuel Deutsch (London: John Murray, 1874), pp. 364-380 and Footnote 2, page 33, chapter 2.
agent is constantly interposed."¹

Even though this hypothesis is much more self-evident for the Targums than for the Septuagint, there are instances of anthropomorphisms being retained², and some places where the Targums appear to be more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text³.

The two most valuable works on this subject are the article, "Die Anthropomorphisms in den Thargumim", by Ginsburger in the Jahrabücher für Protestantische Theologie (1891) and the book on the Targum of Jonathan to the Prophets by Churgin⁴, published in 1927⁵. Ginsburger classifies his various paraphrases of the anthropomorphisms into three sections: the oldest, the later, and the youngest paraphrases. Of these only the first two are pertinent to this investigation⁶. Churgin is somewhat broader in his scope but is much less complete than Ginsburger in the material covered. Both men, however, fail to discuss the material completely.

¹Thackeray, op. cit., p. 37.
²See Appendix VII, p. 407ff.
³See Appendix VII.
⁵Misprinted in book as 1907.
⁶Indicated in the body and footnotes of this dissertation by the letters E (oldest) and L (later).
1. THE ASCRITION TO DEITY OF HUMAN (PHYSICAL) FORM

If the thesis is to be firmly established that the Targum eliminates, tones down, or explains away the ascribing of human action or properties to God, the Targum then must eliminate or modify all (or at least most of) the passages which imply or state that God is a man or even compare God to a man. To a certain extent the Targum of the Twelve modifies or eliminates these offensive anthropomorphisms.

Many passages containing terms which infer\(^1\) that God is a man are modified. Even the statements which negate the idea that God is a man undergo alteration.

\[(1)\] HOSEA 2:4\((2)\)\(^2\)

\[
\text{זַעַבְנֵיהֶ לֹא אִישָּׁה} \quad \ldots \quad \text{and I am not her husband --}
\]

\[
\text{זָפְקִיסָה לֹא} \quad \text{מַקְבָּלָה} \quad \ldots \quad \text{and My Word\(^3\) does not accept (receive) her prayers --}
\]

The Targum’s rendering here is not clear; perhaps

---

\(1\) E.g., Malachi 3:17. Here the clause זַעַבְנֵיהֶ יַעֲלֵיהֶ ("and I will spare them as a man spares his son who serves him.") is translated as זַעַבְנֵיהֶ יַעֲלֵיהֶ כֹּמָה רָמֵי מִזְדַּבָּב לֹא יִזְרַח צָלַמָה ("and I will spare them as a man spares his son who serves him"). In this instance the comparison is retained; cf., the Septuagint (see page 39, footnote 2).

\(2\) The Septuagint here translates literally; see page 38, footnote 3.

\(3\) מִיְּרוּם ("My Word") may indicate either a paraphrastic, allegorical interpretation, representing מִי יְרוּם ("her husband"), or, preferably, as Ginsburger, it may stand for the personal pronoun ולָכָה ("I").
•**0*01
(and My Word) translates *21K1 (wand I”), and
*0*01 ("her prayers") is substituted for נְבֵא (”her
husband”). The סכּבּי ("accepts") has been added as a result
of the translator’s choice of Aramaic words to represent
דְּלָו ("her prayers") and נְבֵא ("her husband”).

(2) HOSEA 11:9

This translation is obviously not literal but a
paraphrastic rendering which adds an emphatic note to more
definitely emphasize the difference between God and man.

This passage and the preceding one are excellent examples
of the lengths to which the targumist went in order to avoid
any possible implication that God might be human.

(3) HOSEA 11:4 E

The Septuagint translates literally; see page 38,
footnote 1.

Apparently Memra has been added here and the negative
deleted because the targumist was offended by the suggestion
that anyone could conceive even of the possibility that God
could be human.
and My Word will be to them as a good farm-hand who is lax with the shoulders of oxen,

("My Word") here cannot be a translation of the personal pronoun, although it is obviously a paraphrase for God. The translation completely avoids the anthropomorphism of the Masoretic Text\(^1\), yet the Targum reflects a Hebrew text which is essentially the same as our Masoretic Text.

(4) HOSEA 2:25(23)

**זֹרַח הַיִּהוָה לָי**

 zs'khim'onèg' kham (בָּארְאָה בֵּית שְׁכִינָה)

and I will sow her\(^2\) for myself.

... and I will establish them before me (in the land of the house of My Shekinah).\(^3\)

The Targum here clearly is dependent upon a Hebrew text similar to the Masoretic Text. The problem in connection with this passage arises principally because the same verb (זָרַע = "to sow, scatter") occurs also in Zechariah 10:9 where the Targum translates literally -- although perhaps in

---

\(^1\)This passage illustrates clearly the difference between the Targum and the Septuagint. The Targum here is anti-anthropomorphic whereas the Septuagint increases the anthropomorphism; see page 161f.

\(^2\)Following the Revised Standard Version footnote j, page 937. Procksch (op. cit., p. 897, footnote) emends the text to מְשַׁפֶּר וַיִּשְׁמַע ("and I will sow him for myself"); the Revised Standard Version in its text follows the same emendation. The Septuagint literally translates the Hebrew as καὶ σπέρω αὐτήν ἐμαυτῶ ("I will plant her for myself. . . ").

\(^3\)This translation conveys the basic idea of the Hebrew.
this latter instance the targumist may have read a different verb.

Through I scattered [sowed] them among the nations,

... and as I have scattered them among the nations,

The inconsistency of translation suggests that the translation in Hosea 2:25(23) is not an anti-anthropomorphism, but that the translator may have selected a different verb, "to establish", merely to emphasize his interpretation of the passage. The difficulty of understanding the motive of the targumist may be seen by observing the translations of the remaining occurrences of "to sow" in the Twelve:

[Hosea 10:12]

1 So Jansma (op. cit., p. 89).

2 The Septuagint renders the Hebrew literally as καὶ σπερμάτων ἐν λαoίς ("and I will sow them among (the) people"). One manuscript (86ΜG) translates the verb as εἶπεν γερων ("I will raise up"). See page 41. Perhaps this manuscript exhibits a pro-Israel bias.

3 With this possible exception, the verb "to sow, scatter" never elsewhere is used of the dispersion in an unfavorable sense (so Wright, op. cit., pp. 285f). Moreover, usually (never elsewhere, according to Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 301) this verb is not used of scattering human beings (cf. Hosea 2:25(23) above). The usual verb is נל, and, therefore, Wellhausen, Nowack, Smith (G.A.), perhaps Mitchell (loc. cit.), and Oort (op. cit., p. 149) emend the Masoretic Text to נל. Jansma (op. cit., p. 89) agrees that the Targum read a form of נל.
Sow for yourselves righteousness,

0 house of Israel, work for yourselves good works,

[2] HOSEA 8:7

For they sow the wind,

The house of Israel is like to a scattering wind [to that which a wind scatters].

[3] NAHUM 1:14

No more shall your name be perpetuated;

... and there will be no longer a record of your name;

In the remaining two passages the Hebrew is translated literally. Thus, the verb (רָאָה = "to sow, scatter") sometimes is translated literally and other times more freely. This inconsistency makes it difficult to discover an antianthropomorphic pattern in the Targum's rendering of the verb רָאָה("to sow"). Since, however, this can mean "scatter" in both the Hebrew and the Aramaic, perhaps the concept of God as sowing was considered only to mean that God scatters. This concept would be less anthropomorphic.

(5) AMOS 9:15

---

1Frocksch (op. cit., p. 943, footnote) emends to לֹא יִזָּכְרֵן נַעֲרָה ("Your name will be remembered no longer").
I will plant them upon their land.

... and I will establish them upon their land.

Although the Targum gives in its translation the essential meaning of the Hebrew, the rendering here is probably an anti-anthropomorphism. This verb (יָטַ֫ס נֹדָעָה "to plant") occurs three times in a non-theological sense (Amos 5:11; 9:14; Zephaniah 1:13), and in each instance the verb is translated literally. Therefore, especially since יָטַ֫ס ("to plant") is rendered literally in Amos 9:14, the translation of יָטַ֫ס ("to plant") by הָעִי ("to establish") in Amos 9:15 arose probably because of an anti-anthropomorphic bias of the translator.

(6) GOD PICTURED AS FEEDING OR TENDING

The treatment in the Targum of the passages which describe God as feeding or tending (as a shepherd) is obscure. In Micah 7:14 and Hosea 4:16 the reference to God as feeding (הָעִי) is clear, but in four places in the eleventh chapter of Zechariah the actor (subject) of הָעִי ("to feed, tend") is not so certain.

[1] MICAH 7:14

Shepherd thy people with thy staff,

1 The Septuagint translates literally as ποιμαίνε 

λαον σου  ("Feed thou thy people..."
Sustain Your people by Your Word.

[2] HOSEA 4:16

Now Yahweh will lead them...

The translation of רעה ("feed") by דבר ("lead") is scarcely anti-anthropomorphic, since רעה also means "to shepherd". Therefore, "to lead" is an adequate rendering of that idea. In the passages in Zechariah and also in Micah 5:6(5) the verb רעה is interpreted in the Targum as meaning "to rule, govern", a legitimate meaning. In most of the remaining occurrences of רעה ("to feed, shepherd") in non-theological passages, except for the qal active participle used as a substantive, this verb is translated by ד睁开 ("to endow, provide, sustain, cultivate") as occurs in the theological passage (Micah 7:14) above. In three passages, however, a different verb occurs: (1) in Jonah 3:7, רעה ("to feed, tend"); (2) in Hosea 9:2, לון ("to support, nourish"), and (3) in Hosea 12:2(1) where

Ephraim herds on the wind,
is softened to

---

1The Septuagint translates accurately: "... the Lord will now feed them..."

2Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 945.
the house of Israel is like to a scattering wind...

This last passage in the Targum may reflect the influence of an earlier translation in Hosea 8:7.

[3] HOSEA 11:4

and I bent down to them and fed them.

and also when they were in the wilderness, I multiplied to them good things to eat.

This is the only remaining passage where God is said to feed anyone in the Twelve. Since this translation retains the essential idea of the Hebrew, it may not be an anti-anthropomorphic softening.

(7) GOD AS ISRAEL'S HUSBAND

The description of the relationship between Israel and God as man and wife was much too anthropomorphic to be left unaltered in the Aramaic translation. One passage has been discussed earlier in this chapter.

---

1See page 196.
2Perhaps the Targum read יגש (so Ruben, op. cit., p. 19).
3The Septuagint here differs considerably; see pages 42-43.
4Hosea 2:4(2) E; see page 192f.
The Targum avoids the anthropomorphism of "My Husband" by substituting "My worship". The selection of "My worship" probably arose from the prophetic concept that for Israel to depart from serving the true God was to behave towards Him as an idolatrous wife.

The change in the verbs from "You will call me" to "You will follow eagerly" results naturally from the choice of "My worship". The Targum here gives the meaning of the spiritual interpretation of this passage.

---

1See page 278 and 328.
2The Septuagint translates literally; see page 78, footnote 4.
3The Septuagint translates literally; see page 200, footnote 4.
This translation follows the same pattern of avoiding the anthropomorphism as Hosea 2:18(16) L. Here, however, "לשלומך ("to My worship") translates not "שׁו"ם ("My Husband") but "שׁותא ("My Wife"). The Targum reproduces the spiritual interpretation of the passage.


... and [I will] return to my first husband,
And [I will] return to the worship of my former lord (husband).

The translation of לשלומךリアル ("to my former husband"), by לשלומךリアル ("to the worship of my former lord") varies the established pattern somewhat. Probably the idea of return to their former worship was too offensive for other reasons, e.g., cultic objections, pro-Israel bias, or the like. Moreover, such a statement fails to indicate clearly that Israel is returning to the worship of the true God, whereas by the addition of "lord" ("my lord") makes clear that Israel is returning to her former lord's worship, i.e., Yahweh.

[4] HOSEA 3:3

---

1The Septuagint here translates literally; see page 38, footnote 3.

2Some manuscripts omit.
You must dwell as mine for many days;

Many days you will be given to My worship;

Usually Memra (מימר) is the device which the targumist uses to avoid the personal pronoun. Probably the allegorical interpretation of the preceding chapter is reflected in the translation of למלותונם ("as mine") by למלותונ ("to my worship").

[5] HOSA 2:21(19) f

The idea of God being betrothed to Israel, although this idea involves a concept similar to the wife-husband relationship, does not follow the above pattern.

... and I will betroth you to me...

... and I will establish you before Me.

Perhaps because the degree of intimacy implied by betrothal is less than that of marriage, 'זוותון ("My worship") is not used by the targumist.

(9) GOD'S SOUL (NEPHESH)

---

1The Septuagint translates literally here: ημερας πολλας κατηηθη εκ εμοι ("Thou shalt continue many days for me . . .").

2The Septuagint here is literal; see page 39, footnote 1.
The targumist, unlike the Septuagint translator\(^1\), clearly recognized the anthropomorphism\(^2\) contained in the concept of God's nephesh (יְהוָה). Hence, he altered the two passages in the Book of the Twelve where the concept is found. In each case he substituted Memra (מֶמְרא).

\[1\] AMOS 6:8

The Lord God has sworn by Himself ...

Yahweh of Gods swears by His Word.

\[2\] ZEZCHARIAH 11:8

But I became impatient with them,

And My Word has removed (loathed) them.

(9) GOD'S SPIRIT

---

\(^1\) See page 37, footnote 2.

\(^2\) Cf. Knight (op. cit., p. 42): "The word nephesh, however, is seldom specifically mentioned in the Old Testament in connection with God, but when it is, it is probably a conscious anthropomorphism."\(^3\)

\(^3\) The Septuagint is literal; see page 37, footnote 2.

\(^4\) "The Memra is prominent in connection with the divine oath." (Box, G. H., "The Idea of Intermediation in Jewish Theology," The Jewish Quarterly Review 33(1932): 111. Cf. also, "It is the Memra who is always the subject of swearing or oath taking. Either the Memra takes the oath, or God swears by His Memra." (Abelson, J., The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature [London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1912], p. 157).

\(^5\) The Septuagint is literal; see page 37, footnote 2.

\(^6\) A solecism (so Jansma, op. cit., p. 101).
Three times the Targum substitutes Memra for spirit.
In these passages\(^1\) the targumist may have considered מָר ("spirit") to be the equivalent of the reflexive pronoun\(^2\) or to be almost identical with God\(^3\).

1. **ZECHARIAH 4:6**

   נָעַם אָבְרָהָמִים . . . but by my Spirit, אֶזְכַּרְאָה לֶאַמְרָה . . . except by My Word,

2. **ZECHARIAH 7:12**

   אָשָׁר שַלֹּחַ יְהוֹה לַעֲבֹדוֹת בָּרֹחַת בְּרֵי תוֹבָאָיוֹת קַרְאָבָאָמִים . . . which the Lord of hosts had sent by his Spirit through the former prophets. אָשָׁר יְהוֹה לַעֲבֹדוֹת בָּרֹחַת בְּרֵי מִכְרָמָי בְּרֵי הָעֵד הֹבַעְדָיָה . . . which Yahweh of Hosts has sent by His Word through [by the hand of] the former prophets.

3. **MICAH 2:7**

   קַאַצְרַךְ רָחַח יִהוֹאָה Is the Spirit of the Lord impatient? מְקַאַפְרַךְ מָמֵר מְסָד יִהוֹאָה Has the Word from Yahweh been shortened?

---

\(^1\)Zechariah 4:6; 7:12; Micah 2:7.

\(^2\)"... he [Zechariah] elsewhere (46 68) seems to refer to the Spirit of Yahweh as if he were thinking of Yahweh himself," (Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, *op. cit*., p. 202).

\(^3\)"... ruah is the essential substance of the Divine Being," (Knight, *op. cit*., p. 47).

\(^4\)The Septuagint renders literally.

\(^5\)The Septuagint is literal.
Two other passages which refer to the Spirit of God are altered in the Targum. In these passages Memra is not used.

[4] ZECHARIAH 6:8

... those who go towards the north country have set my Spirit at rest in the north country.

... those who are going to the land of the north, say to them, 'Do My Will in the land of the north'.

This translation softens the idea of "easing" or "setting God's Spirit at rest" by the command to do the will of God.


My Spirit abides [stands] among you;

... and My prophets teach [among] you ... .

The remaining three references to God's Spirit in the Twelve are translated, substantially, literally. In Joel 2:28(3:1) f, the only change in the Hebrew is that the Targum adds the word קדוש ("holy") to describe His Spirit. In Micah 3:8 ת師פנ ("prophecy") is added; thus the Targum says

---

1The Septuagint here also avoids, see Appendix II.

2A free translation (so Rignell, op. cit., p. 213).
that the prophet is filled with "Yahweh's Spirit of prophecy."
The inconsistent rendering of the passages in the Twelve which refer to God's spirit makes it difficult to discover conclusively why the targumist altered certain passages and left others unaltered. One final passage is of interest because of the translation in the Targum.

[6] MICAII 3:7d

ב. א"ט מענה אלוהים 포 for there is no answer from God.

י"ר ל"ט בהות רות Because they do not have [lit., there is not in them] the Spirit of prophecy from Yahweh.

This translation avoids an anthropomorphism and also gives a fuller reason than why the seers are disgraced and the diviners are shamed. Moreover, it avoids the idea that God would not answer the people. It also places more responsibility upon the people and less upon God than the Hebrew does. It is illustrative of the increased importance of the Spirit of Yahweh.

(10) GOD COMPARED TO A FATHER AND MASTER

In Malachi 1:6, where God assumes that He is a father and a master, the Targum softens this anthropomorphism by

1The Targum read its text as the Masoretic Text but "expanded the phrase slightly" (Taylor, op. cit., p. 83).
the introduction of the comparative ח (as). Perhaps the use of these terms, הב and לזר, as Divine names had lessened the anthropomorphic feeling towards them. The latter consistently is translated by לזר whether לזר refers to man or God.

In several passages actions are ascribed to Deity which imply that God is a father, e.g., the act of chastising (ר). The Targum usually softens the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew slightly, yet retains the Hebrew meaning intact.

[1] HOSEA 7:12

םֹּר הָעָת I will chastise them...
ִּּ תַּנַּ יִגְזָיִ I will bring upon them chastisements...

[2] HOSEA 7:15

1 Cf. I Samuel 15:29 Septuagint where the Greek translator tones down the Hebrew סֹּרְרָה הָעָת סֶדֶּךְ ("for he is not a man, that he should repent") by the insertion of ως (=ב, as), ה as, וה as, ו
although I trained

and as I bring chastisements...

[3] HOSEA 5:2

but I will chastise [am a corrector to] all of them.

and I will bring chastisement to all of them.

In both these instances the Targum softens the statement of God that He chastises to that of bringing chastisements. The meaning of הָרָע ("chastise") in Hosea 7:15 may be uncertain, but the targumist certainly understood it in the sense of 'chastise'. In the remaining passage the targumist alters the meaning of the Hebrew and employs the intermediary device of the Memra.

[4] HOSEA 10:10

1The Septuagint translates literally; see page 45, footnote 2.

2"The usual meaning of לֵו, chasten, punish ..., i.e., strengthened by chastisement, gives no sense. If MT is retained it must mean trained, or disciplined," (Harper, op. cit., p. 306).

3See Harper, loc. cit. The Septuagint translates literally; see page 45, footnote 2.
In my desire, to chastise them;

By My Word I will bring against them chastisements.

Probably ("by My Memra" = "Word") here translates the Hebrew ("in my desire", "when I desire"). If so, then the translation here follows the pattern already established.

(11) GOD PORTRAYED AS KING

Usually the description of God as a king is left unchanged in the Targum. In one passage, however, this concept is softened slightly:

[1] ZECHARIAH 14:9

ראותי יהוה לכלملע
כלהמאר בירום תחתים
רִשְׁתַּהוּ על כל życי
ארעת

And the Lord will become king over all the earth;

... and the kingdom of Yahweh will be revealed unto all the inhabitants of the earth;

---

1The Septuagint varies slightly; see page 44; cf. page 258.

2Following The Revised Standard Version, footnote s, page 943.

3E.g., Zechariah 14:16f; Malachi 1:14.

4The Septuagint translates literally as και εσταὶ κυρίος εἰς βασιλεία εἰπ πασαν τὴν γῆν ("And the Lord will be king over all the earth.").

5Jansma (op. cit., p. 134) considers this to be a standard translation.
If the targumist interpreted למלל 1 as a verbal form, then the translation here would be consistent with his translation of Micah 4:7 where it is stated that God reigns:

[MICAH 4:7]

... and the Lord will reign over them in Mount Zion.

... and the kingdom of Yahweh will be revealed unto them in Mount Zion.

Since in both Zechariah 14:9 and Micah 4:7 a kingdom is described as being God’s possession, the anthropomorphism of the Hebrew is retained. Therefore, the conclusion cannot be reached that the Targum avoided all anthropomorphic expressions. 2

(12) GOD PICTURED AS A WITNESS

Three times in the Twelve God is described as being a witness or witnessing. The verb, יִנָּה ("to witness"), is translated accurately in Malachi 2:14 without the use of any protective device. The noun ( יִנָּה) is translated accurately enough, but in each passage the targumist substitutes Memra מְמַרָּא for God as the witness, e.g.:

---

1E.g., because he possessed a text without the initial ב.

2See Appendix VII.
... and let the Lord God be a witness against you,
... and let the Word of Yahweh God be a witness against you,

(13) THE CONCEPT OF GOD BEING WEARY

Only in one passage in the Twelve is God described as being made weary. In Malachi 2:17 this idea occurs twice:

You have wearied the Lord with your words. Yet you say, "How have we wearied him?"

You cause to labor in Yahweh's Presence with your words, and yet you say, "How have we caused to labor in His Presence?"

The targumist obviously had the same Hebrew text, but he desired to soften the anthropomorphism. Therefore, he added before God's name קרפ ("before"). This fact is supported by the literal translation in the secular sense of עָלָם ("to make weary") in Habakkuk 2:13. Apparently the Septuagint also avoided this concept in Malachi 2:17.

2. DESCRIPTION OF GOD AS HAVING PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

God frequently is described as having hands, eyes,

---

1 So also Malachi 3:5.
2 See page 48.
feet, etc., which enable Him to see, feel, move about, eat, speak, etc. Many of these anthropomorphic terms are eliminated, softened, or otherwise avoided in the Targum.

(1) THE HAND AND ARM (SHOULDER) OF GOD

Frequently hand (תֵּאכֶר) is used in connection with Deity to express the idea of Divine punishment. In these instances the expression, "My Powerful Stroke" ("My Hand"), usually is substituted for "תֵּאכֶר" ("My Hand").

[1] AMOS 1:8 L

I will turn my hand against Ekron; And I will cause My Powerful Stroke (Blow) to turn against Ekron;

This same procedure is followed also in Zephaniah 1:4 L; 2:13 L; Zechariah 2:9(13) L2; 13:7 L. In each of these instances the Septuagint retains the anthropomorphism. In one passage (Hosea 2:12 [10]3) the expression "ל" ("My Hand") is translated literally in the Targum (and also in the Septuagint). This literal rendering is especially surprising because portions of the same chapter have been interpreted allegorically.

1The Septuagint renders fairly literally: καὶ ἐπαξὼ τὴν χεῖρα μού ἐπὶ Ἀκκαρῶν ("... and I will lay my hand on Akkaron,"").

2See page 323.

3See page 214, footnote 1.
In several passages the expression, יָד יְהוָה (''the hand of Yahweh''), does not convey this ominous thought, and, therefore, other devices were employed to avoid the anthropomorphism.

[2] AMOS 9:2 L

שָׁם יְדוּרָה From there shall my hand take them;
ָמַסְתִּי בְמַמַּר רַדְשָׁרְוִ יְהוָה From there by My Word they will bring them down.


כִּי מֵאָז With a plumb-line in his hand.
כִּי דִקְרַנוֹת יְהוָה 2 and before him was judgment.

Apparently the targumist interpreted the plumb-line to mean judgment. Perhaps this interpretation accounts for the reason מֹר, with the pronominal suffix, was used instead of מִרְמָה.

Two more passages occur with יָד (''hand''). In Micah 5:8(9) יָד (''hand'') may be the ''hand of God'', or it may refer to the Israelitish remnant as Malbini3 and others4 have

1The Septuagint is literal.
2The Septuagint is literal.
3According to Cohen (op. cit., p. 177, footnotes).
interpreted it. Perhaps the targumist considered it to refer to the remnant since he translated מֵאָו literally.


רֵנִים מֵאָו לְךָ ... rays flashed from his hand;
מְקֹדשׁ הקדְסַתְךָ ... and sparks from the chariot of his Glory go forth;

The text here is very uncertain; this makes it difficult to reach any conclusions regarding this verse.


סֵפֹר עָלֵי בְּנַעַת The cup in the Lord's right hand -- will come around to you ... מְחֹר עָלֵי בְּנַעַת ... and the cup of cursing will return against you from Yahweh.

Apparently the Targum renders לִי מֶמְלַכָת ("right hand") as לִי זֶד ("a curse, cursing").

At least one passage exists in which a Hebrew verb suggests that God possesses a hand and which the Targum

---

1 Alternatively, this passage may have undergone revision, and the מֵאָו מַיִם may have been replaced by the literal מֵאָו. This has been done in several places in the Targum of Onkelos where מַיִם has been replaced by the literal מַיִם. So Ringgren, H., Word and Wisdom: Studies In the Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East, (Uppsala: Lundsqueistska Bokhandeln, 1947), p. 160.

2 The Septuagint is literal.
alters. In Jonah 1:4\(^1\) the Targum softens למות ("hurl") to רעים ("raise").\(^2\)

Usually the idea of smiting or piercing is reproduced literally in the Targum. In Habakkuk 3:14, however, the Targum alters the concept.

\[
\text{Targum: Thou didst pierce with his shafts the head of his warriors, who came like a whirlwind to scatter me,}
\]

\[
\text{Hebrew: יגש וברך רishi מאתי בשמים לבל רותא ילב תבונת בך עלעלותי}
\]

\[
\text{You divided the sea by the rod of Moses, and the strong leaders of the army of Pharaoh who were devising evil devices against your people, you drove them by a whirlwind.}
\]

The Targum increases the anthropomorphism by translating "they came like a whirlwind" as if it were "you came like a whirlwind", i.e., "you drove them by a whirlwind". Possibly the context recalled the Exodus to the attention of the translator who inserted it into his rendering. In any case the Targum here is obviously not anti-anthropomorphic.

The verb סע "to storm, rage" also occurs in Zechariah 7:14\(^4\) where והעם ("and I scattered them with a

\(^1\)Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 69f.

\(^2\)The versions are consistently softer than the Masoretic Text; the Syriac = יברוח and the Vulgate, misit, so Kalisch, op. cit., p. 151.

\(^3\)Following The Revised Standard Version footnote m, p. 977.

\(^4\)The Septuagint may be a softening; see page 70.
whirlwind..."") is rendered as אֵזֶזֶזְרַדִּיםּ ("and I will scatter them"). This may represent a softening of the Hebrew here. If this suggestion is correct, and if in Habakkuk 3:14 the targumist read a ה for a in סֶעָרִי, then the translation of Habakkuk 3:14 may be also a softening.

Moreover, God is described in Amos 9:5 as touching אִישָּׁם (the land). The Targum softens this anthropomorphism into an anthropopathism by stating that God rebukes or is angry אִשָּׁם with the land.


I took them up in his arms... 

---

1 Cf. Hosea 13:3 where the Targum retains the idea of blowing and also Jonah 1:11,13 where it reproduces adequately the idea of the Hebrew.

2 והֵדְתִי יְהוָה הָעֹבֶדֶת הַגֶּגֶגֶגֶגֶו ("The Lord, God of Hosts, he who touches the earth..."").

3 Usually אִשָּׁם ("touch, draws near") is translated by בָּרָד ("to draw near"). In Hosea 4:2, however, the clause containing it is changed completely. In Zechariah 2:12(8), אִשָּׁם occurs twice; the first one is rendered as here by but the second by בָּרָד. The translations of the passages in which אִשָּׁם is used non-theologically suggest strongly the possibility that the translation of Amos 9:5 is a softening.

4 יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי צֶבָּאֹת הנְוּדִי בָּאָרְזָא ("... and Yahweh, the God of Hosts, is the One Who is angry with the earth").

5 See a discussion of this passage on pages 158f.

6 The Septuagint, Syriac, and Vulgate read "my shoulders."

7 Following The Revised Standard Version, footnote a, page 944.
and I carried (received) them as upon the arms (shoulders).

In this one instance of shoulders (arms) in the Twelve, the Targum seems to be more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew. Could the targumist have considered the reference to be to the arms of the messenger of God?

In conclusion, the targumist apparently follows a plan to avoid certain anthropomorphic concepts of Deity which imply that God has hands of His own. Wherever (with the one exception of the literal rendering in Hosea 2:12[10]) the hand of God is used to express Divine Judgment, the phrase מַחְפָּשׁי נְבוֹרָת (with the appropriate pronominal suffix) occurs. When it does not have this ominous connotation, other devices, אֶת הָאָרֶץ, are used. Certain verbs which imply hands, אָמוּנָה, to touch, are avoided, but generally the verbs are reproduced faithfully.

(2) THE EYES OF GOD

"Eye" (יָעִים) is another anthropomorphic term which the Targum avoids. Whenever the term "eye" (יָעִים) represents the equivalent of the personal pronoun, the substitution of Memra מֵמְרָא is made.

[1] AMOS 9:3 L

1Also in Amos 9:4 L (without יֹעֵל); Jonah 2:5 L; Habakkuk 1:13 L (without יָעֵל).
... and though they hide from my sight at the bottom of the sea,

... and though they hide in the islands of the sea from My Word.

In two passages\(^1\) דָּלַי ("before") is used without Memra (מְרָא) to avoid the ascription of eyes to Deity. In both these passages the expression, "in My (Yahweh's) eyes" is the equivalent of "in the presence of Yahweh". Therefore, the rendering in the Targum as רָאֵי ("before Me") is appropriate. Perhaps these translations explain the rendering of the Targum in Zechariah 9:1.

For to the Lord belong(s) the eye of Adam (or man),\(^2\)

Because before Yahweh are the deeds of the sons of man,

A similar translation also occurs in Amos 9:8 L:

Behold, the eye of the Lord God ...

Behold, before Yahweh, God, is revealed the deeds of ...

These two translations avoid the grossly anthropomorphic expression, the "eyes of Yahweh", yet not in the same way. In Zechariah 9:1 the targumist apparently substitutes

---

\(^1\)Malachi 2:17; Zechariah 8:6; cf. the Septuagint; see page 54, footnote 4.

\(^2\)Following The Revised Standard Version, footnote k, page 989.

\(^3\)Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 55f.
the deeds of the sons of") for "eye", and "before" here apparently translates the "in to Yahweh". On the other hand in Amos 9:8 L, as in the above mentioned Malachi 2:17 and Zechariah 8:6, the "before" seemingly translates "the eyes of Yahweh", and the "is revealed the deeds of") apparently is added. Similarly, in Zechariah 4:10 the Targum avoids the implication of eyes belonging to God by the substitution of כנפ for עינí. 

Similarly, in Zechariah 4:10 the Targum avoids the implication of eyes belonging to God by the substitution of כנפ for עינí. 

These seven are the eyes of the Lord, which range through the whole earth.

...seven rows (of stones) as these. Before Yahweh are revealed the deeds of men in all the earth.

The two passages which state or imply that God is looking upon Israel (or Judah) the targumist interprets as being favorable to Israel (or Judah), using the verb נל ("to reveal") and the expression, דנוהה ("My Power"): 

ZECHARIAH 9:8

for now I see with my own eyes.

for now I revealed My Power to do good to them.

---

2 Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 56f.

2 Following Wright (op. cit., p. 55) essentially.

3 A solecism (so Jansma, op. cit., p. 113).
But upon the house of Judah I will open my eyes,

1 And unto the house of Israel I will reveal My Power to do good to them.

These two translations may be due as much to a pro-Israel bias as to an anti-anthropomorphic bias. In Zechariah 12:4 the verb of motion may have suggested the use of the verb, "ל" ("to reveal").

The only remaining passage which involves the "eyes of God" is:

Compassion [repentance] is hid from my eyes.

... and because they transgress My law, I will cause My Shekinah to ascend from them.

Although the motive for the avoidance of is obvious, the reason for the selection of , etc., is not clear.

The concept of God seeing occurs fairly frequently,

1"Probably T. parallelizes with ix 8." (Jansma, op. cit., p. 113).

2See pages 296, 313, 316, 326 and 339ff.
but there is no consistent method of translating the different expressions. The verb, וָדַּֽא ("to see"), is translated literally in Hosea 6:10 but is eliminated in Habakkuk 3:6. Moreover, the anti-anthropomorphic intermediary, Memra, is employed in Habakkuk 1:13\(^1\). In Hosea 9:10 the verb is translated by הבָּה ("to love")\(^2\). In Jonah 3:10 L and Zechariah 9:8\(^3\), on the other hand, the idea is retained, yet it is softened by the use of the impersonal passive of מָזוּמ:  

When God saw what they did,
and their deeds were revealed before Yahweh.

The situation concerning בָּשָּׁמ ("to observe") is somewhat different. Twice it occurs in Habakkuk 1:13. The first time the targumist renders בָּשָּׁמ literally\(^4\), yet in the Targum this is really a continuation of the preceding clause which has for its subject Memra (aphael) not God. Since Memra sees instead of God, there is no need to change the translation. The targumist also avoids the anthropomorphism of the second occurrence of בָּשָּׁמ in Habakkuk 1:13 by the change of subject:

... why dost thou look upon faithless men,

---

\(^1\)See page 217, footnote 1. Memra is probably due to the presence of "eye" (יָלְע).  
\(^2\)The Masoretic Text, רָאָֽיָת ("I saw your fathers,"), is translated as רָאָיָֽיָת ("I loved your fathers,").  
\(^3\)See pages 219f.  
\(^4\)See page 217, footnote 1.
In only one other passage in the Twelve is God said to look up (observe - נון):


... and the peace offerings of your fatted beasts I will not look upon.

... and your holy victims will not be received before Me.

Although this translation avoids the possible anthropomorphism of the Hebrew, much of the idea of the Hebrew is retained.

The other verbs which suggest that God can see, and, therefore, possesses eyes, are נב ("to look") and נבש ("to observe"). The former occurs only twice. In Malachi 2:13

it is reproduced faithfully, but in Zephaniah 3:15 the verb חפ ("to split, search") is substituted for נב ("to look"). The other verb, נבש ("to observe"), also occurs in the Twelve only twice:


---

1Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 57f., 58 footnote 1.  
2Cf. the Septuagint; see page 57, footnote 4.
like a leopard I will lurk [watch] beside the way.

as a leopard who lies in wait upon the path.

The Memra (מדרש), introduced earlier in the verse, here is compared by the targumist to a leopard.

[7] HOSEA 14:9(8)

and I look on him;

and I will have compassion on him (by My Word).

This last translation may also reflect a pro-Israel bias.

The gross anthropomorphic picture of God's eye is avoided in the Targum. Memra is used when ייע ("eye") is almost identical with the personal pronoun. The prepositional phrase (בְּעַיִן) appropriately is rendered by עִי. Certain expressions concerning God's eyes could not be avoided satisfactorily by the use of Memra. Hence the passive and/or יָדַע("before") were employed to convey the same general idea but without the gross anthropomorphic phrase. Twice the expression, "the eyes of God," is given a favorable interpretation in the Targum. In these passages, יָדַע is employed with an appropriate verb.

1American Jewish Translation.
In one passage both the Hebrew meaning and the translation are uncertain -- yet the translation avoids the anthropomorphic picture.

Concerning verbs which suggest that God has eyes, the situation is not so evident. Whenever the targumist uses Memra or another anti-anthropomorphic device in connection with the verbs, the verbs usually are reproduced in the Targum literally. At times מָזַר with or without the passive of מְזַר, avoids the anthropomorphism, and twice the anthropopathic verbs, לֶבֶן ("love") and לְאָה ("to be compassionate"), soften the Hebrew. Therefore, the conclusion must be reached that the targumist avoids describing Deity as possessing a human eye.

(3) THE FEET OF GOD

In the Twelve, three times God is described as having feet. In two passages (Nahum 1:3; Zechariah 14:4) the Targum omits the mention of God's feet. The remaining instance occurs in the difficult third chapter of Habakkuk where Memra apparently is substituted for "feet".

[1] HABBAKUK 3:5 L

וְיָשַׁר כִּבְרָא מִ_ATTRA L
And fiery bolts go forth at His feet.2

1Unless in Nahum 1:3 מָזַר ("before Him") stands for His Feet.

2American Jewish Translation.
and go out as flames of fire from His Word.

[2] NAHUM 1:3

... and the clouds are the dust of his feet.
... and he lays down a cloud of dust before Him.

[3] ZECHARIAH 14:4

On that day his feet shall stand...
... and He will be revealed with His Power at that time...

Certain verbs also suggest the existence of feet. The verb "to stand" in ""will be discussed later in connection with the denial of place to Deity. In four passages the verb "" occurs. In one passage (Micah 1:3) the verb is reproduced literally, but in the other three instances, the Targum differs from the Hebrew.


... and treads on the heights of the earth...
... who goes and prepares and brings darkness to the wicked in order that he may bruise the wicked of the earth.

1Perhaps נבוגה means "represents"?

Thou didst trample the sea with thy horses,
You were revealed over the sea in the chariot of your glory.


For I have bent [i.e., with the foot] Judah as my (bow);
Because I have made the house of Judah strong before Me;

Therefore, a consideration of these passages (which contain the anthropomorphistic pictures of God's feet) reveals that the Targum consistently alters this anthropomorphism — although not always in the same way. Certain alterations suggest that the targumist possibly was influenced by his treatment of motion and place with reference to Deity and by a pro-Israel bias.

(4) THE MOUTH OF GOD

God is described only twice as having a mouth in the Twelve. In both places Memra occurs in the Targum, yet only in Micah 4:4 is Memra indisputably a substitute for מִפֶּרֶם ("mouth").

1 The Septuagint also changes; see page 71.
[1] HOSEA 6:5

I have slain them by the words of my mouth,

I brought against them murderers because they have transgressed against the Word of My Will . . .

[2] MICAH 4:4

. . . for the mouth of the Lord of Hosts has spoken.

Because by the Word of Yahweh of hosts this is decreed.

Although the mouth of God occurs seldom in the Twelve, there are many actions of God which imply that He possessed a mouth. Thus, in Hosea 13:8\(^2\), God is described as eating, but the Targum alters this to the idea of killing (הַשָּׁם).


. . . the Lord God will sound the trumpet,

. . . the trumpet will sound before Yahweh God.\(^3\)

[4] HAGGAI 1:9

---

\(^1\)This translation "is no doubt an attempt to avoid a seeming anthropomorphism." (Taylor, op. cit., p. 96).

\(^2\)See pages 240f.

\(^3\)Cf. I Corinthians 15:52.
This translation of חצה ("blow") as שלח ("send") softens the Hebrew somewhat.

God is also described as possessing a voice. Usually, in the Targum, Memra is substituted for voice, for example:


The Lord utters his voice... and Yahweh lifts up His Word...

[6] HAGGAI 1:12 L

Then Zerubbabel... obeyed the voice of the Lord their God,

Then Zerubbabel... obeyed the Word of Yahweh their God...

In one passage (Micah 6:9), however, the substitution of Memra (memra) for voice (הייחו) is not made. In this place the addition of "the prophetic" (והונים) is made to avoid the anthropomorphism. This is an addition which one would

---

1 This same substitution occurs also in Joel 4(3):16 L and Amos 1:2 L.

2 This same substitution occurs also in Zechariah 6:15 L. In this verse a different verb translates עשה.
have thought to have been made more frequently.


The voice of the Lord cries to the city.

The voice of the prophets of Yahweh, they call to the city.

In Zephaniah 3:2, the targumist apparently understood the voice in "She listens to no voice," to refer to the voice of Deity because he translates the clause as, "She did not listen to the voice of His servants, the prophets".

Perhaps the normal substitution of Memra (Word) for voice (קול) may explain why Memra is not used, usually, in the translation of דבר ("to speak"). In three passages, however, Memra does occur.

[a] OBADIAH 18

for the Lord has spoken.

for by the Word of Yahweh this is decreed.

---

3The Targum avoids anthropomorphic expressions:” (Taylor, op. cit., p. 140).

2In Joel 2:11 the noun דבר is rendered by מים; cf. Hosea 13:14, where דבר (= "plague") also is translated by מים.

3The same clause and translation occur in Joel 4:3:8.

4In one passage (Micah 4:4) 입 ("mouth") occurs; see page 227.
In Hosea 1:2 the targumist apparently took the verb דיבר ("speak") as a noun since he translated it by אמרות ("a decree, word") -- his usual translation of the noun. In Amos 3:1 the verb דינ ("decree") is used to translate דיבר:

[9] AMOS 3:1

This translation of דיבר ("speak") by דינ ("decree") is a natural one. In Hosea 12:11 and Amos 3:8 the concept of God speaking is retained, although a different verb, בכר ("to say, speak"), is used. In Habakkuk 2:1 the same verb occurs, but it is altered to an impersonal passive form.

[10] HABAKKUK 3:2

Here the idea hearing God's report has been softened by the addition of נבורה ("your power").

The statement that God is silent occurs twice in the Twelve and is altered both times.


1 Cf. the Septuagint; see page 67.
... and art [thou] silent when the wicked swallows up the man more righteous than he?

... and you give length of life to the wicked and they consume the ones more righteous than themselves?

[18] ZEPHANIAH 3:17

Betesh beenahoth

... he will be silent in his love;

B‣ba betesh

... he will tread upon your sins by his love;

Note that the Targum here is really more anthropomorphic than the Hebrew in its translation of ירהש ("he will be silent") as ב‣ba ("he will tread").

With three exceptions, all of which translate "answered and said", the statement that Yahweh answered (מען) consistently is softened by the rendering בפ, which normally means "to receive". In the three exceptions mentioned, this verb would be unintelligible, and, consequently, the verb, בפ, "to turn", is employed: once

---

1 Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 66f.

2 Following The Revised Standard Version footnote 1, p. 982.

3 For Micah 3:7, see page 206.

4 Hosea 2:23(21); 14:9(8); Jonah 2:3; Micah 3:4; Zechariah 10:6; 13:9. In the first passage ירה ("to answer") occurs twice; the first ירה is translated by בפ ("to receive") and the second by רפ ("to command").

5 Habakkuk 2:2 (includes רפ).
its passive form ("to be answered") occurs, and twice\(^1\) the active form is used.

The idea of God calling (יָשָׁה) is not consistently rendered in the Targum. In Hosea 11:1 and Haggai 1:11 the verb is rendered literally as יָשָׁה ("to call"). The anthropomorphism, however, in Joel 3:5 (2:32) is softened by translating the verb as "to appoint" (יָפָה). In Amos 5:8 (and 9:6) where God calls the waters, the Targum, although retaining the idea of calling or speaking, safeguards Deity somewhat by the translation, יָשָׁה לְבָנַשׁ שִׁירָי הָדָמְן ("Who commands to gather armies which are numerous as the waters of the sea"). Moreover, in Amos 7:4 where God calls to contend by fire, the Targum faithfully reproduces the idea but transforms יָשָׁה ("to call") into a verb of motion, יָפָה ("to come"). In Zechariah 7:7 the prophet says that God is calling or proclaiming. In the Targum this idea is softened slightly by rendering יָשָׁה ("to call") as יָפָה ("to send").

The use of the prophets as intermediary agents, as in Zechariah 7:7, both in the Hebrew and in the Targum, is developed more fully in the Targum of Micah 6:9\(^3\) and of Zechariah 7:13. The Targum of the latter reads:

\[^1\] Joel 2:19; Zechariah 1:13.

\[^2\] The Targum of Amos 9:6 reads יָפָה for יָשָׁה.

\[^3\] See page 229.
This same inconsistency of translation applies also to רָאָה (hiphil = "to declare, tell") which is rendered literally in Amos 4:13 by רָאָה ("to tell"). In Zechariah 9:12, however, the idea has been softened slightly by the insertion of יִנָּחַת to make the idea, "I send to tell you" instead of "telling you." 2

While the pictures of the mouth (and voice) of God are consistently avoided in the Targum, usually by the employment of Memra, the verbs which imply that God has a physical mouth are not circumvented so consistently. Certain grosser anthropomorphisms, e.g., Yahweh's blowing of a trumpet, have been avoided. Other concepts have been softened. These alterations show that the targumist was offended at the suggestion that God had a physical mouth of His own and attempted, therefore to avoid or soften this portrayal of Deity.

(5) THE FACE OF GOD

The face of God is a frequently occurring expression...
in the Twelve and, with three exceptions, consistently is translated by מָרָם, an accurate enough translation for מִנָּה גוֹד with its prepositional prefixes. Twice מַרָם occurs, but דָּאֳיוֹן בְּשַׁם יָהֵוָה ($"to avoid prophesying in the name of Yahweh") is also added. In one passage, however, the intermediary device of the Shekinah is employed:

**MICAH 3:4 L**

וָיִשֵּׁר פְּנֵי מַלְאָכָיו בְּעֵת... he will hide his face from them at that time,

רִיצֵלָה שֶבֶנֶת יַהֲנוֹן... and His Shekinah will ascend from them at that time.

Certainly both the Hebrew and the Aramaic express the same idea, namely, a graphic expression of displeasure. In this last instance, however, the usual stereotyped translation would not convey the Hebrew meaning, and so naturally the alternate idea of using the Shekinah suggests itself.

(6) THE NOSE OF GOD

Finally, although the concept of a nose is nowhere

---

1Hosea 5:15; 6:2; 7:2; Jonah 1:2,10; Nahum 1:5; Habakkuk 2:20; 3:5; Zephaniah 1:7; Haggai 1:12; 2:14; Zechariah 1:7(13) [see page 52]; 7:2; 8:21,22; Malachi 1:9; 3:1,14,16.

2Jonah 1:3 (twice).

3This translation conveys the import of the Masoretic Text.

4"The Targum modifies the anthropomorphic," expression (Taylor, op. cit., p. 79).
encountered in the Targum, nevertheless, there are three rather interesting interpretations of the phrase, אֵן-אֲרָם-אֶת, "length of nose". Rather than the usual interpretation of 'long-suffering', the targumist has translated both words as מְרַחֲק רֹגֵז ( Marki Razz) ("removing anger"). This translation does convey, ultimately, the same meaning as the Hebrew -- yet the Hebrew is somewhat more picturesque. The use of & otherwise is interpreted metaphorically, even as the verb, "to smell" (מִרְי), is in Amos 5:21.

(7) THE HEART OF GOD

The concept of God with a human heart is found only in one place in the Twelve, namely, Hosea 11:8. Here the Hebrew נַחֲמַת עֲלֵי, הָיְנָה ("My heart recoils within me,") is avoided by the translation מָסֵר קָרִים עַבְרִי ("there comes up the Word of My covenant to obey (receive) Me").

(8) THE MIND OF GOD

The statement that God has an intellect is not stated directly in the Masoretic Text of the Twelve, but this conception of Deity is implied in several passages in the Twelve. For instance, in six passages God is said to remember:

---

1Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2; Nahum 1:3

2Cripps (op. cit., pp. 26,195) considers that the Masoretic Text here means that God refused to smell Israel's offerings. If this view is correct the Targum here is anti-anthropomorphic.
[1] HOSEA 5:3

I know Ephraim . . .
Before Me are revealed the works of the house of Ephraim . . .

This translation of הָיָה הִדְרֵחָה אֶפְרַיִם ("I know") as קֶדֶם ("Before Me are revealed") avoids the concept that God knows, i.e., the conception that God has an intellect or mind.


It was I who knew you in the wilderness,
I gave you your necessities in the wilderness,

The Targum has interpreted God's statement that He knew Israel in the wilderness to mean that God supplied there their needs -- food, water, etc. Even so, the translation avoids the conception of the mind (intellect) of Deity.


1For Hosea 8:4 see page 324; there the passage implies that God is not omniscient.

2The same procedure occurs also in the Targum of Amos 5:12 and Nahum 1:7 (for the latter see pages 281f.

3Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 132f and 151.

4"... a common expression = to show favor," (Harper, op. cit., p. 397).
You only have known of all the families of the earth;

Only you have I chosen from all the kindreds of the earth;

The Targum here translates the meaning of the Hebrew and yet avoids the conception of Deity as having a mind.

Statements that God remembers, forgets, and thinks usually undergo changes in the Targum's translation. Moreover, usually, the concept of Deity as thinking or counseling is avoided in the Targum. In Micah 4:12 "the thoughts (משבות) of Deity" is rendered as His secrets (זריו)

---


2See pages 325f.

3See pages 324f.

4See page 325. Micah 2:3 is rendered fairly literally.

5In Micah 4:12 counsel (וענה) is rendered adequately as שמותה.

6"Targ. has מ lié, a rendering the genesis of which is well brought out in Dr. Hatch's note on ἡμετέρων:-- 'It is frequently used in the Apocryphal books... in a majority of passages of secrets of state, or the plans which a king kept in his own mind. This was a strictly Oriental conception. A king's 'counsel' was his 'secret,' which was known only to himself and his trusted friends. It was natural to extend the conception to the secret plans of God.' It is not without interest to note this similarity in mode of thought between the Targumist and the Jews who wrote Greek." (Taylor, op. cit., p. 106).
In Amos 4:13, however, God's thoughts (דש)¹ are conceived as being His Works (עבודה).

The above passages demonstrate clearly that the targumist usually sought to avoid the implication that God possessed a mind or intellect, presumably with physical or human limitations.

(9) THE EARS OF GOD

The concept of God possessing ears is implied whenever God is said to hear (שמע). The Targum usually avoids this idea, but in Amos 5:23 the verb is rendered literally. Examples of instances where the Targum alters the verb are:

[JONAH 2:3(2)

and thou didst hear my voice.

you have done My will.

In Micah 7:7 and Zechariah 7:13 God is said to receive (琛) people's prayers (הانية) instead of hearing (שמע) people. In Zephaniah 2:8 the impersonal passive of comprises "before Me", to avoid the concept of God hearing. The translation, however, of Habakkuk 1:2 is

¹Occurs only here (Cripps, op. cit., p. 177); cf. the Septuagint (see page 135). Harper (op. cit., p. 103) considers that the Targum is the equivalent of the Hebrew קָנָה. The Syriac renders as "how great is his glory" (Ibid., p. 104).
interesting:

[Habakkuk 1:2]

Habakkuk 1:2

...and thou wilt not hear?

It is not revealed before you?

This passive expression also occurs in Malachi 3:16:

[Malachi 3:16]

Malachi 3:16

...the Lord heeded and heard them,

...there is heard before Yahweh and revealed before Him,

The last passage (Malachi 3:16) also contains a synonym for ישמע. This verb (יםָם) also is softened in the Targum.

Therefore the targumist usually avoids stating that God hears anyone or anything.

3. ANTI-ANIMISTIC TENDENCIES OF THE TARGUM

Usually the targumist introduces some type of alteration to avoid describing God as an animal or an inanimate object;

---

1 This word includes all animate and inanimate things except man.

2 Cf. Habakkuk 1:12 where the term אֵין ("Rock") as a name for God is omitted in the Targum; cf. the Septuagint (see pages 74f).
etc.

In the majority of the examples, Memra (מֶמְרָה) is substituted for God and the comparison is retained, e.g.:

(1) HOSEA 5:12 E

Therefore I am like a moth to Ephraim,
Therefore My Word (Memra) is like a moth to the house of Ephraim.

When God is described as being a light, the Targum softens the animism by translating the noun into a verb:

(2) MICAH 7:8

Yahweh is shining unto me.

Another change of considerable interest concerns the only comparison in the Twelve, of Deity to a lion(ess) in which Memra is not the device used to safeguard the concept of Deity.

(3) HOSEA 13:8

---

1See also Hosea 5:14 E ("lion" = הָיוֹת); 14:6 E ("dew" = דָּשַׁן); 13:8 E ("bear" = לוֹד); see pages 240f); 5:14 ("lion" = לוֹד); cf. also Hosea 5:12b ("rottenness" = הָיוֹת); 13:7b (see pages 222f); and Zechariah 2:9[5] ("wall" = חֵדֶשׁ). For the Septuagint see pages 73ff.
and there I will devour them like a lion[ess],

and I will kill them there as the offspring of lions,

This translation may soften the picture a little, but it remains as animistic as the Hebrew. Two other alterations are:

(4) Hosea 14:9(8)

I am like an evergreen cypress,

I will make him [the Israelites] as a beautiful fir,

(5) Amos 5:6

... lest he break out like fire in the house of Joseph,

... lest perchance His rage is kindled as fire against the House of Joseph,

Finally, the conception of Deity as an animal may be implied in the description of God as roaring
yet the Targum apparently avoids this description only once:

(6) Hosea 11:10

---

1See the conception of God as talking on pages 229ff.

2In Amos 1:2 and Joel 4(3):13 the translation is literal.
... he will roar like a lion; yea, he will roar,

His word is as a lion which roars, for He will roar,

Since the targumist almost always avoids the grosser anthropomorphisms, the conclusion thus far is inescapable that the Targum exhibits an anti-anthropomorphic bias.
CHAPTER VII

THE THEOLOGICAL ALTERATIONS OF THE TARGUM:

THE LESSER ANTHROPOMORPHISMS

The Targum does not avoid the lesser anthropomorphisms to the same extent that it does the greater ones, but here, too, the Targum, quite obviously, shows a much greater anti-anthropomorphic tendency than the Septuagint.

1. THE ANTI-ANTHROPOPATHIC EXPRESSIONS OF THE TARGUM

Generally speaking, the anti-anthropopathic tendency exhibited by the targumist is not as great as his anti-anthropomorphic tendency. There are, however, certain emotional descriptions which are altered consistently in the Twelve, and these alterations may be due either to this anti-anthropopathic tendency or else to a more general tendency to avoid descriptions which are too derogatory of the character of the One, Holy, Transcendent God. Such derogatory descriptions must be eliminated in some way.

(1) THE CONCEPT OF GOD BEING JEALOUS

One human emotion which the targumist might be expected to avoid, is that of jealousy. Jealousy belittles a man's character and, therefore, is offensive enough when it is found in a prophet or a saint, but in God -- that would be intolerable!  

1At least so one would think!
Twice (Zephaniah 1:18 and 3:8) the Targum substitutes "vengeance" for קֶנְגָּז" ("jealousy").

[Zephaniah 1:18]

In the fire of his jealous wrath, all the earth shall be consumed;

And by the fire of His vengeance all the evil men of the earth will be consumed.

This translation safeguards the targumist's conception of Deity, both by eliminating the emotion of jealousy and by avoiding the implication that God would destroy the earth completely, for in the Targum it is only the evil men who are consumed.

In two places the verb, נֹשֵׂה ("to be jealous"), occurs in conjunction with נֶשָּׁה ("jealousy"). The verb is rendered by the ithpaal of יַעֲבֹד ("to be repaid, be revenged"), but נֶשָּׁה is translated literally. Yet in these two passages still occurs.

[Zechariah 1:14]

I am exceedingly jealous for Jerusalem and Zion.

1 Only occurrences of this word in the Twelve.

2 Cf. also Zephaniah 3:8.
I take vengeance for [the avenging of] Jerusalem and Zion with great jealousy [zeal].

Zechariah 8:2

I am jealous for Zion with great jealousy, and I am jealous for her with great wrath.

I really take vengeance on Zion with great jealousy (zeal) and there is great rage before Me upon the nations who have provoked her to jealousy.

The verb אָפֵל ("to be jealous") occurs only once more in the Twelve. In this remaining passage the verb is translated by סִפּו ("to pity"), another anthropopathic expression:

Joel 2:18

Then the Lord became jealous for his land,
And Yahweh had pity upon His land.

Possibly the targumist's selection of שְׂפִיטָא ("and pitied") for אָפֵל ("and was jealous") may have been influenced by the appearance of סִפּו ("and had pity") in the second half of this verse.

The substantive, אָפֵל ("jealous"), occurs only once (Nahum 1:2) in the Twelve. Here it occurs in a theological context. In this passage the Targum renders it as לְאָפֵל ("a judge"), an anthropomorphic term apparently acceptable to the
The translations of these passages show that the Targum does not consistently avoid the ascription to Deity of the emotion jealousy, contrary to what was anticipated. Moreover, the targumist is not consistent in his translation of the Hebrew words for jealousy. Perhaps the situation would be clearer if there were any non-theological passages in the Twelve in which these words for jealousy occurred.

(2) THE CONCEPT THAT GOD HATES

Whether the targumist attempted to avoid attributing to God the human emotion of hatred is very problematical. Usually he translated קֵּנָה ("to hate") by an Aramaic word which means both "to remove" and "to loathe" — פֵּר. In Amos 5:21 יִשְׁחַד ("to hate"), the exact Aramaic equivalent of

1A free translation — a characteristic of the Targum of Nahum.

2In Amos 6:8 the verb דָּרָה ("to loathe") occurs. This verb the targumist renders by דָּרָה ("to disgrace, make vile").

3Thus, in Hosea 9:15; Amos 6:8; Zechariah 8:17; Malachi 1:3.
("to hate"), and ıםי are used parallel to one another. Here ıםי clearly means "to loathe" and makes it more probable that the targumist was using it in this sense in his translations of יַּסְּרֹע ("to hate"). The only passage in which there is a substantial change occurs in Malachi 2:16:

ָחַסְר מָרָנ For he hates divorce.

גֶּדָּה לָּכָּה For if you hate her, divorce her. . . .

This translation is essentially the same as the Septuagint and, therefore, may reflect a defense of the Mosaic law of divorce, possibly against the Christian teachings.

A consideration of the above passages suggests that the targumist did not attempt to avoid the idea that God could hate.

(3) THE CONCEPT OF GOD REPENTING

The concept of repentance, however, was abhorrent to

1Cf. Amos 4:11 where יַּסְּרֹע ("to remove, hate") translates לֹעַמ ("to overthrow").

2Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 88f.

3Following Revised Standard Version, footnote j, page 996.

4Cf. "wenn du sie hassest, entlasse sie." (Sellin, op. cit., p. 606). The targumist here is translating "with a theological bias (so Sellin).

the translator, and he avoided such a suggestion. His avoidance of any ascription of repentance to Deity probably arose more from his objection to the inference that God was changeable than to any offense at the picture of a compassionate Deity. The verb, ינני ("to repent, be compassionate"), occurs nine times in connection with Deity.

In four instances ינני ("to repent, be compassionate") occurs where God is represented as repenting of the evil He originally had planned to do. In three passages, the targumist substitutes the intermediary device of the Memra:

[1] JOEL 2:13

יוסף עַל נַחֲרָת And [God] repents of evil.
נסחיב מִמֶּרֶה And His Word turns from doing evil.
מלאת תמה בישה

In the fourth passage, however, Memra is not inserted in the Targum:

[2] JONAH 3:10

ויוסף
האלהים על־נחמה
אשרא־ברע לעשוה־לשם

God repented of the evil which he had said he would do to them;

ותב ידומה מִי־בישתא דגר
למְעַבָּר עלון

But Yahweh turned from the evil which He had decreed to do to them,

---

1See also Jonah 4:2; Zechariah 8:14.

2The Targum's "transl. is due to dogmatic scruples." (Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 56).
In all four passages the verb זינק ("to repent") is translated by בון ("to turn"); the fact that Memra is not used in Jonah 3:10 is all the more interesting because Memra occurs just two verses later in Jonah 4:2. This gives rise to the question: could Memra have been lost in the transmission of the text of the Targum in Jonah 3:10?

Elsewhere the Targum avoids this concept of God repenting in other ways. Twice the Targum adds the device: דודוןיה ("His rage"): 

[3] AMOS 7:3,6

גָּנַת יִהוָה עֲלָיוֹת
ואֶבֶּבִי יִהוָה רֹגְנוּהָ

The Lord repented concerning this;
Yahweh caused His rage to turn from this.

In two other parallel passages the question was raised whether God would repent.


מִי יִשְׁבוֹת וּמוֹלָד
mal'dlí v'shob w'mód
מי ידוע אם יתייבשו
Who knows whether he will not turn and repent,

ויִהְבַּל יִשְׁבַּב מִיְּבָשָׁת
וֹיְרוֹתָמְלָוְיו
Who knows that there are in his hand sins, let him turn from them and compassion will be shown unto him. 

*Also Jonah 3:9.

Kalisch [M.M., Bible Studies, Part II, The Book of Jonah (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1878), p. 261f] says, "... the Targum, anxious to remove anthropopathic notions, renders freely: 'whoever is conscious of guilt, let him turn away therefrom and he will receive God's compassion' (רֹדֵךְ וֹיְרוֹתָמְלָו; ...); the Masorites are supposed to have followed the same interpretation, since they provided מִי יִשְׁבוֹת וּמוֹלָד with a more strongly distinctive accent than מִי יִשְׁבַּב מִיְָבָשָׁת; and so also the Syr. ... and others ...; see pages 319f.
In the one passage where נוה clearly means "to be compassionate" or "to comfort", the Targum unhesitatingly translates it literally:

[5] ZECHARIAH 1:17

זוהים יוהה עוד ארי

And the Lord will again comfort Zion. •

לוהים יוהה עוד ית

And Yahweh will again comfort Zion. •

Finally, one very puzzling passage should be noted:

[6] HOSEA 11:8

יחד נסרה נוחתי

... my compassion grows warm and tender.

כתאה מתחללה רמה

At the same time the compassion of your fathers has been rolled up.

This translation avoids the anthropopathism by attributing compassion to the forefathers of the Israelitish people rather than God.

Although there are two passages in which the targumist does not avoid the concept of God being compassionate or repentant, the remaining instances clearly show that the Targum usually avoids this anthropopathism.

(4) THE CONCEPT OF GOD BEING SORRY

In the one passage in the Twelve where God may be
described as mourning, etc., both the Septuagint\(^1\) and the Targum change the person of the verbs from the first person to the third person. The Septuagint and the Targum differ only as to number\(^2\). Perhaps here in Micah 1:8 they understood that the speaker had shifted from God to the prophet.

(5) THE CONCEPT OF GOD’S ANGER

Frequently the Hebrew words which denote anger are translated literally. In a few passages the Targum may be anti-anthropopathic.

[1] HABAKKUK 3:8

Was thy wrath against the rivers, O Lord?

Was there anger from You, O Yahweh?

In this passage the targumist uses הָרָע and the impersonal third personal singular form of the verb. He follows

---

\(^1\)See pages 84f.

\(^2\)The Septuagint is singular, and the Targum is plural.
essentially this same pattern in Nahum 1:2 and Zechariah 8:21:

[2] NAHUM 1:2

והעל תחיה... and wrathful;\(^2\)

And power is multiplied before Him.

In other passages intermediary devices or other changes have been introduced.

[3] HABAKKUK 3:8

אסיבים עכרות... or thy indignation against the sea,

And against the sea you have made known to them the vengeance of your power.

This translation may be a softening. Likewise the translations in Hosea 11:9; Jonah 3:9\(^3\); Zephaniah 2:2; and 3:8 of רוחה ("burning anger") as עקוק\(^4\) ("strength") may be softenings. Finally, in Habakkuk 3:25 ראות ("rage, wrath") either is omitted in the Targum or else is translated as רעתך ("your will").

---

\(^1\) See page 245.

\(^2\) Literally "and a master of wrath".

\(^3\) See pages 319f.

\(^4\) In Nahum 1:6 the translation is חֲנַעְתָּם ("offence, displeasure").

\(^5\) See page 325, footnote 1.
Since הָעַף ("nose, anger") is rendered always as anger and since many of the other Hebrew words which convey the idea of anger are translated literally or nearly so, the few examples of the seeming anti-anthropopathisms cannot establish the principle that the targumist sought to avoid the concept of God being angry.

(6) THE CONCEPT OF GOD BEING INDIGNANT

Perhaps the idea of God being indignant was more offensive to the targumist than the concept of God being angry. In Micah 7:9 the word הָעַף ("indignation") is either omitted or else translated זָוִיל ("a curse").

[1] MICAH 7:9

I will bear the indignation of the Lord

I will receive a curse from Yahweh

It is very difficult to see how this rendering would be less objectionable to the targumist than the Masoretic Text.

[2] ZECHARIAH 1:12

---

1Only occurrence of הָעַף in the Twelve as applied to Deity.

2The Targum's "... בָּרָד גֶּפֶן and בָּרָד are familiar methods of avoiding expressions that might seem to bring God unduly near to man's level." (Taylor, op. cit., p. 173).
The translator clearly had a Hebrew text before him which was similar to, or identical with, the Masoretic Text. Moreover, the last two translations are probably not anti-anthropomorphic because סע "("to be indignant") in Micah 6:10 is translated also by לעו ("a curse"):

And the scant measure that is abominable?

And the measures of falsehood bring a curse?

Likewise the substantive, סע ("indignation"), is

1Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 79f.
2A free translation (Rignall, op. cit., p. 45).
3Cf. the Septuagint; see page 80.
4ענוי occurs here in a non-theological passage.
5American Jewish Translation.
not rendered consistently in the Targum. In Hosea 7:16 it is translated as שדוקפ ("trickery, insidiousness"), in Habakkuk 3:12 by מיל ("a curse"), in Nahum 1:6 by "vengeance"), and in Zephaniah 3:6 by חותם ("My Wrath").

Therefore, the Targum does not exhibit an anti-anthropomorphic tendency with respect to the concept of Deity being indignant, although the Targum does alter a greater percentage of passages involving מԩ than it does those which depict God as angry.

(7) THE CONCEPT OF DEITY AS HAVING PLEASURE OR DESIRE

Usually the concept of Deity being pleased (דבר) is rendered literally, but twice the statement is softened by being recast into an impersonal form:

[1] HOSEA 8:13

יהוה לא רצמ... but the Lord has no delight in them.

\[1\] Cf. the Septuagint; see page 81.
\[2\] Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 82f, and 318.
\[3\] Cf. the Septuagint; see page 83.
\[4\] Cf. the Septuagint; see page 83.
\[5\] דבר means "to be pleased" or "to accept".
\[6\] E.g., in Malachi 1:10 ("and I will not accept an offering from your hand") is translated as וירכז לבטאת איבים ("and a pleasing offering I will not accept from your hands").
and before Yahweh there is no pleasure in them.


I will not accept them;
are not pleasing

Another word "to be sweet, pleasing") occurs twice⁴ in theological passages.


and they shall not please him

Neither will pleasure be accepted

This translation avoids the anthropomorphism, but it clearly rests upon the Hebrew Text.


Then [the offering of Judah and Jerusalem] will be pleasing to the Lord.

There will be received before Yahweh

The next word to be considered is יָדוֹן ("to be pleased, delighted"). This root occurs both as a noun and as a verb

---

¹These are the only two occurrences in the Twelve; cf. the Septuagint (see page 87).
in theological passages.

[5] **MALACHI 1:10**

אֱלֹ֔יִי חָסְמִ֖י בֵּבֵ֑י
לֹא רָעֹתָ֑ה קֹדֶם בּוֹבֵ֖ו

I have no pleasure in you,

There is no pleasure before Me in you . . .

The verb occurs in Micah 7:18 where the Targum translates it adequately by "to delight in", etc.

[6] **JONAH 1:14**

בַּכְּשָׁר תְּפֻׁצָה עָשִׂיחְתָּהוּ
כִּמָּה דַּרְעָוֹת קְרֵם

...[for thou]... hast done as it pleased thee.

According as there is will (pleasure) before you, you have done.

This verse might be offensive both because it is anthropopathic and because it could be interpreted as meaning that God is capricious. The targumist has softened the statement slightly.

[7] **HOSEA 6:6**

כִּי חֹם טָפַשׁ

For I desire stedfast love . . .

---

2Only occurrence of the noun in a theological passage in the Twelve.

2The only four occurrences of the verb in the Twelve are discussed here.
Because with those who are practicing mercy there is more pleasure before me than [in sacrifices]...

MALACHI 2:17

The translation of these last two passages avoids the anthropopathism by the use of the impersonal third person singular form of the verb and דָּרָּפָה ("before") with the appropriate pronominal suffix.

Only one passage in the Twelve ascribes the emotion of desire (Ｋָזַח) to Deity. In this passage, Hosea 10:10,

the Targum avoids the anthropopathism by translating ("in my desire") as וּלְבָּנַח ("by My Word").

An examination of the passages and words which depict Deity as exhibiting the emotions of pleasure or desire reveals that the targumist does not avoid this anthropopathism consistently. The verb דָּרָּפ ("to be pleased, accept") usually is translated literally, although twice the Targum avoids the

1Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 87 and 208f.
2Revised Standard Version, footnote s, page 943.
anthropopathism. The targumist softens the verses which contain the verb ידע by the use of the impersonal, third person singular, passive form of the verb. The noun, קַדְרֶה, and the verb, קָדַר, are translated usually as substantives by דָּמוּ with an appropriate pronominal suffix.

These passages demonstrate that the targumist usually attempts to soften or avoid the anthropopathic expressions of the Hebrew. This fact makes it probable that the Targum of Hosea 10:10 (last example, above) is an anti-anthropopathism.

2. ALTERATIONS IN THE TARGUM REGARDING GOD'S POSSESSIONS

In several places in the Twelve God is referred to as having possessions which normally only human beings have. Many passages which ascribe these possessions to God are left unaltered in the Targum, and at times the targumist even adds possessions in places where none exist in the corresponding Hebrew text. In a few instances, however, especially in the third chapter of Habakkuk, perhaps the targumist was offended by this type of anthropomorphisms.

(1) HABAKKUK 3:11b

לָאוּר הָעֵזֶר יִזְהַלֶּה • • • at the light of thine arrows as they sped,

עֵמֶק בִּי מָשָׁרְך • • • Your people prevailed with your Word. • •

(2) HABAKKUK 3:11c

לָנְגָּה בְּרִכְךָ זֵכְרָה • • • at the flash of thy glittering spear.
... in the strength of the victory of Your Power.

(3) ZECHARIAH 9:14

... and his arrow will go forth like lightning;

And His decrees will go out like lightning;

In each of these examples the anthropomorphic concept of Deity having physical weapons is avoided in the Targum. A change of greater importance is the substitution of Memra for God's staff in Micah 7:14. Other interesting changes are:

(4) JOEL 1:7

It has laid waste my vines,

He (it) set the fruit of the vines of My people a desolation.

The targumist added here "עמי" ("the fruit of") and "עמי" ("My people") which eliminated the anthropomorphism by the alteration of "My vines" to "the vines of My people". This change may indicate also a pro-Israel bias.

(5) HABAKKUK 3:6

1 T. interprets יעשה as יעשה... (Jansma, op. cit., p. 75).

2 See pages 197f.

3 Cf. Habakkuk 3:15.
... when thou didst ride upon thy horses,

... because You are revealed for the sake of Your covenant upon the chariots of your Glory,

In this passage the Targum substitutes על מרחבת יקרד ("upon the chariots of your Glory") for על-סוסי ("upon thy horses").

(6) NAHUM 1:2

... the Lord takes vengeance on his adversaries and keeps wrath for his enemies.

Yahweh comes to take vengeance upon those hating His people and with vehement wrath against the masters (Sheids) of their (His) enemies.

This translation probably reflects a pro-Israel bias of the translator; it hardly avoids the anthropomorphism — although it does eliminate the idea that God had enemies and/or adversaries.

There are many other minor changes in the Targum which may reflect an anti-anthropomorphic tendency to avoid the ascription of possessions to Deity. Undoubtedly the most important (and consistent) effort to avoid attributing possessions to God is the treatment of passages which refer to the paths or ways of God. Of course, these passages have
been interpreted spiritually by the targumist, and all the references to God's paths or ways have been altered in the Targum:

(7) MICAH 4:2

זיווגו מדרכתי והולכה
בראתיהו
らせ נגנה מוארתּ
نحن קדۦעה נגנה
בבראתיו
זיווגו והולכה
... that he may teach us his ways and we may walk in his paths.

And He will teach us the paths of righteousness before Him, and we will walk in the instruction of his law.

(8) ZECHARIAH 3:7 L

אס־בדרכיך תהליך
אם באוזנתך רוקן
דומ ענך
If you will walk in my ways ...  

If you will walk before Me in the paths of righteousness ...  

(9) MALACHI 2:9 L

אס־Breadcrumb שמרים
את־גרייך
כמה לוחותך נסרים
יחי אורחות רוקן קרמי
... inasmuch as you have not kept my ways ...  

... inasmuch as you have not kept the paths of righteousness before Me.

This type of anti-anthropomorphism only partially is

Even as most commentators have.

2"There is nothing noteworthy in the Targ.: its paraphrases are in its ordinary manner: —" (Taylor, op. cit., p. 93).
considered here because most alterations are of a textual nature which makes it impossible to know certainly whether the alterations were caused by a variant or an originally corrupt text or by an anti-anthropomorphic bias. The examples cited above are probably instances of changes motivated by a theological bias\(^1\). The consistent alterations of God's paths (or ways) are clearly anti-anthropomorphic.

3. ACTIONS OF DEITY WHICH ARE ANTHROPOMORPHIC

Several of these actions have already been discussed in the preceding chapter in connection with the physical form or portion of a human body which they suggest. There are also, however, many actions which convey an anthropomorphic picture but which do not bring to mind either the entire form of a man (or other physical form) or suggest any part of the human body. Yet these particular actions are intimately connected with human life.

(1) GOD DESCRIBED AS SAVING

The targumist considers that very few of these actions are sufficiently derogatory of Deity to necessitate alteration. Thus, out of the many instances\(^2\) in which God is described as a Savior or as saving His people, there is only

\(^{1}\text{Cf. Habakkuk 3:8; see page 315.}\)

\(^{2}\text{E.g., in Hosea 13:4; Micah 7:7; Habakkuk 3:13,18; Zechariah 8:16,13; 9:16; 10:6; 12:7 where the translation is fairly literal.}\)
one place where this concept is altered by the use of Memra (מימרת):

[1] HOSEA 1:7

... and I will deliver them by the Lord their God;
... and I will redeem them by the Word of Yahweh their God;

In two passages the idea of redemption by the Word of God is found in the Targum, whereas any idea of God’s redeeming or saving is absent in the Hebrew:

(a) HOSEA 3:2

So I bought her [for myself] ...
And I will redeem them by My Word ...

The targumist has interpreted this passage allegorically, having assumed that the subject is God and not the prophet.

(b) MICAH 7:10

Where is the Lord your God?
Where are you who were redeemed by the Word of Yahweh your God?

1 So also Joel 2:17; see page 300, footnote 2.
The Hebrew passage might have been offensive to the targumist because it implies that God is not omnipresent\(^1\). The translation avoids this offensive implication and may reflect also a pro-Israel bias.

Aside from Hosea 1:7 only one other passage avoids the anthropomorphic description of God as a Savior:

\[ \text{Habakkuk 1:2} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{וּלָּא חָוִיטֻך} & \quad \ldots \text{and thou wilt not save?} \\
\text{הלֵּא רָכָּלָה קְדָם} & \quad \text{Is there not power before you to deliver (redeem)?}
\end{align*} \]

(2) GOD DESCRIBED AS FINDING

The idea of God finding Israel occurs only in Hosea 9:10 E in the Twelve. This concept the Targum avoids by substituting Memra for God and altering the verb:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{כחַּהַיִּשְׂרָאֵל} & \quad \ldots \text{I found Israel.} \\
\text{עַרְעָה מְימֵר, לִיִּשְׂרָאֵל} & \quad \text{My Word meets (calls to) Israel.}
\end{align*} \]

(3) GOD DESCRIBED AS HEDGING OR WALLING UP

The three passages in the Twelve which attribute such actions to Deity are altered in the Targum.

\[ \text{Hosea 2:8(6)a} \]

\[ ^{1} \text{it would seem that the Targumist on the Prophets avoids a question which would imply the possibility of Jahweh's absence.} \text{(Taylor, op. cit., p. 175).} \]
Therefore I will hedge up your way . . .

Therefore, I will cast out your ways . . .

In the same verse God is also described as walling up:

[2] HOSEA 2:8(6)\textsuperscript{b}

... and I will build a wall . . .

... and I will cut off as those who cut off with walls . . .

The Targum avoids stating that God hedges up, but the translation of "... and I will build a wall" as 'םיירנות ("and I will cut off") is as anthropomorphic as the Hebrew.


... and [I] repair [wall up] its breeches,

... and I will found their turrets, or fortify them.

Perhaps the Targum softens the anthropomorphism here.

(4) GOD DEPICTED AS A HEALER\textsuperscript{3}

\footnote{Following Revised Standard Version, footnote f, p. 936.}

\footnote{םיירנות (so Sebök, Harper [so Harper, op. cit., p. 236]).}

\footnote{The only passage in which the non-theological use of "heal" occurs in the Twelve is Hosea 5:13. In this case the Targum translates literally.}
In the majority of passages where God is described as a Healer, the Targum differs from the Hebrew\(^1\).

[1] **HOSEA 7:1**

כSpecifier לישרל

כSpecifier חַסְמְיָבָא יִשְׁרָאֵל

... when I [God] would heal Israel,

... as the sins of Israel were sought out,

The use of the impersonal passive ("to seek out")

to translate רָפֵא ("to heal") eliminates God as being the actor.

[2] **HOSEA 11:3**

כSpecifier כי

כSpecifier יֶחְדַּשְׂיָי דָּם

כSpecifier מַחְתַּדְיִים עַלְיוֹנִים

... but they did not know that I healed them.

... but they did not know that from before Me there is compassion unto them.

The use here of קדם ("before me") avoids the anthropomorphism.


I will heal their faithlessness;

I will receive them in their turning;

The selection of בָּלָה ("to receive") to translate

---

\(^1\)In Hosea 6:1 the Targum retains the idea of the Hebrew.
The Aramaic translations, especially of Hosea 7:1 and 14:5(4), suggest that the targumist may have possessed a different text or else misread his text.

(5) THE DESCRIPTION OF DEITY AS DEFENDING

Twice in the Twelve God is described as defending people. In both passages the targumist softens the anthropomorphism to an anthropopathism -- to have compassion:

ZECHARIAH 9:15²

יהוה צבאות יגן עליהם
Yahweh of Hosts will protect [defend] them,

יהוה צבאות יראת
Yahweh of Hosts will pity them,³

(6) THE DESCRIPTION OF GOD AS SPREADING OUT

This anthropomorphism is not rendered consistently. In Hosea 7:12 שד ("to spread out") is translated by the corresponding Aramaic verb, שד ("to spread out"). In Zechariah 2:10(6), the Targum uses a different verb although it conveys the essential meaning of the Hebrew:

¹The "translation [the Septuagint] perhaps manifests a desire to tone down the strong figures of the passage ... More especially is this tendency observable in the Targum," (Wright [C.H.H.], op. cit., p. 573).

²Cf. also Zechariah 12:8.

³Wright, op. cit., p. 573.
ZECHARIAH 2:10(6)

The situation is a little more confusing in connection with הנש ("to stretch out"). In two passages\(^1\) where it occurs, in connection with God's hand, the targumist translates the verb by יד ("to raise, lift up") which is also anthropomorphic. Once\(^2\) it is translated by ינ ("to lift up, suspend, hand"). In the last passage to be considered, Hosea 11:4\(^3\), אשוב ("and I bent down") is translated by ינושם ("I caused to multiply"). The different translations suggest that the translator was not motivated by an anti-anthropomorphic bias in respect to the verb, הנש\(^5\).

(7) THE DESCRIPTION OF GOD AS TEACHING (SHOWING)

In like manner, the Hebrew verbs meaning "to teach" or

\(^1\)Zephaniah 1:4 L; 2:13 L; see page 212.

\(^2\)Zechariah 12:1; this passage conveys the essential meaning of the Hebrew.

\(^3\)See page 199; cf. the Septuagint (see page 39).

\(^4\)The Targum = בִּשְׁמַיָּהוּ (Ruben, op. cit., p. 19).

\(^5\)In Zephaniah 1:4 L; 2:13 L; Zechariah 12:1 the Hebrew qal stem occurs; in Hosea 11:4, the hiphil stem. In two non-theological passages the hiphil stem also occurs (Amos 2:7f; Malachi 3:5). The niphal stem occurs twice, Amos 5:12 and Zechariah 1:16, both in non-theological connotations.
"to show" in theological passages have been given a variety of translations. One verb, רָאֵה (hiphil stem), occurs only once: רָאֵה הָיִיתָ = back to walk, not teach.

[1] HOSEA 11:3

וַיַּגַּוֵּן, וְלָאָמְרוּנָה יַלְאַףְרֵים, יַעֲבַר בְּכָל הָעָלָה מֵאָרוֹן, רֵעֲבָנָה. Yet it was I who taught Ephraim to walk,

... הַנָּחַת, וְלָאָמְרוּנָה יַלְאַףְרֵים, ... and I, with my Angel (messenger) sent from Me, lead...

Perhaps the א in יַלְאַףְרֵים should be translated as "by the means of". If so, the Targum avoids the anthropomorphism. If א does not have the meaning of "by the means of", then the idea of God’s teaching has been altered to a concept of God, Himself, leading.

The hiphil of רָאֵה ("to show, teach") is translated literally in Micah 4:2\(^1\) by the verb רָאֵה, ("to teach"), but twice the targumist does not make a literal translation, viz:

[2] HOSEA 10:12\(^2\)

וְיָדַעְתָּ לָכֵם, לַאֲשֶׁר יִרְאֶה, וְיָדַעְתָּ לָכֵם לָאָמְרוּנָה לְגַלֵּה. ... and teach you righteousness ... 3

וְיָדַעְתָּ לָכֵם, וְיָדַעְתָּ לָכֵם לְגַלֵּה. ... and He will bring justice to you.

---

\(^1\)See page 202; cf. the Septuagint (see page 94).

\(^2\)Cf. Hosea 6:3 (see page 317f.) where the Lord’s coming is compared to the spring rains.

\(^3\)Following the Syriac, Targum, Vulgate, Dathe, Hitzig, Henderson, Pusey, and Orelli (so Harper, op. cit., p. 356).
Whether הָעִיר (hiphil) here means that God will rain or teach righteousness, the Targum softens the anthropomorphism.

The final verb to be considered, וְהָיָה ("hiphil = "to show"), is translated literally except in Habakkuk:

[3] HABAKKUK 1:3

לָאָמָר, וְהָיָה Why dost thou make me see [or show me] . . . ?

לָאָמָר Why do I see oppressors?

This translation avoids the statement that God shows the prophet wickedness, etc., which would be objectionable either as an anthropomorphism or because of the translator's conception of the character of Deity. The translation, however, does state that the prophet sees, which retains the essential meaning of the Masoretic Text.

(3) OTHER ANTHROPOMORPHIC DESCRIPTIONS OF DEITY

Three other translations of passages involving anthropomorphic descriptions of Deity remain to be considered:

[1] HOSEA 6:5

עַל-כֹּן righteous
בְּנוֹבֵי אֶום goodly
↑ על הָאֲרוֹמִים therefore, I warned them by the embassy of the prophets,
בָּשֵׁל הָעָרִים righteous
Therefore, I have been them back by the prophets,

God's hewing (בָּשֵׁל) has been softened to God's warning (בָּשֶׁל), although this rendering is still a good interpretation.

↑ Wellin's Pahlgott reads, 'יהוה' (I warned).
Lagercrantz's Pahlgott and Chaldee has, 'יהוה' (I held back).
Research based on Lagercrantz's Ed.
of the Hebrew.


And I will deliver your sons...

This translation is still anthropomorphic, although it probably softens the anthropomorphism to some extent. Probably the translation reflects a pro-Israel bias. The assumption that the translation reflects a theological bias is confirmed by the literal translation of מכר ("to sell") in the same verse when it is used in a non-theological sense.


I will engrave its inscription,
I will reveal its [the stone's] vision,

In this passage the Targum is interpretive although it avoids the anthropomorphism.

These translations seem to clearly establish the fact that certain concepts found in the Hebrew were considered to be too anthropomorphic or too derogatory of God to be translated literally, while other actions were not so considered.

\footnote{Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 96f.}
4. ACTIONS OF MEN TOWARD GOD WHICH IMPLY THAT HE IS ANTHROPOMORPHIC

Some of the relationships of man to God, which directly or indirectly impute form to God, are retained, as, for example, the idea of finding God in Hosea 5:6, but many others have been altered.

(1) KNOWING GOD

Several very interesting translations occur in connection with the concept of man knowing God.

[1] HOSEA 8:2

My God, we Israel know thee.

Now we know that no God except You has redeemed us because we are Your people Israel...

This translation avoids stating that Israel knows God.

Moreover, it reflects a pro-Israel bias by the additions made.


... the knowledge of God, rather than burnt offerings.

... and serving the law of Yahweh rather than offering whole burnt offerings.

\[\text{Cf. Hosea 13:4, where the Targum translates literally, and Hosea 4:6 (see page 275), where the change in the Targum reflects solely a pro-Israel bias.}\]
The Targum interprets the knowledge of God as serving the law. Furthermore, this rendering reflects the growing importance of the law.

[3] HOSEA 5:4

**...and they know not the Lord.**

**...and they do not seek teaching from (of) Yahweh.**

The addition of "הַנִּלְסָל" ("teaching") and the translation of "יִדְעָה" ("they know") as "יִדְעַה" ("they seek") softens the anthropomorphic implication and also may illustrate the increased importance of the cultic instruction.

The remaining five passages which refer to knowing God are translated with the addition of a derivative of יִתְנָה ("to fear, worship").

[4] HOSEA 2:22(20)

**...and you will know the Lord.**

**...and you will know to fear (worship) before Yahweh.**

[5] HOSEA 4:1

**...and no knowledge of God in the land;**

**...and there are none who are walking with in the fear of Yahweh in the land;**

... because you have rejected knowledge,
... because you hated to know My fear,


Let us know, let us press on to know the Lord;
We will learn, we will strive to know the fear of Yahweh;

[8] Habakkuk 2:14

For the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord,
Because the earth will be filled in order to know the fear of Yahweh.

These five passages have all been interpreted allegorically. The last translation suggests the targumist might have had a text in which הענון ("glory") was lacking, and, therefore, he added יתהלל ר' ("the fear of") as in earlier passages.

(2) Tempting God

Three times the verb תָּמַן ("to try, test, tempt") occurs in the Twelve. In Zechariah 13:9 the translation is

1See pages 382ff for Hosea 4:6a.
essentially literal\(^1\), but in the two passages in Malachi the targumist softens the Hebrew by the use of בור (*"before").

\[1\] **MALACHI 3:10\(^2\)**

\(\text{בְּהֵשֵׁםִּיֶּהוּ הַצֹּאֲחָה} \quad \text{. . . and thereby put me to the test,}\)

\(\text{וְזָכָהָ כַּעָלָן כַּעָלָן} \quad \text{. . . and thereby put to the test in My presence,}\)

\[2\] **MALACHI 3:15\(^3\)**

\(\text{נֹאֲבַעֲבִּיםֶּהָיָה} \quad \text{. . . but when they put God to the test . . .}\)

\(\text{אַף} \quad \text{בְּכָפָרְרֵי קָדָם יַחְדָּוָה} \quad \text{. . . also they have put to the test in My presence . . .}\)

(3) **HEARING GOD**

For man to hear (שמע) God implies that God has an audible voice and, therefore, a mouth. Usually the Targum avoids stating that man can hear God.

\[1\] **HOSEA 9:17 L\(^4\)**

\(כִּי} \quad \text{. . . because they have not hearkened to him;}\)

\(אָרָם} \quad \text{. . . because they have not received (accepted) His Word;}\)

\(^1\)The Targum slightly softens the Hebrew.

\(^2\)Cf. the Septuagint; see page 106.

\(^3\)Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 106f.

\(^4\)So also Zechariah 1:4 L.
The Targum alters the verb שמע ("hear") to ביב ("receive, accept") and substitutes חכמה ("His Word") for the personal pronoun "him". The verb ביב ("to receive, accept") is the usual translation in the Targum for שמע ("to hear"). Both שמע ("to hear, listen to"), and a synonomous verb ביב ("to hear, listen") occur in two passages, (Zechariah 1:4; 7:11).

[2] ZECHARIAH 7:11

...והם צוותו את הקשיבם
זאוגתם חתביי לוים משמע
ושרבו להם ללבלו...ואזזנו חוה
יקחו כלמשמע

But they refused to hearken ... and stopped their ears that they might not hear.

And they were unwilling to accept ... and they made their ears heavy that they might not hear.

In this passage ביב is translated by ביב; whereas שמע is translated literally.

[3] ZECHARIAH 1:4 L

ולא שמעו ולא-קשיבו
וכל לא קבילה ולא-איצוה

But they did not hear or heed me,

But they did not receive nor listen to My Word.

(4) CALLING (CRYING) TO GOD

Whenever man calls (cries) to God, he is assuming

translated שמע in Amos 8:11 and Zechariah 1:4 L; in Habakkuk 3:8 the targumist translates שמע literally but also adds הקשיב. He also translates שמע literally in Micah 6:1.
that God possesses an ear with which to hear him. Usually
the verbs אָסָר ("to call") and פָּנַי ("to cry"), if they occur
in statements where man is said to cry (call) to God, are
translated by מָזַר יִלְיָא ("to pray before"); for example:

HOSEA 7:7 E

דָּבָר יִלְיָא מַעֲרָה בְּטַחְנוֹ . . . and none of them
calls upon me.

דְּמַלְאָי מֵאֲגַמּוֹ . . . who prays among
them before Me.

In one passage (Hosea 2:18 [16] L²) this standard pro-
cedure is not followed. In this passage there are several
offensive ideas in addition to the anthropomorphism of calling
to God; i.e., the anthropomorphic description of God as
"husband" and the offensive (cultically) descriptive term of
Deity as "Baal". The targumist's allegorical interpretation
of this chapter and these additional offensive terms probably
were the decisive factors which caused the targumist to vary
from his standard translational pattern in respect to אָסָר.

In any case, the Targum consistently avoids this
anthropomorphic description³.

¹E.g., Hosea 7:14; Jonah 1:6,14, (Ginsburger, op. cit.,
p. 260, incorrectly lists Jonah 1:4. Perhaps he meant 1:6 or
1:14; if so, then an L should be added after either 1:6 or
1:14).

²See page 200.

³Cf. also the verb נָאַב ("to speak") in Hosea 7:18 E
(see page 293 ) and in Hosea 14:3(2) E where אָסָר לִי
("... say to him," ) is rendered as נָאַב לִי מְדָהוֹן ("... speak
before Him").
The Targum naturally would be expected to avoid stating that one could see God. A statement that God could be seen implies strongly that God has a physical form.

Twice the anti-anthropomorphic conception of Deity was safeguarded by the introduction of the Glory of God:

[1] AMOS 9:1

רָאָה֤ הַנָּבִיא֣ נַעֲמַתּוֹ
I saw the Lord . . . .

וַתָּרָא֑וּ הַנִּימָלָֽהּ
I saw the glory of the Lord . . . .

[2] HABAKKUK 3:10

רָאָה֤ הַגּוֹיִים֥ יְהוָה֙
The mountains saw thee, and withered;

בְּאֶדֶם֙ סִינָאָ֔יִם
When You were revealed upon Mount Sinai, they

זֶרֶםּוֹ הַגּוֹיִים֥ וַיָּרְאוּֽ
they saw Your glory . . . .

In both these passages the targumist makes clear that no one has seen God, but that, in any revelation of Deity, the people see God's glory.

In two other passages the passive of "תֹּב ("to be revealed") translates נָדַר ("to see"):


Then the Lord will appear over them,
And Yahweh will be revealed over them.

[MALACHI 3:2]

In Zechariah 12:10, a cognate verb, occurs. In this passage the Targum translates by "to seek before" thus avoiding the anthropomorphism:

[ZECHARIAH 12:10]

This clause occurs in a passage which the early Christians interpreted as referring to Christ.

[MICAH 7:7]

Finally, in this verse (Micah 7:7) the Targum translates "I will look [to God]" as "I will exult" and adds Memra:

1Following the Revised Standard Version footnote s, p. 992.
2So C.H.H. Wright, op. cit., p. 587.
3"On the other hand the Targumist was unfamiliar with the precise idea expressed in our verse, an idea quite suitable to the context, and was misled by his familiarity with the passages where rejoicing in God is the theme; the Targ. on Hab. iii.16 contains the very words employed here..." (Taylor, op. cit., p. 171).
But as for me, I will look to the Lord,

But as for me, I will exult in the Word of Yahweh.

Therefore, the Targum everywhere denies that God might be seen by men.

(6) LEANING ON GOD

The idea of leaning (relying) on God was so anthropomorphic that the Memra was used as a substitute for God.

[1] MIGAH 3:11

יִשְׁעֵנָה יְהֹוָה מִמֶּרֶם רְאוּ הָיִיתַים • • • yet they lean upon the Lord • • •

רְאוּ הָיִיתַים יְהֹוָה • • • and upon the Word of Yahweh they will lean • • •

[2] NAHUM 1:7 L²

Apparently the targumist³ considered the idea of taking refuge in God to be essentially the equivalent of leaning on God:

וִידַע הַמֶּרֶם • • • he knows those who take refuge in him.

¹"For the usual • • • is found here." (Taylor, op. cit., p. 171).

²Gf. the Septuagint; see pages 108ff.

³The Targum has spiritualized here (so Haldar, op. cit., p. 28).
The scarcity of passages in which these verbs occur in the Twelve makes it impossible to prove by them that here the targumist is anti-anthropomorphic.

(7) SEEKING GOD

Frequently the Targum avoids this anthropomorphism by the use of רָדָר ("before") with הוּה or an appropriate suffix:

[1] ZEPHANIAH 1:6d

לֶא-רָדָרִי . . . or inquire [seek]
of him.

לֶא-כוֹעָר מִתְּדוּרִי . . . nor sought before Him.

The verb שָׁאָר with this translation occurs only in this one place in the Twelve1. Usually "עָב ("to seek") translates the Hebrew verb שָׁאָר("to seek"). This translation is especially interesting because שָׁאָר also occurs in this verse (see page 284 for its translation). The targumist may have intended the pronominal suffix "תָּא" ("him") to refer either to Yahweh or to the Fear of Yahweh (see page 284).

[2] HOSEA 7:10

1It also occurs in Hosea 10:12 (page 283) and Amos 5:4,6 (page 284 - note also footnote 3, same page).
nor seek. 

nor seek Him.

Three times the targumist adds '教學' ("teaching") in his translation of the thought that man was seeking God:


לבקש את-יהוה... to seek the Lord,

למייתבעו וגלמור... to seek teaching from Yahweh,

Since the concept of seeking God is closely connected to the concept of worshipping Him, the addition of סבלנה ("worship") and התחלה ("fear, worship") by the targumist is not surprising.

[4] HOSEA 3:5 L

ובקש את-יהוה... and seek the Lord their God,

ויתענהชาว טולוחם... and (they) will seek the worship of Yahweh their God.

[5] HOSEA 10:12

主旨לדר億元-יהוה... for it is the time to seek the Lord,

主旨לדרylon... return to the fear (worship) of Yahweh.

---

\(^1\)This same method of translation also occurs in Zechariah 8:2ff.
Could the targumist perhaps have read "return", for יִנְעָה (or דְוִרְבֹּן)? Usually when the Targum adds יִחְסָל ("fear, worship"), the targumist translates the different Hebrew verbs by יִבַּע ("to seek").

[6] HOSEA 5:15 L¹

יִבַּעְנֹתָי... they seek me,

יָבֹעַ אוֹתְךָ... they will seek My fear (worship),

[7] ZEPHANIAH 1:6c²

רַעַשְׁר לְאָבֶקְשׁוֹת אָתָה... who do not seek the Lord...

דוֹלוּתָה בְּעָתוּת יְהוָה... and who have not sought the fear (worship) of Yahweh...

[8] AMOS 5:4 L³

דםַרְגֹּונִי... Seek me...

סְכַבֶּהְךָ... Seek My fear...

The only passage of a theological nature in which no

¹Earlier in this same verse the clause יִבַּעְנֹתָי ("... and seek my face,"') is translated in the Targum as יִגְוֹנָה מִלֶּא דֶּמֶר ("... and they will seek before Me,"). Probably the reason that יִחְסָל was not added here is that the targumist believed that his translation of יִגְוֹנָה ("My face") as יִגְוֹנָה ("before Me") was an adequate safeguard against the anthropomorphism.

²The same verb (דםַרְגֹּונִי) occurs also in Zephaniah 2:3 where the Targum also translates as יִגְוֹנָה and adds יִחְסָל.  

³Cf. Amos 5:6 L where the Targum also adds יִחְסָל and translates יִגְוֹנָה as יִגְוֹנָה.
alteration occurs is in Malachi 3:1. The targumist here may have understood that "יִهوֹדָה ("the Lord") in the clause יִהוֹדָה עַל-אָשֶׁר-אָשֶׁר מִבְּדָקֵשׁ ("... the Lord whom you are seeking") referred to the previously mentioned angel (מֶלֶךְ = "My messenger or angel") or to some other intermediary.

The passages just quoted clearly demonstrate that the targumist avoided the anthropomorphic expression of "seeking God". Instead the Targum has men seeking the fear or worship of God. A few times the Targum describes men as seeking in His presence (or before Him) or as seeking teaching from God.

(8) COMING BEFORE (OR MEETING) GOD

The idea of meeting God or coming before Him does not occur too frequently in the Twelve. Since the idea of coming before (נָא) God is associated closely with the act of worshipping Deity, it is not surprising that the Targum spiritualizes its translation of נָא ("to come before") by using the verb נָא ("to worship").

[1] MICAH 6:6

...נָא הָיוֹדָה יִהוֹדָה With what shall I come before the Lord, ... Shall I come before him ...

...נָא אֶלְּלָה נָא With what shall I worship before Yahweh? ... Shall I worship before Him ...

[2] AMOS 4:12
... prepare to meet your God.

Be prepared to take up the teaching of the Law of your God...

The targumist, perhaps influenced by the increased importance of the Law to him, has avoided the anthropomorphism both by his selection of the verb ניב and by the addition of יראת ("the teaching of the Law [of]").

(9) WALKING WITH (GOING AFTER) GOD

The targumist usually avoided the concept of walking with (going after) God by the addition of לינה ("worship") or לנה ("fear, worship").

[1] HOSEA 11:10

They shall go (walk) after the Lord,

They will walk (go) after the worship of Yahweh.

[2] MICAH 6:8 L

... and to walk humbly with your God?

... and be discreet to walk with the fear (worship) of your God?

1 Cf. also Hosea 2:9(7).

2 "... like the Pesh... it [the Targum] avoids the bolder expression 'walk with thy God.'" (Taylor, op. cit., p. 140).
One more passage shall be noted:


וַיִּזְמוֹר עֹלוֹת אִתֶּם ָוַיִּזְמָר עֹלוֹת אִתֶּם
And Judah wanders restlessly with God,
And those of the house of Judah were strong in worship,

Since the meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain, no definite conclusion can be reached concerning the reasons of the targumist for the translation given.

The treatment of these passages shows that here the targumist probably was motivated by an anti-anthropomorphic bias.

(10) DEPARTING FROM GOD

In the Twelve there are several passages which describe men as departing from God. Usually, in the Targum, the highly anthropomorphistic and offensive language is softened by the insertion of either מְמוֹרֶד ("worship, service") or מְמוּלֵד ("worship, fear"):}

[1] HOSEA 1:2 L

---

1 Cf. the Septuagint; see page 100.
2 Following Brown, Driver, Briggs, op. cit., p. 923.
3 The concept of men departing from God is not only anthropomorphistic, but also it implies that God is not omnipresent -- an idea which the Targum avoids.
• by forsaking (departing from) the Lord.

... by forsaking (departing from) the worship of Yahweh

HOSEA 7:13 L

... for they have strayed from me!

... because they have removed from My fear (worship)!

Another verb נָשָׁה ("to go astray, fornicate") occurs in the Twelve. Whenever the Hebrew states that this departure (going astray, fornication) is from God, the targumist adds דִּבְרֵי ("worship").

HOSEA 4:12 L¹

... and they have left their God to play the harlot.

... and they have gone astray from the worship of their God.

Whenever the going astray or fornication is not stated explicitly to be from God, the targumist does not add דִּבְרֵי ("worship"). This is especially interesting since several of

¹So also Hosea 9:1 L; cf. Zephaniah 1:6.
these passages are closely allied to the above passage, e.g.:

[4] HOSEA 4:10

... they shall play the harlot, but not multiply, because they have forsaken the Lord to cherish harlotry.

They will take wives (women) but they will not beget sons, because they have left the worship of Yahweh and have not kept (guarded) it.

The addition of מדרשיה ("worship") here is not due to the presence of the verb נון ("to play the harlot") but is added to avoid the concept of leaving (בוי) God. Note, however, that the Targum does soften the concept of Israel fornicating, probably because of a pro-Israel bias.

[5] HOSEA 4:15

Though you play the harlot, O Israel,

Though you err, O house of Israel,

A comparison of the above passages, and their translation in the Targum, shows that the targumist avoided the anthropomorphc and offensive language of the Hebrew by the

---

1Cf. also Hosea 2:7(5); 3:3 [הנהלמה occurs just before the verb]; 4:18; 5:3 [the Targum uses the verb יעשה]; 4:13,14 [T. = ?].
The description of man as rebelling against God is strongly anthropomorphic. The targumist, therefore, avoids this concept by the insertion of Memra (אֶמְרָה = "word") when the verbs מַעַשֶּׂה ("to transgress, rebel"), צִוּר ("to rebel"), and מָרָד ("to rebel") occur:

[1] HOSEA 7:13 L¹

כִּי יָשָׂעְו בַּיָּמִים... כִּי יָשָׂעְו בַּיָּמִים... for they have rebelled against me!

[2] HOSEA 7:14 L²

יוֹדְרוֹ בַּיָּמִים... מַרְדּוֹ בַּיָּמִים... they rebel against me.


כִּי מְרָגְעַת בָּאָלָהִיָּה... אָלָהִיָּה... because she [Samaria] has rebelled against her God;

ַיָּרָה סְלִיָּבָה עַל מִמידָה... אָלָהִיָּה... because she has rebelled against the Word of her God;

¹So also Zephaniah 3:11 L.

²Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 100f.
This verse is interesting because the targumist does not translate מרהַ "to rebel") by his usual verb, מרד ("to rebel").

Another passage should be noted because the targumist makes an addition: מָרָד בְּכֵיסָם יְהֹוָה עִלְיוֹר מִלְכוֹ ("... they have rebelled against My Word by putting over themselves a king ... ").

The targumist also avoids the concept of men being false (treacherous) toward God or of merely being opposed to Him.

[4] HOSEA 5:7\(^2\)

בְּכֵיסָם יְהֹוָה They have dealt faithlessly with the Lord;

בְּכֵיסָם יְהֹוָה They have been false to the Word of Yahweh;

[5] HOSEA 6:7\(^3\)

שֵׁם בַּרוֹר בַּיָּהָר . . . there they dealt faithlessly with me.

סֵפֶן שֶׁבֶר . . . they lied against My Word.


---

\(^1\) Hosea 10:9; cf. Habakkuk 3:6 where the Targum adds, עַל תֶּם הַרְגֵּא עֲבָרָה עַל מִרְמָה ("over the people of the generation who passed over His Word").

\(^2\) Cf. the Septuagint; see page 103.

\(^3\) Cf. the Septuagint; see page 103, footnote 3.

\(^4\) Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 101f.
It is thy destruction, O Israel, That thou art against Me, against thy help.

When you made your deeds wicked, 0 house of Israel, the nations ruled over you. But whenever you have turned to My Law, My Word is at your assistance.

Although the correct translation of the Hebrew is uncertain, nevertheless, the targumist obviously has interpreted and softened the meaning of the Hebrew text. Certainly, the prominence of the Law and the spiritual truths stated in the Targum illustrate that fact. The addition of Memra possibly reflects an anti-anthropomorphic bias.

The targumist avoided the anthropomorphic and offensive idea of being, or rebelling, against God. This fact is established by an examination of the above passages as well as by comparison with the literal translations used whenever the rebellion is not directed towards God.

(12) OTHER ACTIONS AGAINST DEITY

In addition to using the devices of ṣedeq ("worship"), ṣarea ("fear, worship"), and Memra ("Word") the targumist also used MEMRA ("before") to avoid describing actions of men which were directed against Deity:

1American Jewish Translation.
TO SPEAK AGAINST GOD

(a) HOSEA 7:13 E

... but they speak lies against me.

... but they have spoken lies before Me.

(b) MALACHI 3:13

Your words have been stout against me ... 'How have we spoken against thee?'

Your words are powerful before Me ... 'How have we multiplied speech before you?'

The targumist softens the Hebrew in each of these passages by translating "against, unto" as דִּבְרֵי ("before").

PROVOKING GOD TO ANGER

ZECHARIAH 8:14

... when your fathers provoked me to wrath ... 

... when your fathers were angry before Me ... 

In this passage the targumist translated "as" דִּבְרֵי ("before").

ROBBING GOD
MALACHI 3:8

Will a man rob God? . . .

*How are we robbing thee?*

Is a man angry before the Judge? . . .

*How have we been angry before You?*

[4] SURROUNDING GOD WITH LIES

HOSEA 12:1(1:12)

Ephraim has encompassed me with lies,
The house of Ephraim has multiplied lies before Me,

In the last two passages the Targum adds מַדֶּר ("before").

In Malachi 3:8 it softens the Hebrew even further by its translation of אלֶיהוּ ("God") as דֹּרֵי ("judge").

[5] RISING UP AS AN ENEMY

MICAH 2:8

But yesterday my people rose as an enemy;

Because of the sins of my people they have been handed over to the enemy.

---

1 Cf. the Septuagint; see page 104f.

2 Following the Revised Standard Version, footnote e, p. 966.
Here the Hebrew text\(^1\) is corrupt; therefore, no definite conclusion may be reached from the translation of the Targum.

[6] PLANNING (DEVISING) AGAINST GOD

(a) HOSEA 7:15

דしない, ישבו רעה... yet they devise evil against me.

ל lesbi, קדה, בינש... to plan evil before Me.

(b) NAHUM 1:9

What do you plot against the Lord?

What do you plan before Yahweh?

(c) NAHUM 1:11

... who plotted evil against the Lord,

... who planned evil against the people of Yahweh...

The targumist avoids the concept of plotting evil against the Lord by the translation of יָדִי ("unto, against") as בד in Hosea 7:15 and in Nahum 1:9. In Nahum 1:11, however, the targumist translates the preposition יָדִי literally but avoids the anthropomorphism by the addition of עָמַד.

\(^{1}\)E.g., see Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 61.
"the people of"]. This addition suggests that the targumist also was influenced by a pro-Israel, anti-heathen motive.

(13) HIDING FROM GOD

The targumist avoids this concept, yet he does not follow a consistent pattern in his translation. He translates Hosea 13:14\(^1\) in such a peculiar manner that it is impossible to be certain just what part of the Aramaic corresponds to a given part of the Hebrew. Moreover, the entire verse contains so many offensive anthropomorphic ideas, especially this last clause, that the reason for the targumist's paraphrase is obscure.

[1] AMOS 9:3a\(^2\)

Though they hide themselves (on the top of Carmel),

Though they consider to be hidden (at the top of the tower of the fortified city),

This translation conveys the essential meaning of the Hebrew and yet softens the concept by the addition of "they consider".

[2] ZEPHANIAH 2:3

... perhaps you may be hidden on the day of the wrath of the Lord.

\(^{1}\) See pages 220f.

\(^{2}\) See pages 217f for Amos 9:3c L.
These verses show that the targumist avoids the concept of being hidden from God. In one passage (Hosea 5:3) the Targum is fairly literal. Here the Hebrew text states that Israel is not hid from God — therefore, no alteration was necessary.

(14) FEARING (WORSHIPPING) GOD

The description of men fearing¹ (worshipping) God is retained generally with only slight changes. The targumist usually adds only דֵּדֶמ ("before") to soften the anthropomorphism while retaining the spiritual truth. Thus the Targum states that men fear (worship) before God instead of saying directly that men worship (fear) God, e.g. מִשְׁכַּחֵרל ¹ 2 יָדִיד לַָּבֶּן ("and they fear [worship] before You.") for בַּשְׁכַּחֵר 3 יָדִיד ("... and they shall fear because of thee.").

In this same verse (Micah 7:17) another verb occurs which conveys a more offensive idea — that of men dreading God. In both passages where this concept is suggested, the

¹Whenever the Twelve describes man as fearing anyone or anything except Deity, the translation is literal.

²Note Targum of Hosea 2:9(7) [see page 201] and 12:1 (11:12) [see page 287] where the idea of worshipping before God has been added.

³Micah 7:17e
targumist translates in a way that avoids conveying this idea.

**[1] MICAH 7:17d**

This translation avoids the offensive anthropomorphic concept. Moreover, it also may reflect an anti-heathen bias.

**[2] HOSEA 3:5**

This translation of יִדְדָה יְהֹוָה ("and they will dread") by יָמָה יְהֹוָה ("and they will follow eagerly"), coupled with the addition of קֹדוֹס יְהֹוָה ("worship"), softens the offensive idea of dreading God and also is more favorable to Israel. It may reflect then a pro-Israel bias.

(15) SERVING GOD

The description of man as serving God, like that of man fearing Him, is closely associated with the concept of worshipping Deity. Therefore, the targumist selected יָדָה.

---

1. "... it is observable that at Hosea iii,5 they [Targum and Syriac] do not seem quite at home with this construction," (Taylor, op. cit., p. 187).
("to serve, worship") as a translation of the Hebrew verb עבד ("to serve"). In addition, he used לפני ("before") in Zephaniah 3:9 and in Malachi 3:14,18 (twice).

MALACHI 3:14

It is vain to serve God.

There is no joy to one who worships before Yahweh.

The targumist uses only the verb שלת ("to serve, worship") in Malachi 3:17 (see page 192, footnote 1) as a translation of עבד ("to serve").

(16) RETURNING TO GOD

Usually the targumist avoided the anthropomorphic concept of returning to God by adding מתנות ("worship"), for example:

1 JOEL 2:12 L²

שוב עלי, . . . return to me . . .
ותובו עלילות. . . . return to My worship . . .

1See also Zephaniah 3:9 and Malachi 3:17,18. The targumist uses only the verb שלת ("to serve, worship") in Malachi 3:17 (see page 192, footnote 1) as a translation of עבד ("to serve").

²The same procedure is followed in Hosea 3:5; 5:4; 6:1; 7:10; 14:3(2); Joel 2:13 L; Amos 4:6 L, 8, 9 L; 10 L, 11; Zechariah 1:3; Malachi 3:7; cf. Haggai 2:17 L. In Malachi 3:7 the targumist translates the second בנות literally but adds מלח. In Malachi 3:18 the targumist translates literally without any additions.
In one passage, however, the synonymous term "fear, worship") occurs.

[2] HOSEA 14:2(1)

שובה ישראל עוד
Return, O Israel, to the Lord your God,

יתוה אלחתך

Return, O Israel, to the fear (worship) of Yahweh your God.

In all of these passages the Targum uses שובה ("return"), the Aramaic verb corresponding to the Hebrew הבש ("to return"). In one passage, however, another verb occurs.


והת התכלהך תשוב
So you, by the help of your God, return,

והת באלוהים דאלך
So you be strong in the worship of your God.

These translations prove that the targumist considered it necessary to safeguard his conception of Deity from the anthropomorphic and non-omnipresent implications of the Hebrew text.

(17) BELIEVING, ETC., IN GOD

The concepts of believing (ךֹל or הבש), rejoicing (שמח,_UL, or דְּלִי), and being strong (בָּנָב or רָמָה) in God were objectionable to the targumist who may have considered them to be highly anthropomorphic. He avoids these concepts
by introducing the intermediary agency of the Memra or Word (מִמְרָא) of God.

[1] JONAH 3:5

גָּאָלָה יָמָנוּנָה יָנוּנָה And the people of Ninevah believed [in] God;

חַיְּמִין יָמָנוּנָה יָנוּנָה And the men of Ninevah believed in the Word of Yahweh;

[2] ZEPHANIAH 3:2

בִּיהוָה לֹא בְּמַסְתָּה She does not trust in the Lord,

בֵּשַׁמְרָה רַ֫֫֫֫֫֫֫בְּהוָה לֹא She does not believe in the Word of Yahweh.


גָּאָלְתָּה וֶשַׁמְתָּה בָּיוֹתוֹ Be glad ... and rejoice in the Lord, your God;

בֵּשַׁמְרָה וֶשַׁמְתָּה בָּיוֹתוֹ Rejoice and be glad in the Word of Yahweh your God.


וַאֲנִי בִּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיָה Yet I will rejoice in the Lord,

וַאֲנִי בֵּשַׁמְרָה רַ֫֫֫֫֫֫֫בְּהוָה I will rejoice in the Word of Yahweh;


The same translation occurs also in Joel 2:23 (see above), but in Habakkuk 3:18 the Targum translates יִנְלִי ("I will joy . . .") as יִרְאוּ ("I will exult . . .") — a different verb.
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Their hearts shall exult in the Lord.

... their hearts shall rejoice in the Word of Yahweh.


I will make them strong in the Lord...

And I will make them strong in the Word of Yahweh...


The inhabitants of Jerusalem have strength through the Lord of hosts, their God.

 Salvation has been found for the inhabitants of Jerusalem in the Word of Yahweh of Hosts, their God.

These translations clearly demonstrate that the targumist has avoided these anthropomorphic concepts.

(18) REMEMBERING AND FORGETTING GOD

The related concepts of remembering and forgetting God occur a few times in the Twelve. In each instance the targumist avoids the offensive idea by interpreting it spiritually. He usually adds דְוִלְתוֹנָה ("worship"), but in

1Following Wright (C.H.H.), op. cit., p. 585.
one instance he adds "fear, worship".

[1] HOSEA 8:14 L

For Israel has forgotten his Maker,

For Israel has forsaken the worship of his Maker,

[2] ZECHARIAH 10:9

... yet in far countries they will remember me,

... yet in a distant land they have remembered My fear,

The pattern of consistent avoidance of the concept of forgetting God, whenever it is stated explicitly or is implied, by saying that man will remember God proves that the targumist deliberately avoided this offensive concept.

(19) HATING GOD

The description of Israel as hating God occurs only once in the Twelve, and here it is avoided by the addition of "worship":

ZECHARIAH 11:8

1The same paraphrase occurs also in Jonah 2:8 L (where the verb "remember", occurs) and in Hosea 2:15(13) and 13:6 (where the same verb "to forget", occurs).
And they also detested me.

because their soul hated (rejected) My worship.

An examination of nineteen groups of actions, attitudes, etc., of men toward God, which imply that God is anthropomorphic, indicates that the Targum generally avoids the use of anthropomorphic expressions.

The conclusion may be reached from this study that the Targum usually avoids these "lesser anthropomorphic" expressions but even more consistently avoids use of the "grosser anthropomorphisms".

1The Targum "explains" as מִכְסִיתֶה (so Jansma, op. cit., p. 101).
CHAPTER VIII

FURTHER ALTERATIONS CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF GOD IN THE TARGUM

In the preceding two chapters, the effect of the targumist's concept of Deity and his attitude toward the grosser and lesser anthropomorphisms has been discussed. In this chapter the effect of his concept of Deity as omnipresent, omniscient, unchangeable, etc., will be considered. In a few passages already mentioned or discussed the effect of certain of these concepts has been noted. Many of the passages considered here are anthropomorphic.

1. THE OMNIPRESENCE OF DEITY

The description of Deity as being in a particular place, or as moving about, would be offensive to those who believe that God is omnipresent. Consequently, if the targumist conceived of Deity as omnipresent, in his translations of passages which localize God to a particular place, or which describe Him as being in motion, alterations might be expected.

(1) THE DENIAL OF PLACE TO DEITY

The targumist usually avoided the description of Deity as being in a certain place by the addition of the Shekinah.
The verb "to dwell" (שָׁכֵן) may have suggested the use of the intermediary device of the Shekinah to the targumist. Each passage in the Twelve in which God is described as dwelling (שָׁכֵן) in a certain place is translated in the same manner (as here) in the Targum.

In one passage God is said to encamp. The Targum alters this statement following the established pattern:

[2] ZECHARIAH 9:8

וָגִין יִלְיִיתָה Then I will encamp at my house as a guard,
מַעֲבַד אֶזֶר יִבְּכוּת And I will cause the Shekinah of My Glory to dwell in the house of My Sanctuary,
מִקְדָּשׁ שְׁלִימָה
יָרֵי

The additions of "My Glory" and "My Sanctuary" probably arise from the targumist's interpretation of "at my house" as referring to the temple.

1Ginsburger, (op. cit., p. 434) incorrectly reads Jon. 4:17,21 for Joel 4:17,21.

2The verb שָׁכֵן occurs also in Joel 4(3):21 L; Zechariah 2:14(10) L, 15(11); and 8:3. In each instance the Targum translates correspondingly, adding the Shekinah.

3A "standard translation" (Jansma, op. cit., p. 68).
In this verse Damascus is described as being God's resting place. This idea would be offensive not only because it seems to localize God to a given place but also because Damascus, a heathen city, was conceived as being the location of God's dwelling (or perhaps a temple devoted to God). Hence, the Targum softens this clause somewhat:

רומש מנוחה

And in Damascus shall be His resting-place;

ולמימין מחות בית שבלונחת

And Damascus returns to be a part of the land of the House of His Shekinah.

Here the targumist has added יִבְּנָה ("house") and יִרְאָה ("land") as well as Shekinah to avoid limiting Deity to a given place. In Hosea 2:25(23) and 9:3 mention is made of God's land. In the former, the Targum softens it to "the land of the house of My Shekinah," and in the latter to "the land of My Shekinah".

1The Hebrew is somewhat ambiguous, and either the Word of God or the Lord may be considered as resting in Damascus. See, e.g., Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 262. The Targum, however, apparently considered that Yahweh had a resting-place in Damascus.

2American Jewish Translation.

3Churgin (op. cit., p. 110) compares this translation with Sifre Deut. 116 and Com. Cant. r. מְקָר יִשְׂרָאֵל.

4Cf. Cohen (op. cit., p. 303) who states, "Both Hadrach and Damascus will become part of the new Kingdom and God's Presence will abide there." Perhaps the Targum, as well as Cohen and the Yalkut, considered that the Hebrew meant, "... Jerusalem will in the future be reaching as far as Damascus ... and this expression 'His rest' means nothing else than Jerusalem," (King, op. cit., pp. 47f).
who builds his upper chambers in the heavens, and founds his vault upon the earth;

... who has placed the Shekinah of His Glory in a strong place and honored His assembly upon the earth.

The addition of Shekinah ("the Shekinah of His Glory") avoids describing God as being localized to certain chambers -- even in heaven.

This same pattern of procedure is followed in those passages where God is said to be in the midst of (ֶלְךַר, ֶבֶר) people or of a place.

[5] JOEL¹ 2:27 L²

כִּי בֵּקֶרֶב יִשְׂרָאֵל ... that I am in the midst of Israel,

שָׁאַלְתִּי נַגְּמְאָה אֶלְצַרְיָה ... that I cause my Shekinah to dwell in the house of Israel.


---

¹Ginsburger (op. cit., p. 434) incorrectly reads Jon, for Joel.

²The same translation for the corresponding Hebrew occurs also in Zephaniah 3:5 L (see page 327), 15 L, and 17 L, where בֵּרֶב also occurs.

³Cf. also Zechariah 2:14(10) L, 15(11); and 8:3, where the preposition נַגְּמָה also occurs, and the Targum renders the same Hebrew idea in the same way. See page 306, footnote 2.
... and I will be the glory within her.

... and with honor I will cause My Shekinah to dwell with her.

In two passages, however, the targumist avoids this idea in a slightly different manner:

[7] HOSEA 11:9 L¹

... the Holy One in your midst,

Then I will covenant with you My Holy Shekinah.

[8] MICAH 3:11 L²

Is not the Lord in the midst of us?

Is not the Shekinah of Yahweh with us?

In several passages God is described as having His own place ( hakkil), temple ( זכיה), and habitation ( ל GFX). ¹ ² ³

¹Cf. also Amos 5:17 L, where not only place but motion with respect to God is involved. This verse is discussed in the next section. See pages 318f.

²A similar idea of the limitation of Deity to a given place may be observed in the query in Micah 7:10 (see page 264) and Joel 2:17. The latter reads, מָזַה לעתים חָמָן ("Where is their God?"). The targumist translates this by " בְּדִי הָאֲדָמָה ("Where are those who are redeemed by the Word of their God?"). In Malachi 2:17, however, the targumist translates מָזַה לעתים חָמָן ("Or by asking, "Where is the God of justice?")) accurately as וְלֹא אֲכָלֵה מֶשֶׁתָרָם דִּי הָאֲדָמָה ("Or, where is the God who makes justice?").

³For Zechariah 2:17(13), see pages 322f.
The targumist surprisingly is not consistent in his treatment of these terms.

[9] HOSEA 5:15

I will return again unto my place;
I will cause My Shekinah to ascend; I will return Him to My Holy Dwelling.

The verbs of motion involved in this passage, and in the following one, complicate the problem.

[10] MICAH 1:3 L¹

For behold, the Lord is coming forth out of his place,
For behold, Yahweh is revealed from the city of the house of His Shekinah,

In four places, in the Twelve, reference is made to God's Temple. In three passages the idea is translated literally, but in Habakkuk 2:20 the concept is altered.


¹The same translation occurs in Habakkuk 3:13 and Zechariah 14:3 for נג"ה ("to go forth"); in Hosea 6:3 the translation of נג"ו ("going forth") is literal.

²"The coming forth is rightly interpreted as a self-revelation." (Taylor, op. cit., p. 5).

³Jonah 2:8(7); Micah 1:2; and Malachi 3:1.
But the Lord is in his holy temple;

But Yahweh wished to place the Shekinah in the temple of his holiness.

The targumist also avoids depicting God as having upper chambers or a vault in Amos 9:5. In Micah 4:2, moreover, the Targum adds the Shekinah to "the house of the God of Jacob." The targumist may have thought that the context here suggested that God was localized to Jerusalem, and, thus, he avoided this statement by the addition of the Shekinah. Similarly, the Targum avoided the idea that God is "on high" by the use of the Shekinah:

[12] MICAH 6:6

shall I submit myself to the God whose Shekinah is in the high heavens?

Certain verbs, which imply that Deity may be found in certain places, are avoided by the Targum in a few instances. The verb, "to sit", for instance, is translated by "to reveal", a standard translation of a verb of motion. Similarly, the verb "to stand" is translated by "to reveal".

---

1See page 308.
2For the verb "to dwell" see page 306.
3Joel 4(3):12 L; Malachi 3:3.
4Habakkuk 3:6; Zechariah 14:4 (see page 225).
("to reveal"), but the cognate verb הָיַת ("to stand") is translated literally once and by מָגַן ("to ascend"), a verb of motion, once.

Two other verbs, הָיַת ("to withdraw") and נָשָׁה ("to depart"), must be considered. These verbs, strictly speaking, are verbs of motion, but in the context they imply that God is confined in space as well as that He moves about. Hence, the targumist follows the usual procedure in translating these verbs:

[13] HOSEA 5:6 L

והָיַת מַהַה

... he has withdrawn from them.

יסְלֵיָא שֵׁבְתֵיהּ מִנּוֹה

... His Shekinah has ascended from them.

[14] HOSEA 9:12 L

בֵּשָׁרוּ מַהַה

... when I depart from them!

בְּסַלְקוּתיָא שֵׁבְתֵיהּ מִנּוֹה

... when My Shekinah departs from them!

Two more groups of passages should be discussed here. The first group consists of about nine passages in which the targumist inserts Shekinah, and yet the motive for the insertion is not clear. For example, in Haggai 1:8 God tells the people to rebuild the temple, and then He adds:

---

1Amos 7:7.

2Amos 9:1.
and I will take pleasure in it, and I will be glorified.\footnote{American Jewish Translation.}

The targumist translates this passage as if he thought that the Hebrew limited Deity to a certain locality, namely as:

\begin{align*}
\text{וַיִּגְנָּעֶזֶר לְאַשְׁרָאֶה} & \quad \text{בָּקֶר} \\
\text{and I will choose (be pleased) to place My Shekinah in it with glory.}
\end{align*}

Perhaps the targumist considered that the only way God could take pleasure in the rebuilt temple and be glorified was for Him to dwell in it. Therefore, he used his usual method of avoiding any implication that God is not omnipresent.

Likewise, when God is said to have chosen Jerusalem, the translator may have considered that this implied that He would dwell there. Therefore, he follows his usual mode of rendering:

\begin{align*}
\text{זֶהָרֵיְהוּ יִתְוַה} & \quad \text{Jerusalem rebukes you!} \\
\text{הַנָּבָּא בְּיִروֹשָׁלַם} & \\
\text{The Lord who has chosen Jerusalem rebukes you!}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{יִגְנָּעֶזֶר יִתְוַה} & \quad \text{Yahweh who chose (was pleased) to place His Shekinah in Jerusalem} \\
\text{הַנָּבָּא בְּיִרוֹשָׁלַם} & \quad \text{rebukes you!}
\end{align*}

In Hosea 13:14\footnote{See page 220; see also Amos 9:3 L and Zephaniah 2:3 (see pages 296f). Cf. Hosea 5:3.} and Habakkuk 3:4 statements occur which
the targumist seemingly considered to have been opposed to
the idea that God is omnipresent and omniscient:

[16] HABAKKUK 3:4


There He revealed His Shekinah which had been hidden from the sons of men with great power.

The targumist may have considered that Micah 3:4¹ implied that God was not omnipresent, and, therefore, he made use of the intermediary, the Shekinah.

The targumist who interpreted the second chapter of Hosea allegorically may have considered the clause נִלְטָמָה הָשֵׁכִינָה ("... lest I strip her naked...")² to mean that God would leave Israel alone completely and, therefore, that He was not omnipresent. Hence, he translated:


lest I should remove My Shekinah from her³... .

The remaining three verses are much more difficult to understand. One verse (Zechariah 9:1⁴) has been discussed earlier in this chapter. The remaining two are:

¹See page 234.

²Hosea 2:5(3).

³This translation is somewhat less unfavorable to Israel.

⁴See page 307.
[17] HABAKKUK 3:8

Your Shekinah was strength and redemption to your people.

[18] ZEPHANIAH 3:7

My Shekinah will not destroy their habitations from the earth.

The final group of translations, which protects the targumist's belief in the omnipresence of Deity by avoiding the limitation of Deity to space, consists of statements that God is with someone, e.g., Israel:

[19] AMOS 5:14 E

... and so the Lord, the God of hosts, will be with you.

[20] HAGGAI 1:13 E

... and now the Word of Yahweh, the God of Hosts, will be at your assistance.

---

1According to footnote h, p. 981, Revised Standard Version.

2Essentially this same translation occurs in Zechariah 8:23 E, where the preposition יָגוּר occurs instead of יָכוּר.
I am with you,

My word is at your assistance,

This latter expression of the targumist also occurs in his translation of three passages, which involve the close connection of God and Israel, and is added in a fourth:

[21] HOSEA 1:9 E

 Yosemite  לא-אתיה לעמ

... and I am not your God.

 hodam  לא חוה

... and My Word will not be at your assistance.

[22] MICAH 2:13 E

 יזוחת בראשם

... the Lord at their head.

 וOMEMא רזוחת

... and the Word of Yahweh (is) at your assistance.

[23] HOSEA 11:11

Here the Targum adds to the statement that God will restore the Israelites to their homes,

1Essentially this same translation occurs in Haggai 2:4 E with the preposition את and in Zechariah 10:5 E (see Hamp, Der Bergriff "Wort" in den aramäischen Bibelübersetzungen [München: Pilser-Verlag, 1938], p. 50) with the preposition ב.

2One of these (Hosea 13:9) has already been considered; see pages259ff. Probably, in this instance, the יבִעֲשׂ ("against thy help") suggested the מִימֵרִי הוֹת בָּשָׁר הָמוֹן ("My Word will be at your assistance").

3So the Revised Standard Version: their footnote a, page 936 reads, "Heb 'I will not be yours".
Although the Targum does not avoid consistently limiting Deity in space\(^1\), the translations of the above passages clearly establish that the targumist does seek to safeguard his concept of an omnipresent Deity.

(2) THE DENIAL OF MOTION TO DEITY

Since the description of Deity as being in motion implies not only that God is not omnipresent but also that God has a visible form, the usual device that the targumist employs to soften this concept of Deity is to use the verb, ידנה ("to reveal"), for example:

\[
\text{הוֹזָא} \quad \text{that he may come}
\]
\[
\text{כָּנֵנַיִיתּוֹל} \quad \text{Now He is revealed}
\]

The only two exceptions to the translation of ידנה ("to come") as ידנה ("to reveal") occur in Malachi 3:1\(^3\) and Hosea 6:3. The latter is translated as follows:

\[1\text{Cf. Amos 1:2 L; see page 228, footnote 1.}\]
\[2\text{This same procedure is followed for ידנה ("to come") in Habakkuk 3:3; Zechariah 2:14(10); 14:5; and Malachi 4:5 (3:24).}\]
\[3\text{Translated essentially literally here as ידנה.}\]
... he will come to us as the showers,
... and blessings will come to us...

[2] MlMAH 1:3b L\(^1\) (ירד)

... and [the Lord] will come down...
... and will be revealed...


Then I will draw near to you for judgment;
Then I will be revealed unto you to make a decision;


Thou didst bestride the earth in fury,
When you bring a curse over those who hate your people, when you are revealed to break the wicked ones of the earth...

[5] AMOS 5:17 L\(^2\) (عبر)

---
\(^1\) For Micah 1:3a L (ק"י) see page 310, footnotes 1 and 2.

\(^2\) Elsewhere this verb is translated literally once (Micah 7:18), twice (Amos 7:8; 8:2) by בזא ("to send away"), and once (Hosea 10:11) the passage in which it occurs is interpreted allegorically. Therefore, nothing definite can be concluded regarding this verb, בזא ("to pass through").
... for I will pass through the midst of you,

... because the making of this punishment in your midst is revealed.

The verb "to go" ( EACH ליהל ) occurs but twice. Once\(^1\) it is translated essentially literally, but in Hosea 5:15 it occurs in close connection with the verb "to return" (ךשע of the verb "to return"). This passage, however, already has been discussed\(^2\). In two other passages the description of God as returning is associated closely with the conception that He repents. The targumist avoids this offensive concept by making man, not God, do the turning (or repenting).

[6] JONAH 3:9\(^3\) (ךשע)

מיירז"ע ישב והנה התואר
מל ידע ראתו בידיה.

內容 ישמא אסינן
ru'עיסיו אלו מחל

Who knows, God may yet repent and turn from his fierce anger,

Whosoever is conscious of guilt, let him turn away therefrom and he will receive God's compassion\(^4\) and He will turn from His strong rage.

In three passages the targumist avoids this concept

\(^1\)Hosea 5:14.

\(^2\)See page 310.

\(^3\)Also Joel 2:14 (see pages 249f.).

of Deity by the addition of Memra.

[7] HOSEA 2:11(9) (borah)

לך אשོ ему ולקחת therefore I will take back . . .

לך יחות palabras Then My Word will return to take back . . .

In the remaining occurrences the Targum translates literally2. This group of literal translations includes the concept of God restoring Israel from captivity3.

The verbs קומ ("to arise"), עז "arouse"), סור (hiphil, "remove"), and מחר ("to ride") are translated by when Deity is the subject, e.g.:

[8] ZEPHANIAH 3:11 (borah)

כֵּיָא אָדִיר מִטְברָךְ . . . for then I will remove from your midst your proudly exalting ones . . .

---

1 So also Micah 7:19 L essentially; cf. Hosea 11:9 E. In two passages (Zechariah 1:3 and Malachi 3:7) God looks ("ID) by the agency of His Memra. In Hosea 5:15 (page 310) the targumist uses an intermediary, the Shekinah.

2 E.g., Nahum 2:3(2); Zechariah 1:16; and 8:3.

3 Hosea 6:11; Joel 4(3):1; Amos 9:14; Zephaniah 2:7; and 3:20.

4 Zephaniah 3:8; in Amos 7:9 the verb is translated literally.

5 Zechariah 2:17(13); see pages 322f.

6 Zephaniah 3:11,15.

7 Habakkuk 3:8.
Then I will reveal among you your praiseworthy warriors. . .

Usually ירה (hiphil, "to bring down") is translated literally, but in two instances (Amos 8:9\(^1\); 9:2) the targumist alters.


From there I will bring them down.

From there by My Word they will be brought down.

At times the targumist also avoids the anthropomorphic action of God by the use of the impersonal third person plural and the addition of Memra. The idea of God "bringing down" also occurs in one other passage:


Bring down thy warriors, O Lord.

Then Yahweh will break the strength of their warriors.

This rendering avoids the description of Deity in motion and also avoids the offensive idea of God having

\(^1\) In Amos 8:9 the context probably caused the change in translation. Here the verb מְנָכָה ("to cover") occurs.

\(^2\) So also Obadiah 4.
heavenly warriors.

Two other verbs, usually translated literally, should be noted. Each verb, יהוה (hiphil = "to bring up") and נקע ("to take"), occurs in a passage which undergoes some alteration in the Targum.


By a prophet the Lord brought Israel up from Egypt,

Moreover when your fathers descended to Egypt, Yahweh sent a prophet and he caused Israel to ascend from Egypt.

The action of bringing Israel from Egypt has shifted more to the prophet than in our Masoretic Text.

[12] HAGGAI 2:23† (nakhe)

I will take you, O Zerubbabel

I will summon you, O Zerubbabel

[13] ZECHARIAH 2:17(13) (יער)

Be silent, all flesh, before the Lord; for he has roused himself from his holy dwelling.

---

1See Hosea 2:11(9), page 320.
The examination of the above passage establishes that the targumist sought to safeguard his conception of Deity as omnipresent, usually, by avoiding the use of verbs which describe Deity as in motion.

2. THE UNCHANGEABLENESS OF GOD

The suggestion that God was changeable and capricious was very offensive. Hence this concept was avoided in the Targum. This strong feeling probably accounts for the translations concerning God's repenting (מוה and חז). The thought of God repenting implies that He changes His mind.

1 Probably the verb of motion accounts for this translation rather than the limitation to a given locality.

2 Perhaps the Targum understood רומד in Micah 2:7 to mean, "Do I change?". The Targum renders this clause as ["עביד" כחר רחאמש, "Is not what I said really correct?"]

3 See page 248.

4 See Joel 2:14 (see pages 249f); Jonah 3:9 (see pages 319f).
This concept of Deity was intolerable.

3. THE OMNISCIENCE OF GOD

Another derogatory implication was that God was not omniscient. Especially the statement, made by God Himself that there was something that He did not know, would be offensive:

[1] HOSEA 8:4

וְלָא יְדַעֵי • • • but without my knowledge.

וְלָא מִרְצְעוֹ • • • but not by My Will.

The statements that God could forget also implies that He was not omniscient, and, consequently, such assertions were altered:


אֲשֶׁר בָּנָי I also will forget your children.

אֲרָה יָבֹא I will drive out your sons.


אַס-אֲשָׁבָת לְגַזְת Surely I will never forget any of their deeds.

כִּל-מְעַשְׁיָמָם Surely all your works will be forgotten.

The translation in Hosea 4:6 is anthropomorphic, but

1This is the only instance in the Twelve where God is said not to know something.
it avoids the implication that God could ever forget anyone (or anything) -- i.e., that He is not omniscient. In Amos 8:7, however, both the anthropomorphism and the offensive implication that God was not omniscient were avoided.

In Jonah 1:6 and Hosea 7:2 statements occur which imply that God could be forgetful. Therefore, these statements were avoided by the targumist:


Perhaps the god will give a thought to us,

Perhaps compassion may be shown from Yahweh unto us,

[5] HOSEA 7:2 L^1

... that I remember all their evil works.

... that all their evil deeds are revealed before Me.

The passages which depict anyone as being hidden from

^1In Hosea 8:13 and 9:9 the Masoretic Text states that God will remember (הָאַרַי) Israel's iniquity (ดาวע). The context in both instances suggests that God's remembrance is for the purpose of punishment. Hence, the Targum states that God will exact (שִׁפַע) the penalty of their sins (לְתוֹרֵבֶת). In Habakkuk 3:2, on the other hand, the Targum translates the plea for God, in wrath, to remember compassion (בִּגְדָמוֹת וְיַעֲקֹב; רעֵוֵי, רעֵוֵי רעֵוֵי וְיַעֲקֹב וְיַעֲקֹב; the translation) as "but the just who do your Will, You remember with pity."). This last translation retains the idea of God as remembering even though the other three passages in the Targum avoid this concept.
God not only are anthropomorphic, but they imply a lack of knowledge on the part of Deity. The targumist alters these passages\(^1\) in his translation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{AMOS 9:3} \\
\text{Though they hide themselves... and though they hide from my sight at the bottom of the sea,} \\
\text{And if they think to hide... and if they hide in the islands of the sea from My Word,}
\end{align*}
\]

Although the Targum translates the one remaining passage\(^2\) literally, yet the eight passages considered demonstrate that the Targum attempted to avoid the implication that God was not omniscient.

4. THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE TARGUMIST’S CONCEPT
OF THE CHARACTER OF DEITY

In conclusion, there are several passages in which the desire of the targumist to safeguard his concept of Deity has motivated the changes in his translation.

(1) ZEPHANIAH 1:16\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) For Hosea 13:14 see page 220, for Micah 3:4 see page 234, and for Zephaniah 2:3 see page 296f.

\(^2\) Hosea 5:3.

\(^3\) Cf. Zechariah 2:17(13); see pages 322f.
The Targum retains the essential idea of the Hebrew but softens it slightly by changing calmayi Universities ("all the inhabitants") to "all the wicked". This change avoids stating that God would destroy everyone by asserting that He would destroy only all the wicked persons.

(2) ZEPHANIAH 1:12

The Lord will not do good, nor will He do ill.

This translation avoids having anyone say that the Lord will not do either good or evil.

(3) ZEPHANIAH 3:5

The Lord within her is righteous, he does no wrong; The righteous Yahweh says that he will cause His Shekinah to dwell in her midst and no one does falsely before Him.

This translation also avoids stating that God will not do wrong. Probably the expression "within her" accounts for the addition of Shekinah.  

1 See pages 305-317.
Another passage (Hosea 2:18[16]) safeguards Deity by the elimination of the title 'Baal' for God. This translation also may result from a pro-Israel bias as well as from the desire to avoid a cultically offensive term applied to Deity.

In one passage the Davidic line is compared to Deity. This idea would be offensive for several reasons; the targumist softens it:

(4) ZECHARIAH 12:8

David shall be like God,
and the house of

David will be as princes.

A similar desire to avoid implying that man is as great as, or greater than God, may account for the translation of Hosea 12:4(3). Alternately, the strong anthropomorphic description may be the reason.

(5) HOSEA 12:4(3)

he strove with God.

... and in his manhood

1Only instance of this in the Twelve; see page 200.

2Cf. "Onk. and Ps. Jon. Gen iii 5, vi 2, 4, xxxii 10
Onk. has also 1 הרביה (Jansma, op. cit., p. 116).

3Only instances in the Twelve of this idea.

4Cf. Hosea 12:5(4) where the Masoretic Text also substitutes הָגָלָם ("angel") for בָּל ("God").
Finally, in Hosea 1:6 the Targum softens the Hebrew which implies that God will have no mercy upon Israel. The clause, which the Targum adds, not only is favorable to God's character but also more favorable to Israel:

(6) **HOSEA 1:6**

כִּי-נָשָׁא אָשָׁא לָהּ ֥וֹתָם

... to forgive them at all.

אִם יִחְוָבֵל מְשָׁבכָּנַיְם לִתְהוֹן

If they return, I will surely forgive them.

These passages illustrate the attempts of the targumist to avoid (or soften) statements in the Hebrew which were offensive to his theological concepts.

---

1In Micah 7:18, the translation is literal. These are the only two verses in the Twelve in which נָפֵל is used in the meaning of God forgiving.
CHAPTER IX

THE ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHIC AND PROTECTIVE
DEVICES USED IN THE TARGUM

Several different intermediaries and devices were added by the targumist to avoid the ascription of human form to Deity and/or to safeguard Him by the elimination of derogatory actions either performed by him or directed towards Him, and the like. These devices and intermediaries have been constantly mentioned in the preceding chapters (VI - VIII) in Section III. These different added safeguards will be considered here separately, and, in the case of the intermediaries, some of their theological implications will be noted. An attempt will be made to discover the relationship, if any, which exists between these devices and intermediaries.

1. THE FEAR AND/OR WORSHIP OF DEITY

Two Aramaic words which are almost synonymous are recurring constantly in the Targum. These words are: מְלַאכָּה и פָּנַי. The former is from the root מַלַּח meaning primarily to till or work. Thus it comes to mean service to man or Deity and, hence, to worship. The noun denotes servitude or service but is used especially to refer to the priestly (Temple) service and worship. The latter word (פָּנַי) is from the root פָּנַי to be depressed, bent, and then to fear, shun, worship, and revere. The noun thus has reference either to the actor, i.e., the fearer or worshipper,
or to the recipient of the action, the thing feared, and, therefore, means either fear or deity. Consequently, this word comes to refer also to the fear or worship of Deity.

(1) **THE WORSHIP (.Feed) OF GOD**

This noun occurs in the Twelve approximately forty¹ (or forty-two²) times. Usually this word has been added whenever a relationship between God and man, stated in anthropomorphic terms, conveyed a cultic (religious) connotation. Thus when man is said to leave (depart)³, go astray from⁴, turn away from⁵, forget⁶ (or remember⁷) God, return to⁸, come (draw) near to⁹, be in dread of (come trembling to)¹⁰,

¹Hosea 1:2; 2:4 (twice), 5, 9, 15, 18; 3:3, 5, 5; 4:10, 12, 17; 5:4, 8; 6:1; 7:10; 8:3, 14; 9:1; 10:1; 11:10; 12:1, 7; 13:6; 14:3; Joel 2:12, 13; Amos 4:6, 8, 9, 10, 11; Jonah 2:8; Zephaniah 1:6; 3:2; Haggai 2:17; Zechariah 1:3; 11:8; Malachi 3:7.

²Hosea 2:9; 9:8.

³Hosea 1:2 (.Feed); 4:10 (.Feed); 4:17 (a pro-Israel alteration -- idea of departure by man found in the Targum alone).

⁴Hosea 4:12; 9:1; cf. 8:3 where the targumist has understood 21א to refer to God.

⁵Zephaniah 1:6; cf. addition in Targum of Hosea 5:8.

⁶Hosea 2:15; 8:14; 13:6 ( Rape).

⁷Jonah 2:8 ( ראי).

⁸Hosea 2:9; 3:5; 5:4; 6:1; 7:10; 12:7; 14:3; Joel 2:12, 13; Amos 4:6, 8, 9, 10, 11; Haggai 2:17; Zechariah 1:3; Malachi 3:7 ( ראי).

⁹Zephaniah 3:2 ( ראי ); cf. addition in the Targum of Hosea 2:5.

¹⁰Hosea 3:5 (.Feed ).
walk after\(^1\), or seek\(^2\) God, then God was safeguarded by the appropriate addition of יִהְיוּד or יִהְיוּד with the required pronominal suffix. In this manner the targumist eliminated the offensive anthropomorphic language and yet retained the meaning of the Hebrew, e.g., for one to return to God means that the person concerned has returned to the worship of God.

In five passages, however, יִהְיוּד occurs in situations where another device would have been expected. In Hosea 2:4(2) where Israel is described as Yahweh's wife and in 2:18(16) where Yahweh is stated to be Israel's husband, יִהְיוּד scarcely would have been anticipated. Normally the intermediary, the אֶרֶם, was used wherever the description of God was extremely grossly anthropomorphic, e.g., when He is described as being like a farmer, as having parts of the human body, and the like. Therefore, this device (ארם) would have been expected in Hosea 2:18(16). The context both in Hosea 2:18(16) and in Hosea 2:4(2)\(^3\) was unsuitable for the use of ארם. Moreover, since the targumist considered this chapter to be manifestly allegorical, he apparently thought the term יִהְיוּד to be more suitable for use in Hosea 2:18(16).

Probably a similar exegetical motive would explain

---

\(^1\)Hosea 11:10 (יִהְיוּד); cf. also Hosea 2:9(7).

\(^2\)Hosea 3:5 (ץִבּוּל).

\(^3\)For the circumlocution employed here, see pages 200f.
the use in Zechariah 11:8 where God stated that the people of Israel hated Him, although here another device easily could have been employed. The selection, however, of this word retained for the Aramaic translation the real meaning of the Hebrew and yet avoided the very offensive statement, especially from the mouth of God Himself. The other two passages are of a more cultic nature. In the last part of Hosea 2:4(2) עזילית occurs again in the allegorical interpretation of "And her adulteries from between her breasts;" as referring to the worship of idols. Similarly in Hosea 10:1 Israel no longer increases the number of his altars, an especially offensive cultic concept, but rather he has multiplied worship at his altars.

Two more passages perhaps should be mentioned. In one (Hosea 2:9) an explanatory addition "when I used to be (in) service before Him", is made at the close of the verse, and in the other (Hosea 9:8) the statement that Ephraim was a watchman with my God was altered to refer to the worship of idols.

Therefore עזילית occurs in passages which are descriptive of the religious relationship between God and man and where the targumist possibly desired to emphasize this religious and cultic relationship.

1American Jewish Translation.
This particular word ( населения) is used less frequently as a protective addition. In all, it occurs about twenty\(^1\) times in the Twelve. In many of these places it corresponds to the use of [ noen, e.g., to seek God\(^2\), to walk with Him\(^3\), to return to Him\(^4\), to depart from Him\(^5\), and to remember God\(^6\). Comparison of these passages with those which utilize the addition of [ noen does not disclose any significant constant factor. In these instances, at least, the two different Aramaic words were regarded as synonymous. Perhaps they were introduced either by different translators or by different groups of translators.

אֱלֹהִים, however, is used in certain places where [ noen is excluded. For example, in Hosea 4:1,6; 6:3\(^7\), where the Hebrew refers to the knowledge of God, אֱלֹהִים has been added, possibly to avoid any suggestion that God's knowledge might

\(^1\)Hosea 4:1,6; 5:15; 6:3; 7:13; 8:10; 10:12; 13:13; 14:2; Amos 5:4,6; Micah 6:8; Habakkuk 2:14; Zephaniah 1:6; 2:3; Zechariah 8:6; 10:9; 11:13; Malachi 2:2 (twice).

\(^2\)Hosea 5:15 (ארֹשׁ); Hosea 10:12; Amos 5:4,6 (שד); Zephaniah 1:6; 2:3 (שְׁדָו).

\(^3\)Micah 6:8 (יְדָיו).

\(^4\)Hosea 14:2 (בְּנָשׁ).

\(^5\)Hosea 7:13 (לְבוֹז).

\(^6\)Zechariah 10:9 (בְּנִי).

\(^7\)Cf. the addition in the Targum of Hosea 13:13 and the substitution for glory in Habakkuk 2:14 (knowledge of God's glory).
be limited, as well as to avoid the anthropomorphic language. Moreover, unlike מִנָּה is used as a substitute for the personal pronoun, where the targumist may have interpreted it as referring to Deity. This happens perhaps twice in Malachi 2:2 and possibly also in Hosea 8:10 and Zechariah 8:6. These passages also may stem from a Hebrew text which is slightly different from the Masoretic Text.

Finally, in the Targum of Zechariah 11:13 God states that He has made his Fear (מאים) precious in their sight. This may be the translation of the Hebrew אֶשֶׁר יִקְרָאֵנוּ בְּעַלְפֵיהֶם ("... that I was prized at of them.") These passages are of particular interest because the Memra (םימרא) is the usual substitute for the personal pronoun whether it is expressly stated or implied by the verb in the Hebrew.

(3) THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN מִנָּה AND דָּחַל

מִנָּה and דָּחַל, based upon the above cited occurrences in the Twelve, seem to be synonymous expressions which probably were introduced by different translators or groups of translators. The word, מִנָּה, however, is used apparently as a substitute for the personal pronoun in places where the context would not have been thought to suggest either מִנָּה or דָּחַל. The only known instances in the Twelve where מִנָּה is used as a substitute for the personal pronoun are where the sense of the passages naturally

---

1 See following remark in Section (3).

2 American Jewish Translation.
would suggest its use.

2. THE WILL (brit) OF GOD

This word (brit = pleasure, will, goodwill, ambition) is scarcely an anti-anthropomorphic device of any importance. In this capacity it occurs very plainly only once, namely, in Hosea 6:5, where it is a substitute for the mouth of God, but in Hosea 8:4 it is the means by which the targumist avoids the offensive statement by God that there existed something which He did not know. He interprets (and perhaps correctly) that the essential idea of the Hebrew is that an act had been performed which was contrary to the will of God, and so he translates מראות. Perhaps the most interesting of these passages occurs in Zechariah 11:11 where those who heed (רומ) God is altered by the Targum to those who perform His will — a concept which avoids the offensive implications of the Hebrew and yet retains its substance.

The remaining instances are mainly of interpretative additions to the text which involve the idea of serving (doing) God's will, (e.g., Hosea 6:7; Habakkuk 3:2; Zechariah 11:12; Malachi 3:12 — the last one, for instance, giving as the reason that Israel was praised by the heathen the fact that Israel performed God's will in His land.).

3. THE GLORY ( Raptors ) OF GOD

The word (Raptors)¹ is used in the Targum to translate

¹ Raptors is the usual translation of היכל.
The word, however, occurs in some ten other passages as additions or substitutions.

In several passages the glory becomes an anti-anthropomorphic device. It is added in the Targum to avoid the concept of God standing ( עובר) in Amos 9:1, to avoid the picture of God being seen in Habakkuk 3:10, and, in Malachi 1:5, to alter the statement that God is magnified to the conception of the glory of God being made great. In the same manner the glory together with other alterations avoids the idea of God having horses in Habakkuk 3:8,15 and is involved in the anti-anthropomorphic alteration in Habakkuk 3:4.

Finally, נברון is added in Amos 9:6 and Zechariah 9:8 to the Shekinah and once in Habakkuk 3:4 without any apparent reason.

4. THE POWER (גבורת ) OF GOD

The word ( גבורת) properly denotes the superiority, strength, or might of an object, animal, or person. When it refers to God it also may signify the Divine Majesty or even God Himself as well as the manifestations of His Power.

In the Targum this word occurs approximately sixteen

---

1It is also used to convey the verbal idea in Haggai 1:8.

2See page 226, 260f.

3See page 313f.

4Hosea 5:14; Amos 1:8; Habakkuk 3:2,3,6,8,9,11; Zephaniah 1:4; 2:13; Zechariah 2:9(13); 9:8 (twice); 12:4; 13:7.
times and frequently is an anti-anthropomorphic device. Coupled with "blow, stroke" it is found five times as a substitute for the "hand" of Deity. In each instance the Hebrew conveys the idea of Divine punishment and implies that some mighty act is to be accomplished by Him. Twice (Zechariah 9:8; 13:14) the word (ָּסֵנְאָא) occurs alone to avoid presenting the idea of God being the possessor of eyes. Already in the Hebrew there is the suggestion that the opening of God's eyes is a metaphorical figure -- the targumist interprets it as a favourable action on the part of Deity.

ָּסֵנְאָא is also a device utilized to avoid the concept of weapons. Thus, it occurs for a bow in Habakkuk 3:9 and for a spear in Habakkuk 3:11.

In each example cited thus far the anthropomorphic picture implies the might of God, and this has been replaced by an anti-anthropomorphic expression which has heightened this implication into a stated certainty. In certain passages also the concept of God's power is not so self-evident. When ָּסֵנְאָא is used to safeguard Deity in Habakkuk 3:2 from the anthropomorphic implication of having a mouth in the statement that His report (ַּנַּשְּ) had been heard, the picture of fear, etc., in the context suggests the possibility that the report was a powerful one. The Targum has interpreted this possibility as being a certainty. Similarly the targumist added ָּסֵנְאָא to describe the wrath (or vengenance) of God in Habakkuk 3:8.

---

1 Amos 1:8 L; Zechariah 1:4 L; 2:13 L; Zechariah 2:9(13) L; 13:7 L.
One of the most uncertain passages occurs in Habakkuk 3:6 where "His goings are as of old."\(^1\) has been interpreted as "the eternal power which is His."\(^2\). Moreover, in several places has been added apparently only with the motive of emphasizing the Majesty or Might of Deity, e.g., in Hosea 5:14, Habakkuk 3:3; Zechariah 9:8.

Hence, the targumist apparently used גבורה when he either wished to stress the Might of God or interpreted the Hebrew to convey that idea.

5. THE SHEKINAH ( שְׁכִינָה \(^2\)) OF GOD

The Shekinah is one of the most popular intermediary devices employed by the targumist. In all it occurs about thirty-four\(^3\) times and is chiefly used to avoid limiting God to a given place. The use of the intermediary serves to make God less immanent and more transcendent, as well as more omnipresent, than our Masoretic Text does. Thus, the Shekinah becomes "... a way of speaking about God such as conveys

---

\(^1\)American Jewish Translation.

\(^2\)The term, 'shekinah', is derived from the Hebrew root, לְשׁ ("to dwell"). The derived noun, therefore, means "that which dwells". This word does not occur in the Old Testament but frequently does occur in the Talmud and twice in the Midrash also.

\(^3\)Hosea 2:5(3),25(29); 5:6,15; 9:3,12; 11:9; 13:14; Joel 2:27; 4(3):17,21; Amos 9:6; Micah 1:3; 3:4,11; 4:2; 6:6; Habakkuk 2:20; 3:4,6; Zephaniah 3:5,7,15,17; Haggai 1:8; Zechariah 2:9,14,15; 3:2; 8:3; 9:1,2,8; and Malachi 3:12.
the truth of His omnipresence, accessibility and special activity within the created world without infringing the doctrine of His transcendence.\(^1\)

The Shekinah implies the Divine Presence or Manifestation\(^2\) and illustrates beautifully the paradox of Rabbinical theology which first makes God very aloof and transcendent and then strives by various means to bridge the gap which had been created between God and man. The Targum adds Shekinah whenever the Hebrew would limit God as to space.\(^3\) Hence even the idea of the removal of God from a place would require this use of the Shekinah\(^4\) which was extended to include the avoidance of such anthropomorphic possessions as land, temple, house, etc. The Shekinah was used even to circumvent the statement that God was localized in heaven(on high). Gradually the concept of the Shekinah in the Targum was

---


\(^2\) The Shekinah is very closely connected with the Holy Spirit; see, for example, Box, G. H., *op. cit.*, p. 117.

\(^3\) See Section 1(1), pages 305ff.


\(^5\) Hosea 2:25; 9:3; cf. used with respect to Israel in Malachi 3:12.

\(^6\) Habakkuk 2:20

\(^7\) Micah 4:2; cf. pages 305ff for the usual avoidance of this anthropomorphic possession.

\(^8\) Micah 6:6
extended (and personified\(^1\)) to the point that it could be a substitute for God Himself, e.g., in Hosea 5:6

"His Shekinah has ascended from them," appears for דלך ממעה ("... he has withdrawn from them"), and in Micah 3:11 for יאיא אוחה יבגון ("Is not the Lord in the midst of us?") the Targum reads עליא עבגנה יאוחה יבגון ("Is not the Shekinah of Yahweh in our midst?")\(^2\). The indentification of the Shekinah with God led to statements such as אבגנה ("My Shekinah is holy") in Hosea 11:9, and the like.

Therefore, the Shekinah is the standard term which is added when God is limited by space in the Hebrew text, i.e., it is used whenever the omnipresence of Deity is to be asserted\(^3\).

6. THE MEMRA (Memra) OF GOD

This is the final intermediary added in the Targum to avoid certain types of anthropomorphisms which will be

---

\(^1\)The "... shekinah acquires what semblance of personality it has solely by being a circumlocution for God in contexts where personal states or actions are attributed to him." (Moore, George Foot: "Intermediaries in Jewish Theology", Harvard Theological Review 15(1922): p. 59).

\(^2\)Cf. the Targum of Habakkuk 3:4.

\(^3\)Moore, op. cit., p. 56.

\(^4\)This word is the Aramaic equivalent of the late Hebrew word, ידנה, which is derived from ידנה ("to say"). Hence Memra can mean, "dictum". Cf. Moore, op. cit., p. 47.
discussed here. In fact, in the Targum the Memra is the favourite anti-anthropomorphic expression.

No doubt the roots of this intermediary are to be found in the Old Testament as Oesterley and Box observe. Certainly passages such as, "I stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you the word of the Lord,"; "He has despised the word of the Lord,"; "The word of the Lord tried him,"; "He sendeth His word and healeth them,"; "Thy word have I hid in my heart,"; and "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made"; all contributed to laying the foundation for the subsequent development of this concept. On the other hand, it should be remembered, that Memra customarily is not used to translate the word (כְּוַיּוֹ) of

---

1 For other intermediaries see pages 400ff.

2 It is strange that such a popular device is essentially limited by the rabbis to the Targums. "Possibly on account of the Christian dogma, rabbinic theology, outside of the Targum literature, made little use of the term 'Memra'." (Kohler, Kaufmann, "Memra", The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. 8, 1908-6, New York City: Funk and Wagnalls Co., p. 465).


4 Deuteronomy 5:5.

5 Numbers 15:31.

6 Psalms 105:19.


8 Psalms 119:11.

9 Psalms 33:6.

10 The usual translation is בְּלַיְבָנָא ("word"), (so Moore, op. cit., pp. 45f.)
God or expressions like 'God spake' or 'God said'.

In the post-Biblical world God's creative activity was conceived, as above in Psalms 33:6, as being meditated, as it were, by (through) the Word of God. This development of the concept of the Word prepared the way for the targumist. Other instances of the development of this concept are: "In the words of the Lord are his works,"¹ and "O God . . . Who hast made all things with thy word . . . .²"

The gradual development of this intermediate agent, however, alone would not account for the theological position of the targumist. Again the decisive factor is the belief in the transcendent Deity who, although He was not directly (i.e. personally) involved in the events of history, could not be divorced from them. It was inconceivable that God should have less interest in His people, etc., than He had shown in former ages. Therefore, although " . . . it was held to be derogatory on the part of Jehovah to concern Himself personally with mere human affairs, . . . On the other hand, it was inconceivable that God should forget about, and forsake, His own creation."³ In this connection a distinction must be made between the doctrine of God as held by the targumist and the doctrine of the Alexandrian theologian. The former held

¹Ecclesiasticus 42:15.
²Wisdom 9:1.
³Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 209.
that God is virtually unknowable\(^1\) while the latter considered Him to be without qualities\(^2\). Moreover, the targumist, unlike Philo, did not "... speculate about the position of the Word relatively to God ... [He was] content to connect ... [his] generalizations with the O T representation of the creation of the world mediately through Wisdom."\(^3\) In this he did not develop further the "obscure and intermediate position" of Wisdom by his intermediary of the Memra. Hence, the Memra occupies essentially the same position in the Targum as the earlier concept of the Wisdom (α&omicron;r&omicron;x or σοφία) of Judaism although the Memra is given perhaps wider scope than the earlier Wisdom.

(1) THE USE OF MEMRA TO AVOID ANTHROPOMORPHIC EXPRESSIONS

Altogether Memra occurs almost one hundred times in the Targum\(^4\). In the Targum a distinction is made between

---

\(^{1}\)Fairweather, W., "Development of Doctrine in the Apocryphal Period", Hastings, James, A Dictionary of the Bible (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1904), Extra Vol., p. 284.

\(^{2}\)Loc. cit.

\(^{3}\)Fairweather, op. cit., p. 284.

\(^{4}\)Moses 1:7,9; 2:4,11,17; 3:2; 5:7,8,12,14(twice); 6:5,7; 7:13,14; 8:4; 9:10,17; 10:9,10; 11:4,6,9(twice); 10,11; 13:7,8,9(twice); 14:14,15; 14:1,8,9(twice); Joel 2:11(twice); 13, 17,23; 4(3):8,16; Amos 1:2; 4:11; 5:14; 6:8; 9:2(twice); 3,4; Obadiah 4,13; Jonah 2:5; 3:5; 4:2; Micah 1:2; 2:7,13; 3:11; 3:14; 7:7,10,14,19; Nahum 1:7; Habakkuk 1:12,13; 3:2,5,6,9, 11,13,18; Zephaniah 3:2,8,11,14; Haggai 1:12,13; 2:4; Zechariah 1:3,4; 2:9; 3:7; 4:6; 6:15; 7:12; 8:14,23; 10:5,7,12; 11:8; 12:5; Malachi 3:5,7,14.
the Word as spoken (Pithgama1) and the Word as speaking or revealing Himself (Memra)2. Thus מַאֲמָר is almost never used when הבaceous יwould have been used in the Hebrew3; instead מַמְרָא is used. Memra is reserved (in part at least) to avoid the grosser anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew. Thus Memra occurs when God is compared to a farmer4, is described as being a witness5, or is stated not to be or to function in the capacity of a man6. It is used to avoid ascribing to God certain portions of the human body; thus, the Memra is a substitute for God’s eyes7, heart8, mouth9, feet10, voice11,

1Cf. e.g., Amos 3:1; 5:10; 7:16; Jonah 3:5; Micah 2:7; Habakkuk 2:3; Zephaniah 2:5; Haggai 1:3; 2:5; Zechariah 1:6; 4:6; 7:7; 9:1; 11:11.
2Edersheim, op. cit., I, p. 47.

3Apparent exceptions are found in Hosea 13:14 (here is pointed "plague" in the Masoretic Text) and Joel 2:11.

4Hosea 11:4 E.
5Micah 1:2 E; Malachi 3:5.
6Hosea 2:4; 11:9 E.
7Amos 9:3 L; 4 L; Jonah 2:5 L; Habakkuk 1:13 L.
8Hosea 11:8.
9Hosea 6:5; Micah 4:4; cf. also Joel 4(3):8; Obadiah 18.
10Habakkuk 3:5 L.
11Joel 2:11 L; 4(3):16 L; Amos 1:2 L; Haggai 1:12 L; Zechariah 6:15 L.
hand\(^1\), and even God's *nephesh*\(^2\) and spirit\(^3\).

Certain anthropomorphic actions\(^4\) of God also are eliminated by the use of Memra. Moreover, certain derogatory actions of men towards God which imply His anthropomorphic nature are now directed towards the Memra instead, e.g., rebellion against God\(^5\), being against God\(^6\), leaning on God\(^7\), hearing\(^8\) or looking\(^9\) to Him, answering (responding)\(^10\), waiting on God\(^11\), and rejoicing\(^12\), believing\(^13\) and being strong\(^14\) in God. The anthropopathic action of God repenting\(^15\) which also

\(^1\)Amos 9:2 L; see section 4, pages 337ff.
\(^2\)Amos 6:8; Zechariah 11:8. The term *ywdl* ("by his soul") in the Hebrew usually means "by himself" -- see Knight, op. cit., p. 42; cf. pages 37, footnote 2.
\(^3\)Micah 2:7; Zechariah 4:6; 7:12.
\(^4\)Redeem (Hosea 1:7; 3:2; Micah 7:10); Chastise (?) (Hosea 10:10); Meet (Hosea 9:10 E); Answering (Hosea 14:9); and look on (Hosea 14:9).
\(^5\)Hosea 5:7,8; 6:7 (twice); 7:13 L,14L; 10:9 (addition); 14:1; Habakkuk 3:2 (addition), 6 (addition); Zephaniah 3:11 L.
\(^7\)Micah 3:11; Nahum 1:7 L.
\(^8\)Hosea 9:17 L; Zechariah 1:4 L.
\(^9\)Micah 7:7.
\(^10\)Hosea 2:17.
\(^11\)Zephaniah 3:8.
\(^12\)Joel 2:23; Habakkuk 3:18; Zechariah 10:7.
\(^13\)Jonah 3:5; Zephaniah 3:2.
\(^14\)Zechariah 10:12; 12:5.
\(^15\)"Places in which it is said that God 'repented' (was sorry, changed his mind) are treated in various ways, according to the context." (Moore, op. cit., p. 50).
implies that He is changeable is avoided by the addition of Memra in Joel 2:13 L; Jonah 4:2; Zechariah 8:14. Memra is also the usual device to eliminate the animistic description of Deity.

Finally, the targumist apparently had a text unaltered by the Sopherim, and, so to protect God from the derogatory and anthropomorphic implication that it was possible for God to die, he translated (in Habakkuk 1:12) the idea as מִימְרוֹת יְהוָה ("Your word endures [is established] forever, O Yahweh,"\(^2\)).

In one respect the intermediary Memra seemingly functions in the same capacity as the Shekinah — namely to deny place to God. Whenever the statement occurs that God is with Israel, the Targum has rendered this as, אַל אִשָּׁה, מִימְרוֹת יְהוָה אֲלֵהֶיהָ ("The Word of Yahweh, the God of Hosts, is at your assistance,"\(^3\)). This statement occurs in the negative in Hosea 1:9 where the Hebrew reads לא אִשָּׁה, לָא אֶתָּה הָעָשְׂרֵי הַמַּעֲשֵׂהוֹן ("... and I am not your God,"\(^2\)); in Hosea 11:11 as an addition, and in Hosea 13:9 where the targumist changes the entire verse to avoid the statement that Israel was against God. The question, therefore, arises: why did the targumist use Memra here instead of Shekinah? The reason in

---

\(^1\)See section [3], pages 239ff,
\(^2\)See page 14.
\(^3\)Amos 5:14 E; cf. Haggai 1:3 E; 2:4 E; Zechariah 8:23 E; 10:5 E.
Hosea 1:9 is fairly obvious. He substituted Memra for the personal pronoun, as he frequently does, and then substituted בְּכֵי for הָלְכוּ in order to make the meaning intelligible. Perhaps, having established this pattern here, it was easy to follow whenever the comparatively similar Hebrew clause מַהוּ or one of its equivalents occurred. If so, the addition in Hosea 11:11, its inclusion in the re-constructed verse of Hosea 13:9, and its use as the translation of דְּרָשְׁהוּ ("... the Lord at their head") may be understood easily. In any case, the targumist preferred not to translate these verses in a manner which would require the use of the Shekinah but apparently interpreted them in some anthropomorphic sense.

Moreover, the omnipresence of Deity is safeguarded by Memra (or by the statement that God is acting by means of [with] His Memra) in several instances of motion. The verbs are limited to the hiphil of רָיָם and to בּוֹשָׁה. Finally, the omnipresence of God also is safeguarded by the alteration of the question אָנוּ חַיָּיָאָה ("Where is their God?") to אָנוּ חַיָּיָאָה ("Where are those who were redeemed by the Word of their God?").

---

1 For example Hosea 5:14; 8:4, et. al.
2 Micah 2:13.
3 Amos 9:2; Obadiah 4.
4 Hosea 2:11 E; 11:9 E; Micah 7:19 L; Zechariah 1:3; Malachi 3:7.
5 Joel 2:17.
These passages which use Memra as a means (completely or partially) to avoid the limitation of Deity as to space and motion, may, of course, result from an anti-anthropomorphic bias, or they may be illustrative of the instances "... where the Targum inserts the word Memra ... even when there is no danger of anthropomorphism." More likely they are illustrative of Ginsburger's rule: "Whenever a relation is predicted of God, through which His spiritual presence an earthly being must be assumed, the paraphrase with Memra is employed."

The motivation, however, becomes increasingly less clear when Memra is used as a substitute for a possession as, for instance, a staff, an arrow, or as a substitute for "" (charge, service). While the elimination of the first two (staff and arrow) is anti-anthropomorphic, to alter the concept of keeping God's charges scarcely can be so regarded. Thus, possibly these alterations, following Nahmanides', suggest "that the Memra has a deep theological

---

1Abelson, J., op. cit., p. 152. Abelson here refers to Nahmanides' statement.
3Abelson's translation, op. cit., p. 151.
4Micah 7:14.
5Habakkuk 3:11.
6Zechariah 3:7; Malachi 3:14.
7So Abelson, op. cit., p. 152.
or mystical significance."\(^1\)

The scarcity\(^2\) of these instances in the Twelve has prevented the discovery of this significance in this investigation.

\[(2) \text{ THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE MEMRA TO THE SHEKINAH}\]

The first, apparently self-evident, distinction between Memra and Shekinah is that the Memra is used to avoid the grosser anthropomorphic and animistic descriptions of Deity while the Shekinah avoids the limitations of Deity to space. Hence Memra was used at times in connection with God's land, house, etc.

Secondly, the Shekinah is far more impersonal\(^3\) than the Memra\(^4\). Sanday\(^5\), moreover, maintains that the Memra participates actively in Israel's redemption, whereas the Shekinah does not. This is not completely true because already in the Targum the Shekinah is becoming personalized\(^6\), and in

\[^{1}\text{Abelson (loc. cit.) et al.}\]
\[^{2}\text{Cf. the Memra in Habakkuk 3:9,13 where the reason for its presence is especially obscure.}\]
\[^{3}\text{Cf. Sanday, W., "God (in N T)"; Hastings, J., A Dictionary of the Bible, (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1905), II, p. 207, and Oesterley and Box, op. cit., p. 218.}\]
\[^{4}\text{On the other hand, Knight (op. cit., p. 105) considers that the Shekinah is the next step forward in the Targum from the Memra.}\]
\[^{5}\text{Sanday, op. cit., p. 207.}\]
\[^{6}\text{At least to the point of indentification with God; cf. Abelson, op. cit., p. 79.}\]
the Targum of Habakkuk 3:8 the Shekinah is described as being redemption and strength to the Israelite peoples.¹

Thirdly, the Shekinah especially has reference to the visible (and invisible) manifestation of the presence of Deity, whereas Memra is both distinguished from God and yet a mode of God's revelation of Himself².

7. THE DISTINCTIVE USE OF THESE DEVICES IN THE TARGUM

These six "terms" which have been discussed above are not used indiscriminately but follow a set pattern. If the exact extent that each targumist (or school of targumists) translated were known, the pattern would no doubt be clearer and more consistent. Yet even in this "hodge-podge", the following distinctions are apparent:

(1) The words יָדוֹ and אלהי were used when the targumist interpreted the action of man towards God as being essentially a religious action;

¹Abrahams distinguishes between the Memra, Glory (Yeqara) and the Shekinah slightly differently. He considers the Memra "... to express the invisible presence of God in man; ... [the] glory, to express the visible appearance of God;" but the Shekinah to refer "... to both the visible and the invisible Presence, especially when it is conceived not only as a momentary revelation, but as a continuous religious experience." (Abrahams, op. cit., pp. 51f.) The last is especially important -- that the Shekinah refers to a continuous religious experience, not so much to a momentary one. This may explain the use of Memra where the Hebrew says that God is with them. The targumist may have interpreted this to be of "momentary" (i.e., slight) duration and hence, preferred the use of Memra there to Shekinah.

²Fairweather, op. cit., p. 294; Edersheim, op. cit., I, p. 47.
(2) The Will of God as an anti-anthropomorphic device apparently was not extensively nor consistently used;

(3) To a great extent this is also true of the glory of God, although several times the visibility of God is plainly involved — the Glory, however, is not identical with the Shekinah. Shekinah translates the Hebrew שקינה only once1 (Zechariah 2:9), although the two are closely associated in Amos 9:6 and Zechariah 9:8;

(4) The Power of God stresses His omnipotence and, consequently, is used for the hand of God when it expresses the Might of God;

(5) The Shekinah is used to convey the immanence of the transcendent, holy, and yet omnipresent God;

(6) The Memra is used when the relationship predicated of God requires not only His spiritual presence but also a physical one — thus the Memra is used to avoid the grosser anthropomorphisms found in the Twelve;

(7) Memra and Shekinah acquire to a great extent what semblance of personality they have in the Targum "... by being a circumlocution for God in contexts

1So Ramsey, op. cit., p. 19.
where personal states or actions are attributed to him, 1

(a) 2 Perhaps the Targum was written for the simple people, not for the educated ones. Streeter maintains that the Targums were "... popular renderings of the Old Testament lessons intended for congregations the majority of whom knew neither Hebrew nor Greek, but were sufficiently advanced to find difficulty in the more startling anthropomorphic expressions of the Old Testament ..." 3 If so, then the "Word of the Lord" may be their way... of struggling to put the idea of immanence into ordinary terms, and to express their belief that God's will was a fact of experience in the world

1 Moore (op. cit.; p. 59); cf. Box, op. cit., p. 111. In this connection Kohler's suggestion that the Rabbinical schools gave up the personified Memra and replaced it by the Torah or Spirit of God because of the Christian exegetical treatment of the Word is most interesting; see K. Kohler, Jewish Theology (New York: MacMillan Co., 1923), p. 199.

2 These works by Moore and Knight were unavailable to this investigator until after the thesis had been completed. Hence, only scattered footnotes have been added. This investigator, although agreeing with them in part, feels that perhaps they have pushed the case too far against the idea that the Memra and Shekinah were intermediary persons. Probably these devices were personalized to a certain extent but not to the extent that many Christian authors have attempted to prove. A mediate position is to be preferred, this investigator believes.

Likewise, the Shekinah would not be something (or person) which "... take the place of God, but a more reverent way of saying 'God'."

3. CONCLUSION

Unlike the examination of the Septuagint, the Targum clearly exhibits an anti-anthropomorphic and anti-anthropopathic tendency. In chapter six about eighty-six percent of the passages examined are anti-anthropomorphic. Only about three percent were uncertain, and about ten percent are substantially unaltered.

In chapter seven which considered the anthropopathic and the "lesser anthropomorphic" expressions of the Masoretic Text, the percentage of passages which, in the Targum, definitely avoid the anthropopathic and anthropomorphic expressions of the Hebrew text, is less -- only about seventy-one (or -two) percent of the passages examined. A larger number of uncertain passages are found -- about nineteen percent. The number of substantially unaltered passages is almost the same -- nine percent.

In chapter eight, eighty-two percent of the passages which describe God in a certain place are avoided in the Targum. Two percent are uncertain, and sixteen percent of the passages still confine Deity to a given locality. On the

---

1Knight, op. cit., p. 85.
2Moore, op. cit., p. 58.
other hand only sixty-one percent of the passages which in the Hebrew text describe God as moving about are avoided, whereas about seven percent of these passages are uncertain. Moreover, about thirty-three percent still retain the idea of God in motion in the Targum.

In chapter eight certain offensive concepts were considered also. Almost all of these passages are altered (over ninety percent). In less than ten percent of the passages discussed there the targumist failed to avoid the offensive concept.

In these three chapters over five hundred passages have been considered. In about seventy-seven percent of these passages the targumist clearly has made his translation because of a theological bias. In approximately eleven percent of the passages uncertainty exists as to the reason for the rendering in the Targum, and in some thirteen percent of the passages the translations in the Targum apparently do not reflect a theological bias on the part of the translator.

These figures as well as a consideration of the passages compel an investigator to conclude that the targumist allowed his theological beliefs to affect his translations.
APPENDIX I

CULTIC PROTECTION IN THE SEPTUAGINT

The desire to protect God led the targumist, the talmudist, the midrashist, and the (h)aggadist to make certain lexical and other alterations pertaining to the protection of the sacred and profane cultic objects, persons, etc. For example, the Targum distinguishes very carefully between the true God and the idol by reserving $\pi\nu\nu$ to be used solely for the former and (a) different and derogatory word(s) to be used for the latter. This distinction is not carried out by the Septuagint.

Moreover, the Septuagint, unlike the Targum, does not maintain a distinction between the true and false prophets or priests, secular and holy statues, etc. Probably there is no distinction meant in the alteration in Hosea 4:19 from $\pi\nu\nu$ ("sacrifice") to $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\sigma\tau\iota\pi\omicron\nu$ ("altar"). On the other hand the addition of $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\acute{o}$- ("false") as a prefix in Zechariah 13:2 may indicate the beginning of a distinction between the true and false prophets or may be an addition to avoid the

---

1See Appendix IV.

2Cf. Zephaniah 1:5 ( $\tau\nu\nu$ is translated as $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ ).

3See Appendix IV, page 2.


5Cf. Hosea 6:5.

6Cf. the distinction the Targum makes, Appendix IV, pages 397f.
suggestion that God would eliminate the true prophet(s):

καὶ τοὺς ψευδοπροφητὰς... 
and also I will remove... the prophets...

And I will remove [carry away] the false prophets...

The context plainly shows that the prophets referred to in Zechariah 13:2 are false prophets, and this fact may indicate why Zechariah did not use the epithet "false."

In addition to this there are other translations which may have been adopted from a desire to protect the cultus.

(1) THE TEREBINTH: HOSEA 4:13

... under oak, poplar, and terebinth,
and...

... under an oak and a beech and a shady tree,

---

1 So also the Syriac, Vulgate (Wright, op. cit., p. 416) and Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 539, and the Targum (loc. cit.).

2 "LXX. understand 'The prophets' correctly as ψευδοπροφητὰς... [false prophets] (Lowe, op. cit., p. 114).


4 Only passage in the Twelve referring to the terebinth.

5 πευχης in 86c, Sap; cf. Isaiah 41:19.

6 κεδρου in 410.

7 α' = και τερεβίνθου; σ' = και πλανανο επισκαζουσαν.
The translation of "and terebinth" by καὶ δένδρου συσκευάζοντος ("and shady tree") avoids the cultically offensive term, "terebinth".

(2) TEREPHIM

This translation avoids the reference to the terephim (דֶּרֶך) by the translation of oude δηλων ("without manifestations"). Elsewhere δηλων translates דְּרֶך. If δηλων 4 represents דְּרֶך, the translator must have misread his text or possessed a different one. Since, however, he also translates ephod (דִּרְדָּן) by εἰρατεῖας ("priesthood"), avoiding another cultically offensive word, he probably introduced both changes with deliberate intent.

1Harper, Wellhausen, Novack, and Gardner consider the Masoretic Text to be in error here and suggest emendations (so Harper, op. cit., pp. 260f).

2 ou δηλων = στηλης.

3So Harper (op. cit., p. 216) and Cheyne (op. cit., p. 121). Graetz thus emends (op. cit., p. 12) and Harper (op. cit., p. 216).

4According to Bagster, op. cit., p. 1072, footnote λ, δηλων has reference to the Urim and the Thummim or else to the Urim alone. If this assumption is correct, the choice of δηλων follows naturally upon his selection of εἰρατεῖας to translate דִּרְדָּן.
ZECHARIAH 10:2

For the terephim utter nonsense,
Because the prophesiers spoke of labours,

Although this translation of τερεφιμοί ("terephim") as ὀι ἀποφθεγγομένοι ("the prophesiers") avoids the cultically offensive word -- 'terephim', the reason for the selection of ὀι ἀποφθεγγομένοι is uncertain. The word τερεφιμοί is not translated consistently in the Septuagint by a single word.3

(3) IDOLS: HABAKKUK 2:18

... a teacher of lies?  

... a false image...

The Septuagint translator may have objected to the idea

A soletism (Jansma, op. cit., p. 82). Elsewhere φαντασιαν ψευδη translates Ἰδιν, ἡμι, ἔδιν, ἱν, ἑκ, ἐπ (Jansma, loc. cit.).

Lowe, op. cit., p. 91.

Kennedy (op. cit., p. 11) emends to θέραμοι, translating clause as "and an object of fear".


Reinke (op. cit., p. 128) suggests that the Septuagint read ἱππιτός.

A literal translation.
that anyone could credit an idol with teaching anything, even lies!

(4) PILLAR (IDOL, STATUTE)¹

HOSEA 10:1²

... he improved his pillars.
... he erected pillars.

Although the translator avoided הָעַרְבָּה ("pillars") in Hosea 3:4, he has retained the idea in Hosea 10:1,2 and Micah 5:13(12). Therefore, the conclusion cannot be reached that the translator sought to avoid reference to pillars which were objectionable to the cultus.

(5) SACRIFICE

In secular, non-theological passages the word (ומדים, "sacrifice") is translated with the meaning of "a present".

[1] HOSEA 10:6

מִסְמֶה לְמִלְךָ יְרֵם For a present to King Contentious;³ or possibly read מִסְמֶה לְמִלְךָ יְרֵם

ֶסְטֵאָה תּוֹ בָּשִׁילֶה • • • as a present to the king Iarim.

¹See also Hosea 3:4, page 358. The Septuagint of Hosea 3:4 also has an interesting translation of ephod.
²Cf. Hosea 10:2; Micah 5:13(12).
³American Jewish Translation.
In theological passages where נַחֲמוֹן ("sacrifice") has reference to the cultus, it is translated literally as תְּוַסִּיא, for example:

[2] ZEPHANIAH 3:10

יִבְּךֹל מַגְּזֵה... shall bring my offering.

וְאִיסַּאְנִי תְּוַסִּיאָּהּ... they shall bring sacrifices for me.

Since the translator of the Twelve uses two different words to translate נַחֲמוֹן ("offering") depending upon whether it means to give tribute or gifts to men or whether נַחֲמוֹן refers to offerings to Deity, this distinction may have resulted from an embryonic desire to protect the cultic idea of sacrifice.

(6) NEW MOONS: HOSEA 5:7

Now the new month shall devour them with their fields.

... the cankerworm [mildew] shall now devour them and their portions.

The commentators have suggested many Hebrew equivalents for η ἐρυσίβη ("the cankerworm, mildew"). The best suggestions for a misread or different text are the proposals made by

1 See also Joel 1:9,13; 2:14; Amos 5:22,25; Malachi 1:10, 11,13; 2:12,13; 3:3f.

2 So Harper, op. cit., p. 268.

3 Cf. Nyberg (op. cit., p. 37) who says: "η ἐρυσίβη = ζνάιν ἱστ. ἀπι, eine verzweifelte Konjektur."
Harper and Wellhausen. Harper\textsuperscript{1} suggests that the translator read \( חָנַן = חָנָן \). Wellhausen\textsuperscript{2} suggests that \( חָנָן \) may be a corruption of \( חָנַן \) which was a transliteration of \( חָנַן \).

Although either of these suggestions are plausible, the translator may have introduced the change to avoid mentioning the "new moons". Of course, the Septuagint could be an accurate translation of the original Hebrew text which has been corrupted into our present Masoretic Text.

Finally, there are three passages which may indicate that the ideas of feasts and of the temple were given increased importance at the time when the Septuagint was being translated.

(7) FEASTS

[1] HOSEA 12:9(10)

\begin{verbatim}
כִּמֵּי מֹועֵד As in the days of the
appointed season.
\end{verbatim}

[2] ZEPHANIAH 3:18a

\begin{verbatim}
אָבָה מָסַע . . . . from the appointed
season.
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{1Harper, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 268.}

\footnote{2Cf. Nyberg (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 37) who says: "\( חָנָן \) קְרָא st. \( דּוֹנֶק \), eine versweifelt Konjektur."}

\footnote{3So Harper, \textit{loc. cit.}.}

\footnote{4\textit{American Jewish Translation}.}

\footnote{5So American Jewish Translation. The \textit{Revised Standard Version} (p. 932) translates as the Septuagint. Its footnote indicates that the Hebrew is obscure.}
Most commentators follow the Septuagint and add this to verse 17.

(8) TEMPLE

In Haggai 2:9, at the close of the verse, the translator adds καὶ εἰρήνην ψυχῆς εἰς περιποίησιν πάντι τῷ κτίζοντι τοὺς αναστήσας τον ναὸν τοῦτον ("... even peace of mind for a possession to everyone active in again raising up this temple.")

In conclusion, in Hosea 13:2, the Septuagint is perhaps less acceptable, cultically, than the Masoretic Text.

If the Septuagint represents a text more original, or

---

1See Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 262 for a partial list.

2Treitel (op. cit., p. 233) says: "Haggai 2:9 fügt vertent der Übersetzung von hinzu, wie solche Zusätze überhaupt zum Handwerkzeuge der Septuaginta gehören... den Frieden des Herzens will ich geben dem, der... Für den Tempel Gottes wieder aufzubauen, ein Zusatz, der gewiss sinnig ist als nähervere Ausführung des Themas von Friedensgewährung."

3Following Revised Standard Version, footnote j, page 945, essentially, but not completely.
one closer to the original, than our Masoretic Text, the alteration by a later copyist to our present Masoretic Text would not be surprising.

\[1\text{For several suggested original texts and a fuller discussion, see Scott, op. cit., pp. 148f.}\]
APPENDIX II

THE INTERMEDIARY AGENTS IN THE SEPTUAGINT

The theological belief in a holy, transcendent God may have produced other theological changes in the thinking of the spiritual leaders of Judaism. The stress on the transcendence of God raised the problem of how God could contact man, especially since the former is holy and righteous and the latter, imperfect and unrighteous. Thus the theophany was spiritualized by the introduction of intermediaries1 whose function was to act in a mediate position between God and man.

In the official religion of the Synagogue the embryonic intermediaries2 of the Old Testament were developed and enlarged to include also the Metatron, the Holy Spirit, the Shekinah, the Bath Kol, the Messiah, and the Torah3. Although some of these are found highly developed in the Targum, the Greek translators apparently were little influenced by any desire to protect God in this manner. Hence, their use of intermediaries is very little advanced over that of the later books of the Old Testament.

1. THE MESSIAH

The Messianic doctrine of the Greek Book of the Twelve

---

1See pages 3ff; cf. Eichrodt, op. cit., II, pp. 5-18.
2See pages 3ff.
remains essentially unchanged except for a slightly increased emphasis given by more frequent mention of the Messiah and the ascription to the Messiah of some of the minor functions which were formerly ascribed to God; for example:

(1) AMOS 4:13

... and declares to man what is his thought;
... and proclaim for men his anointed one (Messiah, Christ) —

Possibly the increased importance of the Messiah may have led the translator to read as . If so, this translation may indicate a further stage in the development of the use of intermediaries.

(2) HABAKKUK 3:13

... for the salvation of thy anointed.
... to save your anointed ones.

---

1. \(\alpha\) = εις ομιλία αυτου; \(\theta\) = τον λόγΟν αυτου; \(\epsilon\) = την αδολεσχίαν αυτων.

2. The Septuagint = ιωσορ ιωσ (Harper, op. cit., p. 103).

3. "(eene christelijke verandering zien wij hier niet)." (Stekhoven, op. cit., p. 114).

4. The translator may have possessed a different text.

5. Froesch (op. cit., p. 949, footnote) emends either to υπενθυλορ or to ηυσίν.


7. A literal translation.
This translation of a singular (τὸν Χριστὸν τούτον) by a plural (τοιούτους σοῦ) changes the application from the Messiah to the Israelite people. The text, here, is uncertain; some manuscripts\(^1\) read a singular, τον Χριστον. Therefore, no definite conclusion may be reached.

(3) **ZECHARIAH 9:10**

I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim...  
He will destroy chariots out of Ephraim...

The shift in person from the first, singular, to the third\(^3\), singular, changes the actor from God to the Messiah-King. Many commentators\(^4\) consider that the correct text is "(and he will destroy)", following the Septuagint. Probably either the Septuagint indicates the original text, or else it reveals a theological change\(^5\).

Five passages are of special interest to Christians because of an anti-Christian exegesis which may possibly be

---

\(^1\) B*, B-S*, Ach Aeth\(^\downarrow\), o: λ, ζ; cf. ε, σ, θ, α.

\(^2\) Procksch (op. cit., p. 966, footnote) emends to ἔξολοθρεύεται, following the Septuagint. Th\(^{166}\) = Masoretic Text.

\(^3\) The Syriac also changes the person (Wright, op. cit., p. 571).

\(^4\) For a partial list see Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 277.

\(^5\) This alteration protects God by ascribing the action to the Messiah-King.
found in the Greek. Two\(^1\) of these passages show little alteration and one\(^2\) passage only in the plural.

(4) HOSEA 11:1

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{דרמא, לבנ} & \quad \ldots \text{I called my son.} \\
\text{מעטיקולסא תא} & \quad \ldots \text{and I called his children . . .}
\end{align*}
\]

This passage was quoted by early Christians\(^4\) in support of the Messiahship of Jesus Christ. Certainly no Christian scribe would have altered τὸν υἱὸν (τέκνον) μου \(^5\) ("My son [child]") to τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ ("His children"). On the other hand an alteration of this type might have been made by a zealous Jew or proselyte to Judaism in the days of the violent Christian-Jewish controversy.

(5) ZECHARIAH 11:13

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ששל, חותן אל-היוצר} & \quad \text{Cast it into the treasury} \quad \text{RSV, \textit{Jerusalem} 1985} \\
\text{ארור תחكر אדר סדרתנ} & \quad \text{the lordly price at which I was paid off by them.} \\
\text{מעלותמ} & \quad \text{\textit{Valued}.}
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^1\)Joel 3:1(2:28) f.

\(^2\)Zechariah 13:7.

\(^3\)Co, Aeth, Arm\(\text{P}\), a\(\uparrow\), σ\(\uparrow\) = Masoretic Text.

\(^4\)E.g., Matthew 2:15.

\(^5\)The Syriac reads "my son" (so Harper, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 360).
This passage the early Christians\(^5\) also understood to have a prophetic meaning which was fulfilled by Judas. Wellhausen\(^6\) considers that Matthew 27:39 reflects a dual interpretation of this passage, and Jansma says, "G. had a badly written Hebrew text\(^7\) possibly with some slight differences from M., conceived the sentence as dealing with a foundry . . . and rendered the difficult words accordingly."\(^8\) Perhaps an anti-Christian Jewish scribe made some alterations here, following an already established interpretation, to make the passage somewhat less acceptable to the pro-Christian exegetes.

(6) ZECHARIAH 13:6

He will say, 'The wounds which I received in the house of my friends'.

---

1. \(\text{αιτους}^1\) εἰς τὸ χωρευτήριον καὶ σκέψεις εἰς δοκιμον εστίν ὁν τροπον εὐδοκιμασθήν\(^2\) υπὲρ αὐτῶν

2. Drop them into the furnace, and I will see if it is good metal, as I was proved for their sakes.\(^4\)

3. \(\piτην\) αὐτού \(\text{αιτους}^1\) εἰς τὸ χωρευτήριον καὶ σκέψεις εἰς δοκιμον εστίν ὁν τροπον εὐδοκιμασθήν\(^2\) υπὲρ αὐτῶν


5. See Matthew 27:9f.


7. So many commentators (loc. cit.).

καὶ εἶπεν Ἀχεπιρήν εἰς
tὸ σικώ τῷ ἁγιστῆρι τοῦ ἐμοῦ.

And he will say, those
with which I was wounded
in my beloved house?

The Septuagint may have understood 'μακαρίαν to be a
paed passive participle, singular, with a first person
singular suffix, as in the Aramaic, or the translator (or
editor) may have softened the Hebrew because of a pro-Israel
(and/or anti-Christian) bias.

(7) ZECHARIAH 13:7

In this passage certain manuscripts change the command
παταξάτε τοὺς ποιμένας ("... smite the shepherds,")
to παταξῶ τὸν ποιμένα ("I will smite the shepherd"),
as Matthew and Mark also do. The Hebrew reads: πυρπυρος την
("Strike the shepherd,") which both agrees and disagrees with

1So W; A - 544 L 91 Co Arm Cyr (= IV 680 V 560 X 216)
Tht. P Hi. read τοῦ ἁγιστην which is closer to the
Masoretic Text.

2Jansma, op. cit., p. 125.

3Cf. "Those wherewith I was wounded in the house of
them that made me to be beloved" (King, op. cit., p. 71).

4So W - S* Co (vid.) Aeth Greg. Naz.

5So W - S* Aeth Greg. Naz. Tert. (vid.) O.

6Bagster, op. cit., p. 1125.

7So V-538 46--86r-711c 106 233 Arab Arm Cyr. P =
Matthew 26:31; Mark 14:27.

8So rel (Barn. Iust. Eus. ecl.) = Matthew 26:31; Mark
14:27.

926:31.

1014:27.
these Greek translations. Possibly the Masoretic Text and the Greek Manuscripts\(^1\) which have παταξεω for παταξατε were altered to protect the concept of God's character. Later perhaps these same Greek manuscripts were altered to τον ποιμενας for τον ποιμενα to avoid the Christian exegesis that "the shepherd" referred to Jesus Christ and His death. For a similar reason the τον ποιμενα \(^2\) μου which occurred earlier in this verse was also changed to the plural\(^3\).

No definite conclusion, however, may be reached concerning the reason for the changes in Zechariah 13:7 or any of the other verses which vary from the early Christian exegesis.

The final changes\(^4\) in translation which concern the Messianic era occur in Joel 2:11,31(3:4); Malachi 4:5(3:24). In these passages the Day of Yahweh is described as being

\(^1\) W* B-S* Co (vid.) Aeth Greg. Naz.

\(^2\) So rel. (Iust. Bus. eel.) = Masoretic Text.


\(^4\) Seeligmann, I. L. (The Septuagint Version of Isaiah A Discussion of Its Problems [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1948], p. 26) considers that the translation of "In the midst of years renew it; in the midst of years make it known," in the Septuagint of Habakkuk 3:2 as ἐν τῷ παρείναι τον καιρὸν ἀναδείκνυσιν ("In the midst of two living beings thou wilt be known, when the years draw nigh thou wilt be acknowledged; when the time is come thou wilt be pointed out;") is reminiscent of the story of Jesus' birth in the manger between the ox and the ass. He refers in particular to the Protevangelium Jacobi and Evangelium pseudo Matthaei 22.
'terrible' (חָרָא); the Septuagint translates this word as 'manifest' (ἐπιφανῆς). This change is especially interesting because in every instance in the Minor Prophets, in which the niphal participle (חָרָא) of חָרָא ("to be afraid") occurs, the Greek equivalent is always ἐπιφανῆς ¹ ("manifest"), e.g., Malachi 1:14:²


Therefore, the translator may have been softening the Hebrew idea, or he may have considered the root of חָרָא ("to see"). This problem has been discussed already ³.

2. THE TORAH

Another intermediary which was of great importance in later Judaism is the Law or Torah (תּוֹרָה). The concept of the Torah as an intermediary device shows little ⁴ if any advance. In fact, Dr. Sheldon H. Blank considers that in the

¹Or a form of the corresponding verb; cf. Zephaniah 2:11 -- depending on the Greek codex.

²Cf. also Habakkuk 1:7.

³See pages 145ff.

⁴According to Östborn, Gunnar (Töra In The Old Testament: A Semantic Study [Lund: Häkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, 1945], pp. 172-178) the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion -- all apparently interpreted חָרָה as law and not teaching.
Septuagint there are fewer references to γάρνα than in the Masoretic Text. He concludes that "... these terms [γάρνα and γάρνα] were being added as glosses by Hebrew Scribes at a late date." There are several passages of interest:

(1) AMOS 4:5

... offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving of that which is leavened,

... for having publicly read a law...

Probably the translator read an γ instead of a γ in this passage.

(2) HOSEA 8:12

Were I to write for him my laws by ten thousands, they would be regarded as a strange thing.

I will prescribe for him a multitude. Though his rites were devised for other purposes,

1 "Judgement"


3 a = ευχαριστίαν.

4 "The use of νομίμον ["conformable to custom, usage, or law"; "observant of law"; "customs"; etc.] to render περὶ ["teaching, law"] is with one exception confined to the portions of the Bible in which νομίμον is used to render πρᾶπνον ["statute, law"]; the Pentateuch, Jeremiah, Ezek, and the Book of the Twelve..." (Blank, op. cit., p. 278).
The Septuagint here probably represents a different or misread Hebrew Text in which the לְפָחְתָּו ("by ten thousands") was doubled and the לְפָחְתָּו ("my laws") was read as לְפָחְתָּו.

These two passages cannot establish that the Torah (תנור) was used by the translator as an intermediary device. The instances are probably examples of misread or different texts.

3. THE HOLY SPIRIT

The Holy Spirit is another intermediary in which the Septuagint may show development. In the Hebrew only one word, נְקָד ("spirit"), is used in the Minor Prophets, to denote spirit. This word, when it means wind, is translated three times in the Greek Twelve by ἅτρεμος ("wind") and five times by πνεῦμα ("spirit, wind"). In the remaining five occurrences of נְקָד ("spirit, wind"), it denotes either the spirit of man or of God and is translated by πνεῦμα ("spirit") or ϑυμός.

---

1 Hosea 13:15; Zechariah 2:6(10); 6:5.
2 Hosea 4:19; 12:2(1); Amos 4:13; Micah 2:11(?); Zechariah 5:9.
3 Habakkuk 1:11; Haggai 1:14(three times); Zechariah 12:1; Malachi 2:15,16.
5 Zechariah 6:8.
("wrath"). Thus, there is no consistent lexical translation with reference to נָרִי ("spirit, wind").

Certain passages, however, relating to God's Spirit in either the Septuagint or the Masoretic Text should be considered.

(1) ZECHARIAH 6:8

(א) וְתַחַת הַרְדָּעָה (... those ...) have set my Spirit at rest...

(ב) וְאָפְסָעַסְתָּנָה (... they ...) have appeased my wrath...

The word, נָר ("spirit"), may have been used here in the sense of "wrath", or the translator may have been offended at the statement of the Hebrew. Therefore, he may have softened it by his translation. In the only other passage, in which נָר ("spirit") is God's spirit, the Greek translation is literal.

(2) ZECHARIAH 1:6

---

1 See also Hosea 4:12; 5:4; Habakkuk 2:19; Zechariah 13:2; Malachi 2:15a, where also is translated πνεῦμα in the Septuagint; cf. Hosea 6:7 and 9:7.

2 τρευρνον (68); το πνευμα (Bo Tht Θ = Masoretic Text).

3 The Targum translates נָר by יותיעי ("my will, pleasure"); see page 205.


5 Micah 2:7 Masoretic Text = נָרִי 닥 разв (בדעך תיि י) נוֹר ("O house of Jacob? Is the Spirit of the Lord impatient?"). Micah 2:7 Septuagint = Οικὸς Ιακώβ παρωγήσε κυρίου ("The house of Israel [Jacob] hath provoked to wrath the spirit of the Lord.").
which I commanded my servants the prophets...

... all that I, by my spirit, give in charge to my servants the prophets,

This addition of 

_חֶבְרֹה_ "by My Spirit"

may follow the example of the Hebrew in Zechariah 7:12, or it may reflect the increased importance of God's Spirit.

4. OTHER INTERMEDIARIES

Two other intermediaries of later Judaism should be mentioned briefly: The Glory and the Word (Logos). There are two passages in which the Septuagint translation involving these concepts is interesting.

(1) MICAH 2:9

... from their young children you take away my glory forever.

... for their evil devices they have been expelled; draw ye near to the everlasting mountains.

The Syriac and the Targum both avoid the idea that God's Glory could be removed. Perhaps this desire to protect his concept of Deity (and of God's Glory) induced the Greek

---

1 So Lowe, op. cit., p. 9.
translator to alter his translation; his zeal, coupled with a slightly different text (or a misread text), would easily account for this translation.

(2) HABAKKUK 3:5

לעם ילך דבר Before him went pestilence,
προ προσώπου αυτοῦ Before him Logos (the word) will march,
pορευεται λόγος The translation of הָרֶב ("pestilence") as λόγος ("Logos, word") involves only a change of vocalization of the Hebrew consonants. Such a vocalization change could easily arise from the increased importance of "Word" in the mind of the translator.

1 Cf. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 63f; et al.
2 σ' = pestis; ζ' = mors.
3 Cf. Amos 4:13 where Theodotion translates ("what is his [God's] thought") as τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ("his word"). See page 366.
APPENDIX III

THE ATTITUDE OF THE GREEK TRANSLATOR TOWARDS THE HEATHEN AND THE FORMER KINGDOMS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH

While this attitude of the translator, strictly speaking, may not be a theological concept, yet this attitude stemmed in part from his seal for God. Therefore, because of his seal for God and because of the intimate connection of the heathen and the kingdoms of Israel and Judah with eschatology, this subject may be considered appropriately here.

1. ANTI-HEATHEN EXEGESIS

The intense hatred of the translator for the heathen may be reflected in his translations. Perhaps this hatred may be observed in the intensification of his translations of single words and short phrases, e.g., καὶ εἴηματεν η ψυχή σου ("... and thy soul hath sinned [greatly]"); for ἀμαυτά ("... you have forfeited your life."), διέταξεν εὐνή ("... nations melted away;") for διὰ τῶν ἄρα ("... and shook the nations;")⁴, et al. Of a similar nature are the following lexical variations: οἱ κατἀφρόνηται.⁴ ("..."

---

1Habakkuk 2:10; the Septuagint is the equivalent either to ἀμαυτά (so Procksch, op. cit., p. 943 footnote) or to ἀμαυτή (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 16).

²or "and caused nations to start up." (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 231).


⁴This involves only the substitution of a "for a" (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 165; Wutz, op. cit., p. 201; Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 10; cf. Procksch, op. cit., p. 946, footnote ἀμαυτή).
despisers[1]) for מְעֹרָיִים ("... among the nations," in Habakkuk 1:5 and καὶ τὸ λήμμα 1 ("and his gain") for מְשַׁשָּׁה ("... and dignity...") in Habakkuk 1:7[3].

(1) The translator's dislike of the heathen is also found in the increased punishment that is given the nations who fail to go up to Jerusalem to the feast of Tabernacles in the Messianic Age. It is no longer the lack of rain (or in Egypt's case, the overflow of the Nile), but the punishment of Zechariah 14:12. Thus the appropriate portions of 17f., לֹא עֲלֵיהֶם יִזְוָהֵת הָעִוָּם ... וְלֹא יִשְׁמַעְתּוֹר הָעִוָּם ("... there will be no rain upon them ... upon them shall not come the plague with which the Lord afflicts the nations ...) are translated as καὶ οὗτοι εἰκενὸς προστέθησονται[5]. ... ... ... καὶ: 6

1"an etymological rendering" (Stonehouse, op. cit., p. 169).

2Or burden; a free translation.

3A softening?; cf. στὶ = δογματι.

4Following the Revised Standard Version footnote 7, p. 994.

5 καὶ συν ἔσται εἰπ αὐτοῦς νετος (W E L =618-770 876-68 Tht = Masoretic Text; cf. α', α', ι', ι') Kähler (so Lowe, op. cit., p. 129) and Wright, C.H.H. (op. cit., p. 508 footnote 1) consider that the Septuagint read ἀλλὰ ὧν ὁ πατὴρ ἔχει παρακάτω· Lowe (op. cit., p. 129) considers that the translator read ἀλλὰ ὧν ὁ πατὴρ ἔχει παρακάτω ("and to them shall be the-making-to-approach-of-the-others" -- loc. cit.) as in late Hebrew; cf. Jansma, op. cit., p. 130.

6The Septuagint omits the מָלֶד of the Hebrew; six Hebrew manuscripts omit מִלְי or מִלֵּד, (Wright, C.H.H., op. cit., p. 508, footnote 1; Treitel, op. cit., p. 234).
epi toutoici 1 estai 2 hna pataxei kurioc pantata eunh ("... even they shall be added to those... upon them shall be the plague with which the Lord will smite all the nations...")

(2) Likewise this anti-heathen feeling may be observed in the denunciation of the heathen for their treatment of Israel. The Septuagint describes their treatment of Israel as action against God Himself, e.g., Zephaniah 2:10 (δια της άλλης ονλας "... because they scoffed and boasted against the people of the Lord of Hosts") becomes διατι ονειδίσαν και εμεγαλυνθήσαν επί τον κυριον τον παντοκρατορα ("... because they have reproached and magnified themselves against the Lord Almighty"); cf. Malachi 1:4.

(3) This feeling of antagonism to the heathen may be seen in statements, such as, the alteration of Ἔρημος ("... the arrogant...") in Malachi 3:19(4:1), which refers to the

---

1 Procksch, (op. cit., p. 972, footnote) emends with the Septuagint and Syriac to ἐπιτύχει.
2 πληγη (Wc (?) L=407mg -613-770c).
3 The Septuagint B·S·A·Q, Aquila, Syriac H, HP, 48, 153, 233 omit (so Smith, Ward, Bewer, op. cit., p. 231).

4 Dy kann aus der Vorlage der LXX versehentlich ausgefallen sein (Haplographie nach ὑ). Wahrscheinlich steckt aber in der griechischen Übersetzung eine bewusste Tendenz, zumal da sie denselben Gedanken ausdrückt wie in 2,8:" (Gerleman, op. cit., p. 39).

5 Bagster, op. cit., p. 1110.
Jewish people, to \( \text{o} \) \( \text{i} \) \( \text{αλλογενεῖς} \) \(^1\) ("... the aliens ..."), and also in the intensification of \( \text{αὐτοὶ} \) ἀλλογενὲς ("... because they have threshed Gilead with threshing sledges of iron."), in Amos 1:3, by translating it as 

\( \text{αὐτὸν} \) \( \text{ὡν} \) \( \text{ἐπιρίζον} \) προσπε σιδηροίς τὰς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐκχοῦσας 

τῶν \( \text{ἐν} \) \( \text{Γαλαὰδ} \) \(^3\) ("Because with iron saws they have sawed asunder the pregnant wives of the men of Gilead;"). The additional words found in the Greek translation may be an insertion from 1:13. Moreover, the hatred of the heathen (probably the Samaritans)\(^5\) may also be observed in Amos 6:1 where the prophet links a warning to Judah and Israel together, but the translator changes it to those who hate Zion, etc.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woe to those who are at ease in Zion, and to those who feel secure on the mountain of Samaria,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alas for them who despise Zion and have put their trust in the mount of Samaria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) \text{The Septuagint requires only the misreading of } \text{α} \text{ as a } \text{γ} \text{ (cf. Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 84).} \\

\(^2\) \text{The Septuagint } = \text{ ὁλίσθω (?) (so Harper, op. cit., p. 13).} \\

\(^3\) \text{α} = \text{ἀνέ ὡν} \text{ ἠλογοῦν τροχοῖς σιδηροῖς} \text{ (α} = \text{ ἠλογοῦν ἐν τροχοῖς} \text{ (ἡ τριβολοῖς); } \theta = \text{ἀξός; )} \text{ τὴν ἐκαλααδ.} \\

\(^4\) \text{So Volland (op. cit., I, p. 260; Harper, op. cit., p. 14) and Harper (loc. cit.). These additional words are not supported by the other versions.} \\

\(^5\) \text{"LXX and Pesh., which have } \text{those who despise Zion", doubtless intend a paraphrase for Samaria;" (Cripins, op. cit., p. 202).} \\

\(^6\) \text{θα (Iust.) } = \text{κατασκαταλώντες σιῶν} \text{; } \text{α} = \text{οὐαί οἱ ἐνθησάντες ἐν σίων.}
This translation may reflect an anti-Northern Kingdom bias, but it is just as likely directed against the later Samaritans.

2. THE PRO-ISRAEL EXEGESIS

Unlike the Greek Book of Kings, the Greek Minor Prophets do not seem to exhibit any unforgiving attitude towards the Northern Kingdom. On the contrary, for both Ephraim (Israel) and Judah the Septuagint shows a most favorable attitude. These alterations may be classified as follows:

(1) SOFTENING OF STATEMENTS UNFAVORABLE TO ISRAEL:

[1] HOSEA 1:4

וְהָשִׁיטָם מָלָכָה בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל

... and I will put an end the kingdom of the house of Israel.

καὶ ἀποστρέψω βασιλείαν οἶχου Ἰσραήλ

... and [I will] cause the kingdom of the house of Israel to cease.


זְדֵנֶם עֲקָם מְכַלֵּי הַדֻּמָּה

My people are destroyed for the lack of knowledge.

---


2 καταπαυσώ (rel.) = Masoretic Text; also определ

3 See page 146 for a discussion of this verb.
Though you play the harlot, O Israel, let not Judah become guilty.

As for thee, Israel, continue not in ignorance; and thou Judah . . .

Like a stubborn heifer, Israel is stubborn;

For Israel was maddened like a mad heifer:

Let him alone.

---

1 Procksch (op. cit., p. 298 footnote), emends to following the Septuagint and Syriac. Harper (op. cit., p. 253) considers the Septuagint to be the equivalent of (passive).

2 οἱ ἔσιμπλέκτες λαὸς μου ὑπὸ οὐκ ἔχον γνῶσιν; σὲ ἐφιμώκη; 

3 The Septuagint connects with verse 14.

4 The Septuagint = בְּנֵי-יִשְׂרָאֵל (so Nyberg, op. cit., p. 30).

5 The Septuagint = יִשְׂרָאֵל (Harper, op. cit., p. 262; Ruben, op. cit., p. 10).

6 Bagster, op. cit., p. 1073.

You have plowed iniquity,
Why have you concealed impiety....

[7] MICAH 4:11

Let her be profaned,
Let us rejoice exceedingly....

[8] MALACHI 2:11

Judah has been faithless,
...and has married the daughter of a foreign god.

---

1 σκανδάλα = πτώμα (Rueben, op. cit., p. 11); "...perhaps G represents some word which has been lost;" (Harper, op. cit., p. 262).

2 εσπειρατε σπάσει (Ach AethP Ambr II 100; the Septuagint = "σπάσει μετα, natürlich undenkbar" (Nyberg, op. cit., p. 81).

3 επιχαρωμεθα = 1 I; a 'incidet in furorem; σ' = κατακριθησεται.

4 Rysell considers the Septuagint to be free translation; cf. Taylor, op. cit., p. 105f.

5 See also Zephaniah 3:15, page 57, footnote 4.
Juda has been forsaken, and has gone after other gods.

Bewer\(^4\) considers that the Septuagint has paraphrased freely, perhaps in order to avoid the mentioning of marriage with foreigners.

\[\text{[3]}\] ZEPHANIAH 3:2(1)

Woe to her that is rebellious and defiled, the oppressing city!

Oh! the illustrious and redeemed city! This dove hearkened not to a voice.

\[\text{[10]}\] HOSEA 14:5(4)

I will heal their faithlessness;

I will heal their habitations.

(2) SOFTENING OF STATEMENTS REGARDING ISRAEL'S EVIL ATTITUDE TOWARDS GOD:

\[\text{[1]}\] HOSEA 5:7

\(^1\) ηθέτησεν  Ach = Masoretic Text\(^\dagger\); cf. also α\(^i\) = ηθέτησεν.

\(^2\) α\(^i\) = και έσχε θυγατέρα θεού απελλοτρισμένου;

σ\(^i\) = και εσχε την θυγατέρα θεού απαλλοτρισμές;

θ\(^i\) = και ελάβε την θυγατέρα ηλ ξένου.

\(^3\) Bagster, op. cit., p. 1128.

\(^4\) Mitchell, Smith, Bewer, op. cit., p. 58.
They have dealt faithlessly with the Lord;

Because they have forsaken the Lord,

Hosea 7:14(15)

... they rebel against me;

By me they were instructed —

Hosea 13:9

It is thy destruction, O Israel. That thou art against Me, against thy help.

In thy destruction, O Israel, who can give succour?

The Ascription to Israel of Statements which Refer in the Hebrew to God

Hosea 11:12(12:1)

and is faithful to the Holy One[s].

1 For a fuller discussion see pages 103f.

2 See pages 100f.

3 See pages 100f.

4 Froeschl, ibid., p. 909 footnote, emends with the Septuagint and Syriac to מ' בּוּשְׂרֵי.

5 American Jewish Translation.
καὶ λαὸς ἀγιός κε- 387  κλησται θεοῦ*  . . . and they were to be called the holy people of God —


σήμαιρε ἄγιος ἄγιος  I will set your captives free from the (waterless) pit.

ἐξαποστείλας δεσμίους  (thou) 3. . . hast sent forth thy prisoners out of a pit (which hath no water,)

σου εκ λακχου  

[3] MICAH 4:2

יווונג מרכז  . . . that he may teach us his ways . . .

καὶ δειξοῦσιν ἡμῖν  4 . . . that they may point out to us his ways . . .

(4) STATEMENTS UNFAVORABLE TO ISRAEL IN THEIR RELATIONSHIP WITH THE HEATHEN WHICH ARE REVERSED (OR SOFTENED) IN THE GREEK:

[1] HOSEA 5:11

The Syriac (and Septuagint?) =酐 קרותי נמשכカラ (so Procksch, op. cit., p. 907, footnote). The Septuagint =全面建成国王 (so Volders [op. cit., I, p. 256] and Harper [op. cit., p. 374]). Nyberg (op. cit., p. 91) considers that the Septuagint corresponds to舞蹈国王כמשכカラ. 2538 - εξαποστείλα ; Aeth. = Masoretic Text.

The context favors the first person (Wright, C.H.H., op. cit., p. 571).

2538 = εξαποστείλα (Iust.); the Septuagint may have read ἐξαποστείλα (Taylor, op. cit., p. 93).
Ephraim is oppressed, crushed in judgment, because he was determined to go after vanity.¹

Ephraim tyrannized over his adversary, he trampled down judgment; because he set the example of going after vanities.

**[2] HOSEA 8:3**

אֵֽלֵי יְהוָ֣ה... the enemy shall pursue him (Israel),

אֶֽחֶרֶ֖ן קַֽדְּמָֽהָ֖ן... they have pursued an enemy.⁵

This translation requires only a change in vocalization.⁶

(5) MESSIANIC VARIATIONS

The Septuagint teaches that the Lord will bring back all the exiles and recompense them for their time of exile:

**[1] ZECHARIAH 9:12**

¹Revised Standard Version, footnote s (p. 939) reads "a command".

²κατεδυναστεύσειν = ῥυ (Nyberg, op. cit., p. 38).

³καταπλατήσεις = καταπλήσσεται (so Procksch, op. cit., p. 900 footnote).

⁴ἐχθρὸς καταδιώκειν αὐτὸν -- V Arm; cf. o1 λ'

⁵Bagster, op. cit., p. 1075.

⁶So Nyberg (op. cit., p. 62) who adds, "... was mir das Richtige zu treffen scheint."; cf. Harper (op. cit., p. 301).
... today I declare that I will restore to you double.

... and for thy one day's sojourning I will make thee twofold compensations.¹

[3] ZECHARIAH 10:10

... till there is no room for them.

... and there shall not even one of them be left behind [in exile, that is].²

Secondly, the idea that they pierced the Messiah is softened slightly in Zechariah 18:10:

... so that, when they will look on me³ whom they have pierced,

... and they shall look upon me, because they have mocked me.⁴

Finally, the Greek translation apparently teaches the existence of a Saviour in Joel 3:5(2:32) where ובוֹדִיוּתָם תַּחַתי,

¹See pages 63f.

²Bagster, op. cit., p. 1122.

³Following Revised Standard Version, footnote s, p. 992.

⁴Perhaps he read "leap" as one of Kennicott's (op. cit., p. 300) manuscripts, or he interpreted "leap" figuratively (Lowe, op. cit., p. 111).

⁵Bagster, op. cit., p. 1124.
and in Jerusalem there shall be those who escape," is rendered as καὶ εν Ἰερουσαλημ ἦσται ἀνασῳμενος ("... and in Jerusalem shall be the Saviour,").

(6) STATEMENTS IN THE SEPTUAGINT WHICH ARE BOASTFUL OF ISRAEL.

AMOS 5:15

Ḥate evil, and love good,

We have hated evil and loved good;

This translation changes a command into an exaltation of Israel.

3. GREEK TRANSLATIONS WHICH FAVOR THE HEATHEN AND ARE UNFAVORABLE TO ISRAEL.

Sometimes the Septuagint is less favorable to Israel than the Masoretic Text. This situation may exist, e.g., in Hosea 2:17(15) where καὶ ταπεινωθήσεται ("... and she shall be humbled...") translates πασχεῖ ("And [there] she will answer..."), in Amos 9:12 where the idea of the remnant of Edom being possessed (יְהִי - hiphil) by Israel is altered so that the remnant of men and the heathen (ἐκζητήσωσιν) seek God (presumably); and finally, in Zechariah

1 σὺ = qui fugerit = o εξερευνών.

2 The Septuagint took the root of πιέω to be root III, "to be low, humble".
2:15(11) where the picture of God dwelling in the midst of Israel is changed to that of the heathen\(^1\) dwelling in Israel’s midst.

\(^1\)Here the Septuagint is more favorable to the heathen than the Masoretic Text.
APPENDIX IV

CULTIC PROTECTION

The fact that the Targum of Jonathan was read in public worship, and probably was produced primarily for the more uneducated listeners (and readers?), produced certain changes of a more lexical nature designed to safeguard the targumist's concept of Deity and of the reverence which should be shown in His worship. These changes\(^1\) which were introduced in the Targum are noted in connection with the use of הָאָרְזָא (ארז in the Targum), the words designating idols, priests (true and false), prophets (true and false), justice (of God or man), etc., and thus may be thought of as attempts to safeguard the reverence due the cultus. Therefore, they may be considered under the heading, cultic protection.

1. THE USE OF הָאָרְזָא

The Masoretic Text applies הָאָרְזָא to both God and idols, but in the Targum the use of הָאָרְזָא\(^3\) is restricted to

\(^1\)"The targumist made it a principle to differentiate between the holy and the profane. Words which are equally applied to the holy and the unholy are rendered by the targumist by distinct words to maintain the difference. The Masorites followed a similar way. So that when "י" is followed by the name of God it is vocalized with a patach ... While followed by a profane it is vocalized with a zeire." (Churgin, op. cit., p. 111).

\(^2\)For an example of the desire to defend the Mosaic law of divorce, see Malachi 2:16 (page 247.)

\(^3\)Note that the Targum, with one or two possible exceptions, always translates the plural הָאָרְזָא by the singular הָאָרְזָא.
God alone. Usually whenever גלויים ("gods"), אל ('"god"), or שמים ("god") refer to idols, the targumist translates them by שמעונים ("idols"), e.g., Hosea 3:1; Amos 2:9; Micah 4:5; Nahum 1:14; Habakkuk 1:11.

Moreover, in Hosea 3:1 the targumist avoids any imputation of deity to these idols by translating אלים קדומים ("other gods") as שמות עמים ("idols of the nations"). Possibly this motive explains the additional remarks that the targumist adds in Hosea 8:6 (ידיהו בייח צאר, "the useless one") and in Jonah 1:5 (ותעון איז שלח בונה צורך, "when [and] they saw that there was no usefulness in them.").

Likewise, the targumist usually avoids the use of בעל ("Baal"). Thus, for example, in Hosea 2:10(3), 15(13), 18 (16), 19(17); 11:2; 18:1, the targumist substitutes שמעונים.

1 Cf. Hosea 14:4 where אלים ("god") is retained. The context here, however, favors the retention because in this passage it is predicated that Israel will cease to call idols her gods. Note, however, that the targumist still translates the plural by a singular. Another interesting passage occurs in Zephaniah 1:8: "ועל כל גלויים מלבושים נבר ("... and all who array themselves in foreign attire."). The targumist in his translation strikes at the religious implication of these acts of assimilation: עלכל כל현재הלאשו להוסף עמים ("and all who are excited to worship idols"). Similarly the Targum renders אבל חי אלא יבר ("... and has married the daughter of a foreign god") in Malachi 2:11 as ודואים עראשון ("... and they desired to receive for themselves as wives the daughters of the heathen.").

2 Cf. Churgin, op. cit., p. 118 for other examples of this.

3 Loc. cit.

4 See page 200.
("idols") for בעליו ("Baalim"). In Zephaniah 1:4 and Joel 1:8 it is retained, and in Nahum 1:2 it is omitted. In a few passages, e.g., Amos 9:4, expressions like ירבד ותאול ("before the Baalim [masters] of their opponents") occur.

In a few passages the targumist uses רדחת ("fear") to translate אלהים ("God"). Concerning these passages Churgin states that "... the targumist is anxious to avoid even an innocent profanation ... On the other hand, when this profane אלהים is not employed in the sense of in¬
crimination but as a fact the rendering is רדחת 'fear'."

He cites as an example Jonah 1:5. To this example may be added also Hosea 8:6; Amos 8:14; Zephaniah 2:11; and the unique translation in Habakkuk 2:20 of עֲשָׁרָה בָּאָרֶץ ("... let all the earth keep silence before him") as ייָקָעֵל מִן קִדְמֵי קָדְר הַחֲלָה אֲרֻעָה ("... and every idol of the earth will cease before Him").

Finally, the translation of אֲדֹנִי ("gods") in Amos 5:26 should be noted. Here סעודות ("idols") occurs in the Targum just a few words preceding the occurrence of אֲדֹנִי in the Hebrew text. Perhaps this fact may account for the single occurrence in the Targum of the Twelve of

---

1Churgin, op. cit., p. 112.
2Ibid., p. 113.
3דעת.
2. THE USE OF עם ("ALTAR")

The targumist makes a clear distinction between the altars of God and the idolatrous idols. The altars of God he translates by the Aramaic equivalent מזבח 2, and he translates, the profane, idolatrous altars as מזרע 3 ("the pile"). The word, עם ("altar"), suggests the concept of sacrifices and the act of sacrificing.

The verb, מת kişi ("to sacrifice"), is not rendered consistently. In Hosea 4:13; 8:13; 11:2; 12:13(11); 13:2; Jonah 1:16; Habakkuk 1:16; Zechariah 14:21; Malachi 1:8, and 14 the verb is translated by the Aramaic equivalent מזבח even though people are sacrificing to God or to idols (אֵלָי, Habakkuk 1:16). In the Targum of Hosea 4:14 the idea of sacrificing is eliminated. In the remaining passages מת kişi is translated by בַּרְפָּא.

In like manner the targumist usually translates מת kişi ("sacrifice") by the Aramaic equivalent מזרע. In Zephaniah 1:7,8, however, a derivative of the root בֵּשָׁפ ("to kill") is used, and in Amos 5:25 the targumist interprets sacrifices

---

1Cf. also Zechariah 12:8.
2So in Joel 1:18; 2:17; Amos 9:1; Zechariah 9:15; 14:20; Malachi 1:7,10; and 2:13.
3So in Hosea 8:11 (twice); 10:1,2,8; 12:13(11); Amos 2:8; and 3:14 (twice).
4Sacrificing to God in Jonah 2:10(9).
to mean "hallowed victims". The most interesting change occurs in Hosea 4:19 where the Targum explains that Israel will be ashamed because of her idolatrous altars (אגרות) instead of because of her sacrifices.

In connection with the acts of worship one more passage needs to be noted. In Malachi 1:12 the statement in the Targum concerning the polluting of the table of the Lord is softened perhaps by the translation, "מפורש ד hemat בברא" ותא ובסיר לא מתגלה הנביה ("... the table of Yahweh is a shameful thing, and shameful are the gifts from it.").

3. THE USE OF י斫 ("PRIEST")

With three exceptions in the Targum of the Twelve the word י斫 ("priest") is translated literally. In Hosea 4:4 the idea of striving with the priests is softened to the teachers (מלכים) and in Amos 7:10 ראה ("great") translates י斫 when it refers to Amaziah, the priest of Bethel.

According to Churgin the idolatrous priest is translated מלך, but in the Targum of the Twelve this word does not occur as the translation of י斫. In Zephaniah 1:4 ימריו designates the idolatrous priests.

4. THE USE OF יוב ("HIGH PLACE")

The targumist does not follow a consistent policy of translating יוב ("high place"). In Hosea 10:8 the Targum

---

1Churgin, op. cit., p. 115.
renders the high places of Aven as the high places (משכן) of Bethel. This same word also occurs in Amos 7:9, but in Amos 4:15 renders renders. In Micah 1:8 and Habakkuk 3:19 translates renders, and in Micah 1:5 renders ("And what is the high place of the house of Judah?") is softened to renders ("where have those of house of Judah sinned?").

5. THE TRANSLATION OF תרפים ("TEREPHIM")

The word תרפים ("terephim") occurs only twice in the Twelve. In Zechariah 10:2 it is rendered as תרפים אלים ("worshippers of images") and in Hosea 3:4 as תרפים ("and oracles").

6. THE TRANSLATION OF אפוד ("EPHOD")

This word אפוד occurs only in Hosea 3:4 where it is rendered literally.

7. THE TRANSLATION OF שׁם ("JUDGMENT")

In the Twelve שׁם ("judgement") usually is translated by a corresponding Aramaic word ארעה. In Hosea 5:1 the idea of judgment pertaining to Israel is rendered as ארעה למלעה ("to know My Fear") and in Micah 7:9 the command to execute judgment, as ארעה עולבנה ("and avenges my wrong doing").

8. THE TRANSLATION OF פִּן ("STATUTE")

The targumist clearly distinguishes between profane or idolatrous statutes and the holy statutes of God. The latter
word (כְּנֶנ), as in Amos 2:4; Zechariah 1:6; Malachi 3:7; and 4:6(3:22), consistently is translated as כְּנֶנ ("covenant"). On the other hand, כְּנֶנ when it refers to the profane or idolatrous statutes, as in Zephaniah 2:2, consistently is rendered in the Targum as כְּנֶנ 1.

2. THE TRANSLATION OF כְּנֶנ ("PROPHET")

The targumist reserves כְּנֶנ ("prophet"), the Aramaic equivalent, to translate כְּנֶנ ("prophet") whenever it applies to the true messenger of God 2 as, for example, in Hosea 6:5; Micah 3:11 3; etc. Whenever the term כְּנֶנ suggests professional prophetism (or that they emit a false message), the term רֶדֶד ("scribe") occurs, as in Zechariah 7:3. In Micah 3:5 4,6; Zechariah 13:2,4, for example, the context suggests that כְּנֶנ refers to the prophet of another deity. In these passages the targumist renders כְּנֶנ literally but adds רֶדֶד ("false") 5.

10. THE HOUSE (יִב) OF GOD

With six exceptions (Haggai 1:8; 2:3,7,9; Zechariah

---

1 So Churgin, op. cit.; pp. 117f.

2 Following Churgin’s (loc. cit.) statements in this paragraph.

3 Here רֶדֶד ("scribe") or the addition of רֶדֶד ("false") might have been anticipated.


5 So also Hosea 4:5.
The targumist always adds נֵסֶרֶךְ ("sanctuary") to distinguish the house of the true God from those of idols or the usual profane homes and palaces. This addition occurs in twenty-three passages, e.g., Hosea 8:1. This tendency to distinguish between the holy and the profane house may be seen also in the statements which the targumist adds to the Hebrew text and in the statements which include the phrase, "the house of the sanctuary", as in Hosea 9:11; 12:1; Joel 2:14; Zephaniah 3:7; and Zechariah 8:5, as well as in the interesting translations of Amos 6:9 and Zechariah 10:10.

11. THE INCREASED IMPORTANCE OF THE ASSEMBLY OR SYNAGOGUE

Even more so, the importance of the concept of the Assembly or Synagogue of Israel is seen in the addition of אָסִמְרַה ("assembly, synagogue") in Hosea 2:4(2), 7(5), 15(13); 3:3; 4:5; Amos 5:2, 12, 15; 8:13; 9:6; Micah 2:9; 4:8, 10, 13; 7:11; Zephaniah 3:14; Haggai 2:14; Zechariah 2:11, 14; and 9:9.
APPENDIX V

THE INTERMEDIARY DEVICES OF THE TARGUM

Most of these devices\(^1\) have been discussed earlier and have been treated particularly in Chapter IX. The agency of the Spirit of God was discussed in Chapter VI, pages 203-206. Here two more intermediary devices or agencies are considered: (1) the Law (Torah), and (2) the Messiah (including the development of Messianic beliefs).

1. THE INCREASED IMPORTANCES OF THE TORAH (LAW)

In the Book of the Twelve the targumist refers to the Law (Torah) of God in at least thirty-six passages where the Masoretic Text makes no such references.

He considers that the children of Israel cease to be God's people whenever they fail to follow God's Law (Hosea 1:9 and 2:1). Therefore, failure to obey the Law (Torah) resulted in disasters for Israel (Hosea 2:5(3); 10:1; 13:14; Amos 4:12\(^2\); 9:1; cf. also Hosea 4:14; 5:4\(^3\); 7:16; 10:2; Amos 3:10; 5:10; Zephaniah 2:1). Similarly, other peoples also suffer for failure to accept and to follow the Torah (Micah

\(^1\)One interesting change occurs in the Targum of Amos 6:10. The Targum translates 'ךכ לא חיו עם יהוה' ("We must not mention the name of the Lord.") as 'ךכ לוי קם לא חיו עם יהוה' ("Because as long as they were established they were not praying in the name of Yahweh").

\(^2\)See pages 285f.

\(^3\)See page 274.
On the other hand returning to God and repenting means the return to the Torah, i.e., to its observance, (Hosea 2:3(1); 10:12; 11:7; 13:9; Micah 1:12; 4:2; Nahum 1:3; Habakkuk 3:1; 2, 7; cf. Hosea 6:6). In fact, whenever Israel turned to God, His Memra assisted them (Hosea 13:9). God also prefers people to follow (serve) the Torah rather than to make sacrifices (Hosea 6:6).

The targumist also emphasizes that God has revealed the Law to Israel (Hosea 2:16; 5:9; Nahum 1:6; Habakkuk 3:3; Zechariah 13:1; Malachi 2:5) and that Israel was prosperous when she followed the Torah (Hosea 9:13). The teaching of the Torah is considered to be beautiful (Zechariah 9:17), and the targumist identifies knowledge with the Torah (Hosea 6:6; cf. Hosea 5:4; Amos 3:10).

2. THE CONCEPT OF THE MESSIAH AND THE MESSIANIC AGE

As Churgin notes, the targumist followed many of the Messianic ideas which were current in his days, e.g., the exile would be ended and Judah and Israel would be reunited (Hosea 2:2(1:11); 11:10, 11; 14:8; Amos 9:11; Micah 5:2, 3; 7:12), with a descendent of the house of David as their king.

---

1 See pages 291f.
2 See page 273.
3 Churgin, op. cit., p. 122.
4 Loc. cit.
5 Ibid., pp. 124f.
(Hosea 2:2(1:11); 3:5; Amos 9:11; cf. Zechariah 3:8; 10:4). This leader was to be their king and Messiah (Hosea 3:5) who existed from the beginning and had been hidden because of Israel's sins (Micah 4:8; 5:1; Habakkuk 3:18; cf. Zechariah 4:7; 6:12). The kingdom was to be God's (Obadiah 21), and at that time the united Israel would be the chief nation and highly exalted (Amos 9:11f; cf. Zephaniah 2:3). The temple would then be rebuilt by the Messiah (Zechariah 6:12).

For the heathen, the prospects were not so bright. God would take vengeance on all those heathen who had hated Israel (Nahum 1:2,3; Joel 4(3):21; cf. Malachi 3:19(4:11)). Likewise, not all Israelites would prosper. The righteous would be resurrected and would live eternally (Hosea 6:2; 14:8,10;), but the wicked would be thrown into Gehenna (Hosea 14:10). In connection with this judgment two other facts should be noted: (1) that the wicked had been given an extra long time in this world in order to repent and to return to the Torah (Habakkuk 3:1,2; cf. Zephaniah 2:1,2) -- in fact, the Torah then would be revealed (Zechariah 13:1) -- and (2) the world then would be renewed (Habakkuk 3:2). Wonders and miracles will accompany the advent of the Messianic Age even as they did the Exodus from Egypt (Zechariah 10:11).
APPENDIX VI

THE ATTITUDE OF THE TARGUMIST TOWARDS THE HEATHEN AND THE KINGDOMS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH

The targumist, like the Greek translator, made certain changes in his translation which may reflect a bias towards the heathen and the earlier kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

1. THE TARGUMIST'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS ISRAEL AND JUDAH

The targumist, in his treatment of the Book of the Twelve, exhibits no hatred toward the northern Israelites -- for example, he exhibits partiality toward both Ephraim and Judah.

HOSEA 4:17

Ephraim is joined to idols, let him alone.
The men of the house of Israel have been joined to idols; they have left My worship.

This translation softens the idea that Israel is left alone -- presumably by God; it places the blame for the separation more clearly upon Israel's shoulders.

In Hosea 2:17(15); Joel 2:21; Zechariah 9:8; and 12:4 the pro-Israel and pro-Judah bias of the Targum is more self-evident. In these passages additions have been made which

---

1Cf. the Septuagint; Appendix III.
state that God will do good unto Israel. Moreover, in Amos 9:7, the targumist changes the comparison of Israel to Ethiopians before God, to likening Israel to beloved children before God. In the Targum of Micah 5:9(8)-14(13) the translator softens the statements that God will remove Israel's horses, chariots, cities, images, statutes, etc., from her. Instead God is promising to remove the horses, idols, etc., of the heathen from the midst of Israel.

The targumist also may exhibit a pro-Israel bias in the extension of the kingdom of Israel to include Damascus (Zechariah 9:1), Hamath² (Zechariah 9:2), etc. Moreover, Israel also will conquer the Chaldeans (Habakkuk 2:8) and will rule over the heathen (Amos 9:11f).

In the Targum, as in the Septuagint³, there are passages in which Israel is closely identified with God; e.g., in Nahum 1:11⁴ the devising against God is changed to devising against the people of God (הנה יִעַבְרֶנִי יִשְׂרָאֵל) and the substitution of "my people" for the pronominal suffix "My" in Zechariah 1:17 (cf. the addition of "my people" in Joel 1:7).

Another good example of this close identification of

---

¹So Cohen (op. cit., pp. 177f), et al.
²See also Appendix II; cf. also Habakkuk 2:17.
³Cf. Appendix III, pages 386f.
⁴See also Nahum 1:9; Hosea 7:15.
⁵Cf. also Habakkuk 3:12.
God with His people occurs in Nahum 1:2. Here the targumist alters the idea of God taking vengeance upon His adversaries, etc., (תנומת יזוחהΛלדדיהΛונמסדחונאהΛליאיבים) by the addition of "His people." Thus the targumist translates:

"Yahweh comes to take vengeance upon those hating His people and with vehement wrath against the masters of their enemies." (יַהֲוֶה לְאֵלָיו וּמִסְגָּלְיוּ עִמָּהוּ וּמֵרָעֲא עִמָּהוּ מִבֵּןְיוּ מַבֶּלָיו.)

The Targum also changes Micah 2:8:

אָחָתוֹל עָמִי לָאָוָיָב
יָכוֹם
מָכָבִיהּ חָטאַיְהוּ דּוֹ
לָעָיָל דָּבָא מֶסְפָּר
But yesterday my people rose as an enemy;
Because of the sins of My people, they have been handed over to the enemy.

This translation avoids the suggestion that Israel was opposed to God. Similarly, the translation in Hosea 12:1 exalts the children of Israel by calling them "the Holy People" because they were steadfast.

In Hosea 2:9(7) the targumist also adds the statement, "from now on I [Israel] will not worship idols" (לַאַלֵּשְׁנִים לַאֶפְּלָה). Similarly, Hosea 4:10 in the Targum is softened to "taking wives" (יאַזיוֹל) for "committing harlotry" (יָנוֹר). Another pro-Israel softening occurs in verse 6 of the same chapter. There the clause נִדְמוּ עָמִי מְבִיל ("My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge;") is

1Following Revised Standard Version, footnote e, page 966.
rendered in the Targum as "יָֽשְׁפֵלֵנִי עֵם מַכֶּל יְהוָה ("My people have become foolish because of lack of knowledge.").

The targumist also softens the idea that the Israelitish people would come in fear (דומיהו) to Yahweh in Hosea 3:5. This clause he translates as רְיֹתַנְנוּ לָשׁוֹלוֹן יְהוָה ("and they shall follow eagerly the worship of Yahweh").

Certain actions of God (other than those already considered) were altered (or softened) by the targumist because of His pro-Israel bias. He softens the idea of God selling (מוכר) a people into slavery by translating the idea as handing over or delivering (מסר) the people. Similarly, in Zechariah 9:13 the targumist avoids stating that God bends (ארチョים קרית בית ירבח) Judah by the translation, "אִֽתְּחוּ בָּעָלַת ("Because I have made the house of Judah strong before Me.").

This group of alterations also includes the following two passages:

(1) HOSEA 14:9(8)

וַאֲשֶׁר רוֹאֵינוּ And [I] look on him;
וַאֲסִירֵהֶים עֲלָוָּיו And I will have compassion upon them.

---

1See page 298.

2Joel 4:3(8); see page 272.

3American Jewish Translation.
(2) HOSEA 2:5(3)

Lest I strip her naked

Lest I should remove My Shekinah from her . . .

2. THE ANTI-HEATHEN ATTITUDE OF THE TARGUMIST

A few passages in the Twelve suggest that the targumist may have hated all Gentiles. In Micah 7:11 the Targum states that the decrees of the heathen will be useless and in verse 17, that the heathen will be broken in Yahweh's presence. Similarly, in Habakkuk 3:12,17; Nahum 1:9; Zephaniah 2:10; etc., destruction is promised by God upon those nations who have spoiled Israel¹.

¹Cf. also Zechariah 8:2.
APPENDIX VII

ANTHROPOMORPHIC PASSAGES IN THE TARGUM

The Targum, unlike the Septuagint, has very few passages which are more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text. In Hosea 11:3 the Targum supports the Septuagint against the Masoretic Text in suggesting that God carried Israel on His arms (shoulders). This fact suggests that they represent a Hebrew text more original than the Masoretic Text:

\[
\text{כָּתָם עֵילָּו-רֹבוּחִיוּן} \quad \text{Taking them by their arms;}
\]
\[
\text{וּנְשָׁחֲתִינֻוּן־כִּיּוּר עַל} \quad \ldots \text{and I carried them upon the arms;}
\]

The Targum of Hosea 11:2 also supports the Septuagint against the Masoretic Text:

\[
\text{כְּרַמָּה לְחָם} \quad \text{The more they called them}
\]
\[
\text{שִׁלְחִית נּוּ הָּלָבָם} \quad \text{I sent My prophets to teach them.}
\]

This translation suggests that the targumist is attempting to avoid some anthropomorphism such as the Septuagint's \(\kappaα\varphi\omegaς \cdot \muε\zeta\kappa\alpha\lambda\varepsilon\sigma\cdot α\upsilon\tauους\) \(5\) ("The more I called them,").

---

1 See pages 216f.

2 American Jewish Translation.

3 Cf. the Septuagint; see pages 158f.

4 Following the Revised Standard Version, footnote y, p. 944.

5 See pages 163f.
Another passage in which the Targum is more anthropomorphic than the Masoretic Text is Zephaniah 3:17. Here God is said to be silent (‘חֵרוֹן בְּעַמּוֹ) in His love; the targumist renders it as: הבוש על חורב בָּרָהַתָּה (“He will tread upon [stamp out] your sins with [by] His love.”).

In Nahum 2:14(13) and 3:5 the expression חַנּוֹנָה אֱלִיִּים (“behold I am against you,“) is translated as וּרְאֵהוּ עֹלָה (“Behold I am sending My anger against you...”). Perhaps this rendering safeguards the targumist’s conception of Deity; but this passage, coupled with the translations of Nahum 1:4 (‘וֹעֵר בִּים “He rebukes the sea...“) and of Malachi 3:11 (‘וֹנְעֶה לְכָּמָנוּ “I will rebuke the devourer for you,“), respectively, as ‘וֹנְעֵי בָּהָם (“Who is angry at the sea...“) and ‘וֹנוֹזִיק לְכָּמוֹנִים (“And I will be angry for you with the destroyer,”), suggests that in these four passages the Targum is more anthropopathic than the Masoretic.

In connection with the instances in which the Targum is more anthropomorphistic than the Masoretic Text; it must be recalled that the Targum retains many anthropomorphisms. God is still said to fight\(^1\) and to have an inheritance\(^2\). In the only passage in the Twelve where God is pictured as a Judge\(^3\),

\(^1\) Zechariah 14:3.


\(^3\) Micah 4:14(5:1).
the Targum has a plural for the singular of the Masoretic Text. This plural avoids the anthropomorphism, but perhaps the targumist had a plural in his text since, in the Targum of Joel 4(3);12\(^1\) and of Micah 4:3, God is described as judging\(^2\).

\(^1\)In Joel 4(3):2 God is described as taking vengeance (Ith. of יִדּ) instead of judging.

\(^2\)Cf. also Micah 4:3; Habakkuk 1:12.
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