

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES IN THE SOLOMONIC
NARRATIVE OF OG 2 CHRONICLES AS EVINced BY OG
2 CHR 4-6

**A Thesis submitted to Middlesex University in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

by

Adam W. Jones

Middlesex University

Supervised at London School of Theology

June 2022

Abstract

Adam W. Jones

Translation Techniques in the Solomonic Narrative of OG 2 Chronicles as Evinced by OG 2 Chr 4-6

Doctor of Philosophy

Middlesex University
Supervised at London School of Theology
2022

Within the field of LXX studies, much research is conducted topically (studies of rhetoric, verbs, etc. in a certain book) or broadly (translation techniques for a large corpus). This thesis includes a broad examination of the Solomon narrative (2 Chr 1-9) and a narrow focus on three specific passages found in 2 Par 4-6 which, when taken together, exhibit contrasting translation styles.

It is predominantly true and established that within any given passage the translator of 2 Chronicles takes varying approaches to words and phrases. When passages like the temple furnishings in ch. 4 and the prayer of dedication in ch. 6 are juxtaposed and analyzed, discrepancies in semantic, syntactic, and stylistic choices are visibly prominent. The temple furnishings section displays that the translator was unfamiliar with several technical terms as he opts for translations of some terms that stray significantly from standard translation options, and he transcribes several words rather than translating them. In contrast, while the prayer of dedication does exhibit some inconsistent translation decisions, it is more carefully handled overall. Nestled between these passages, the translator deals with a more standard narrative section, the ritual text of 2 Par 5:1-6:13, as expected—with straightforward, standard translations.

The OG version of Chronicles has seen little attention, especially in recent years. The goal of this thesis is to begin to fill this gap in scholarship by using an eclectic methodology to give special attention to a smaller unit of text within the larger corpus of OG Chronicles and the Solomonic Narrative in 2 Par 1-9.

Acknowledgements

I owe my sincerest appreciation to many people for their encouragement and support during the process of completing this thesis. I am thankful for many friends who have been great listeners as I discuss various issues and challenges I've faced in research. They have celebrated the good times and offered support in the hard times. I would like to especially thank Jackson Carter, Joey Dodson, Sadie Sasser, David Wilhite, and Libby Hilliard. I am thankful for the financial support I received from the Carey Baptist Association and the churches that make up that organization.

The faculty of the Pruet School of Christian Studies at Ouachita Baptist University first instilled in me a love for biblical studies as an academic discipline. Since my time as an undergraduate student, they have consistently been available for guidance and encouragement. I have had the privilege of knowing most of these women and men as professors and I now know them, including those who have joined since my undergraduate days, as friends and colleagues.

The faculty at Asbury Theological Seminary continued to nurture this love for biblical studies during my time there. It was during my studies at Asbury that I first considered the field of LXX studies as a possible path for my academic career. Through the advice of professors there, I decided to pursue this PhD.

I have great appreciation for Dr. Michael Matlock, whom I met during my time at Asbury. From my very first interaction with Dr. Matlock, I clearly saw a man who cared deeply about rigorous academics and love for the Church. When I discovered that he was working on commentaries in the Brill Septuagint Commentary Series, I approached him to discuss the field of LXX studies as an area to explore for PhD studies. It was during the ensuing conversations about the LXX that Dr. Matlock offered to serve as my PhD supervisor. I cannot thank him enough for the care, kindness, and encouragement I have received from him during this process. It has been an honor to learn from him.

My students at Ouachita Baptist University have been a constant source of encouragement as I have journeyed through this PhD program. I have learned much from them over the last few years. Perhaps most significant is the way that I saw them continue to work hard, even in the face of very large national and global issues over the past few years. Their perseverance has served as an inspiration to me during the difficult seasons of my research.

My parents, Connie and the late Stan Jones, showed me what a life of following Jesus ought to look like. They taught me to love God and care deeply about studying

and knowing the Bible. My mother taught me how to keep my head up during difficult times in life through the positive attitude she maintains as she battles Multiple Sclerosis and as she has recently beaten cancer. My father was an incredible motivator in my life, especially in the first half of my time in this program. Sadly, he died halfway through my time in the program. Somehow, I have found additional motivation to finish this thesis, perhaps in part as a way to honor him and his impact on my life.

I am thankful to and for Devin, to whom I have the privilege of being married. She has stood by me faithfully and supported me immensely through my time as a student for the whole time we have been together. She has been understanding of the times I spent long nights and weekends at my office working away at this thesis. She has loved me through my stressful seasons. I could not ask for a better companion during this journey.

Thanks be to God who has sustained me throughout this process, in the best and worst of times.

Abbreviations

<i>BAGL</i>	<i>Biblical and Ancient Greek Linguistics</i>
BDAG	Bauer, W. <i>A Greek – English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3 rd Ed. Rev. and ed. by F. W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BGU	<i>Aegyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden</i> . Berlin, 1863-.
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
<i>BrillDAG</i>	Montanari, F. <i>The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek</i> . 3 rd Ed. M. Goh and C. Schroeder, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
<i>CGCG</i>	Emde Boas, E. van, A. Rijksbaron, L. Huitink, and M. de Bakker. <i>The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek</i> . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
Chr	Chronicles
CPR	Corpus Papyrorum Raineri.
CSB	Christian Standard Bible
<i>DCH</i>	Clines, D. J. A., ed. <i>The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . 8 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-2011.
esp.	especially
ESV	English Standard Version
<i>GELS</i>	Muraoka, T. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
GKC	Gesenius, F. W. <i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Edited by E. Kautzsch and Sir A. E. Cowley. 2nd English ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
<i>HALOT</i>	Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, M. E. J. Richardson, and J. J. Stamm. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Leiden: Brill, 1994-2000.
<i>IBHS</i>	Waltke, B. K. and M. P. O'Connor. <i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i> . Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
ID	<i>Inscriptions de Délos</i> . 7 vols.; ed. by F. Durrbach, P. Roussel, M. Launey, J. Coupry, and A. Plassart; Paris, 1926-1972.
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae, consilio et auctoritate Academie Scientiarum Berolinensis et Brandenburgensis editae</i> . Berlin, 1873-.
JM	Joüon, P. and T. Muraoka. <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i> . SubBi 27. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006.
Kgdms	Kingdoms (OG Samuel-Kings)
Kgs	Kings
LES	Lexham English Septuagint
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, and R. McKenzie. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NASB	New American Standard Version
NET	New English Translation
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
<i>NIDNTE</i>	Silva, M., <i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2014).
NIV	New International Version
NLT	New Living Translation
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
OG	Old Greek

Par	Paraleipomena/-on (LXX/OG Chronicles)
P.Mich.	<i>Michigan Papyri</i> . 19 vols; 1931-1999.
RSV	Revised Standard Version
Sam	Samuel
Smyth	Smyth, H. W. <i>Greek Grammar</i> . Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1956.
SSG	Muraoka, T. <i>A Syntax of Septuagint Greek</i> . Leuven: Peeters, 2016.
TDNT	Kittel, G., G. W. Bromiley, and G. Friedrich, eds. <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
UPZ	<i>Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit (ältere Funde)</i> . Edited by U. Wilcken. Berlin—Leipzig, 1927. Berlin, 1935-1957.

All other abbreviations used below are from *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abbreviations	iv
Table of Contents	vi
Chapter 1	
Introduction	1
The Study of Translation Technique	2
The History of the Texts of Chr and Par	8
Previous Scholarship on Par	11
Gillis Gerleman	11
Leslie C. Allen	12
Roger Good	14
Previous Scholarship on Translation Technique outside of Par	15
Translation Technique: Literal or Free?	19
Research Methodology	25
Chapter 2	
Translation Technique of 2 Par	29
Translation Technique of 2 Par	29
2 Par 1:4	33
2 Par 2:6 (2 Chr 2:5)	37
2 Par 3:1	39
2 Par 7:21	42
2 Par 8:5	43
2 Par 9:13	45
Preliminary Conclusions on Translation Techniques in 2 Par	46
Chapter 3	
Translation Technique in the Temple Furnishings Section	47
Translation of the Temple Furnishings Section in the MT and the LXX	47
The Translation and Transcription of Technical Terms	53
Terms in 2 Chr/Par 4:3	53
Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:11	54
Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:12	56
Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:13	58
Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:14	58
Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:16	58
Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:21-22	60
Conclusions for Technical Terms	62
Transcriptions in the Solomonic Narrative and Other Technical Terms in Nearby Passages	63
אלם	64
שרשרות	66
במה	68
Code-Switching	69
Conclusions	70
The Translator's Dealings with Other Nontechnical Terms	70
Translations of ים	70
Verbs of Cleansing in 2 Chr 4:6	71
Directional Terms in 2 Chr/Par 4:6-8	71
The Use of τίθημι for Different Verbs in 2 Par 4:6-10	73

The Translator's Use of ἀύλῆ in 2 Par 4:9	73
Order of Words Concerning Measurements	74
Pluses, Minuses, and Various Other Changes	75
2 Par 4:1	75
2 Par 4:2	76
2 Par 4:3	76
2 Par 4:4	77
2 Par 4:5	78
2 Par 4:10	79
2 Par 4:13	79
2 Par 4:16	80
2 Par 4:17	80
2 Par 4:19	81
2 Par 4:20	81
Conclusions	82
Chapter 4	
Translation Technique in the Account of the Temple Dedication Ritual	83
Translation of the Dedication Ritual Text in the MT and the LXX	83
The Translation of הַיָּא and הוּא	89
The Translation of the Relative Pronoun	90
The Translations of Forms of קָדַשׁ הַקְּדוּשִׁים in 2 Chr 5:7 and Beyond	92
The Translations of Forms of אָב in 2 Chr	94
The Choice of ἀγαθόν for טוֹב in 2 Par 5:13	95
The Use of the Pluperfect Indicative for a Qal Participle	96
Pluses, Minuses, and Various Other Changes	98
2 Par 5:1	98
2 Par 5:2	99
2 Par 5:4	99
2 Par 5:5	100
2 Par 5:6	101
2 Par 5:8	103
2 Par 5:9	103
2 Par 5:10	104
2 Par 5:12	104
2 Par 5:13	105
2 Par 6:2	107
2 Par 6:3	108
2 Par 6:4	110
2 Par 6:6	111
2 Par 6:9	113
2 Par 6:10	113
2 Par 6:13	114
Conclusions	115
Chapter 5	
Translation Technique in Solomon's Prayer of Dedication	116
Translation of Solomon's Prayer of Dedication in the MT and the LXX	116
The Translation of the לְ Preposition	123
The Dative Case	124
The Preposition εἰς	125
The Translation of לֹא־אָמַר and לְ with Other Infinitives	125

Other Translations of ל	127
Conclusions for the Translation of the Preposition ל	128
The Translation of לפני	128
Παῖς and Δοῦλος as Translations of עבד	129
Δικαίωμα and Κρίμα as Translations of משפט	133
The Semantics of Κρίμα, Κρίσις, and Δικαίωμα and Their Relation to משפט	134
Analyzing the Translations of משפט in 2 Par	137
The Translation of סלח	140
Ἀκούω and Its Compound Forms as Translations of שמע	141
The Structure and Rhetoric of 2 Par 6:19	144
Pluses, Minuses, and Various Other Changes	146
2 Par 6:15	146
2 Par 6:17	147
2 Par 6:18	148
2 Par 6:19	149
2 Par 6:20	150
2 Par 6:21	151
2 Par 6:23	151
2 Par 6:24	152
2 Par 6:26	153
2 Par 6:27	153
2 Par 6:28	155
2 Par 6:29	158
2 Par 6:30	158
2 Par 6:31	159
2 Par 6:32	160
2 Par 6:33	161
2 Par 6:34	162
2 Par 6:36	162
2 Par 6:37	164
2 Par 6:39	164
2 Par 6:40	165
2 Par 6:41	165
Conclusions	166
Chapter 6	
Conclusions	167
Contributions of This Study	168
Expanding Allen's <i>The Greek Chronicles</i>	168
An Inconsistent Translator	168
Concluding Remarks	172
Recommendations for Further Study	172
Bibliography	173

Chapter 1:

Introduction

In the Canadian comedy television series *Kim's Convenience*, the family patriarch Sang-il Kim attempts to distract house guest Pastor Nina by asking her whether dinosaurs can be found in the Bible. Pastor Nina responds, 'Oh. Uh, well, believe it or not there are a few possible references to dinosaurs in the Bible. Yes. It depends on the translation. Because translators, if you think about it, are only products of their time and culture. For example, a major shortcoming of the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, was their complete lack of attention to synonyms. So, words like "mercy" and "compassion" and "love" were often confused'.¹ Though she speaks rather generally about the LXX,² Pastor Nina's claims are important and insightful, especially with regard to the role of place and time for the context of any translation. For now, the accuracy of the claims is less important than the fact that study of the LXX is exhibiting increased research interest.³

The field of LXX studies is burgeoning with many areas yet to be explored. Interest in studying the LXX is not surprising for a number of reasons, such as (1) the translation of the LXX was, at least in present estimation, the earliest major translation project in human history, (2) the completed LXX provided access to sacred scripture for diaspora Jews in the second temple period,⁴ and (3) the Greek version of the Old Testament was considered authoritative for the early church.⁵ In fact, Marguerite Harl is correct in her evaluation: 'The Septuagint is the soil which has nurtured the Christian tradition'.⁶ While scholars have not overworked any book in the LXX, Par has been given little attention.⁷

¹ *Kim's Convenience*, season 2, episode 3, 'House Guest', directed by P. Wellington, aired October 10, 2017, on CBC Television.

² In this study, I will use 'LXX' to refer to the Greek version of the Hebrew Bible and the Greek texts associated with the 'Septuagint'. From time to time, OG will be used instead. This is reserved for quotes and references to specific books.

³ See L. Greenspoon, 'The Septuagint and/in Popular Culture', *BIOSCS* 36 (2003) 61-74.

⁴ For Philo, the LXX served as an apologetic document. In *Mos. 2.27*, Philo asserts that it is only right that Greek speakers also have access to God's Torah.

⁵ According to M. R. Eaton, 'The Intractable Servant of the Septuagint: Translating *'ebed'*', *BT* 48.1 (1997) 114-122, citing 122, 'The Septuagint, to which the Church has *always* had access, is an extremely fertile and insightful source for' Bible translators (emphasis in original).

⁶ M. Harl, 'La Bible d'Alexandrie I. The Translation Principles', in B. A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Oslo, 1998*, SCS 51 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001) 181-197, citing 195.

⁷ Paraleipomena is a transliteration of the Greek participle *'παρὰλειπομενα'*, or 'things left out'. In quotes, this will sometimes be spelled 'Paralipomena'. See also R. Hanhart (ed.), *Paralipomenon liber II, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum* vol. VII, 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014)

The Study of Translation Technique

Of particular interest to many LXX scholars is the study of translation technique. According to Anneli Aejmelaeus, ‘Bei jeder Art von forschungsarbeit an der Septuaginta sind die folgenden drei Grössen zu berücksichtigen: (1) *der Text der Übersetzung*, (2) *der Text der hebräischen Vorlage* und (3) *die Übersetzungstechnik*’.⁸ Emanuel Tov echoes this, claiming that the translators’ intentions, as evinced by their translation techniques, alone ‘determine the real meaning of words in the LXX’.⁹ The goal of such studies is to attempt to understand the relationship between a given translated text and its Hebrew source text with special attention given to how the translator chose to render the Hebrew text. While in the past, a concise, universal definition for ‘translation technique’ has been a point of disagreement for scholars,¹⁰ there is more consensus in recent studies. According to Timothy McLay, ‘The purpose of the study of TT [translation technique] of the LXX is to describe the way in which individual translators engaged in the process of translating a unit of Scripture for a community’.¹¹ Raija Sollamo offers this: ‘The study of translation technique seeks to describe how translators customarily work when they translate Hebrew into Greek’.¹² John Beck claims that translation technique is ‘the pattern of conscious and subconscious decisions made by the translator when transferring a text from the parent language to the target language’.¹³ From these considerations, the study of translation

125. In the first critical note, Hanhart shows that the spelling ‘*παραλιπομενον*’ is also attested (along with other minor changes). To complicate things further, Hanhart opts for *Παραλειπομενων* when using the Greek spelling. Otherwise, he uses ‘Paralipomenon’, as in the title of the volume.

On this and other names for Chronicles, see G. N. Knoppers and P. B. Harvey Jr., ‘Omitted and Remaining Matters: On the Names Given to the Book of Chronicles in Antiquity’, *JBL* 121/2 (2002) 227-243; E. Correia, ‘La place et le sens des livres des Chroniques dans les canons bibliques’, *FoiVie* 109.4 (2010) 49-59.

⁸ A. Aejmelaeus, ‘Übersetzungstechnik und theologische Interpretation: Zur Methodik der Septuaginta-Forschung’, in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, Rev. and exp. ed. (Leuven: Peeters, 2007) 223-239, citing 225. (‘Any type of research of the Septuagint should take into account the following three dimensions: [1] the text of the translation, [2] the text of the Hebrew *Vorlage*, and [3] the translation technique’.)

⁹ E. Tov, ‘Three Dimensions of Words in the Septuagint’, in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, VTSup 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 85-94, citing 87.

¹⁰ See A. Aejmelaeus, ‘What We Talk About When We Talk About Translation Technique’, in *On the Trail*, 205-222, citing 205, ‘It would be helpful if we could finally agree on a definition of the term “translation technique”’.

¹¹ R. T. McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003) 45.

¹² R. Sollamo, ‘The Study of Translation Technique’, in E. Bons and J. Joosten (eds.), *Die Sprache der Septuaginta/The Language of the Septuagint*, LXX.H Band 3 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016) 161-171, citing 162.

¹³ J. A. Beck, *Translators as Storytellers: A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique*, StBibLit 25 (New York: Peter Lang, 2000) 2. Beck picks up on an important issue here: translation decisions are both conscious and subconscious. See also E. H. P. Backfish, *Hebrew Wordplay and Septuagint Translation Technique in the Fourth Book of the Psalter*, LHBOTS 682 (London: T&T Clark, 2019) 10,

technique is the examination of the perceived process of translating from one language to another as evinced by the product of the translation process—the translation itself.

A major complication in the study of translation technique is the fact that no two languages are exactly alike. This makes the act of transporting meaning from one language to another quite complicated. According to Jan Joosten, there are not only problems that arise from a linguistic angle; there are also pragmatic issues. A translated text is removed from the historical and cultural setting in which the source text was composed, a step that ‘is bound to affect the text profoundly’.¹⁴ In light of this, Marieke Dhont claims that ‘a translator’s decisions during the translation process are governed by a multidimensional interplay of various factors that are determined by the translator’s context’, a context about which we know ‘relatively little’.¹⁵ Benjamin Johnson reminds those who work with the LXX that it is both a translation and ‘a literary product of ancient Judaism’.¹⁶ Thus, we must remember that interpretation of the LXX is a difficult task, but one worth taking up.¹⁷

A proper understanding of the general field of translation studies is paramount to a study of translation technique. Gideon Toury has done significant work in the discipline of Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS).¹⁸ In the DTS system, function plays a part in translation that is interdependent with process and product. To clarify, ‘functions’ as used by Toury refer to ‘the (prospective) systemic position ... of a translation’.¹⁹ This does not mean that process and product are not important, but functions ‘should be regarded as always having at least *logical* priority over their

who suggests that ‘translation technique’ for the LXX translators ‘was likely not a self-conscious practice’.

¹⁴ J. Joosten, ‘Translating the Untranslatable: Septuagint Renderings of Hebrew Idioms’, in R. J. V. Hiebert (ed.), *“Translation Is Required”: The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, SCS 56 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010) 59-70, citing 59.

¹⁵ M. Dhont, ‘Septuagint Translation Technique and Jewish Hellenistic Exegesis’, in W. A. Ross and W. E. Glenny (eds.), *The T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research* (London: T&T Clark, 2021) 21-33, citing 24. See also J. K. Aitken, ‘The Origins of KAI ΓΕ’, in J. K. Aitken and T. V. Evans (eds.), *Biblical Greek in Context: Essays in Honour of John A. L. Lee*, BTS 22 (Leuven: Peeters, 2015) 21-40, esp. 37-39.

¹⁶ B. J. M. Johnson, ‘Reading the Septuagint: The Hermeneutical Problem of a Translated Text’, in D. Batovici and K. De Troyer (eds.), *Authoritative Texts and Reception History: Aspects and Approaches*, BibInt 151 (Leiden: Brill, 2017) 20-40, citing 39. It is necessary, though, to remember that the LXX is a *translated* text. As such, we should expect it to more closely reflect the work of translation than composition. See B. G. Wright, ‘The Septuagint as a Hellenistic Greek Text’, *JSJ* 50 (2019) 497-523, esp. 501.

¹⁷ Johnson, ‘Reading the Septuagint’, 39: ‘Interpreting a text is a difficult task, even more so a *translated* text, even more so a translation of a *sacred* text, even more so a translation of a sacred text that became a sacred text in its own right’ (emphasis in original).

¹⁸ See G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond*, rev. ed., Benjamins Translation Library 100 (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2012). Toury’s DTS is a development of Translation Studies, which Toury traces back to a paper given by James S. Holmes.

¹⁹ Toury, *Descriptive Translation*, 7.

surface realizations'.²⁰ Toury urges that any translation must be understood and studied within the context of its original target culture.²¹ He states: 'The intended target society practices its authority and exerts its power on individual translators through *sets of norms* that would-be translators are expected to internalize, whether they are acquired through trial and error, imitation, apprenticeship, or formal schooling'.²² Central to this approach is the desire to understand any differences between the role a translation was intended to have and the role it actually had in the target culture.²³ The goal, according to Cameron Boyd-Taylor, is 'to reconstruct and contextualize these' norms of the individual translators.²⁴

Given the nature of Toury's work, it comes as no surprise that LXX scholars have seen value in his approach. Albert Pietersma summarizes Toury's system: 'DTS provides a framework within which translation technique ("process") and textual linguistic makeup ("product"), together with the prospective slot ("function") of the text within its recipient culture can be described with reference to the translational paradigm that informs the text'.²⁵ A so-called translational paradigm is necessary because in any translation, there is no product without a strategy for translating.²⁶ Drawing directly from Toury, Pietersma suggests that the study of the LXX needs 'a more fully articulated paradigm or model as an explanatory framework for the nature of the text, and by extension its likely origin'.²⁷ The model, called the 'interlinear paradigm', put forth by Pietersma, is more concerned with the intended role (function) of the text than

²⁰ Toury, *Descriptive Translation*, 8.

²¹ Toury, *Descriptive Translation*, 22.

²² G. Toury, 'A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?', *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 13-25, citing 15. T. Rajak, *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) 7, speaks of the Septuagint as a 'bridge for Jews to the Greek cultural mainland, even if it was a bridge which most often carried one-way traffic'.

²³ Toury, *Descriptive Translation*, 8. In fact, in 'Methodological Issues', 13, Toury uses 'contexts, or sociocultural circumstances' in place of 'functions'. See also Harl, 'La Bible d'Alexandrie', 195-196, 'Orphaned by its author, the text remains on its own, open to anyone—person or community—that would accept it, read it and identify with the addressee of its message'.

²⁴ C. Boyd-Taylor, 'Toward the Analysis of Translational Norms: A Sighting Shot', *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 27-46, citing 29. Boyd-Taylor does attempt to differentiate translation technique from the study of such norms. In his view, translation technique is the starting point for a larger study of DTS. Thus, these two fields are actually interdependent.

²⁵ A. Pietersma, 'LXX and DTS: A New Archimedean Point for Septuagint Studies?', *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 1-11, citing 11.

²⁶ Toury, 'Methodological Issues', 21.

²⁷ A. Pietersma, 'A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint', in J. Cook (ed.), *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference* (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 337-364, citing 339. In Toury's language, the 'nature' and 'origin' of the text are tantamount to the 'function' of the text.

the way the text was received.²⁸ If, as is stated in DTS, the target audience has a level of authority over the translation, then Pietersma sees the literalness of the LXX as resulting from the audience's desire for an interlinear-type version of the Hebrew scriptures. So, for Pietersma and others, the 'function' of the LXX is to provide a literal translation of the Hebrew scriptures for pedagogical purposes in a school setting.

Pietersma draws on the Hellenistic educational practice of producing bilingual, interlinear texts in schools as the origin of the LXX even though no physical bilingual or interlinear manuscript of the LXX is extant.²⁹ Pietersma qualifies this by saying that this is not what he means when using the term 'interlinear'. However, he also states that a diglot could have existed, so its existence cannot be ruled out. The term 'interlinear' for Pietersma signals 'a relationship of subservience and dependence of the Greek translation *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew parent text'.³⁰ This explanation is meant to account for the 'dimension of unintelligibility' found in the Greek text.³¹ Pietersma states, 'the independence of the Septuagint *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew, is not a statement about its origins but about its subsequent history'.³² In this way, he admits that the LXX is independent, but not originally.

A simple example offered by proponents of the Interlinear Paradigm is found in the translation of בִּי (1 Kgs 3:17) with ἐμοί (3 Kgdms 3:17).³³ The translator seems to have taken the particle בִּי, 'please', as a preposition בִּי with a 1st person singular suffix, 'by me'. Joosten explains that this particle was no longer used in Late Biblical Hebrew, so the translator decided to translate בִּי as best he could. Joosten adds, 'If the Septuagint had been created in order to explain the Hebrew text, one would have expected the translation to make more sense'.³⁴ This brings to light an interesting point regarding the Interlinear Paradigm more generally, not only regarding the example above. Proponents contend that the Interlinear Paradigm attempts to account for the level of

²⁸ 'It should, therefore, be clear from the outset that, when I speak of the interlinear paradigm, I am speaking of the birth of the Septuagint, i.e. its original *Sitz im Leben*, not about subsequent history and subsequent *Sitze im Leben* assigned to this body of literature' (Pietersma, 'New Paradigm', 340).

²⁹ Pietersma, 'New Paradigm', 346-350. C. Ziegert, 'Kultur und Identität. Wörtliches Übersetzen in der Septuaginta', *VT* 67.4 (2017) 648-665, citing 655, claims that Pietersma's idea fits more appropriately in the 2nd century CE than the 3rd century BCE ('Das von Pietersma vorausgesetzte soziale Umfeld passt besser ins 2. nachchristliche als ins 3. vorchristliche Jahrhundert').

³⁰ Pietersma, 'New Paradigm', 350.

³¹ Pietersma, 'New Paradigm', 350.

³² Pietersma, 'New Paradigm', 340.

³³ See Pietersma, 'New Paradigm', 350-351; C. Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies*, BTS 8 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011) 94.

³⁴ J. Joosten, 'Reflections on the "Interlinear Paradigm" in Septuagintal Studies', in A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, JSJSup 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2008) 163-178, citing 174.

‘unintelligibility’ of the LXX, while still giving credit to its intelligibility.³⁵ However, given the above example, the Interlinear Paradigm actually explains the translation only in areas where the translator produces a literal rendering of his source text that is also intelligible. If what he has produced is not intelligible, then it would have failed in its intended role as a companion to the Hebrew text. That is, ‘unintelligible’ renderings would not have survived the early transmission processes if the readers of the LXX were bilingual. Such renderings would have likely been corrected to accommodate the pedagogical setting and role of the translation. Additionally, this raises questions about whether Greek renderings that are ‘unintelligible’ to modern scholars were regarded as such by the first readers.

Harl and the French scholars working on *La Bible d’Alexandrie* are careful to articulate that the Greek of the LXX should not be considered ‘bad’ Greek. In fact, statements about the quality of the LXX might be avoided altogether. According to Harl, ‘With all the craft, intelligence and refinement the translators used to make the Greek maximally correspond to the Hebrew, the language of their translation remains a fragment in the history of Greek language from Homer down to the Roman historians. It relates to other Greek writings, literary or documentary, Jewish or Gentile’.³⁶ Further, words in the LXX do not obtain meaning from their Hebrew counterparts. Instead, the meaning of these Greek words comes from their meaning within Koine usage and from the context of the sentences in the LXX in which they appear. Once these words took on meaning, perhaps even new or nuanced meaning, their repeated usage ‘makes them more comprehensible’ in their translated context.³⁷

Pietersma claims that the scholars who view the LXX as free-standing ‘time and again feel forced by the evidence to have recourse to the parent text for *essential* linguistic information, in order to account for the Greek’.³⁸ He is not incorrect in this assessment. However, the need for recourse to the parent text does not necessitate interlinearity. Even as a free-standing replacement for the parent text, the LXX is still a translation. Therefore, it is necessary to understand it in light of its parent text. If knowledge of and access to the Hebrew Bible are *necessary for understanding* the LXX, then the translators should be understood as having failed to produce a Greek version of the Hebrew Bible for a Greek speaking audience if indeed their task was to

³⁵ Pietersma, ‘New Paradigm’, 350-351.

³⁶ Harl, ‘La Bible d’Alexandrie’, 185.

³⁷ Harl, ‘La Bible d’Alexandrie’, 186.

³⁸ Pietersma, ‘New Paradigm’, 355 (emphasis in original).

produce a free-standing version.³⁹ Aejmelaeus suggests that the LXX was meant to be a free-standing replacement. She uses the evidence of so-called ‘false renderings’ to show that there are a number of examples in the LXX that cannot be understood by recourse to the Hebrew text. Further, she sees the study of translation technique as only pertaining to the Greek text as it is. The intention of the translator cannot be recovered. Any intentions of the translator can only be observed through the Greek text that exists.⁴⁰ Further, Aejmelaeus argues that the ‘process of translation could be looked at from the viewpoint of “meaning”’.⁴¹ Sometimes this comes through with the meaning of individual words. More often, though, the meaning of units of texts is prioritized over formulaic renderings of specific lexemes or constituents.⁴² This statement, though, is too general, as the evidence in 2 Par will show.

In light of this, it should be established that the *study* of translation technique necessitates looking at both the Greek and Hebrew texts to attempt to understand the choices made by the translator. So in a certain sense, the *study* of techniques must include recourse to the source text(s).⁴³ This, however, is to the benefit of the one studying.⁴⁴

Pietersma’s Interlinear Paradigm, built from DTS, and Aejmelaeus’s free-standing LXX represent two contrasting views on the original *function* of the LXX. The evidence above suggests that the arguments for the Interlinear Paradigm are insufficient to describe the function of the LXX. Concerning this paradigm, Elizabeth Backfish offers this helpful caveat with which I agree: ‘It is not my intention to critique the interlinear model of the LXX, but I wish to guard against a simplistic view of the LXX that sees it as a “crutch” for Hellenistic Hebrew students with little value on its own’.⁴⁵

³⁹ Some Interlinear Paradigm proponents, like B. G. Wright, suggest that the LXX was originally meant to function in subservience to the Hebrew text, but eventually came to stand on its own, as evinced by the high regard the LXX receives in Second Temple Jewish literature; B. G. Wright, ‘Translation as Scripture: The Septuagint in Aristeas and Philo’, in W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden (eds.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures*, SCS 53 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006) 47-61, esp. 53-54.

⁴⁰ Aejmelaeus, ‘Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator’, in *On the Trail*, 59-69, esp. 66-69. See also J. A. E. Mulroney, *The Translation Style of Old Greek Habakkuk*, FAT 2.86 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016) 19.

⁴¹ Aejmelaeus, ‘Translation Technique’, 61.

⁴² Aejmelaeus, ‘Translation Technique’, 61.

⁴³ According to R. Sollamo, ‘Translation Technique as a Method’, in H. Ausloos, et al. (eds.), *Translating a Translation: The LXX and its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (Leuven: Peeters, 2008) 35-41, citing 35, ‘the research of a translation technique *must* begin with the Hebrew source text’ (emphasis added).

⁴⁴ Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 77, suggests that this is even done by ancient readers: ‘By reading the Septuagint alongside of the Hebrew the reader has in textual form the *interpretation* of his language community’ (emphasis added).

⁴⁵ Backfish, *Hebrew Wordplay*, 12.

While we cannot ask the LXX translators about the system that they used for translating, the texts that they produced together with the source texts from which they translated can be used to reconstruct the situation and intended role of the LXX in a Greek-speaking Jewish society. Further, the ‘product’ (the translation) and the *Vorlage* can help us begin to understand the ‘process’ of translation. This is translation technique.

The History of the Texts of Chr and Par

Discussions of the translation ‘product’ and the *Vorlage* necessitate a discussion of the textual history of both Chr and Par. The textual histories of 2 Chr and 2 Par are quite complicated.⁴⁶ This is due in part to the relative lack of data available from extant sources.⁴⁷ While the Dead Sea Scrolls discoveries at Qumran impacted scholarly understanding of the relationship between the LXX and the Hebrew text in a way that is ‘difficult to overestimate’,⁴⁸ only a single tiny fragment of Chr was discovered among the manuscripts.⁴⁹ Schenker highlights the lack of textual evidence for the text of Par: ‘The best textual witnesses for the Paralipomena are uncials Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (S) and minuscule 127 (Moscow, Synodaltibliothek, Gr. 31, 10th cent.), which come closest to the original text’.⁵⁰ Codex Vaticanus in particular is seen as an important textual witness to the LXX. As such, even in the critical editions like Rahlfs and the Göttingen series ‘Codex Vaticanus takes pride of place and dominates the editions’, though other manuscripts are considered in the reconstructions.⁵¹ Schenker goes on to claim that these manuscripts ‘are not free from errors, revisions, or changes’.⁵²

⁴⁶ See L. C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text. Part II: Textual Criticism*, VTSup 27 (Leiden: Brill, 1974) esp. 166-168.

⁴⁷ See Hanhart, *Paralipomenon*, 3-10. Indeed, the textual evidence for 2 Par is only marginally better than that of 1 Par, which is why 2 Par has been done first in the Göttingen series. It may be possible that the lack of evidence is, at least in part, due to a declining trend in the use of Chronicles within Second Temple Judaism. See E. Ben Zvi, ‘The Authority of 1-2 Chronicles in the Late Second Temple Period’, *JSP* 3 (1988) 59-88, though his argument is refuted in M. S. Pajunen, ‘The Saga of Judah’s Kings Continues: The Reception of Chronicles in the Late Second Temple Period’, *JBL* 136.3 (2017), 565-584.

⁴⁸ N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*, tr. W. G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2000) 70.

⁴⁹ I. Kalimi, *The Retelling of Chronicles in Jewish Tradition and Literature: A Historical Journey* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009) 111.

⁵⁰ A. Schenker, ‘Paraleipomenon I and II / 1-2 Chronica / 1-2 Chronicles’, in S. Kreuzer (ed.), *Introduction to the LXX* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2019) 213-221, citing 216.

⁵¹ S. Kreuzer, ‘B or not B? The Place of Codex Vaticanus in Textual History and in Septuagint Research’, in J. Cook and H.-J. Stipp (eds.), *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint*, VTSup 157 (Leiden: Brill, 2012) 69-96, citing 69.

⁵² Schenker, ‘Paraleipomenon I and II’, 216.

Recently, Albrecht has published photographs and transcription of fragments from P.Sinai Gr. 1, which includes parts of 1-2 Par.⁵³ Worth noting is that the fragments Albrecht presents include parts of 2 Par 4-6, the focus texts for this thesis. P.Sinai Gr. 1 is dated between the 4th century CE and the 7th century CE. It serves, then, as an important early witness to the text of Par. While Albrecht’s publication of the photographs happened after the publication of the Göttingen edition of 2 Par, the manuscript was available to Hanhart and is referenced in relevant passages in the Göttingen volume.

Following Barthélemy, some scholars consider Par to have been affected by the *kaige* revision, particularly the translation of ׀ג, ‘and also’, with καὶ γε, ‘and indeed’, or καὶ γάρ, ‘and for’.⁵⁴ This *kaige* revision was an attempt within early Judaism to adapt the translation of the LXX back towards the Proto-Masoretic Hebrew text.⁵⁵ According to Kreuzer, ‘the *kaige* recension not only translates the meaning of the Hebrew text but seeks to show the form of the Hebrew text in its Greek rendering’.⁵⁶ Kreuzer describes the LXX/OG as a ‘one-way’ street which brought the Hebrew text into Greek. *Kaige*, though, creates a ‘two-way street’ in which ‘the reader should get the meaning of the Hebrew Scriptures and at the same time should be pointed back to the Hebrew text’.⁵⁷

⁵³ F. Albrecht, ‘Ein griechischer Papyrus-Codex der Chronikbücher (Ra 880, P.Sinai Gr. 1, *ineditum*)’, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 64.2 (2018) 279-293.

⁵⁴ See D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d’Aquila: Première publication intégrale du text des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le Désert de Juda*, VTSup 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1963) 41-43; S. Kreuzer, ‘Kaige and “Theodotion”’, in A. G. Salvesen and T. M. Law (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021) 449-458. L. Vianès, ‘Chronicles/Paralipomena’, in A. G. Salvesen and T. M. Law (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021) 235-243, citing 236, claims (with no substantive explanation) that ‘the whole manuscript tradition of Paralipomena was left untouched by the *Kaige* revision’. Vianès, ‘Chronicles/Paralipomena’, 236, cites S. P. Brock, ‘Lucian *Redivivus*: Some Reflections on Barthélemy’s *Les devanciers d’Aquila*’, in F. L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica V*. TU 103 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968) 176-181, who attempts to refute Barthélemy’s significant work on the *kaige* revision. This article by Brock has been dealt with and disproven by Kreuzer on several occasions, but notably in S. Kreuzer, ‘“Lukian redivivus” or Barthélemy and Beyond?’, in M. K. H. Peters (ed.), *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013) 243-261. It is worth noting that in 2 Par, καὶ γε only occurs once for ׀ג(י) (there is at least one other disputed instance), while καὶ γάρ occurs six times for ׀ג(י). More often in 2 Par, ׀ג(י) is simply translated with καί. According to Aitken, ‘The Origins of KAI GE’, 39, καὶ γε is a development of the ‘standard (Greek) conjunction’ καὶ γάρ. By the generally accepted time of the *kaige* tradition, though, καὶ γε is used more frequently within Greek translations. As such, ‘the translation choice καὶ γε’ is ‘evidence of literary Greek knowledge in the cultural circle of translators who could appreciate such techniques’ (Aitken, ‘Origins’, 40).

⁵⁵ See A. Aejmelaeus, ‘The Origins of the *Kaige* Revision’, in R. Hakola, J. Orpana, and P. Huotari (eds.), *Scriptures in the Making: Texts and their Transmission in Late Second Temple Judaism*, CBET 109 (Leuven: Peeters, 2022) 285-311, esp. 291.

⁵⁶ S. Kreuzer, ‘Toward the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and the *Kaige* Recension)’, in *The Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology in the Septuagint*, SCS 63 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015) 113-128, citing 122.

⁵⁷ Kreuzer, ‘Toward the Old Greek’, 122.

According to Marcos, *kaige* represents ‘a slight Hebraising revision in favour of the proto-Masoretic text’.⁵⁸ *Kaige* readings can be found in Codex Vaticanus,⁵⁹ which often serves as the basis for even the modern eclectic editions of the LXX text.⁶⁰ The extent of *kaige*’s influence on Par is disputed, as only traces of typical *kaige* characteristics can be found in Par.⁶¹ In fact, Allen goes so far as to suggest ‘it is blatantly obvious that the translator had nothing in common with a systematic reviser producing KR (*kaige* recension) material on consistent and dogmatic lines’ since nearly every instance in which Par exhibits features that are associated with *kaige* can be traced instead to the Greek Pentateuch.⁶² According to Aitken, *kaige* should be seen as ‘a trend in translation rather than a uniform revision’.⁶³ This would help explain ‘the emergence and development of individual translation features’.⁶⁴ However, the inconsistent and infrequent use of *καί γε* as a translation of *וְגַם*(ו) in Par increases the probability that the occurrences should ‘be seen as later revisions that have found their way into the Septuagint text such that *καί γε* was not an original translation feature’.⁶⁵

Vianès concludes that ‘the group formed by’ B, S, and 127 reflects a ‘textual form considered the closest to the Old Greek’.⁶⁶ Concerning the relationship between Par and Chr, Good claims that Par follows closely its ‘*Vorlage*, which was quite close to the MT’.⁶⁷ For the present thesis, I will consider the Göttingen edition of 2 Par as a

⁵⁸ Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, 148.

⁵⁹ V. Mäkipelto, ‘The Septuagint and the Major Recensions’, in W. A. Ross and W. E. Glenny (eds.), *The T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research* (London: T&T Clark, 2021) 161-174, citing 163. See also S. Kreuzer, ‘Kaige and “Theodotion”’, 456: ‘Both traditions, Kaige and semi-Kaige, dominate the great codices, especially Codex Vaticanus and Sinaiticus’.

⁶⁰ Kreuzer, ‘B or not B?’, 69.

⁶¹ R. Good, ‘1-2 Chronicles (Paraleipomena)’, in J. K. Aitken (ed.), *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark, 2015) 167-177, citing 173.

⁶² Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 141.

⁶³ Aitken, ‘Origins’, 27.

⁶⁴ Aitken, ‘Origins’, 27; See also 24, ‘In recent research it has become clear that the multiplicity of traits is indicative of an inconsistent method in which individual translators made choices as to which equivalents to use, favouring at times those that are apparently not the most characteristic of the group’.

⁶⁵ Aitken, ‘Origins’, 27.

⁶⁶ Vianès, ‘Chronicles/Paralipomena’, 236.

⁶⁷ Good, ‘1-2 Chronicles’, 170. See also W. E. Glenny, ‘Translation Technique in the Minor Prophets’, in W. Kraus, M. N. van der Meer, and M. Meiser (eds.), *XV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Munich, 2013*, SCS 64 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016) 379-392. Concerning the Minor Prophets, Glenny, ‘Translation Technique’, 381, states, ‘Because the *Vorlage* of LXX-MP [LXX Minor Prophets] is generally regarded as similar to the MT, the study of translation technique in the Greek Minor Prophets usually uses the MT as a representative *Vorlage*’. According to I. Kalimi, *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005) 13 n. 46, ‘The LXX version most relevant to Chronicles’ is Codex Vaticanus, which ‘strongly resembles the MT, to such an extent that the possibility of the MT’s having been before the translator(s) has been seriously considered’.

viable reconstruction of OG 2 Par unless the manuscript evidence and text-critical data point to an alternative earlier reading.⁶⁸

Previous Scholarship on Par

This section will provide a survey of significant works on Par.⁶⁹ A notable feature of this section is its brevity, a feature that reflects the scarcity of major research projects on Par.

Gillis Gerleman

Gillis Gerleman's contribution to the study of Par dates the translation to the mid-second century BCE in Egypt. This conclusion is drawn from the use of specific vocabulary that is associated with 'Egyptian cult terminology' of this time period.⁷⁰ In two different articles, Laurence Vianès suggests Judean, rather than Egyptian, provenance for Par. However, in neither instance is Judean provenance proven. For example, she states, 'Au total, ces noms de peuples ne fournissent pas d'argument pour l'origine égyptienne du ou des traducteurs'.⁷¹ In many ways, though, her's is an argument from silence. She cites the lack of papyri from Judea that, if found, would help her case.⁷² An argument from nonextant papyri evidence is unconvincing. In a later work, Vianès cites her 2018 article, suggesting 'some *probability* to a Palestinian origin'.⁷³ Again, this conclusion of 'probability' is overstated. Until better evidence to the contrary is presented, Egyptian provenance should be maintained.

Gerleman then discusses the connections between Par and the Greek Pentateuch. Here, he suggests that there is an 'unmistakable dependence' on the Pentateuch evident in Par.⁷⁴ In order to establish this claim, he provides examples of Greek words in the

⁶⁸ According to Vianès, 'Chronicles/Paralipomena', 235, 'the effort to retrieve the Old Greek has now resulted in a critical edition of 2 Paralipomena in the Göttingen series'.

⁶⁹ Since this is a survey of 'significant works', it will not include discussion of articles or dictionary/handbook entries on the topic. These will be dealt with elsewhere.

⁷⁰ G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint II. Chronicles*, Lunds Universitets Arsskrift 43/3 (Lund: Gleerup, 1946) 15.

⁷¹ L. Vianès, 'Peuples exotiques et routes de l'encens dans les livres des Paralipomènes', *Sem Clas* 11 (2018) 195-200, citing 200. ('In total, these names of peoples do not provide any argument for the Egyptian origin of the translators'.) See also, S. Pearce, 'Contextualising Greek Chronicles', *Zutot* 1.1 (2001) 22-27.

⁷² Vianès, 'Peuples', 200

⁷³ Vianès, 'Chronicles/Paralipomena', 240 (emphasis added).

⁷⁴ Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 22. See J. Barr, 'Did the Greek Pentateuch Really Serve as a Dictionary for the Translation of the Later Books?', in M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. Van Peursen (eds.), *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, OLA 118 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003) 523-543. Barr (540) argues that the Greek Pentateuch did not serve as a 'dictionary' like one might expect. It did not provide standard equivalents

Pentateuch, Par, and Kgdms, the Hebrew words they are translating, and the number of occurrences of each translation. For example, the Hebrew word עֶבֶד is translated as παῖς 102 times in the Pentateuch, 58 times in Par, and 100 times in Kgdms. The same word is translated as δοῦλος three times in the Pentateuch, eight times in Par, and 190 times in Kgdms. For Gerleman, this is exemplary of the translator's dependence on the Pentateuch.⁷⁵ Lastly, Gerleman provides examples from synoptic passages in Kgdms and Par in order to show that while the linguistic features of the two are at times similar, they are not the same. Further, there are instances when a 'marked difference' between the style of the two translations can be observed.⁷⁶ This claim of dependence will be further assessed in the present study.

Leslie C. Allen

Leslie C. Allen's two-volume work on Par is the most comprehensive study of the topic published. Allen examines Par broadly, focusing on manuscripts and groupings, but his two sections on 'Translation Techniques' offer some valuable insights. Concerning the characteristics of Par, Allen summarizes Gerleman, agreeing with him 'that Par is a pre-Christian Egyptian creation, probably of second century origin'⁷⁷ and that 'a liturgical connection' exists between Exodus 35-40 and 2 Par 4, which affected the translation of Par.⁷⁸ He further agrees with Gerleman that the translator 'turns to the Gk Pentateuch virtually as to a dictionary', a claim that is contested above.⁷⁹ He provides a number of specific examples of translation technical issues from the entirety of Par, though he admits that more examples are given from 2 Par due to the 'preponderance of names in I Par'.⁸⁰

for words that were difficult to translate. Instead it functioned 'more like a great bag of diverse resources' when translation options were available. The fact that some words found both in the Pentateuch and in other books (διαθήκη, for example) became standard equivalents could simply be a result of their use within Jewish communities. M. Vahrenhorst, "'Mehr al sein Wörterbuch": Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis des 2. Chronikbuches zum Pentateuch', in W. Kraus and O. Munnich (eds.), *La Septante en Allemagne et en France: Textes de la Septante à traduction double ou à traduction très littéraire*, OBO 238 (Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009) 52-63, suggests the phrase 'sprachliches System' (linguistic system) rather than 'dictionary' for the translator's use of the Pentateuch (60). B. Meynadier, 'Éléments de lexicographie comparée des Règnes et des Paralipomènes', in *La Septante*, 37-51, adds (51) 'il semble plus judicieux souvent de parler d'«empreinte» que d'«emprunt», de «trace» que de «copie»' (It often seems more judicious to speak of 'imprint' than of 'borrowing', of 'trace' than of 'copy'). This is an important distinction to consider in the present study.

⁷⁵ Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 22-23.

⁷⁶ Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 30-44.

⁷⁷ L. C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text. Part I: The Translator's Craft*, VTSup 25 (Leiden: Brill, 1974) 23. For a critical response to Allen's work, see M. Zipor, 'The Greek Chronicles', *Bib* 61.4 (1980) 561-571.

⁷⁸ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 25-26.

⁷⁹ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 183.

⁸⁰ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 38-39 n. 2.

Allen focuses on providing a broad range of examples to establish the text rather than in-depth analysis of those examples. Therefore, the examples include little explanation beyond simple notes and groupings. It is worth mentioning that he does draw specific conclusions concerning the way Par was translated. For example, Allen suggests that the translator's use of paraphrase serves 'as a warning against overstressing Par's literalism and drawing wrong conclusions as to the *Vorlage*'.⁸¹ In other words, the way that certain words are translated—due to paraphrasing, not knowing certain words, etc.—does not immediately or necessarily point to the translator's insistence on literalism or to a different *Vorlage*.⁸² On the contrary, Allen sees 'paraphrase and stylistic variation' as being 'an integral part of the translation'.⁸³ Such variation might lead one to assume that multiple translators worked on Par, but Allen suggests 'there is an overall consistency which embraces within it a rich variety of expressions', indicating the likelihood of a single translator.⁸⁴ Further, 'the reader is invited to note how literal and loose renderings overlap and reappear at every stage of the work'.⁸⁵ For Allen, then, it would not suffice to categorize Par as literal or free, since elements of both are found throughout.

Virgil Rogers, in his unpublished dissertation on theology in Par, deals with several examples of 'departures in translation which reflect the interpreter's theological and sociological point of view'.⁸⁶ Allen readily accepts that theologically motivated renderings exist not only in Par, but in the LXX as a whole.⁸⁷ However, he dismisses

⁸¹ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 51.

⁸² Of course, establishing the *Vorlage* can be difficult. The issue becomes even more complicated when the text of Par/Chr is compared to parallel texts in Kgs/Rgs. For instance, Allen notes: 'not only Par but also the translator's Heb text have absorbed varying amounts of contamination from parallel texts' (Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 217).

⁸³ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 124.

⁸⁴ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 38. See also, Aejmelaeus, 'Translation Technique', 60, 'Their work is characterized by intuition and spontaneity more than conscious deliberation and technique. This is seen in how they employ excellent free renderings and helplessly literal, Hebraistic renderings of one and the same Hebrew expression almost side by side'.

⁸⁵ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 38. J. A. L. Lee, *The Greek of the Pentateuch* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018) 269, claims that this feature 'is a matter of *style*, not language' (emphasis in original).

⁸⁶ V. M. Rogers, 'The Old Greek Version of Chronicles: A Comparative Study of the LXX with the Hebrew Text from a Theological Approach' (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1954) 4.

⁸⁷ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 30, 120-124. See also, Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 1, 'It is widely agreed that all translation involves interpretation'; J. Cook, 'Interpreting the Septuagint – Exegesis, Theology and/or Religionsgeschichte?', in W. Kraus and M. Karrer (eds), *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, WUNT 252 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010) 590-606, citing 590, 'all translation is in fact interpretation and thus a hermeneutical activity'; E. Tov, 'Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint', in *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 257-269, citing 257, 'It is, in fact, difficult to imagine a biblical translation without theological exegesis'; A. Aejmelaeus, 'What We Talk About', 218, 'Theological interest and motivation were no doubt present'; C. Kugelmeier, 'Bibel, Papyri und Philosophen: Beobachtungen zur Geschichte hellenistischer Abstraktbegriffe', in J. Joosten and E. Bons

Rogers's attempt to attribute so many translation decisions to theology because the approach is too narrow and speculative. Further, it lacks the text-critical work that would explain many of the proposed theologically motivated renderings.⁸⁸

In the second volume, Allen is concerned primarily with textual criticism. Since he includes examination of certain features, such as substitution, addition, and omission, in this volume, it is indeed still valuable for understanding the translator's techniques. Again, because of the breadth of his analysis, Allen does not often offer a detailed explanation concerning why such changes were made. His conclusion concerning textual criticism of Par is as follows: 'Used with care, Par provides as it were in refrigerated form a Heb text which is a valuable witness to the state of the text of Chron in second century B.C. Egypt'.⁸⁹

Roger Good

Roger Good has provided a rather thorough analysis of the translation of verbs in Par.⁹⁰ While translation technique certainly involves how verbs were translated, it also goes much further than that.⁹¹ Good's study does comprise a major component in characterizing the translation technique of Par. The majority of Good's book involves the reproduction and explanation of data. However, he does provide some insight into issues related to translation technique. For instance, Good works with the categories of dynamic and formal equivalence for verbs, asserting that such categories are indicative of certain levels of literalness.⁹² Further, he claims, 'While the translators were probably not conscious of following a particular technique in their translation work (such as formal equivalence vs. dynamic equivalence), their view of the source ... influenced the way they went about the task of translation'.⁹³

Good goes on to indicate that the LXX translators in general 'set about their task to produce a *literal* translation that was as faithful to the original as they could'.⁹⁴ This claim of literalism is rather general, but nonetheless serves as the starting point for

(eds.), *Septuagint Vocabulary: Pre-history, Usage, Reception*, SCS 58 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011) 25-44, citing 27, 'Übersetzung ist eben immer auch "Interpretation"' (Translation is always 'interpretation').

⁸⁸ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 31.

⁸⁹ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 168.

⁹⁰ R. Good, *The Septuagint's Translation of the Hebrew Verbal System in Chronicles*, VTSup 136 (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

⁹¹ Beck, *Translators*, 200, 'Of all the components of our linguistic analysis, we note that the analysis of the verbal system paid the greatest dividends in terms of revealing literary artistry'.

⁹² Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 7. According to Good, the translator might default 'to the common equivalent ... which perhaps reflects a literalizing tendency'.

⁹³ Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 33.

⁹⁴ Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 33 (emphasis added).

Good. In his view, the departure from literalism indicates ‘a fairly sophisticated understanding’ of the source.⁹⁵ Good observes that the translator of Chr was influenced not only by his understanding of archaic, classical Hebrew, but also his familiarity with post-classical Hebrew spoken during the Hellenistic period.⁹⁶

According to Good, the reader of Par would know that it was ‘translation Greek’ (as opposed to literary Greek).⁹⁷ However, the translator did take liberties to ‘help the Greek text read better (i.e., improve it)’.⁹⁸ Good concludes concerning Par,

[The translator] wanted his translation to make sense.... However, when his translation is compared with antecedent translations, particularly the Pentateuch and Samuel-Kings, we can see an increasing literalizing tendency.... This trend was motivated by the desire to bring the reader to the source text and an increasing reverence for the holy writings.⁹⁹

Good’s contribution is mostly in his collection of data and explanations on the translation of verbs. He has also offered some helpful observations on the potential of a ‘literalizing tendency’. However, as will be established below, this description lacks the accuracy necessary in a discussion of translation technique.

Previous Scholarship on Translation Technique outside of Par

Because of the lack of recent scholarship on translation technique in Par, an overview of recent and/or seminal works on translation technique outside of Par is necessary for understanding the context of this study. Not only will such an overview provide context, but the methodology for the present study will draw significantly from the works mentioned below. So then, while many monographs could have been chosen for discussion here, the survey that follows is made up of works that are foundational to the method(s) used in the following chapters.

Percy S. F. van Keulen’s 2005 monograph *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative* deals with the relationship between the MT and the LXX versions of the Solomon Narrative in Kgs/Kgdms. His study is focused on textual differences, structural changes, and reconstructing the revision process because ‘sizable sequence

⁹⁵ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 36. See below for a full discussion of ‘literal’ and ‘free’ and whether these categories are helpful.

⁹⁶ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 243-244.

⁹⁷ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 242.

⁹⁸ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 203.

⁹⁹ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 248-249. Barr, ‘Greek Pentateuch’, 542, agrees that the vocabulary in Chronicles is closer to that of the Pentateuch than that of Samuel/Kings. However, this cannot necessarily be extended to show that the later translators all used the Pentateuch as a dictionary. This can be seen clearly since some books are more closely aligned to the Pentateuch than others.

differences as a rule are deliberate'.¹⁰⁰ According to van Keulen, smaller (i.e., word-level) 'differences may or may not be intentional'.¹⁰¹ While there is certainly merit to his claim, intentionality need not be proven in order to discuss changes in the text. In fact, whether changes are intentional or not, readers were left with a 'changed' text. If we assume that readers used this 'changed' text exclusively (contra Interlinear Paradigm), then those small changes can be considered as well. Greek-speaking Jewish communities used the text in the form that they had it, changes included.

Although van Keulen deals with a topic similar to that of the present study, the fact that his work is focused outside of Chr/Par means that there is little overlap between the two. He does include a small chapter, which is titled 'Agreements between 3 Regum and Chronicles vis-à-vis 1 Kings', which occasionally deals with Par, and relevant discussions from that chapter will be dealt with in turn.

Any discussion of LXX translation technique ought to include a brief survey of the contributions of Emanuel Tov and James Barr, who write widely on a variety of topics within the LXX but evince a consistent interest in translation technique. For Tov, exegetical, theological, and text-critical issues in the LXX can only be evaluated after translation technique has been considered.¹⁰² Translation technique, then, should be a preliminary step in any study of the LXX. Tov applies five categories of criteria for understanding the literalness of the LXX: (1) internal consistency, (2) the representation of the constituents of Hebrew words by separate Greek equivalents, (3) word-order, (4) quantitative representation, and (5) linguistic adequacy of lexical choices.¹⁰³

Tov argues for using the first four criteria above to provide statistical data concerning the literalness of a given book in the LXX. He admits that most of the LXX books cannot accurately be described as 'literal' or 'free', but rather 'fall somewhere between' the two.¹⁰⁴ Further, for Tov translation technique is more than just evaluating literalness; it also has to do with 'the conditions under which the translation was written' and 'which information is included in the translation itself'.¹⁰⁵ Tov suggests multiple areas of study that fall under the broader field of translation technique, such as

¹⁰⁰ P. S. F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2-11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2-11*, VTSup 104 (Leiden: Brill, 2005) 24-25.

¹⁰¹ Van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 24.

¹⁰² E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, rev. and exp. 3rd ed. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015) 18. See H. Ausloos and B. Lemmelijn, 'Content-Related Criteria in Characterising the LXX Translation Technique' in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, 357-376, esp. 357.

¹⁰³ Tov, *Text-Critical*, 22-25.

¹⁰⁴ Tov, *Text-Critical*, 26-28.

¹⁰⁵ E. Tov, 'The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint', in *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 239-246, citing 240.

‘the verb, prepositions, word-order, pronouns, syntax, word choices and the degree of literalness’.¹⁰⁶

James Barr considers the categories of ‘literal’ and ‘free’ to be ‘very rough and impressionistic’.¹⁰⁷ He continues: ‘there are different ways of being literal and of being free, so that a translation can be literal and free at the same time but in different modes or on different levels’.¹⁰⁸ In addition, Barr argues that the idea of ‘freedom’ in translation is a foreign concept to the world of the LXX translators. As such, what is measurable is the degree of literalism that exists in these translated texts.¹⁰⁹ Barr proposes six criteria for measuring the degree of literalism: (1) division into elements or segments, (2) quantitative addition or subtraction of elements, (3) consistency or non-consistency in the rendering, (4) accuracy and level of semantic information, (5) coded etymological indication of formal/semantic relationships obtaining in the vocabulary of the original language, and (6) level of text and level of analysis.¹¹⁰

Others have built on the works of Tov and Barr, moving the conversation forward in helpful ways. Edward Glenny offers some important insight into recent methods for understanding translation technique and how such techniques are reflective of certain theological tendencies. Glenny describes his basic approach as ‘a comparison of the text of the LXX with the text of its *Vorlage*, with special consideration of the differences between the two’, such as ‘additions (pluses), subtractions (minuses), or substitutions in the LXX’.¹¹¹

In order to examine the level of literalness in Greek Amos, Glenny synthesizes the categories offered by Barr and Tov.¹¹² While this is certainly important to lay the groundwork for Glenny’s method, the more insightful section of his book is his discussion of specific examples of ‘difficult and unknown words’ throughout Greek Amos.¹¹³ Again, Glenny relies on Tov’s categories for ‘conjectural renderings’ in the LXX. These categories include untranslated words, contextual guesses, contextual

¹⁰⁶ Tov, ‘Nature and Study of Translation Technique’, 245.

¹⁰⁷ J. Barr, ‘The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations’, *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternahmens* 15 (1979) 279-325, citing 280.

¹⁰⁸ Barr, ‘Typology’, 280.

¹⁰⁹ Barr, ‘Typology’, 281.

¹¹⁰ Barr, ‘Typology’, 294.

¹¹¹ W. E. Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*, VTSup 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2009) 1. Glenny borrows these categories from McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint*, 77-99.

¹¹² Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 32-69. The specific criteria that he uses are ‘word order, quantitative representation, representation of constituent elements, and stereotyping’ (Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 44).

¹¹³ Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 71 (for the full discussion, see 71-108).

manipulation, reliance on parallelism, employment of general words, and etymological renderings.¹¹⁴ Glenny concludes that examples of conjectural renderings in Greek Amos are evidence of the translator's willingness to interpret his text in light of his 'worldview and cultural context'.¹¹⁵ This synthesis of approaches contributes to the methodological foundation of the present study.

More recently, Jennifer Brown Jones has contributed greatly to this discussion, focusing on the translation of the OG Psalter.¹¹⁶ Jones offers a chart comparing the criteria of Tov and Barr that clearly exhibits the overlap between the two methods.¹¹⁷ In addition to the contributions of Tov and Barr, she adds discussion of Interlinear Paradigm, DTS, the qualitative approach, etc. She does this to lead into a discussion of Polysystem Theory. This theory 'offers a *formal* theoretical framework for highlighting the variety of influences on Septuagintal translation within a multicultural environment'.¹¹⁸ In applying this theory to the Greek Psalter, Jones is drawing on previous works by Itamar Even-Zohar, who coined polysystem theory, and Marieke Dhont's recent monograph on OG Job.¹¹⁹ For Jones, the value of Polysystem Theory for her study of OG Psalms is that it offers 'a framework to identify factors that may have informed both [the translator's] preferred translation technique and potentially stylistic renderings'.¹²⁰

James A. E. Mulroney contributes to the ongoing conversation of translation technique with his monograph on OG Habakkuk. Instead of analyzing the text through the categories of Barr and Tov, Mulroney refers to 'linguistic transformations', such as 'linguistic inventiveness (including neologisms), his [the translator's] probable Aramaic background, improvisation, exegetical disambiguation (changes due to ideology) and toponymic problems'.¹²¹ He argues that the translator made conscious decisions to use Greek rhetoric in the translation of Habakkuk. This is proven by the 'rejection of ... literal [translation] choices' in favor of a more 'creatively literary' translation.¹²²

¹¹⁴ E. Tov, 'Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?', in *Greek and Hebrew Bible*, 203-218.

¹¹⁵ Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 107-108.

¹¹⁶ J. B. Jones, *Translation and Style in the Old Greek Psalter: What Pleases Israel's God*, Septuagint Monograph Series 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2022).

¹¹⁷ Jones, *Translation and Style*, 8.

¹¹⁸ Jones, *Translation and Style*, 17 (emphasis in original).

¹¹⁹ I. Even-Zohar, 'Polysystem Theory' in *Poetics Today* 11.1 (1990) 9-26; M. Dhont, *Style and Context of Old Greek Job*, JSJSup 183 (Leiden: Brill, 2018).

¹²⁰ Jones, *Translation and Style*, 28.

¹²¹ Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 105. See also T. A. W. van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint and Translation Studies*, CBET 47 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007) esp. 57-92.

¹²² Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 105.

However, he does not allow this to simplify the discussion of whether the translation is ‘literal’ or ‘free’. On the contrary, he argues that ‘literalism is ... an insufficient term to explain the translation style of Ambakoum [OG Habakkuk]’.¹²³ Likewise, instead of ‘free’, Mulroneu argues that the ‘exegesis’ on the part of the translator is a result of the influence of the ‘linguistic environment ... upon the mind of the translator when handling his text(s)’.¹²⁴

Mulroneu has therefore contributed to the rejection of the categories of ‘literal’ and ‘free’, which lack the clarity necessary for describing the technique or style of the LXX translators. Like Glenny, Mulroneu examines the theological tendencies of the translator of OG Habakkuk. He concludes: ‘The theological or ideological *Tendenz* of the translator is more-or-less emphasized through’ textual changes, ‘but only as they exist within the context in which they are found as part of the complete textual set’.¹²⁵ Here, Mulroneu provides helpful guardrails for determining theologically motivated renderings. That a translation *might* convey theology does not necessarily mean that it *did* or was intended to.¹²⁶

What these works have in common is an acceptance of the criteria for assessment that feature prominently with Tov and Barr, but a rejection of the terms ‘literal’ and ‘free’ as ends in themselves. Instead, each emphasizes certain features (rhetoric, theology, etc.) while working through the LXX text to determine factors that led to translation decisions. These factors typically go beyond a simple commitment to literalness or freedom, instead indicating a certain fluidity to the translation. That the terms ‘literal’ and ‘free’ only tell part of the story is fundamental to the works discussed above.

Translation Technique: Literal or Free?

Before determining whether the categories of ‘literal’ and ‘free’ can accurately describe the technique of the LXX translators, one must decide how to approach the theory of translation technique. There are two options concerning this: translation technique can be seen as (1) ‘the object of study’ or (2) ‘a question of method in research into the

¹²³ Mulroneu, *Translation Style*, 77.

¹²⁴ Mulroneu, *Translation Style*, 201.

¹²⁵ Mulroneu, *Translation Style*, 201-202.

¹²⁶ For helpful criteria for seeing theology in the LXX, see W. E. Glenny, ‘The Septuagint and Theology’, in *T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*, 313-327; M. Rösel, ‘Towards a “Theology of the Septuagint”’, in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges*, 239-252; R. T. McLay, ‘Why Not a Theology of the Septuagint?’, in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, 607-620.

linguistic phenomena in a translation'.¹²⁷ The former, referred to as the quantitative approach (Barr and Tov), assumes that each translator decided on a specific method before translating. The latter, known as the qualitative approach (the Finnish school), 'takes into account the different elements that can have influenced the translation process, and ... can offer more reliable results concerning certain linguistic features of the Greek text'.¹²⁸ In other words, with the quantitative approach one sees certain translation choices as premeditated by the translator. The qualitative approach builds upon the quantitative, emphasizing 'that it should be exercised in close interaction with the detailed linguistic and grammatical research into literal and free renderings of specific linguistic phenomena'.¹²⁹

According to Aejmelaeus, 'Translation technique cannot be anything more than a collective name for all the different renderings used by a translator. Study of translation technique aims at describing the end-product of a translator's work. It cannot be a question of discovering the system used by the translator, because there was none'.¹³⁰ This, though, is a bit misleading. To study translation technique is indeed to study the 'end-product', but the goal is to describe the process or system that the translator used. Toury, who, as established above, sees translation as function oriented rather than product oriented, claims, 'It is very clear that, in translation reality, the application of a strategy always precedes the emergence of a product'.¹³¹ It is evident, then, that scholars do not agree on the use of a strategy or system in translation. Aejmelaeus's position is partially correct. It would be a challenging, and perhaps impossible, task to determine the strategy or system used by a given translator. However, it would be inaccurate to conclude that this means the translator had no system or strategy, and thus, Toury's conclusion seems more appropriate. It may be the case that Aejmelaeus is simply suggesting that the translators did not think in terms of a system like modern translators use.¹³² For example, current Bible translators tend to

¹²⁷ Ausloos and Lemmelijn, 'Content-Related', 367. See also Sollamo, 'Translation Technique', 37.

¹²⁸ Ausloos and Lemmelijn, 'Content-Related', 367.

¹²⁹ Ausloos and Lemmelijn, 'Content-Related', 367.

¹³⁰ Aejmelaeus, 'Translation Technique', 63. See also Joosten, 'Translating the Untranslatable', 68-69, 'The translators of the Pentateuch did not come to their task with ready-made recipes'. Instead, they used different strategies to translate, sometimes leading to a single short passage with both 'literal' and 'free' elements. According to Sollamo, 'Translation Technique', 36, 'Translation technique does not mean technique in the sense that the translators had worked mechanically like robots according to a certain programme.... but they worked with all their competence and wisdom to translate their source text as well as they could'.

¹³¹ Toury, 'Methodological Issues', 21.

¹³² See Aejmelaeus, 'Translation Technique', 63: 'But in every case, the description of translation technique can only be description of the results of translation, not of the aims and intentions of the translator'.

work on a spectrum of formal equivalence to dynamic equivalence, choosing to approach the translation process as word-for-word, thought-for-thought, or somewhere in between. Even if subconscious, the translator must employ some methodological approach when translating a text.¹³³ Leonard Greenspoon offers a helpful reminder:

It is very easy for us, at many lengths removed from the realities of early Alexandria, to construct highly polished accounts of what happened, in which this or that motivated the translators, who consistently followed a given policy for an audience that was clearly identifiable ... we must admit that such reconstructions are simplistic.¹³⁴

Mulroney adds, ‘the work of the Septuagint was accomplished by translators of differing linguistic abilities and stylistic proclivities, which spanned centuries and probably regions’.¹³⁵ Aejmelaeus does conclude that even if no conscious system existed for the translators, scholars working on LXX translation technique must be systematic. The task of being systematic includes linguistic and statistical analyses of renderings.¹³⁶

While Aejmelaeus is fully convinced that the translators did not have a system for translation, there are still ideas for scholars to discuss regarding the translators and the translation. Aejmelaeus warns against assuming too much intentionality on the part of the translator, claiming, ‘The intended meaning is the meaning that can be read from the translation. As a matter of fact, it is only through the translated text that we know anything about the intentions of the translator’.¹³⁷ So, for Aejmelaeus, ‘the description of translation technique can only be description of the results of translation, not of the aims and intentions of the translator’.¹³⁸ The translators surely had some system or method. Aejmelaeus reminds us that this method cannot be recovered, but perhaps it can be observed through the translated text.

Ausloos and Lemmelijn argue that both the quantitative approach and the qualitative approach are insufficient on their own for characterizing translation technique in the LXX.¹³⁹ The quantitative approach is certainly necessary for gathering data and providing a statistical analysis of a given translation. However, conclusions

¹³³ See Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 66: ‘The translators had a certain method that they used in their translations’. Mulroney admits (n. 208) that this is ‘contra Aejmelaeus’. He claims elsewhere (19) that the translators’ ‘*system* might be irretrievable from the data at hand’ (emphasis in original).

¹³⁴ L. Greenspoon, ‘At the Beginning: The Septuagint as a Jewish Bible Translation’, in *“Translation Is Required”*, 159-169, citing 168.

¹³⁵ Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 19.

¹³⁶ Aejmelaeus, ‘Translation Technique’, 63.

¹³⁷ Aejmelaeus, ‘Translation Technique’, 65.

¹³⁸ Aejmelaeus, ‘Translation Technique’, 63.

¹³⁹ Ausloos and Lemmelijn, ‘Content-Related’, 367-368.

cannot be drawn *only* from statistics. Instead, these statistics should be interpreted through the qualitative lens of linguistics and grammar.¹⁴⁰ They contend, ‘referring to the literalness of a translation is not a workable concept’.¹⁴¹ Instead, ‘one should examine the different kinds of literalness and check the degree to which each is present in a certain translation’¹⁴² by researching ‘as many different elements as possible’.¹⁴³ While such research in collecting this kind of data on different elements of the translation is important, a supplementary study of the cultural circumstances of the translation is necessary to tie together the generalizations that can be gathered by the data.¹⁴⁴ In addition to studying the target culture, John A. Beck argues that a thorough study of translation technique must assess the ‘literary sensitivity’ of the translators as storytellers, specifically with regard to how they translate narrative.¹⁴⁵ Aejmelaeus suggests that when statistical data is gathered and analyzed, it is important to also include detailed analysis of the renderings provided in the translation. She adds, ‘Changing the structure of a clause or a phrase, and by so doing replacing an un-Greek expression by a genuine Greek one closely corresponding to the meaning of the original, is quite a different thing from being recklessly free and paying less attention to the correspondence with the original’.¹⁴⁶ In other words, statistical information alone does not always tell the whole story.

Historically, the categories of ‘literal’ and ‘free’ have been used to describe the technique of the LXX translators. As seen above, Tov makes use of these categories while admitting that most translations fall between the two. To clarify what is meant by ‘literal’, Tov offers alternatives such as ‘wooden, stereotyped, faithful, careful’.¹⁴⁷ He goes on to clarify that ‘literal’ and ‘free’ specifically ‘refer to renderings of individual words, syntagmata, and clauses’.¹⁴⁸ Analyzing whether the translator was ‘faithful’ to the source text is the next step, building from the preliminary discussion of literalness.

¹⁴⁰ Ausloos and Lemmelijn, ‘Content-Related’, 367. See also Sollamo, ‘Translation Technique’, 36-37 on the inability of statistics alone to explain translation decisions.

¹⁴¹ Ausloos and Lemmelijn, ‘Content-Related’, 359.

¹⁴² Ausloos and Lemmelijn, ‘Content-Related’, 359.

¹⁴³ Ausloos and Lemmelijn, ‘Content-Related’, 372. See Tov, ‘Nature and Study of Translation Technique’, 245; S. Olofsson, *Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis: Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version*, ConBOT 57 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009) 64-66; R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 19 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979) 4, ‘This kind of general characterization [of translation technique] would require fuller discussion than is provided by an account of the renderings of the semiprepositions’, but such a study *is part* of characterizing translation technique.

¹⁴⁴ Toury, ‘Methodological Issues’, 25.

¹⁴⁵ Beck, *Translators*, 2.

¹⁴⁶ A. Aejmelaeus, ‘The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint’, in *On the Trail*, 43-57, citing 56.

¹⁴⁷ Tov, *Text-Critical*, 20.

¹⁴⁸ Tov, *Text-Critical*, 20-21.

Therefore, it seems unhelpful to consider ‘faithful’ or ‘careful’ as synonyms for ‘literal’ in the context of discussing translation technique, since faithfulness and literalness actually deal with two different aspects of translation. In addition, Gregory Rabassa notes, ‘Translation can never be reproduction; it is not a copy’.¹⁴⁹ Translation, even in its most literal renderings, cannot reproduce exactly its source text.¹⁵⁰

In a study of the ‘Plague Narrative’ in LXX Exodus, Bénédicte Lemmelijn has made the case that translation technique can be both ‘free’ and ‘faithful’.¹⁵¹ According to Lemmelijn, ‘The translator of Exodus translates very meticulously, and he is, even in his free renderings, *faithful* to the original. However, he is free insofar as he has tried to render the Hebrew *Vorlage* in idiomatic and grammatically correct Greek’.¹⁵² In other words, a ‘free’ translation can also be a ‘faithful’ translation because the two terms do not describe the same aspect of the translation. In fact, Joosten claims, ‘Faithfulness to the original is the overriding concern’ of the translator, but in the details, ‘one observes a sensitivity to the genius of the Greek language’.¹⁵³ Joosten’s claim seems more accurate than Good’s, mentioned above, that the translators intended ‘to produce a literal translation’.¹⁵⁴ If the *intention* was a literal translation, then did some of the translators fail at their task? Harl considers the LXX translators to be ‘competent and conscientious’ and ‘creative’, ‘conscious of the context’, producing ‘comprehensible and coherent’ Greek.¹⁵⁵ According to Rajak, the ‘literalness’ of the LXX translation technique indicates that the Septuagint is not reliant on Hebrew for survival, but instead ‘promoted continuing and close contact with the Hebrew language’.¹⁵⁶ In Rajak’s view, the Septuagint provides the Greek-speaking Jews in the diaspora with an identity, giving them independence in their social and cultural world.¹⁵⁷

The discussion around using the terms ‘literal’ and ‘free’ to strictly describe translation technique centers on how the translator dealt with his source text. Therefore, Tov may be justified in his use of statistical analysis to determine literalness as long as

¹⁴⁹ G. Rabassa, ‘If This Be Treason: Translation and Its Possibilities’, *The American Scholar* 44.1 (1974) 29-39, citing 31. See also Joosten, ‘Translating the Untranslatable’, 69, ‘It is universally agreed that translating is impossible’.

¹⁵⁰ According to E. A. Nida, ‘Principles of Translation as Exemplified by Bible Translating’, *BT* 10.4 (1959) 148-164, citing 150, ‘all types of translation involve (1) loss of information, (2) addition of information, and/or (3) skewing of information’.

¹⁵¹ B. Lemmelijn, ‘Free and Yet Faithful. On the Translation Technique of LXX Exod 7:14-11:10’, *JNSL* 33/1 (2007) 1-32.

¹⁵² Lemmelijn, ‘Free and Yet Faithful’, 2. Emphasis added.

¹⁵³ Joosten, ‘Reflections on the “Interlinear Paradigm”’, 175.

¹⁵⁴ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 33.

¹⁵⁵ Harl, ‘La Bible d’Alexandrie’, 187.

¹⁵⁶ Rajak, *Translation and Survival*, 7.

¹⁵⁷ In this context, the Septuagint, then, allows them to ‘survive’ in ‘the Greek and Roman imperialisms under which they fell’ (Rajak, *Translation and Survival*, 7).

faithfulness is determined using different criteria. Faithfulness to the source text, then, has more to do with accurately translating content (what the source text says) than structure (how the source text says it).¹⁵⁸ Aejmelaeus claims that in general, the translators were primarily concerned with the *meaning of the source text* (including the meanings of words and phrases).¹⁵⁹ If this is correct, Lemmelijn's conclusion that the free renderings in Exodus 'are a testimony to the aspiration to render natural Greek expressions, accurate in their meaning and fitting within their literal context, although diverging formally from the *Vorlage*' can be trusted.¹⁶⁰ Thus, in offering what some would categorize as a free translation, the translator is actually being more faithful to the intended meaning of his *Vorlage*. In this case, Good was partially correct in his statement that the task of the translators was 'to produce a literal translation that was as faithful to the original as they could'.¹⁶¹ Perhaps the task was simply to produce a faithful translation of the meaning of the source text, and as a result, some renderings are 'literal' while others are 'free'. In fact, Nida gives this basic definition of 'translating': 'Translating consists in producing in the receptor language the closest natural equivalent to the message of the source language, *first in meaning and secondly in style*'.¹⁶²

While the words 'literal' and 'free' are not the most accurate when describing translation technique, they can still be useful. Tov's criteria above do consider, primarily, the literalness of the translation. Literalness, though, is just a single part of translation technique. Further, assessing literalness is one of the most preliminary steps in diagnosing translation technique; literalness as a statistical analysis of the employment of standard equivalents in a given translation unit only serves as the foundation upon which advanced study of translation technique can occur. If we follow Aejmelaeus, translation technique is a method by which linguistic features of the text are observed. These observations are then applied to other fields of study.¹⁶³ Concerning

¹⁵⁸ Aejmelaeus, 'Significance of Clause Connectors', 56, 'A distinction should be made between literalness and faithfulness. A good free rendering is a faithful rendering. If a translator uses free renderings that are faithful to the meaning of the original, this is no justification for attributing to this translator all kinds of additions and omissions that occur in his book'. See also, Lemmelijn, 'Free and Yet Faithful', 4.

¹⁵⁹ Aejmelaeus, 'Translation Technique', 61. She contrasts this with an intention 'directed towards the formal representation of items in the original'. Aejmelaeus (63) does qualify this by adding that there are different levels of 'intentionality' not only between translated books, but also within a given work of a translator.

¹⁶⁰ Lemmelijn, 'Free and Yet Faithful', 26. Again, contrast this with Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 33 on literalism as the intention of the translator.

¹⁶¹ Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 33.

¹⁶² Nida, 'Principles', 154-155 (emphasis added).

¹⁶³ Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail*, xiii-xvi. See also, Ausloos and Lemmelijn, 'Content-Related', 367.

the LXX Pentateuch, Lee states: ‘The Pentateuch translation presents an amalgam of natural Greek and Greek affected by Hebrew interference’.¹⁶⁴ He then claims that ‘it cannot be said that one predominates’.¹⁶⁵ Of course, each book of the LXX must be evaluated on its own terms. However, much of Lee’s work would likely shed new light on old conclusions.¹⁶⁶ Ultimately, when dealing with the LXX both the source language (Hebrew) and the target language (Greek) are involved, and the idiosyncrasies of both must be taken into account before drawing conclusions about the translation.¹⁶⁷

As established above, the dichotomy of ‘literal’ and ‘free’ is an oversimplification.¹⁶⁸ These terms are not adequate as *conclusive* terms because the data are too complicated than ‘literal’ and ‘free’ can convey. As such, the use of the terms to categorize translation technique is not helpful and often leads to misguided conclusions concerning the LXX and its translators. Traditionally, LXX books or sections are examined on a scale that might have ‘literal’ on one end and ‘free’ on the other. In a system like this, scholars might place LXX books somewhere between the two poles. The problem arises that it is hard to determine what a single point on that line means. If it is more literal than free, then a book would be placed left of center, but how far? Thus, any attempt to graph the ‘literal’ or ‘free’ elements is overly reliant on statistical analysis, which, along with its various shortcomings, is a means, not an end in itself.¹⁶⁹

Research Methodology

In the next chapter, we will first examine traditional approaches to describing the translation technique of Par. An analysis of several verses from the Solomonic narrative follows, setting the stage for the detailed analysis of a smaller textual unit, 2 Par 4-6. After providing a general description of some trends in the translator’s strategies, this analysis will establish the necessity of chapters 3-5, which will examine the text of 2 Par 4-6 against the text of MT.

¹⁶⁴ Lee, *Greek of the Pentateuch*, 257.

¹⁶⁵ Lee, *Greek of the Pentateuch*, 257.

¹⁶⁶ Regarding whether the LXX is ‘literal’ or ‘free’, he states, ‘Even after a century of work on the language and translation methods of the LXX there is no consensus or established view on this question’ (Lee, *Greek of the Pentateuch*, 211).

¹⁶⁷ Ausloos and Lemmelijn, ‘Content-Related’, 367. ‘It would be methodologically irresponsible to draw conclusions on the word order in translation without taking into account the fact that two different linguistic systems . . . idiomatically speaking simply need a different word order in most of the cases’. See also, Olofsson, *Translation Technique*, 63, ‘. . . no languages have the same distribution of semantic elements and consequently words never match each other completely between the languages’.

¹⁶⁸ In fact, Ziegert, ‘Kultur und Identität’, 650, claims this dichotomy is ‘slowly but surely being broken’ (langsam, aber sicher durchbrochen wird).

¹⁶⁹ See Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 29: ‘Literalism is not meant to be a gauge of how well the LXX translator renders his *Vorlage*, but it is a standard of comparison between translation units in the LXX’.

These chapters from the Solomonic narrative were chosen for two important reasons. First, in line with the discussion above, studies that attempt to cover too much text (all of 2 Par, for example) lack the necessary depth of analysis. It is not enough to only pay attention to the text when there are glaring differences between the MT and the LXX.¹⁷⁰ As such, we prioritize in this study depth over breadth. Second, within 2 Par, there are not many stories of a given character that span for more than a chapter or two. The Solomonic narrative was originally chosen because it is the focus of a longer unit, 2 Par 1-9. In the process of determining method, the length of Solomon's story was deemed too long to allow for adequate analysis. Therefore, we will examine three chapters, 2 Par 4-6, which contain three subgenres of narrative, so that this study includes more than just the analysis of reported speech or main narrative. The diversity under the main genre of narrative will allow for more nuanced results. Rather than dividing these chapters according to the chapter divisions in the MT or the LXX, the following sections will be used: (1) 2 Par 4:1-22a, Report of Construction and Inventory,¹⁷¹ (2) 2 Par 4:22b-6:13, Ritual of Dedication,¹⁷² and (3) 2 Par 6:14-42, Solomon's Prayer of Dedication.¹⁷³

Chapters 3-5 of this thesis follow a similar format. Each chapter begins with a parallel of the text from the MT, an English translation of the MT, the text from the LXX, and an English translation of the LXX. For the MT, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* is used. For the LXX, all quotations from 2 Par come from Hanhart's volume in the Göttingen series. All quotations outside of 2 Par come from Rahlfs's *Septuaginta*. English translations are my own. Following the translation parallels are discussions of translation decisions that either (1) occur over several verses in the section or (2) warrant larger discussion due to the significance of the phenomena. Issues discussed at this stage of each chapter are, at a minimum, represented within that given section of 2 Par. From there, the discussion moves to pluses, minuses, and other various changes (semantic, syntactic, etc.) from the MT to the LXX. More than with any other feature of the translation, the discussion of pluses and minuses has real potential to be a result of text critical issues. This section of each chapter will move verse-by-verse for a discussion of such changes that are present in the text of Par. Verses that do not contain

¹⁷⁰ Lee, *Greek of the Pentateuch*, 257. Lee claims that 'the prominent Hebraic features attract our attention; the many features of natural Greek idiom untouched by Hebrew are less noticeable but no less present'. Similarly, R. X. Gauthier, 'Toward an LXX Hermeneutic', *JNSL* 35/1 (2009) 45-74, claims (66) that 'all of the LXX translated text becomes grist for interpretation, not just instances where the translator deviates from equivalency of set defaults' (emphasis in original).

¹⁷¹ S. J. De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, FOTL 11 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989) 250-251.

¹⁷² De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 254-256.

¹⁷³ De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 257-258.

these types of changes will not be discussed. Each chapter will end with brief conclusions gleaned from the preceding discussion. Major conclusions are reserved for the final chapter.

The present study has a few clear goals. A focused study on a smaller unit of text rather than all of 1-2 Par (or even just 2 Par) will allow for nuanced analyses of the text of 2 Par and the techniques of the translator. As mentioned above, the approach used here draws from methods previously used in studies of LXX translation technique. The present study, though, will use these methods on a unit of text to which they have not previously been applied. Building from the foundation of translation analysis established by Tov and Barr, carried through by the works of scholars like Glenny, Jones, and Mulrone, this study will analyze 2 Par, with an eye beyond the literal/free dichotomy to help establish the translation techniques represented in 2 Par.

What follows is an assessment of the translation technique, as characterized by the end-product, of the Solomonic narrative in 2 Par, focused specifically on the narrative units found in 2 Par 4-6. According to Aejmelaes, ‘Eine ganze Reihe von verschiedenen methodologischen Ansätzen ist in der Septuaginta-Forschung möglich’.¹⁷⁴ The reality is that any given text will exhibit multiple translational features. In addition, multiple explanations are often available for any given translation decision.¹⁷⁵ To do justice to the text, an eclectic approach is necessary.¹⁷⁶ By eclectic

¹⁷⁴ Aejmelaes, ‘Übersetzungstechnik’, 228. (‘A whole range of different methodological approaches are possible in Septuagint research’.)

¹⁷⁵ See Aitken, ‘The Origins of KAI ΓΕ’, 37-39, on ‘multiple-causality’. See also M. Dhont, ‘Multicausality in Septuagint Studies’, *JSCS* 54 (2021) 43-53, citing 50, ‘insofar as multicausation is an approach that allows us to consider various aspects of the translation process, it offers a methodology to describing Septuagint translations beyond the literal-to-free continuum’.

¹⁷⁶ See J. K. Aitken, ‘The language of the Septuagint and Jewish–Greek identity’, in J. K. Aitken and J. C. Paget (eds.), *The Jewish–Greek Tradition in Antiquity and the Byzantine Empire* (New York: Cambridge University Press) 120-134, citing 132, who claims that the language of the LXX is ‘in no case ... consistent, and just as the rhetoric is sporadic so too educated words are mixed with day-to-day vernacular’. He goes on to call the language of the LXX ‘eclectic, a fitting description for much of Koine literature’.

This is similar to the approaches taken by Mulrone and van Keulen. See Mulrone, *Translation Style*, 77: ‘The categories of literalism offered by Barr and Tov most certainly explain some of the aspects of the overall style. Yet there are other, numerous textual changes that are best explained through a number of different causes’. He goes on to claim that when taken together, the stylistic ‘elements reflect the eclectic style used by the translator(s)’ (83); van Keulen, *Two Versions*, 21. Of course, van Keulen’s study is focused on larger structural differences between the two versions, so he uses different strategies than those used below.

See also R. Sollamo, ‘Some “Improper” Prepositions, Such as ΕΝΩΠΙΟΝ, ΕΝΑΝΤΙΟΝ, ΕΝΑΝΤΙ, etc., in the Septuagint and Early Koine Greek’, *VT* 25.4 (1975) 775: ‘...the study of some few details is not enough. Only when many different questions of vocabulary, morphology and syntax have been studied ... is it possible to tell what kinds of translations the books of the Septuagint are’. S. Kreuzer, ‘“Bringing forth from the Treasure New and Old”: Septuagint Studies and Exegetical Methods’, in L. P. Da Silva Pinto and D. Scialabba (eds.), *New Avenues in Biblical Exegesis in Light of the Septuagint*, *The Septuagint in its Ancient Context* 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2022) 9-26, citing 22, claims,

approach, I mean the analysis of multiple translational features in distinct units of the text. For example, the features of some verses will require a detailed analysis of verb tense or semantic equivalents chosen by the translator. In other verses it might be helpful to look at Greek literature, papyri, and inscriptions in order to situate the translator's produced text within its linguistic setting. Proper understanding of some verses might benefit from analyzing parallel passages in other books.¹⁷⁷ Of course, any combination of the above might be required by a given verse or passage.¹⁷⁸ Although this method will necessitate using small sections of LXX text (i.e. smaller than most LXX books), it will allow for more thorough results, providing a broader understanding of the whole of a given translator's techniques.

As a result, this study will build upon the previous work that has been done on Par, especially that of Leslie Allen, to test the previous conclusions against the text of Par. By focusing on smaller units, verses can be analyzed in such a way that more careful conclusions can be drawn. Through such analysis, we will discover a translator who was not always consistent in his rendering of various words and phrases. He was not overly reliant on parallel passages. Even in light of these things, Par stood the test of time, seemingly accomplishing the translator's ultimate goal of providing a usable Greek version of Chr.¹⁷⁹

'Translation technique may be investigated under many different aspects, from the choice of words to the rendering of specific grammatical forms of the Hebrew in Greek and to the rendering of specific expressions'.

¹⁷⁷ For study of Par, parallel passages in 1-4 Kgdms would be used. See van Keulen, *Two Versions*; Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 175-218, on 'Assimilation to parallel texts'.

¹⁷⁸ For examples of the various approaches, see Good, *Septuagint's Translation*; E. Bons (ed.), *Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint*, vol. 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), vols. 2-4 forthcoming; C. J. Fresch, 'Discourse Markers in the Septuagint and Early Koine Greek with Special Reference to the Twelve' (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2015); Backfish, *Hebrew Wordplay*; A. P. Dell'Acqua, 'Le vocabulaire de la Septante à la lumière des papyrus', in E. Bons, P. Pouchelle, and D. Scialabba (eds.), *The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and its Hellenistic Background* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019) 1-13; J. K. Aitken, *No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary*, *Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible 5* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2014); Lee, *Greek of the Pentateuch*; A. Jones, 'Was King Saul Choked by an Evil Spirit?: A Study of πνίγω', *BN 190* (2021) 59-68.

See also Sollamo, 'Some "Improper" Prepositions', 773: 'The scholar who seeks to know what kinds of translations the books of the Septuagint are ... has therefore to examine contemporary Koine Greek, in all known documents and literary genres. He must go through the extant contemporary papyrus material, inscriptions, historical, philosophical, and scientific works, poems, and so on'.

¹⁷⁹ J. R. Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics* (Waco: Baylor University Press; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013) 8-9, discusses the concept of cultural acceptability. He states, 'Within a given culture or community, the standards of "acceptability" for a translation may not be the same as those for a literary work composed in the target language'.

Chapter 2:

Translation Technique of 2 Par

Having discussed important introductory matters, we move here to a general discussion of translation technique and a specific discussion of translation technique in 2 Par.

Translation Technique of 2 Par

The standard stance regarding the translation technique of Par is that it is fairly ‘literal’.¹ Often, such a designation is overly simplistic and not clearly defined, as established above. There are a few of exceptions to these generalized statements. For example, Adrian Schenker provides a helpful distinction in discussing the translation technique of Par. According to Schenker, the translation technique ‘must be judged in both semantic and syntactical respects’.² Thus, on these two separate levels, Par functions more literally regarding syntax and ‘reveals special features’ in terms of semantics.³ According to Schenker, 1-2 Par belong to a group of LXX translations ‘which reproduce the Hebrew word order *precisely* in Greek’.⁴ Laurence Vianès is more optimistic about the translation of Par, claiming, ‘the Greek of Paralipomena is generally good and not especially marked by Hebraisms’.⁵ While this claim is certainly provocative, the evidence that follows in the present study will show this position to be

¹ See Good, ‘1-2 Chronicles (Paraleipomena)’, 170; S. P. Cowe, ‘To the Reader of 1 and 2 Supplements’, in A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) 342-348, esp. 342-343; H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909) 13, claims that 1-2 Par contain neither ‘Good [koine] Greek’ nor ‘Literal or unintelligent’ Greek, but ‘Indifferent Greek’. Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 124, claims, ‘on the surface [Par] does give the misleading impression of extreme literalness’. Regarding the translation of semiprepositions, Sollamo, *Hebrew Semiprepositions*, 286, has 4 categories, with category 1 being the most free and category 4 being the most literal. She classifies 1-2 Par in category 3, but claims that these books are ‘more freely translated than the other books’ in their category. M. Rösel, ‘Nomothesis: The Understanding of the Law in the Septuagint’, in *Tradition and Innovation: English and German Studies on the Septuagint*, SCS 70 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018) 343-363, citing 356, claims that Par is among a group of books in the LXX that ‘cling to their *Vorlage* and show only a little willingness for free renderings or expositions in comparison to other translations’.

For an alternative approach that finds little agreement in the examples cited above, see Ziegert, ‘Kultur und Identität’, 649, who claims that Par is ‘sehr frei’ (‘very free’).

² Schenker, ‘Paraleipomenon I and II’, 218.

³ Schenker, ‘Paraleipomenon I and II’, 218. See also Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 39, ‘The translator generally ties himself rigorously to the Heb order’.

⁴ Schenker, ‘Paraleipomenon I and II’, 218, emphasis added.

⁵ Vianès, ‘Chronicles/Paralipomena’, 238.

untenable. Similar to Schenker, Vianès does go on to communicate that Par is syntactically ‘literal’.⁶ Martin Rehm offers this:

Die griechischen Übersetzungen der Bücher 2 Sm bis 2 Par lassen deutlich das Streben nach möglicher Wörtlichkeit erkennen. Das dieses Ziel nicht überall voll erreicht werden konnte, liegt zunächst in der Verschiedenheit der griechischen und der hebräischen Sprache, die ganz verschiedenen Sprachgruppen angehören und von denen jede ihre eigenen Regeln und Gesetze hat.⁷

Rehm, like Schenker, is still too general, but does make an important distinction. Even if the translator was attempting a literal translation, this is not always possible because of the differences between Greek and Hebrew.⁸

Allen comes the closest to carefully and accurately discussing the text of Par. Unlike the others mentioned above, Allen’s work is contained in two volumes focused solely on issues related to Par.⁹ As such, his work provides a clearer picture of the ‘translation techniques’ in Par, backed with specific evidence. While his work, then, provides the fullest examination of the text of Par to date, there are a few aspects of these two volumes that are deficient.

First, Allen has a clear concern for textual criticism and the reconstruction of the text. This can be seen clearly in his second volume, *Textual Criticism*. In addition to that focus in the second volume, the first volume is dominated by discussions of manuscripts and manuscript groupings. Since the production of Allen’s research on Par, there have been several developments in the study of the LXX. One such development has been a ‘move away from text-critical research to hermeneutics’.¹⁰ To be clear, this

⁶ Vianès, ‘Chronicles/Paralipomena’, 238. This is to be expected, though. J. Lust, ‘Syntax and Translation Greek’, *ETL* 77.4 (2001) 395-401, citing 397, suggests that ‘the main characteristic of Septuagint syntax is its retention of Hebrew word order, even when this militates against typical Greek word order’.

⁷ M. Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik*, *Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen* 13/3 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1937) 14. (‘The Greek translations of the books of 2 Sam to 2 Par clearly show the pursuit of the greatest possible literality. That this goal could not be fully achieved everywhere lies initially in the distinctness of the Greek and Hebrew languages, which belong to quite different language groups and each of which has its own rules and laws’.)

⁸ It is important for interpreters to constantly remember that no two languages are exactly the same, so translation always involves ‘compromise’. This does not mean the translator is a traitor (Traduttore, traditore), as the Italian proverb popular within translation studies states. Instead, it means that the conversation around translation must leave room for the diversity that exists between any two languages. See E. A. Nida, ‘Formal Correspondence in Translation’, *BT* 21.3 (1970) 105-113, citing 105, ‘there are different degrees of cultural and linguistic diversity which separate distinct sets of source and receptor languages’.

⁹ Most of the others mentioned above are single chapters in overview volumes on the LXX.

¹⁰ J. Cook, ‘Towards understanding the Septuagint’, *HTS Theologisches Studien/Theological Studies* 76(4) (2020) <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v76i4.6280>. See also E. Bons, ‘Septuagint Studies between Past and Future: State of the Art and New Perspectives’, in E. Bons, et al. (eds.), *Die Septuaginta — Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen*, WUNT 444 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020) 3-17, esp. 6-7.

does not negate the value of Allen's work. Rather, study of the LXX has experienced a simple shift of focus. In addition, since Allen's work, the Göttingen critical edition of 2 Par has been completed, which has much to offer the one studying Par with respect to issues of textual criticism.

A second concern is the breadth of Allen's research. The two volumes combined add up to 422 pages, including indexes and bibliographies. With so much text to cover in less than 422 pages, depth is sacrificed. Again, this is not an attempt to devalue Allen's work. His purpose is not strictly to study translation technique but Greek Chronicles more generally. As such, the breadth of the study is acceptable. However, it is not adequate for attempting to understand translation technique. Many of Allen's conclusions need to be substantiated by more narrow, detailed study. Such study is necessary because at times, a better explanation than that offered by Allen is warranted. Zipor alludes to this in his critique of Allen's work, claiming that 'we frequently gain the impression that the author relies on generalisations and follows certain of these blindly'.¹¹ According to Zipor, when Allen mentions 'a given phenomenon he wastes no time in providing a lengthy list of illustrations' which could 'be otherwise accounted for'.¹² A necessary 'next step', then, is the examination of smaller units within Par alongside the consideration of explanations for translation decisions beyond what Allen has provided.

Third, in the sections where he discusses issues of translation technique, Allen addresses these issues topically. For example, readers of his first volume, *The Translator's Craft*, will find sections for prepositions, nouns, suffixes, etc. Under each section, Allen typically (though not always) provides a brief description of the issue at hand followed by examples pulled from throughout the text of 1 and 2 Par that serve as evidence of the translator's techniques. While this does provide a good starting point, it fails to analyze a given unit of text in detail. In other words, it is difficult to gain an understanding of characteristics of a translation or a translator's techniques with this approach, as it cannot sufficiently tell the whole story. Grouping together similarly shaped puzzle pieces does not reveal the picture. Likewise, dealing with broad topics rather than a whole unit of text does not allow for a detailed study of a translation.

These shortcomings concerning using Allen's work for the study of translation techniques will be taken into account in the study that follows. Before moving onto an analysis of smaller textual units, it is worth highlighting some valuable takeaways from

¹¹ Zipor, 'Greek Chronicles', 569.

¹² Zipor, 'Greek Chronicles', 569.

what Allen has offered. Some of Allen's conclusions resonate with features found in the Solomonic narrative. Towards the end of his first section on translation techniques, Allen offers this:

[Some changes] show how differently [the translator's] mind worked at different times, now lighting upon the literal, now preferring paraphrase. These opposing traits are here worked out within narrow bounds over and over again. This phenomenon confirms that, as strange as it appears at first sight, one and the same person is responsible for stilted literal renderings and for more sophisticated paraphrase.... The translator can be either flexible or stereotyped in his approach to individual words and to words of similar meaning.¹³

Generally speaking, much of what Allen offers here is true. It is also necessary to mention Good's conclusions concerning 'the translation philosophy', for he too offers important insight.¹⁴ According to Good, 'occasional anomalies in the translation of verbs' are rare, which shows 'that the translator was mostly concerned with representing the Hebrew text as closely as possible in Greek'.¹⁵ He notes, though, that the presence of the anomalies at all 'indicates that the translator was flexible and even had occasional "literary flourishes"'.¹⁶ Study of smaller translation units will bring more clarity and some nuance to the conclusions of Allen and Good.

The rest of this chapter will include some examples from the Solomonic narrative that will provide translational context for the detailed analyses of 2 Par 4-6 that will follow. These examples will exhibit the method established in the previous chapter and used throughout the three chapters that follow. Also, giving some attention to examples throughout the Solomonic narrative will assist in seeing the forest before looking at the trees. Both the overview and the detailed analyses are necessary, so we begin here with the former. In addition, the analysis of these verses will exemplify the main drawback to studies that do not focus on a smaller, more confined textual unit, as we will see in the three chapters that follow. The examination of a few verses from a large narrative section can only provide anecdotal evidence that must be substantiated by fuller study of smaller, cohesive textual units.

¹³ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 57.

¹⁴ Good's conclusions are only briefly mentioned because his work is focused solely on the translation of the verbal system. Though his conclusions are important, they are simply one part of the bigger picture.

¹⁵ Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 248.

¹⁶ Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 248.

Table 2.1

2 Chr/Par 1:4 and English Translations

2 Chr 1:4	2 Chr 1:4 (Translation)	2 Par 1:4	2 Par 1:4 (Translation)
אבל ארון האלהים העלה דויד מקרית- יערים בהכין לו דויד כי נטה-לו אהל בירושלם:	But the ark of God David took up from Kiriath-Jearim in the place David prepared for it, for he pitched for it a tent in Jerusalem.	ἀλλὰ κιβωτὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνήνεγκεν Δαυὶδ ἐκ πόλεως Καριαθιαρίμ, ὅτι ἠτοίμασεν αὐτῇ σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ,	But the ark of God David brought up from the city of Kariathiarim, for he prepared for it a tent in Jerusalem

This verse begins with a rare Hebrew word, אַבֵּל, ‘but’, occurring only 11 times in the OT; three occurrences are in 2 Chr. This word is usually either ‘adversative’, ‘emphatic’, or used as an ‘interjection’.¹⁷ It is translated with ἀλλά, ‘but’, three times total, twice in 2 Chr. In these cases, the translator likely took אַבֵּל as adversative,¹⁸ or perhaps as ‘corrective’.¹⁹ Fresch carefully argues that the primary function of ἀλλά is not adversative, the stance of most lexicons and grammars. Instead, he shows ‘that ἀλλά has one core pragmatic function: It instructs the recipient to process its host utterance as a corrective to information within his or her mental representation of the discourse’.²⁰ His conclusion regarding how the use of ἀλλά influences understanding LXX translation technique is worth considering:

In the end, it is enough to say that describing the motivation behind ἀλλά is not a simple matter of whether or not it was lexically motivated. Almost always, its use required both an awareness of the flow of the discourse and a decision by the translator as to how he would relate the information. Often, this results in a faithful rendering of the Hebrew, even if not exhibiting pure lexical equivalence. Sometimes, it results in guiding the reader down a different mental pathway than the Hebrew. In either case, the translators could not have used ἀλλά without contextual motivation, as the underlying Hebrew lexeme or collocation alone would rarely require it as a rendering.²¹

Given Fresch’s focus on the Book of the Twelve and, when more examples are needed, the Pentateuch, he does not deal with ἀλλά as a translation of אַבֵּל.²² Fresch’s comments

¹⁷ DCH, s.v. ‘אַבֵּל’.

¹⁸ This can be contrasted with the two occurrences in Genesis, translated with *ναί*, ‘yes’, and the three occurrences in Kingdoms, translated with *μάλα*, ‘very’. The translators of these books understood אַבֵּל in their contexts as emphatic.

¹⁹ See Fresch, ‘Discourse Markers’, 116-160.

²⁰ Fresch, ‘Discourse Markers’, 159.

²¹ Fresch, ‘Discourse Markers’, 153.

²² The three times ἀλλά translates אַבֵּל are EsdB 10:13, 2 Par 1:4, and 2 Par 19:3.

raise two important questions: 1) Is 2 Par 1:4 one of the rare examples of a lexically motivated use of ἀλλά? and 2) Does ἀλλά function in this verse as a marker of correction?

As mentioned above, אבל has three major uses: ‘adversative’, ‘emphatic’, or as an ‘interjection’.²³ The examples of ‘adversative’ אבל in *DCH* might actually be more accurately categorized as ‘corrective’, as Fresch recommends for ἀλλά. For example, 2 Chr 19:2-3 says:

ויצא אל־פניו יהואּ בן־חנני החזה ויאמר אל־המלך יהושפט הלרשע לעזר ולשנאי יהוה תאהב
ובזאת עליך קצף מלפני יהוה: אבל דברים טובים נמצאו עמך כי־בערת האשרות מן־הארץ והכינות
לבבך לדרש האלהים:

Jehu the son of Hanani the seer went out to him and he said to King Jehoshaphat, ‘Should you help the wicked and love the ones who hate YHWH? Because of this wrath is against you from the face of YHWH. אבל good things are found with you, for you removed the Asheroth from the land and set your heart to seek God.

The instinct here is to translate אבל with ‘but’ or ‘however’. While that would make sense in the context, what is more important is that on a discourse level, what comes after אבל corrects the assumption the hearer or reader would have made based on what precedes אבל. This is translated with ἢ ἀλλ, which Fresch also concludes marks ‘an exclusive corrective relation’.²⁴

Another example of what Clines designates as ‘adversative’ אבל is found in 2 Chr 33:17. This is the text of 2 Chr 33:16-17.

ויכן את־מזבח יהוה ויזבח עליו זבחי שלמים ותודה ויאמר ליהודה לעבוד את־יהוה אלהי ישראל:
אבל עוד העם זבחים בבמות רק ליהוה אלהיהם:

And he established the altar of YHWH and he sacrificed on it sacrifices of peace offerings and thanksgiving. He told Judah to serve YHWH, the God of Israel. אבל still the people sacrificed at the high places, only to the YHWH their God.

Again, following Fresch’s work with ἀλλά, אבל seems primarily to be functioning as a corrective, perhaps with a rhetorical ‘shock’ effect. The reader is processing positive information, namely that Manasseh was leading the people to serve YHWH instead of other gods and idols. The reader then encounters אבל followed by information which, at least initially, would have countered or corrected the information they had just

²³ *DCH*, s.v. ‘אָבֵל’. 1:109-110. It is likely that אבל is actually best categorized as ‘emphatic’, as Clines mentions that even within the ‘adversative’ category, ‘distinction from the emphatic usage [is] not [always] clear’, and within the ‘interjection’ category, it is also ‘[perhaps] emphatic’. It would follow that אבל would take on an emphatic ‘adversative’, ‘disjunctive’, or, more likely, ‘corrective’ nuance when the context demands it.

²⁴ Fresch, ‘Discourse Markers’, 169, 180-181.

processed: the people continued to sacrifice at the high places typically associated with the worship of other gods. This information is then nuanced as the Chronicler clarifies that even at the high places, the people were actually sacrificing to YHWH. Here it is plausible to see that לְבָנִים is functioning not primarily as adversative, but as corrective.

Regarding the question of whether ἀλλά is lexically motivated, the above examples present a clear answer. Both ἀλλά and לְבָנִים function, at least in the above contexts, as correctives. Therefore, ἀλλά is not lexically motivated, but contextually motivated. The contexts suggest that what precedes ἀλλά/לְבָנִים is corrected by what follows. In 2 Chr 1:3, the Chronicler is identifying the place where Solomon and the assembly went to worship. It seems, then, that לְבָנִים in 2 Chr 1:4 is a corrective of the possible question from the reader, ‘Where is the ark located at this point?’. The translator mirrors this with the use of ἀλλά. If this subtle corrective of the expected response to 2 Chr 1:3 is correct, and if Fresch’s conclusions about ἀλλά are correct, then it was used in 2 Par 1:4 exactly according to its discourse function.

The translator inserts πόλεως, ‘of a city’, before Καριαθιαρίμ, ‘Kiriathiarim’, a decision not forced by the Hebrew text. The inclusion of πόλεως might be to clarify that the city is being referred to, since Καριαθιαρίμ is listed in 1 Par 2:50 as part of a genealogy (Σωβαλ πατήρ Καριαθιαρίμ, ‘Sobal, father of Kiriathiarim’).²⁵ Given the time and location of the translation, the clarification here might have been welcome. However, given that Kiriath-Jearim shows up multiple times in the OT narrative, one might expect readers to have already been aware of the city.²⁶ Another possibility, noted by Allen, must be considered.²⁷ There is some inconsistency with the rendering of קריית יערים, ‘Kiriath-Jearim’, in the LXX. The examples in 1-2 Chr exhibit this inconsistency well. In 1 Par 2:50, 52, קריית יערים is rendered simply with Καριαθιαρίμ. In 1 Par 2:53, the translator has opted for πόλις Ιαιρ, ‘city of Iaeir’. Finally, in 1 Par 13:5, קריית יערים becomes πόλεως Ιαρειμ, ‘of the city of Iareim’ and πόλιν Δαυιδ, ‘city of David’, in 1 Par 13:6. Allen suggests that ‘an attempt has been made to replace Καριαθ

²⁵ See J. Blenkinsopp, ‘Kiriath-Jearim and the Ark’, *JBL* 88(2) (1969) 143-156, especially 153-154. Blenkinsopp claims the ‘ethnic-topographical “genealogies” of the chronicler’ show that ‘various clans and ethnic groups’ in Chronicles are associated with ‘different localities’.

²⁶ Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 128, deals with a ‘toponym’ situation in Habakkuk, stating, ‘It may be that the translator, writing from Alexandria, was unsure of the locale. But as a biblical toponym one might have expected him to follow the wording from Deuteronomy’. Mulroney is dealing with a quite different situation than the one in 2 Par 1:4. In Habakkuk, the translator was obviously unfamiliar with the toponym he encountered. In 2 Par, the translator knows precisely that his source text refers to a city, so he clarifies that in his translation.

²⁷ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 165.

with πόλις' in Par.²⁸ If Allen is correct that an attempt was made, the attempt must be judged as inconsistent, at least with respect to the translation in question, πόλεως Καριαθιαριμ, which shows amalgamation, not replacement.

The phrase בַּהֲכִיֵּן לוֹ דָוִד כִּי נִטְהֵל אֵהָל, 'in the place David prepared for it for he pitched for it a tent', is shortened in Par. The verb ἠτοίμασεν, 'he prepared', is a fairly accurate rendering of הֲכִיֵּן, especially given that ἐτοιμάζω is a common rendering of כּוֹן and is never the translation of נִטְהֵל. But is the translator choosing ὅτι, 'for, because', for ב, 'in', or for כִּי, 'for, because'? The latter would certainly make more sense as a typical rendering, but less sense based on syntax if ἠτοίμασεν is translating הֲכִיֵּן. The form as preserved in BHS is בַּהֲכִיֵּן. This is made up of the preposition, the article, and the perfect (3rd person masculine singular) verb. The article attached to a finite form is rare, and a preposition even more so. Gesenius mentions a few examples of the article, functioning as a relative pronoun, on finite verb forms, mostly 'undoubted' perfects, noting that 'almost all the examples ... belong to the latest Books (Ezra and Chronicles)'.²⁹ The word in question, בַּהֲכִיֵּן, is the only one he includes with a preposition, the article, and a perfect verb. He suggests, 'בַּהֲכִיֵּן [is] equivalent to בַּאֲשֶׁר הֲכִיֵּן to the place, that he had prepared'.³⁰ That GKC only has this example for the combination in question is telling; this is a rare form. Therefore, it should not be surprising that the translator dealt with this in an unexpected way. There is precedent for translating ב with ὅτι, although this is rare. This happens two other times in the LXX. In Exodus 21:8 and Numbers 18:32, ב is attached to an infinitive construct. In both instances, the ב is functioning not in a temporal manner, but a causal one.³¹ It is possible, then, that the translator, reading בַּהֲכִיֵּן as either a perfect or an infinitive construct,³² understood it as causal. This might

²⁸ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 165.

²⁹ GKC, §138 i-k. He clarifies that the instances from the older texts are cases in which 'no doubt the authors ... intended participles' rather than perfects.

³⁰ GKC, §138 i. Emphasis in original. This suggestion is taken by many English Bible translations. See ESV: 'to the place that David had prepared'; NIV: 'to the place he had prepared for it'; NET: 'to the place he had prepared for it'; CSB: 'to the place he had set up for it'; NLT: 'to the tent he had prepared for it'; RSV: 'to the place that David had prepared for it'.

³¹ *IBHS*, §36.2.2b.

³² The difference between the two is simply the vowel under the ה. In his consonantal *Vorlage*, the difference would not be explicit.

have led to translating כ with ὅτι.³³ Thus, it seems clear that a translation for the phrase כי נטה-לו is not represented in Par, which is consistent with the BHS apparatus.³⁴

2 Par 2:6 (2 Chr 2:5)

Table 2.2

2 Chr 2:5/2 Par 2:6 and English Translations

2 Chr 2:5	2 Chr 2:5 (Translation)	2 Par 2:6	2 Par 2:6 (Translation)
ומי יעצ־רכח לבנות- לו בית כי השמים ושמי השמים לא יכלכלהו ומי אני אשר אבנה-לו בית כי אם- להקטיר לפניו:	And who is able to build for him a house, for heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain him? And who am I who is building for him a house except to make offerings before him?	καὶ τίς ἰσχύσει οἰκοδομῆσαι αὐτῷ οἶκον; ὅτι ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐ φέρουσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν δόξαν. καὶ τίς ἐγὼ οἰκοδομῶν αὐτῷ οἶκον; ὅτι ἀλλ’ ἡ τοῦ θυμῶν κατέναντι αὐτοῦ.	And who is able to build for him a house? For heaven and the heaven of heaven cannot bear his glory. And who am I, building for him a house? For unless to burn incense before him.

While the verb עצר means ‘to retain, stop’, the verbal phrase עצר-רכח followed by לו means ‘to be able to’.³⁵ The translator uses just one word for both of these constituents (ισχύσει). The infinitive, לבנות, ‘to build’, is translated with a bare infinitive, οἰκοδομῆσαι, ‘to build’. This translation decision represents one of several ways that the translator renders Hebrew infinitives.

The plural forms השמים ושמי השמים, ‘the heavens and the heavens of the heavens’, are used but are translated with the singular ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ‘heaven and the heaven of heaven’. According to Jonathan Pennington, the use of the singular form of the Greek οὐρανός reflects the trend in ancient Greek literature. For the Hebrew term for ‘heaven’, the plural form is used exclusively. As such, the translator strays from direct correspondence, instead aligning his text ‘closely with the Greek of antiquity’.³⁶ Some of the later LXX translations use the plural Greek form, a

³³ This is, of course, somewhat speculative. Causal כ is translated with other Greek words as well. For example, Deuteronomy 1:27 has διὰ τὸ μισεῖν κύριον, ‘because the Lord hates’, for בשנאת יהוה, ‘because of the Lord’s hate’.

³⁴ Another option is represented by the NLT translation where ‘to the tent he had prepared for it’ seems to be a translation of אהל כי נטה-לו אהל. While it is less likely than the option given above, it might be that, like the NLT, ὅτι ἡτοίμασεν αὐτῷ σκηνήν translates the phrase אהל כי נטה-לו אהל.

³⁵ DCH, s.v. ‘עצר’.

³⁶ J. T. Pennington, “Heaven” and “Heavens” in the LXX: Exploring the Relationship Between אֲשָׁמַיִם and οὐρανός’, *BIOSCS* 36 (2003) 39-59, citing 45.

rendering that Pennington suggests is evidence of ‘Semitic enhancement’.³⁷ That the translator that produced Par avoided this shows his willingness to stray from the literal in favor of more natural Greek.

The phrase *לֹא יִכְלֹלֵהוּ*, ‘cannot contain him’, is translated *οὐ φέρουσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν δόξαν*, ‘cannot bear his glory’. Since a similar change occurs in 2 Par 6:18, the implications of the change in 2 Par 2:6 will be discussed in fuller detail later.³⁸ Unsurprisingly, Rogers claims this change is made due to the translator’s leaning towards anti-anthropomorphism.³⁹ However, we will see below that the translator does not have a ‘policy’ against translating anthropomorphic language. For example, in 2 Par 6:4, Solomon speaks of God, *ὃς ἐλάλησεν ἐν στόματι αὐτοῦ*, ‘who spoke with his mouth’. It is worth considering that the translator may have had more of an issue with considering that something could contain God than with God being described as having a mouth. In other words, there is no anti-anthropomorphism here. Instead, there may be a theologically motivated hesitation with suggesting that anyone or anything could contain God.⁴⁰ This has nothing to do with God’s abilities or the perceived ‘humanness’ of God.

The next clause, *וּמִי אֲנִי אֲשֶׁר אֲבַנֶּה-לּוֹ בַּיִת*, ‘and who am I, who would build for him a house’, sees a few deviations in the LXX (*καὶ τίς ἐγὼ οἰκοδομῶν αὐτῷ οἶκον*, ‘and who am I, building for him a house’). The relative pronoun is not translated here. Also, the Qal imperfect verb *אֲבַנֶּה*, ‘I will build’, becomes a present participle *οἰκοδομῶν*, ‘building’. While he does not specify which verse he is discussing, concerning this ‘*yiqtol* form in a relative clause’, Good claims it is ‘translated by an attributive participle’.⁴¹ Good’s claim that this is an attributive participle is not clearly substantiated. As Muraoka suggests, this phrase is ‘syntactically ambiguous’, and the participle could be ‘an anarthrous, substantivized one or circumstantially used’.⁴² This is the only time in 1-2 Chr where a Hebrew imperfect verb is translated with a Greek present participle.⁴³

³⁷ Pennington, “‘Heaven’ and ‘Heavens’”, 49.

³⁸ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 122.

³⁹ Rogers, ‘Old Greek’, 20

⁴⁰ See M. D. Matlock, *Discovering the Traditions of Prose Prayers in Early Jewish Literature*, LSTS 81 (London: Bloomsbury, 2012) 68: ‘The very thought of discussing God’s *containment* moves the OG translator to change focus from a physical, concrete notion to an abstract notion’ (emphasis added).

⁴¹ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 233. Both LES and NETS translate the participle as an infinitive; *τίς ἐγὼ οἰκοδομῶν αὐτῷ οἶκον* becomes in both ‘who am I to build him a house’.

⁴² SSG, §31ba.

⁴³ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 229.

Fresch offers helpful analysis of the use of ἀλλ' ἢ, 'unless', in Greek versions of the Book of the Twelve and the Pentateuch. He concludes that ἀλλ' ἢ marks 'an exclusive corrective relation'.⁴⁴ However, in none of his examples does the translator provide ὅτι for כִּי as the translator does in 2 Par 2:6. On several occasions in 1-2 Par, ἀλλ' ἢ is used as a translation of כִּי אִם. Only here, though, is ὅτι also included, seemingly as a translation of כִּי. This translation decision is found elsewhere in the LXX on a few occasions in 1-4 Kgdms. Muraoka mentions the inclusion of ὅτι in these instances as a mechanical translation equivalent for כִּי. He also, though, traces the correction of the phrase and/or omission of ὅτι in later versions of the LXX, which contributes to the recognition of the awkwardness of the inclusion of ὅτι in these contexts.⁴⁵ In fact, ὅτι obscures the discourse function of ἀλλ' ἢ. The fact that only here in Par does the translator provide the difficult rendering ὅτι ἀλλ' ἢ, 'for unless', for כִּי אִם, 'unless', serves as both evidence and reminder that the translator is not always consistent with his renderings of given words or phrases.

The prepositional phrase לְפָנָיו, 'before him', is translated with κατέναντι αὐτοῦ, 'before him'. Here we see the translator varying his approach to a prepositional phrase. In 2 Chr 2:3, the same prepositional phrase, לְפָנָיו, occurs. For this occurrence, the translator instead provides ἀπέναντι αὐτοῦ, 'before him'. Both κατέναντι and ἀπέναντι carry nearly identical meanings. However, the variation in form represents an approach, conscious or not, from the translator.

2 Par 3:1

Table 2.3

2 Chr/Par 3:1 and English Translations

2 Chr 3:1	2 Chr 3:1 (Translation)	2 Par 3:1	2 Par 3:1 (Translation)
<p>ויחל שלמה לבנות את־בית־יהוה בירושלם בהר המוריה אשר נראה לדוד אביו אשר הכין במקום דוד בגרן ארנן היבوسی:</p>	<p>Solomon began to build the house of the Lord in Jerusalem on Mount Moriah, where he appeared to David, his father, where David established in the</p>	<p>Καὶ ἤρξατο Σαλωμών τοῦ οἰκοδομεῖν τὸν οἶκον κυρίου ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐν ὄρει τοῦ Ἀμοριά, οὗ ᾧ φησι κύριος τῷ Δαυὶδ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, ᾧ</p>	<p>Solomon began to build the house of the Lord in Jerusalem on Mount Hamoria, where the Lord appeared to David, his father, in the place, which David</p>

⁴⁴ Fresch, 'Discourse Markers', 180-181.

⁴⁵ GELS, s.v. 'ἀλλά'.

	place, on the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite.	ἡτοίμασεν Δαυὶδ ἐν ἄλω Ὀρνὰ τοῦ Ἰεβουσαίου.	prepared in the threshing floor of Orna the Jebusite.
--	--	---	---

This verse begins as expected for a translator that typically follows Hebrew syntax. The preterite is translated with *καί* + verb. This is followed in both the MT and the LXX by the subject, *הַמֶּלֶךְ/Σαλωμων*, ‘Solomon’. The preposition *ל* + infinitive *לִבְנוֹת*, ‘to build’, is translated with *τοῦ οἰκοδομεῖν*, ‘to build’. The use of this construction, *τοῦ* + infinitive, to render *ל* + infinitive is not abnormal for the translator. This Hebrew construction usually indicates purpose or result, but that is not the case here. Instead, this should be understood as a complementary infinitive, ‘he began *to build*’, in which case the expected translation would be a simple, anarthrous infinitive.⁴⁶ Muraoka argues that in the LXX, a distinction cannot always be drawn between *τοῦ* + infinitive and a bare infinitive.⁴⁷ Toward the end of the verse, the articular *הַמֹּרְיָה*, ‘Moriah’, is transcribed, article and all, as *Ἄμορια*, ‘Hamoria’. Further, the genitive article, *τοῦ*, precedes *Ἄμορια*, clarifying the case of this indeclinable name. The addition of the article *τοῦ* means that the Hebrew article has been double rendered—once with *τοῦ*, and again in the transcription.

The relative pronoun *אֲשֶׁר*, ‘which’, is translated with the genitive relative pronoun *οὗ*, which, due to its regular use, has become an adverb meaning ‘where’.⁴⁸ This is followed by the Niphal *נִרְאָה*, ‘he appeared’. *נִרְאָה* is translated as *ὤφθη κύριος*, ‘the Lord appeared’. The addition of *κύριος* is perhaps used to clarify exactly ‘who’ it was that appeared to David. Targum Chronicles (TgChr) reads *אֲתַגְלִי מִלְאַכָּא דִּי*, ‘the angel of YHWH appeared’, which is consistent with the verse that is referred to here (1 Chr 21:16).⁴⁹ By including *κύριος*, Par might be reconciling that while an angel of the Lord appeared to David in 1 Chr 21:16, the Lord himself answered David in 1 Chr 21:26. Par’s *κύριος* is similar, though obviously not the same as *מִלְאַכָּא דִּי*. While it is possible that an earlier form of the text reflected one of these readings, the motivation

⁴⁶ *CGCG*, 51; see also 52.27: ‘The phrase verbs *ἄρχομαι* and *παύω* may be construed either with a dynamic infinitive or with a (present) participle’. See also Smyth, §2032a, ‘The genitive of the articular infinitive is used to limit the meaning of substantives, adjectives, and verbs’.

⁴⁷ *SSG*, §30baa. He does mention that 42% of the *τοῦ* + infinitives in the LXX are ‘final-consecutive’.

⁴⁸ BDAG, s.v. ‘οὗ’.

⁴⁹ David lifted his eyes and he saw the angel of YHWH standing between earth and heaven, his sword drawn in his hand, stretched out over Jerusalem. David and the elders, clothed with sackcloth, fell on their faces.

for Masoretic scribes to omit ‘YHWH’ or ‘the angel of YHWH’ here is unclear.⁵⁰ It would seem, then, that MT reflects the oldest reading, while TgChr and Par sought to clarify the reading of their *Vorlage* by adding an agent.⁵¹ Given that TgChr and Par both have additions, it is also possible that the reading in Par actually reflects the translator’s source text, which, if this is the case, differed from the MT tradition. As such, it would be difficult to call *κύριος* a ‘plus’ here. In relation to the MT it is certainly a plus. However, it might not reflect a plus in relation to the source text. Driver offers a solution to this issue that is dependent on supposed abbreviations in the translator’s *Vorlage*. He proposes that the MT conceals two abbreviations, ‘namely the omission of the final radical letter of a defective verb and the use of ה’ for the divine name’.⁵² More clearly, the ה on the end of נראה in the MT, according to Driver, is actually the abbreviated divine name יהוה.

An additional text-critical issue arises in this same verse, just a few words later. The BHS *apparatus criticus* suggests that the phrase אשר הכין במקום, ‘which he established in the place’, should be read as the variant reading, במקום אשר הכין, ‘in the place that he established’, which would reflect the LXX: ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, ᾧ ἡτοίμασεν, ‘in the place which he prepared’.⁵³ If the MT reading is original, the translator rearranged this clause to be clearer, especially regarding the subject of הכין/ἡτοίμασεν.⁵⁴

Finally, the name אֲרֶנָּה is quite disputed. Variations in spelling include אֲרֶנָּה (2 Sam 24:16); אֲרֶנָּה (2 Sam 24:16 Qere), אֲרֶנָּה (2 Sam 24:18), אֲרֶנָּה (2 Sam 24:20-24), and אֲרֶנָּה (1 Chr 21:15, 18, 20-25, 28; 2 Chr 3:1). It is translated in all cases except one as Ὀρνιά. The one exception is in 1 Par 21:21. In the midst of multiple examples of

⁵⁰ G. R. Driver, ‘Once Again Abbreviations’, *Text* 4.1 (1964) 76-94, citing 90. See also Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 83.

⁵¹ This is supported by even the most basic guidelines for textual criticism. See P. D. Wenger, *A Student’s Guide to Textual Criticism of the Bible: Its History, Methods & Results* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006); E. R. Brotzman and E. J. Tully, *Old Testament Textual Criticism: A Practical Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016); K. H. Jobes and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015) 128-147, esp. 139, ‘the most fundamental canon of transcriptional probability—indeed, of textual criticism as a whole—is this: choose the variant that best explains the competing variant(s)’.

⁵² See also R. W. Klein, *2 Chronicles: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012) 45-46.

⁵³ R. B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, WBC 15 (Dallas: Word, 1987) 27-28, provides an explanation of the difficulties of the MT reading, which give weight to the LXX reading. Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 65, also provides substantial evidence for the LXX reading.

⁵⁴ According to Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 64, ‘There are many cases where it is impossible to determine at what stage the order of words was changed, whether already in the *Vorlage* or in the process of translation or in the course of Gk transmission’.

’Ορνά, here the translator chooses ’Ορνάν. Perhaps the translator added the ν at the end to signify that this is accusative, as necessitated by the preposition πρός, ‘to, towards’.

2 Par 7:21

Table 2.4

2 Chr/Par 7:21 and English Translations

2 Chr 7:21	2 Chr 7:21 (Translation)	2 Par 7:21	2 Par 7:21 (Translation)
והבית הזה אשר היה עליון לכל-עבר עליו ישם ואמר במה עשה יהוה ככה לארץ הזאת ולבית הזה:	(As for) this house, which was lofty, everyone passing by it will be astonished and say, ‘Why has the Lord done such to this land and to this house?’	καὶ ὁ οἶκος οὗτος ὁ ὑψηλός, πᾶς ὁ διαπορευόμενος αὐτὸν ἐκστήσεται καὶ ἐρεῖ Χάριν τίνος ἐποίησεν κύριος τῇ γῆ ταύτῃ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ;	And this house is lofty, everyone passing by it will be amazed and will say, ‘Why has the Lord done (this) to this land and to this house?’

Rather than rendering the relative pronoun and verb **אשר היה**, ‘which was’, with a Greek relative clause, the translator puts the adjective **ὁ ὑψηλός**, ‘the high’, (for **עליון**, ‘high’) in an attributive relationship with the subject **ὁ οἶκος οὗτος**, ‘this house’. According to Rehm, this reflects a tendency by the translator(s) to avoid certain ‘Hebrew phrases’ that include the relative pronoun **אשר**.⁵⁵

The translator does not render the preposition on **לכל**, ‘to all/every’, providing instead simply **πᾶς**, ‘all/every’. BHS recommends following 1 Kgs, which also lacks the preposition. The participle **עבר**, ‘the one passing over/through’, is followed by the prepositional phrase **עליו**, ‘over/by it’. The translator takes the participle and the prepositional phrase together, rendering **עבר עליו** with **ὁ διαπορευόμενος αὐτόν**, ‘the one passing through it’.

The prepositional phrase **במה**, ‘why’, is translated with **χάριν τίνος**, ‘why, for what’. This is a special use of the noun **χάρις**, ‘grace’, functioning exactly how the Hebrew **במה** is working here.⁵⁶ In fact, lexicons consider the accusative **χάριν** in situations like this to function as a preposition. It is striking, though, that this is the only occurrence in the LXX of **χάριν τίνος** for **במה**. The inverse, **τίνος χάριν**, ‘why’, occurs in

⁵⁵ Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 14-15. It is worth noting that some manuscript traditions have ‘**ἡν ὑψηλός**’, which more closely reflects MT (See Hanhart, *Paralipomenon*, 177).

⁵⁶ LSJ, s.v. ‘**χάρις**’; *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘**χάρις**’.

Menander's *Perikeiromenē*.⁵⁷ With or without *τίνος, χάριν*, shows up in this prepositional function several times across ancient Greek literature. Within the LXX, the standard rendering of *במה* is *ἐν τίνι*, 'in what' or 'why', which is a direct translation of each constituent; the preposition *ἐν* translates the preposition *ב*, and *τίνι* translates *מה*. This is even the rendering in the other occurrence of *במה* in 2 Chr. In 2 Par 7:21, then, the translator strays from the normal LXX rendering of *במה* in favor a more natural Greek phrase. This could be seen as an elevated stylistic choice on the part of the translator, perhaps because here *במה* occurs in a context where the Lord is speaking. In other words, it might be that the translator used the more stylistic *χάριν τίνος* rather than the more literal *ἐν τίνι* to elevate the language used by the Lord.

Par lacks a translation for the adverb *ככה*, 'thus'. LES attempts to smooth this out by translating the second part of the verse, 'For what did the Lord make happen to this land and this house'. Allen notes the omission of a translation for *ככה* in a similar context in 1 Kgs 1:6.⁵⁸ In both contexts, a similar question occurs: 'Why did you do (this)'. Although the questions are structured differently, both include *ποιέω*, 'I do, make'. While *οὕτως*, 'thus', which regularly translates *ככה* in the LXX, is expected after the verb, the translators (for 2 Par and 3 Kgdms) saw fit to omit the term, perhaps considering context sufficient to communicate the meaning of the verse.⁵⁹

2 Par 8:5

Table 2.5

2 Chr/Par 8:5 and English Translations

2 Chr 8:5	2 Chr 8:5 (Translation)	2 Par 8:5	2 Par 8:5 (Translation)
ויבן את־בית־חורון העליון ואת־בית־ חורון התחתון ערי מצור חומות דלתים ובריח:	He built upper Beth-Horon and lower Beth-Horon, siege cities of walls, gates, and bars.	καὶ ἠκοδόμησεν τὴν Βαιθωρῶν τὴν ἄνω καὶ τὴν Βαιθωρῶν τὴν κάτω, πόλεις ὄχυράς, τείχη, πύλαι καὶ μοχλοί,	He built upper Beth-Horon and lower Beth-Horon, fortified cities, walls, gates, and bars.

⁵⁷ Menander, *Perik.*, line 801. See also UPZ 1.5, line 41; UPZ 1.6, line 29. Both are Egyptian papyri from around 163 BCE.

⁵⁸ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 159.

⁵⁹ See *CGCG*, §50.37-38.

The translator twice inserts the accusative article τήν before the transcribed Βαιθωρών, ‘Beth-Horon’, for בית חורון, ‘Beth-Horon’. This indicates some level of variation from the MT. Perhaps the reason for this change was the indeclinable nature of Βαιθωρών. Using the article makes clear that the word is accusative.⁶⁰

It is worth noting that the translator uses adverbs for the adjectives גלילי, ‘high’, and תחתון, ‘lower’. In the LXX, גלילי is often translated with an adjective like ὑψηλός, ‘high’, or ὑψιστος, ‘highest’. However, ὑψιστος in the LXX has become a standard way to translate גלילי when it is used to speak of the ‘Most High (God)’. In fact, every time גלילי refers to the ‘Most High (God)’ (31 of the 52 total occurrences of גלילי), ὑψιστος is used. Also, ὑψιστος does not translate גלילי in other contexts, though it is used to translate other words. Those 31 occurrences of ὑψιστος are accounted for. That leaves 21 occurrences of גלילי that are not translated with ὑψιστος because the context does not suggest the title ‘Most High (God)’. Of those 21, 11 (52%) are translated with adverbs. All of the adverbs used are ἄνω, ‘above’, or compound forms of ἄνω. A similar use is found in BGU.6.1226 (260 BCE?):

. . . παρ’ Ἀπολλωνίδου τοῦ νομάρχου ἐκ τῆς ἄνω τοπαρχίας. . .
 . . . from Apollonides, the official from the upper district. . .

As seen here, the adverb ἄνω is being used adjectivally.

Of the 10 occurrences of תחתון in the MT, eight are translated with an adverb, specifically with either κάτω, ‘below’, or a compound form.⁶¹ The other two occurrences are translated with adjectives, but neither of those are clear.⁶² An example like the one above comes from BGU.6.1242 (193 BCE):

. . . Τακόνα τῆς κάτω τοπαρχίας. . .
 . . . Takona of the lower district. . .

Like the examples above, in 2 Par 8:5 these adverbs, found in the attributive position, are functioning like adjectives.⁶³ The point is simple: the Greek resulting from this translation decision (choosing an adverb when an adjective was available) has precedent in Ancient Greek literature. Further, a direct rendering would be one in which

⁶⁰ The use of the accusative article where the Hebrew direct object marker occurs in the MT will be discussed in chapter 5 below.

⁶¹ Only the two occurrences in Par use κάτω as opposed to a compound form.

⁶² In Isaiah 22:9, תחתון is translated with ἀρχαῖος, ‘ancient’. Ultimately, this verse strays from the MT in a few places, and the choice of ἀρχαῖος seems to be motivated by the context, as the ‘old pools’ will be mentioned in the MT just a few verses later. Ezekiel 40:19 has ἐξώτερος, ‘outside’. Again, there is a bit of complexity with this verse in that it varies in a few places from the MT. Ultimately, neither of these verses include a translation of the sense of תחתון.

⁶³ According to Smyth, §1096, if an adverb is in an attributive position, it ‘may serve as an adjective’. See also *CGCG*, §6.10.

grammatical and semantic equivalence is achieved. Here, though, neither truly happen, yet the result is good Greek with precedent outside of translated material.

At the end of the verse, the singular ובריה, ‘and a bar’, is translated as a plural, καὶ μοχλοί, ‘and bars’. 2 Par 8:5 is evidence that, even the most ‘straightforward’ translations exhibit some elements that stray from *exact literalism*.

2 Par 9:13

Table 2.6
2 Chr/Par 9:13 and English Translations

2 Chr 9:13	2 Chr 9:13 (Translation)	2 Par 9:13	2 Par 9:13 (Translation)
ויהי משקל הזהב אשר־בא לשלמה בשנה אחת שש מאות וששים ושש ככרי זהב:	The weight of the gold which came to Solomon in one year was six hundred sixty-six talents of gold.	καὶ ἦν ὁ σταθμὸς τοῦ χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἐνεχθέντος τῷ Σαλωμῶν ἐν ἑνιαυτῷ ἐνὶ ἑξακόσια ἑξήκοντα ἕξ τάλαντα χρυσοῦ	The weight of the gold brought to Solomon in one year was six hundred sixty-six talents of gold.

The Hebrew ויהי, ‘and it was/happened’, is used regularly in narrative to carry forward the action of the story or to resume the main story. In such cases, the LXX translators chose καὶ ἐγένετο, ‘and it happened’, as the standard rendering for ויהי. The translator understood that ויהי was not functioning in this way here. He correctly read משקל, ‘weight’, as the subject of ויהי, and rendered them with καὶ ἦν ὁ σταθμὸς, ‘and the weight was’. This is evidence of the translator’s sensitivity to the source text.

For the relative clause אשר־בא, ‘which came’, the translator has provided a passive participle: τοῦ ἐνεχθέντος, ‘brought’. This is a careful rendering of the relative clause using a normal feature of Greek literature (a participle) that is usually ‘greatly reduced in’ Par.⁶⁴ According to Good, this is irregular in Par, and ‘the equivalent more closely reflecting the Hebrew, a relative pronoun and an indicative, was the translator’s preference’.⁶⁵ We find here, then, a straying from translational norms in favor of a more natural Greek rendering.

While it seems redundant at first glance, the inclusion of ἐνί, ‘one’, for תא, ‘one’, after ἐν ἑνιαυτῷ, ‘in a year’, has precedent in the papyri. See, for example,

⁶⁴ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 227.

⁶⁵ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 228.

ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα, ‘one year’, in line 18 of a fragment from Takona dating to around 190 BCE.⁶⁶ Another example from Takona dates to roughly 220 BCE and has ἐνιαυτόν α, ‘one year’, in line 11.⁶⁷ Again, this serves as evidence that even translations that seem to be word-for-word should be analyzed. The result is affirmation of the translation decision from non-translated material.

The translator omits a couple of instances of the conjunction ו, ‘and’, in the number שש מאות ושישים ושש, ‘six hundred sixty-six’. Normal Hebrew standards necessitate the inclusion of ו to separate each ‘place’ in the number. The translator provides ἑξακόσια ἑξήκοντα ἕξ, ‘six hundred sixty-six’.

In this verse, then, it can be concluded that the translator shows sensitivity to the nuance of his *Vorlage*. He omits things that need to be omitted. A translation choice that at first seems unnecessarily repetitive can be substantiated by evidence from papyri. The translation of this verse is not exactly ‘literal’, but the result is a careful, faithful rendering of the *Vorlage*.

Preliminary Conclusions on Translation Techniques in 2 Par

In the examples above, we have focused on one verse from each of the chapters that will not be discussed below. We move now to some preliminary remarks and conclusions that can be drawn from this section.

First, the above analyses show the value of an eclectic approach. The approach used above does not look only for one feature or only compare the text of Par to certain other texts (i.e., a certain subset of papyri, ancient Greek writings, etc.). The text is analyzed from different angles. An eclectic approach allows for broader and more careful conclusions.

Second, the examples provided above also exhibit the need for study of a specific unit of text. Working through a cohesive unit of text brings more clarity to the observations and subsequent conclusions. The observations made above are helpful to set the stage for the work that will follow. Studies that aim to understand translation techniques but only deal with ‘random’ verses spread throughout a corpus, though, are only able to tell part of the story. This was identified above as a clear shortcoming of Allen’s *The Greek Chronicles*.

⁶⁶ BGU 6.1270.

⁶⁷ BGU 6.1273.

Third, study of translation techniques involves both the exciting and the mundane. Some verses in the LXX have several discussion-worthy translation decisions. Other verses seem straightforward. As seen above, even the most straightforward verses usually still contain features that are worth investigating if we are to produce a study of translation techniques.

The examples from this chapter begin to show the complexity of the translator that produced Par. While he occasionally introduces ambiguity into the text, he usually appears to be concerned with representing the meaning of his *Vorlage*. Sometimes he follows the Hebrew text and reproduces it almost exactly in Greek, often following standard conventions for rendering certain words and phrases. Other times, he strays from the norms and produces quality Greek. Often, these two overlap.

From here, we focus our attention on 2 Par 4-6, making observations from the text and discussing translation decisions, significant and (seemingly) insignificant alike. In doing so, we will be in a better position to provide nuance to the preliminary conclusions here and the conclusions drawn by others in previous studies. So the study moves now to an analysis of the temple furnishings in 2 Par 4.

Chapter 3:

Translation Technique in the Temple Furnishings

Section

Translation of the Temple Furnishings Section in the MT and the LXX

2 Chr 4:1-22	2 Chr 4:1-22 (Translation)	2 Par 4:1-22a	2 Par 4:1-22a (Translation)
1 ויעש מזבח נחשת עשרים אמה ארכו ועשרים אמה רחבו ועשר אמות קומתו:	1 And he made an altar of bronze, twenty cubits was its length and twenty cubits its width and ten cubits its height.	1 Καὶ ἐποίησεν τὸ θυσιαστήριον χαλκοῦν, πήχεων εἴκοσι μῆκος καὶ τὸ εὖρος πήχεων εἴκοσι, ὕψος πήχεων δέκα.	1 And he made the bronze altar, twenty cubits long and the breadth of twenty cubits, a height of ten cubits.
2 ויעש את הים מוצק עשׂר באמה משפתו אל שפתו עגול סביב וחמש באמה קומתו וקו שלשים באמה יסב אתו סביב:	2 He made the cast sea, ten cubits from brim to brim, rounded all around, and five cubits high, and a measuring line of thirty cubits surrounded it around.	2 καὶ ἐποίησεν τὴν θάλασσαν χυτὴν, πήχεων δέκα τὴν διαμέτρησιν, στρογγύλην κυκλόθεν, καὶ πήχεων πέντε τὸ ὕψος καὶ τὸ κύκλωμα πήχεων τριάκοντα.	2 He made the cast sea, ten cubits the measurement, a circle around, and five cubits high and the circumference thirty cubits.
3 ודמות בקרים תחת לו סביב סביב סובבים אתו עשר באמה מקיפים את הים סביב שנים טורים הבקר יצוקים במצקתו:	3 The likeness of cattle was under it on all sides, all around, surrounding it, ten cubits, surrounding the sea all around. The cattle were in two rows, cast in its casting.	3 καὶ ὁμοίωμα μόσχων ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτῆς· κύκλω κυκλοῦσιν αὐτήν, πήχεις δέκα περιέχουσιν τὸν λουτήρα κυκλόθεν· δύο γένη ἐχώνευσαν τοὺς μόσχους ἐν τῇ χωνεύσει αὐτῶν,	3 The image of calves was under it, they circled around it, ten cubits, they surrounded the tub all around, they cast calves, two types, in their casting,
4 עומד על שנים עשׂר בקר שלשה פנים צפונה ושלשה פנים ימה ושלשה פנים נגבה ושלשה פנים מזרחה והים עליהם מלמעלה וכל אחריהם ביתה:	4 It was standing upon twelve oxen: three facing north and three facing west and three facing south and three facing east. The sea was upon them on the top and all their hindquarters were inward.	4 ἧ ἐποίησαν αὐτούς, δώδεκα μόσχους, οἱ τρεῖς βλέποντες βορρᾶν καὶ οἱ τρεῖς βλέποντες δυσμὰς καὶ οἱ τρεῖς βλέποντες νότον καὶ οἱ τρεῖς βλέποντες ἀνατολὰς, καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ἐπ' αὐτῶν	4 for which they made them, twelve calves: three facing north and three facing west and three facing south and three facing east, and the sea was upon them on top, their hindquarters were inside.

		ἄνω, ἦσαν τὰ ὀπίσθια αὐτῶν ἔσω.	
5 ועביו טפח ושפתו כמעשה שפת כוס פרח שושנה מחזיק בתים שלשת אלפים יכיל:	5 Its thickness was a handbreadth, and its edge was made as the edge of cup like a lily blossom, holding it held three thousand baths.	5 καὶ τὸ πάχος αὐτῆς παλαιστής, καὶ τὸ χεῖλος αὐτῆς ὡς χεῖλος ποτηρίου, διαγεγλυμμένα βλαστοὺς κρίνου, χωροῦσα μετρητὰς τρισχιλίους· καὶ ἐξετέλεσεν.	5 Its thickness was a palm-breadth, and its edge was as the edge of a cup, engraved with the bud of a lily, holding three thousand measures and he completed (it).
6 ויעש כזורים עשרה ויתן חמשה מימין וחמשה משמאל לרחצה בהם את מעשה העולה ידחו בם והים לרחצה לכהנים בו:	6 He made ten wash basins and he put five on the right and five on the left to wash in them. The items of the burnt offering they rinsed in them. Now the sea was for the priests to wash in it.	6 καὶ ἐποίησεν λουτήρας δέκα καὶ ἔθηκεν τοὺς πέντε ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ τοὺς πέντε ἐξ ἀριστερῶν τοῦ πλύνειν ἐν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔργα τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων καὶ ἀποκλύζειν ἐν αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἡ θάλασσα εἰς τὸ νίπτεσθαι τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἐν αὐτῇ.	6 He made ten wash tubs and he put five on the right and five on the left to wash in them the works of the whole burnt offering and to rinse in them. Now the sea was for the priests to wash in it.
7 ויעש את מנרות הזהב עשר כמשפטם ויתן בהיכל חמש מימין וחמש משמאל:	7 He made ten gold lampstands according to their specification. He placed them in the temple, five on the right and five on the left.	7 καὶ ἐποίησεν τὰς λυχνίας τὰς χρυσᾶς δέκα κατὰ τὸ κρίμα αὐτῶν καὶ ἔθηκεν ἐν τῷ ναῷ, πέντε ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ πέντε ἐξ ἀριστερῶν.	7 He made ten gold lampstands according to their judgment and he put them in the temple, five on the right and five on the left.
8 ויעש שלחנות עשרה וינח בהיכל חמשה מימין וחמשה משמאל ויעש מזרקי זהב מאה:	8 He made ten tables and he set them in the temple, five on the right and five on the left. He made one hundred gold bowls.	8 καὶ ἐποίησεν τραπέζας δέκα καὶ ἔθηκεν ἐν τῷ ναῷ, πέντε ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ πέντε ἐξ εὐωνύμων. καὶ ἐποίησεν φιάλας χρυσᾶς ἑκατόν.	8 He made ten tables and put them in the temple, five on the right and five on the left. He made one hundred gold bowls.

<p>9 ויעש חצר הכהנים והעזרה הגדולה ודלתות לעזרה ודלתותיהם צפה נחשת:</p>	<p>9 He made the courtyard of the priests and the large border and the doors. Their doors he overlaid with bronze.</p>	<p>9 και ἐποίησεν τὴν αὐλὴν τῶν ἱερέων καὶ τὴν αὐλὴν τὴν μεγάλην καὶ θύρας τῇ αὐλῇ καὶ θυρώματα αὐτῶν κατακεχαλκωμένα χαλκῷ.</p>	<p>9 He made the courtyard of the priests and the great court and doors for the court. Their doors he bronzed with bronze.</p>
<p>10 ואת היסודות נתן מכתף הימנית קדמה ממול נגבה:</p>	<p>10 The sea he put to the southeast side, towards the south.</p>	<p>10 καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ἔθηκεν ἀπὸ γωνίας τοῦ οἴκου ἐκ δεξιῶν ὡς πρὸς ἀνατολὰς κατέναντι.</p>	<p>10 The sea he put from the corner of the house on the right as to face east.</p>
<p>11 ויעש חורם את הסירות ואת המזרקות ויכל חירם [חורם] לעשות את המלאכה אשר עשה למלך שלמה בבית האלהים:</p>	<p>11 Hiram made pots and shovels and bowls. Hiram finished doing the work which he did for King Solomon in the house of God:</p>	<p>11 καὶ ἐποίησεν Χειράμ τὰς κρεάγρας καὶ τὰ πυρεῖα καὶ τὴν ἐσχάραν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ. καὶ συνετέλεσεν Χειράμ ποιῆσαι πᾶσαν τὴν ἐργασίαν, ἣν ἐποίησεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμῶν ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ,</p>	<p>11 Hiram made meat hooks and firewood and the fireplace for the altar and all its utensils. Hiram finished doing all the work which King Solomon put in the house of God:</p>
<p>12 עמודים שנים והגלות והכתרות על ראש העמודים שתיים והשבכות שתיים לכסות את שתי גלות הכתרות אשר על ראש העמודים:</p>	<p>12 two pillars and basins and capitals on the top of the two pillars and two nets to cover the two basins of the capitals which were on the top of the pillars</p>	<p>12 στύλους δύο καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν γωλάθ τῇ χωθαρέθ ἐπὶ τῶν κεφαλῶν τῶν στύλων δύο καὶ δίκτυα δύο συγκαλύψαι τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν χωθαρέθ, ἃ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῶν κεφαλῶν τῶν στύλων,</p>	<p>12 two pillars and on them golath for the chothareth on the tops of the two pillars and two nets to cover the tops of the chothareth, which are on the tops of the pillars</p>

<p>13 ואת הרמונים ארבע מאות לשת השבכות שנים טורים רמונים לשבכה האחת לכסות את שתי גלות הכתרות אשר על פני העמודים:</p>	<p>13 and the four hundred pomegranates for the two nets, two rows of pomegranates for each net to cover the two basins of the capitals which were on the face of the pillars.</p>	<p>13 καὶ κώδωνας χρυσοῦς τετρακοσίους εἰς τὰ δύο δίκτυα καὶ δύο γέννη ῥοΐσκων ἐν τῷ δικτύῳ τῷ ἐνὶ τοῦ συγκαλύψαι τὰς δύο γῶλᾶθ τῶν χωθαρέθ, ἃ ἐστὶν ἐπάνω τῶν στύλων.</p>	<p>13 and four hundred golden bells for the two nets and the two kinds of pomegranates in one net to cover the two golath of the chothareth, which are before the pillars.</p>
<p>14 ואת המכנות עשה ואת הכירות עשה על המכנות:</p>	<p>14 He made the stands and he made the basins on the stands</p>	<p>14 καὶ τὰς μεχωνῶθ ἐποίησεν δέκα καὶ τοὺς λουτήρας ἐποίησεν ἐπὶ τῶν μεχωνῶθ,</p>	<p>14 He made ten mechonoth and he made the basins on the mechonoth</p>
<p>15 את הים אחד ואת הבקר שנים עשר תחתיו:</p>	<p>15 and the one sea and the twelve oxen beneath it.</p>	<p>15 καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν μίαν καὶ τοὺς μόσχους τοὺς δώδεκα ὑποκάτω αὐτῆς</p>	<p>15 and the one sea and the twelve calves beneath it.</p>
<p>16 ואת הסירות ואת היעים ואת המזלגות ואת כל כליהם עשה חורם אביו למלך שלמה לבית יהוה נחשת מרוק:</p>	<p>16 The pots and the shovels and the forks and all their utensils Hiram Abi made from polished bronze for King Solomon for the house of the Lord.</p>	<p>16 καὶ τοὺς ποδιστήρας καὶ τοὺς ἀναλημπτήρας καὶ τοὺς λέβητας καὶ τὰς κρεάγρας καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτῶν, ἃ ἐποίησεν Χειράμ καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν τῷ βασιλεῖ Σαλωμών ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου χαλκοῦ καθαροῦ.</p>	<p>16 The long robes and the ladles and the kettles and the meat hooks and all their utensils which Hiram made of pure bronze and brought up to King Solomon in the house of the Lord.</p>
<p>17 בכבר הירדן יצקם המלך בעבי האדמה בין סכות ובין צרדתה:</p>	<p>17 In the vicinity of the Jordan the king cast them in the thickness of the ground between Succoth and Zeredah.</p>	<p>17 ἐν τῷ περιχώρῳ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ἐχώννευσεν αὐτὰ ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν τῷ πάχει τῆς γῆς ἐν οἴκῳ Σοκχῶθ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Σαρηδάθα.</p>	<p>17 In the area around the Jordan the king cast them in the thickness of the earth in the house of Soccoth and in the middle of Saredatha.</p>

18 ויעש שלמה כל הכלים האלה לרב מאד כי לא נחקר משקל הנחשת:	18 Solomon made all these utensils in very large quantities for the weight of the bronze was not ascertainable.	18 και ἐποίησεν Σαλωμών πάντα τὰ σκεύη ταῦτα εἰς πλῆθος σφόδρα, ὅτι οὐκ ἐξέλιπεν ὄλκῃ τοῦ χαλκοῦ.	18 Solomon made all these utensils in very large quantities, for the weight of the bronze did not go away.
19 ויעש שלמה את כל הכלים אשר בית האלהים ואת מזבח הזהב ואת השלחנות ועליהם לחם הפנים:	19 Solomon made all the utensils which (were in) the house of God and the golden altar and the tables and on them the bread of the presence	19 και ἐποίησεν Σαλωμών πάντα τὰ σκεύη οἴκου κυρίου και τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν και τὰς τραπέζας, και ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἄρτοι προθέσεως,	19 Solomon made all the utensils for the house of the Lord and the golden altar and the tables (and on them the loaves for presentation)
20 ואת המנרות ונרתיהם לבערם כמשפט לפני הדביר זהב סגור:	20 and the lampstands and their lamps for their burning as prescribed before the inner sanctuary, of pure gold	20 και τὰς λυχνίας και τοὺς λύχνους τοῦ φωτὸς κατὰ τὸ κρίμα και κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ δαβείρ χρυσοῦ καθαροῦ	20 and the lampstands and the lamps of light according to the judgment and according to the face of the dabeir, of pure gold
21 והפרח והנרות והמלקחים זהב הוא מכלות זהב:	21 the blossom and the lights and the tongs of gold, the purest gold	21 και λαβίδες αὐτῶν και οἱ λύχνοι αὐτῶν και τὰς φιάλας και τὰς θυῖσκας και τὰ πυρεῖα χρυσοῦ καθαροῦ.	21 and their snuffers and their lamps and the bowls and the censers and the firewood, of pure gold
22 והמזמרות והמזרקות והכפות והמתנות זהב סגור ופתח הבית דלתותיו הפנימיות לקדש הקדשים ודלתי הבית להיכל זהב:	22 and the snuffers and the basins and the saucers and the fire pans of pure gold and the openings of the house for its inner doors to the Most Holy Place and the doors of the house of the temple were gold.	22a και ἡ θύρα τοῦ οἴκου ἡ ἔσωτέρα εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, εἰς τὰς θύρας τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ ναοῦ χρυσαῖς.	22a and the inner door of the house to the holy of holies, to golden doors of the house of the temple.

The Translation and Transcription¹ of Technical Terms

Perhaps the most striking feature of the translation of this chapter is the way that the translator dealt with the terms for the items that were part of the temple furnishings. Starting in 2 Chr 4:11, certain items that were made for the temple by Hiram are described. In this verse and those that follow, the translator seems to have run into several issues with understanding the terms in the *Vorlage*. Katrin Hauspie mentions the tendency of LXX translators, especially those who worked on Kgdms, Par, and Ezra, to transcribe ‘architectural terms related to the temple’.² The words assessed below go beyond those mentioned by Hauspie.³

Terms in 2 Chr/Par 4:3

The translator renders שְׁנַיִם טוֹרִים, ‘two rows’, with δύο γένη, ‘two kinds’. The Hebrew term טור is not common in the MT. The contexts in which it does occur—construction/ornamentation passages in Exodus, 1 Kgs, Ezekiel, and 2 Chr—suggest that it should be considered a technical term. The standard equivalent in the LXX for טור, including in the parallel passage in Kgdms, is στίχος, ‘line, row’. In the other occurrences where טור is translated, στίχος is used. The reverse is true as well; στίχος only occurs in the LXX as a translation of טור. The translator of 2 Par, then, dealt with טור differently than other translators. In this instance and the same issue in 2 Par 4:13 (below), the translator has not consulted LXX Exodus or 3 Kgdms, if he even had access to them. This decision in these two verses may have resulted from the translator guessing based on context. In both instances, ‘two kinds’ makes sense, as he recounts the creation of two kinds of τὸς μὸσχοις, ‘cattle’, and two kinds of ῥοῖσκαων, ‘pomegranates’. In neither instance, though, does the translator communicate the precise *meaning* of the MT.

¹ On the difference between transcription and transliteration, see K. Hauspie, ‘Transcriptions of Hebrew Words’, in *Die Sprache der Septuaginta*, 172-181; F. W. Knobloch, ‘“Transcription Technique” and the Text of Greek Genesis’, *BIOSCS* 35 (2002) 97-109, esp. 98; P. Myers, ‘Septuagint Transcriptions and Phonology’, in *T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*, 37-62. Since the LXX translators were working from a consonantal text, ‘transcription’, as it refers to ‘the mapping of sounds of one language into the best matching phonetic equivalents of another language’ (Hauspie, ‘Transcriptions’, 172) will be used. The rare use of ‘transliteration’ in what follows refers to situations where ‘all letters’ are present, i.e. ‘Sabbath’ for שַׁבָּת.

² Hauspie, ‘Transcriptions’, 177.

³ Worth considering is Nida’s claims about the technical ability of the intended audience of the translation. E. A. Nida, ‘Translating Means Communicating: A Sociolinguistic Theory of Translation II’, *BT* 30.3 (1979) 318-325, citing 319: ‘the choice of a lexical register depends on the receptors for who a translation is being made.... A receptor may, for example, be capable of understanding a more or less technical discourse, but he may simply not be willing to expend the energy required to do so’.

Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:11

In 2 Chr 4:11, Hiram is credited with making pots (סירות), shovels (יעים), and bowls (מזרקות). Each of these three terms should be considered rare, especially in the MT. The first term, סיר, is regularly translated with λέβης, ‘cauldron’. Only here in 2 Par 4:11 is it translated with τὰς κρεάγρας, ‘meat hooks’. This word is found again in 2 Par 4:16 where it is translated τοὺς ποδιστῆρας, ‘long robes’, a word that occurs only there in the LXX.⁴ The next term, יע, is translated with πυρεῖον, ‘firewood’. The Hebrew term occurs only eight times in the MT, and here alone is it translated with πυρεῖον. As with סיר, the translator offers a different translation for the same Hebrew word in 2 Par 4:16. There, though, he provides the more accurate τοὺς ἀναλημπτήρας, ‘the ladles’. Next, the translator renders מזרק with ἐσχάρα, ‘fireplace’. Not only is there a semantic difference here, but he offers the singular τὴν ἐσχάραν for the plural מזרקות. Again, this is the only place in the LXX where מזרק is rendered ἐσχάρα.⁵ Later, in 2 Par 4:21, the translator offers the more appropriate and more regularly attested φιάλη, ‘bowl’.

The terms that the translator of 2 Par uses (κρεάγρα, πυρεῖον, and ἐσχάρα) do occur in contexts together in the Pentateuch.⁶ All three terms can be found in proximity in Exodus 27:3-5. The first two terms can be found together in Exodus 38:22-24 and Numbers 4:14. Of course, all three of these passages have to do with either the construction of or proper use of the tabernacle. As such, there is precedent—little as it may be—for seeing these terms used together. While it is possible that the translator conflated the Pentateuchal uses of these terms with his context in 2 Par 4, this seems rather unlikely, especially since the translator then more accurately translates two of the three terms later in this same passage.⁷ Further, there is no clear influence from the parallel verse in 3 Kgdms 7:26 (1 Kgs 7:40). The translator of 3 Kgdms uses different

⁴ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 170, suggests that the first is a transposition of terms (in 4:11) (see also Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 65) and the latter is a misreading of הסירות (in 4:16). Given their proximity, it seems that the careful translator would have made the connection and rendered the two terms similarly.

⁵ According to Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 115, this is actually an instance where the translator has misread the Hebrew definite direct object marker for a Hebrew abbreviation that would trigger the use of τὴν ἐσχάραν.

⁶ See Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 24.

⁷ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 24, discusses the Pentateuchal influence in this verse as suggested by Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 22, who maintains that there are liturgical motivations for the renderings.

glosses than the translator of 2 Par for each of the terms discussed above.⁸ The translations of these items are noteworthy, especially given some of the other translation decisions in this section that will be discussed below. Perhaps he felt that he need not perfectly translate the terms, so long as he included the types of items that belonged in the Tabernacle/Temple. Further, rather than having access to the Pentateuch, he may have simply used familiar terms from his memory of the Tabernacle account.

Immediately following the terms discussed above, Par contains a plus with respect to MT: τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ, ‘for the altar and all its utensils’. This addition in some ways mirrors 4:16, καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτῶν, ‘and all their utensils’, but not exactly. As noted above, 4:16 contains some of the same terms as found in the first part of 4:11. However, given the translator’s inconsistency in rendering the terms in each verse, the addition of τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ is likely not a conflation with 4:16. Additionally, this does not reflect either 1 Kgs 7:40 or 3 Kgdms 7:26. According to Allen, the addition of καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη αὐτῶν ‘is a case of assimilation to the wrong verse in Ki’ as the translator has carried over a translation for 1 Kgs 7:45 instead of 7:40.⁹ However, on a different occasion, Allen attributes the addition of τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου to ‘the translator’s ... desire to link this whole section with Exodus’.¹⁰ Direct assimilation to either is unlikely, unless his *Vorlage* contained the plus.

Par contains the plus πᾶσαν, ‘all’, after the infinitive ποιῆσαι, ‘to do’, which does not reflect the MT. 1 Kgs 7:40 has אֵת-כָּל-הַמְּלָאכָה, ‘all the work’, here. As such, BHS suggests reading כָּל in 2 Chr 4:11, as it matches both 2 Par 4:11 and 1 Kgs 7:40. 3 Kgdms 7:26 translates the singular הַמְּלָאכָה with the plural noun τὰ ἔργα, ‘the works’, while 2 Par 4:11 uses the singular τῆν ἐργασίαν, ‘the work’. It seems that the translator did not refer to 3 Kgdms here, but rather, his *Vorlage* had כָּל, in agreement with 1 Kgs 7:40. Also possible is Allen’s claim that כָּל is a word that is regularly added or omitted in the transmission process.¹¹ Given the presence of כָּל in the parallel passage (in both 1 Kgs and 3 Kgdms) and the inclusion of an equivalent in 2 Par, it is likely that the *Vorlage* of 2 Par included כָּל here.

⁸ It is worth noting the text critical note on הכירות in 1 Kgs 7:40 in BHS. The translator of 3 Kgdms seems to use the more expected, appropriate glosses for the words discussed, especially if הכירות is actually to be read הסירות.

⁹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 199.

¹⁰ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 82.

¹¹ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 152.

One additional difference from the MT in this verse is worth noting. For the prepositional phrase *המלש דלמל*, ‘for King Solomon’, some manuscripts have the inverted *Σαλωμών τῷ βασιλεῖ*, ‘to Solomon, the king’. According to Allen, changes like this should be attributed to the translator, rather than a misreading or different *Vorlage* ‘either because a more natural Gk order is followed or because otherwise one would have to assume unlikely upheaval in the *Vorlage*’.¹² This claim, though, is difficult, since there are several occasions in 2 Par where the word order *τῷ βασιλεῖ Σαλωμών* is followed, reflecting *המלש דלמל*.¹³ Attributing the decision to ‘more natural Gk order’, then, cannot be consistently applied. If this *was* a decision on the part of the translator, it was one that he did not make regularly.

The Göttingen text retains the word order but reflects a minus with respect to the preposition *ῥ*: *ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμών*, ‘King Solomon’. With this translation, Solomon is not the indirect object of the verb, but the subject. This reading is more problematic than an inversion of word order, since it introduces ambiguity with Solomon as the subject of *ἐποίησεν*, ‘he made’. However, given the prepositional phrase that follows (*ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ*, ‘in the house of God’), *ποιέω* here would communicate placement.¹⁴ The manuscript evidence supports the former, *Σαλωμών τῷ βασιλεῖ*, over *ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμών*. Perhaps the difficulty of *ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμών* contributes to its inclusion in the Göttingen main text, but *Σαλωμών τῷ βασιλεῖ* is also difficult since the more commonly attested rendering of similar phrases is to follow the word order represented in MT.

It is difficult to suggest that the above changes in this verse are the result of interference from either 1 Kgs/3 Kgdms or the Pentateuch. The differences are clear between 2 Par and 1 Kgs/3 Kgdms. Attempts to connect this verse to a reading in Exodus also require a level of interpretative ingenuity that seems disingenuous. It is possible that the translator’s memory of Tabernacle furnishings from Exodus influenced his decisions regarding the words he encountered in this verse.

Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:12

Where 2 Par 4:11 began to reveal the translator’s trends in dealing with certain technical terms, 2 Par 4:12 magnifies those trends. After translating the first items, two pillars,

¹² Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 133.

¹³ See 2 Par 4:16; 5:6; 8:10, 18; 9:9, 12, 15, 20.

¹⁴ See *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘ποιέω’.

accurately, the translator inserts the prepositional phrase ἐπ’ αὐτῶν, ‘upon them’.¹⁵ From this point, the translator makes several interesting decisions.

The terms והגלות והכתרות, ‘and the basins and the capitals’, are transcribed without the conjunction before the second term, and the second term is in the dative case: γωλάθ τῆ χωθαρέθ.¹⁶ While neither Hebrew term is ‘common’ in the MT, each shows up several times. That the translator was unfamiliar with the terms is certainly possible. Later in the verse, the translator provides τὰς κεφαλὰς τῶν χωθαρέθ, ‘the heads/tops of the Chothareth’, where גלות הכתרות, ‘the basins of the capitals’, occurs in the MT. According to Rehm and Allen, the translation of τὰς κεφαλὰς for גלות here suggests a misreading, where the translator is instead rendering תלגלג, ‘skull’.¹⁷ This certainly makes better sense of the translator’s decision to translate a word (גלות) with which he may have been unfamiliar or unsure. It is worth noting that the translation also lacks a rendering of תשׁת־א, ‘the two’, before גלות הכתרות. Perhaps more striking is that the same phrase, תשׁת־א גלות הכתרות, occurs in the next verse where the translator offers this: τὰς δύο γωλάθ τῶν χωθαρέθ. Allen is correct, then, concerning τὰς κεφαλὰς for גלות: this ‘translation sticks out like a sore thumb’.¹⁸ Allen and Rehm are likely correct that there was either a misreading on the part of the translator or a misspelling in his *Vorlage*. Another possibility is that the translator inserted τὰς κεφαλὰς given that ἐπὶ τῶν κεφαλῶν occurred two other times in this verse (for שׁא־לע, ‘on the tops’), but this is unlikely, especially since κεφαλή renders שׁא־לע in those other instances.

The relative clauses at the end of 2 Par 4:12, 13 contain the copulative verb ἐστίν, ‘is’. This is not the decision made in 3 Kgdms 7:27, 28, even though the relative clauses in 1 Kgs 7:41, 42 are very similar to those found in 2 Chr 4:12, 13. The translator of 3 Kgdms deals with the first using the participle τὰ ὄντα, ‘the things that are’, and the second by omitting the relative pronoun altogether. As such, the translators of 2 Par and 3 Kgdms have taken different approaches to dealing with the relative clauses in their respective *Vorlagen*, but neither has opted for a like-for-like translation.

Twice in 4:12, the translator renders the singular שׁא־לע, ‘top, head’, with the plural τῶν κεφαλῶν. This is not unique to 2 Par, as the same shows up in the parallel in

¹⁵ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 36, suggests that this is a case of importation from a verse that would have appeared in the next column over.

¹⁶ Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 70, attributes this to a *Vorlage* that matches 1 Kgs.

¹⁷ Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 59; Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 167.

¹⁸ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 167.

3 Kgdms. It is likely that the translator of each felt that the plural was the more natural rendering since the tops of multiple pillars are in view.

Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:13

There is evidence of possible interference from the Tabernacle furnishings section of Exodus, as the translator renders הרמונים, ‘pomegranates’, in 2 Chr 4:13 with κώδωνας χρυσοῦς, ‘golden bells’. That the translator later in this same verse renders this Hebrew term more accurately with ροῖσικων, ‘pomegranates’, suggests that he was familiar with the meaning of the word. According to Allen, it is possible that due to the translator’s knowledge of Exodus 39:25 and surrounding passages which use the Hebrew רמונים and פעמני, ‘bells’ in proximity, he assumed that the two words were ‘loose equivalents’, and so alternated κώδωνας χρυσοῦς and ροῖσικων for stylistic purposes.¹⁹ It is also possible that the translator was recalling the Exodus passages, which put the two Hebrew terms close to one another. He might have unconsciously provided the translation that he did because of his knowledge of the similar verses in Exodus. With this option, it would be that the translator was allowing interference from his memory of Exodus 39:25ff. rather than correcting toward Exodus.²⁰

Later in the verse, the translator uses γένη, ‘types’, to translate the Hebrew term טורים, ‘rows’. The translator made the same decision regarding the translation of this word in 2 Par 4:3. Only in these two verses is טור translated with γένος. The standard equivalent for the Hebrew term is στίχος, ‘row, line’. We see again in this verse גלות הכתרות transcribed as γωλάθ τῶν χωθαρέθ, this time with χωθαρέθ marked by the article as a genitive plural rather than a dative singular.

Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:14

The translator again transcribes at the beginning of this verse, as he renders מכנות, ‘base’, with μεχωνώθ. He does this twice in this verse. There are a few other interesting features of this verse, but those will be discussed below.

Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:16

As mentioned above, many of the technical terms that appeared in 2 Chr 4:11 can be found again in 2 Chr 4:16, where they are dealt with differently by the translator. The

¹⁹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 25.

²⁰ We might call these ‘imprints’. See Meynadier, ‘*Éléments de lexicographie*’, 51.

term הַסִּירוֹת, ‘pots’, is translated τοὺς ποδιστῆρας, ‘long robes’. In 2 Par 4:11, this was rendered τὰς κρεάγρας, ‘meat hooks’. Next, the term הַיַּעִים, ‘shovels’, in 2 Chr 4:16 is translated τοὺς ἀναλημπτήρας, ‘ladles’. In 2 Par 4:11, it was translated instead with τὰ πυρεῖα, ‘firewood’. While the first two Hebrew terms in 2 Chr 4:16 are direct parallels to 2 Chr 4:11, the MT preserves הַמִּזְלָגָה, ‘meat forks’, in 2 Chr 4:16 where readers would expect הַמִּזְרָקוֹת, ‘bowls’, based on 2 Chr 4:11 and the parallel in 1 Kgs. Where one would expect a single translation for הַמִּזְלָגָה, Par has two terms: τοὺς λέβητας, ‘kettles’, and τὰς κρεάγρας, ‘meat hooks’. The translator has either synthesized 2 Chr 4:11 and 2 Chr 4:16 or his *Vorlage* had the double reading (both הַמִּזְלָגָה and הַמִּזְלָגוֹת). The Hebrew and Greek terms employed in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:16 do not display exact equivalence. Allen offers the following explanation:

The second pair [τοὺς λέβητας καὶ τὰς κρεάγρας] is original. λεβ stands for סִירוֹת, a standard rendering in the LXX generally. (It is translated πυρεῖα in v.11, where the translator is borrowing from Exodus, as so often in this chapter.) κρεάγρας is used for יַעִים in v. 11: there יַעִים ... סִירוֹת are transposed in translation. In I 28.17 מִזְלָגוֹת is translated κρεαγρῶν. יַעִים and מִזְ are accordingly regarded as synonymous by the translator, and he renders them with a single term. ἀναλ. was probably intended to represent the missing term. ποδ. is based on a misreading, יסודות.²¹

A few things are worth mentioning concerning Allen’s conclusions here. First, to say that this chapter ‘borrows’ from Exodus often is inaccurate. As seen above, it would be fairer to claim that knowledge of Exodus may have influenced the translator here, but he likely did not ‘borrow’ translations from Exodus. Second, Allen claims that both λέβητας and ποδιστῆρας can be linked to סִירוֹת, the former by way of standard rendering and the latter by way of misreading. However, it is unlikely that the translator would have represented סִירוֹת twice (unless he was completely unsure of the meaning), as it is also unlikely that the translator simply uses κρεάγρας for both יַעִים and מִזְלָגוֹת. Third, the assumption that ἀναλημπτήρας was inserted for a missing word is difficult to prove.

Ultimately, the LXX has four terms where the MT has three. The answer may be found by returning to the final two terms in the list in the LXX and the possible missing term in the MT. Where 2 Chr 4:16 has הַמִּזְלָגָה, 1 Kgs 7:45 and 2 Chr 4:11 have הַמִּזְרָקוֹת. As discussed above, it is quite possible that the *Vorlage* of 2 Par had both terms, since 2 Par 4:16 has τοὺς λέβητας and τὰς κρεάγρας. There is certainly semantic overlap between הַמִּזְרָקוֹת and τοὺς λέβητας on the one hand and הַמִּזְלָגָה and τὰς

²¹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 170.

κρεάγρας on the other. This accounts better for a ‘missing term’ than Allen’s suggestion, especially since ἀναλημπτήρας actually serves well as a translation of יעים. That leaves only ποδιστήρας as the term that is difficult to explain. For this term, Allen’s suggestion of a misreading is likely correct.

Terms in 2 Chr/2 Par 4:21-22

The LXX rendering of these two verses is shorter than their MT counterparts. Each of the technical terms found in these verses will be analyzed below.

There are seven Hebrew terms that occur in 2 Chr 4:21-22 concerning additional temple furnishings. Here, we begin with פרח. This term usually means ‘blossom’ or, in a context like this, ‘decorative floral work’. The next term that occurs is נר, which means ‘light’ or ‘lamp’. The term מלקחים refers to ‘tongs’, especially in the context of wick trimming for a lamp. 2 Chr 4:22 begins with the term מזמרות, ‘snuffer’, or something like ‘scissors’ to trim a wick, similar to מלקחים. Next, מזרק, ‘basin, bowl’, appears. The similar term, כף, ‘bowl, saucer’, follows. The final technical term in the list is מחתה, which means ‘fire pan’ or ‘censer’.

The translator provides five Greek terms for furnishings in the temple in 2 Par 4:21-22, roughly corresponding to those found in the MT. The first word is λαβίς, ‘clasp, candle snuffer’. The next term is λύχνος, ‘lamp’. This is followed by φιάλη, ‘bowl’, and θυῶσκη, ‘censer’. The final term is πυρεῖον, ‘firewood’. In 2 Par, all of these terms are found in 4:21.

Concerning the omission of a translation for פרח, Allen suggests that the translator had ‘a poor understanding of the context’ and ‘considered [the term] ill fitting’.²² Of course, the translator was familiar with פרח, as he translated it with βλαστός, ‘shoot, blossom’, just a few verses earlier in 2 Par 4:5. According to Allen, in 2 Par 4:21 ‘floral ornamentation was perhaps thought out of place in a list of cultic utensils’.²³

A simple transposition has taken place in the translation of והנרות והמלקחים with καὶ λαβίδες αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ λύχνοι αὐτῶν.²⁴ This is clear given the regularity with which מלקחים is rendered with λαβίς and נר with λύχνος. It is worth noting the addition of the

²² Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 117.

²³ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 117.

²⁴ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 65.

genitive pronoun *αὐτῶν* after each term here.²⁵ The phrase *זהב הוא מכלות זהב*, ‘gold, the purest gold’, at the end of 2 Chr 4:21 is omitted in 2 Par. Allen speculates that the translator omits the phrase because he was not sure what to do with *מכלות*, which only occurs here in the MT.²⁶ BHS marks *הוא מכלות זהב* as a plus with respect to the parallel in 1 Kgs and the LXX. If this phrase was not in Par’s *Vorlage*, this explains why it is not represented in Par. What would be left, then, is *זהב*, which the translator may have missed or thought to be misplaced, since it occurs again at the end of the list of items.

As was the case with *פרח* in 2 Chr 4:21, in 4:22 *מזמרת* occurs with no translation in the LXX. Allen suggests that this omission is due to parablepsis, where the translator skipped over *מזמרת* because of the similarities between *מזמרת* and *מזרק*, especially in its plural form as it occurs directly following *מזמרת*. Given the rare nature of *מזמרת*, it is also possible that the translator was unfamiliar with the term, or he may have considered it accounted for as he had already provided *λαβίς* for the similar *מלקחים* above.

Whereas the translator rendered *מזרק* in 2 Par 4:11 with *ἔσχαρα*, ‘fireplace’, he translates it in line with its standard equivalent, *φιάλη*, here, as in 4:8. There is plenty of precedent, especially in the Pentateuch for the translation of *כף* with *θυσιακή*, as the translator has provided here. Thus, with the translation of these two terms, the translator has rendered each according to standard expectation. The final technical term in 2 Chr 4:22, *מחתה*, is translated with *πυρεῖον* in 2 Par 4:21. Again, there is precedent in the Pentateuch for this translation decision, so the translator should be seen as following general norms of translation, even if the two words do not have the exact same meanings.²⁷ As mentioned above, the translator offers *χρυσίου καθαρῶ*, ‘of pure gold’, in 2 Par 4:21 for *זהב סגור*, ‘pure gold’, found in 2 Chr 4:22.²⁸

The translator considered the phrase *ופתח הבית דלתותיו הפנימיות*, ‘and the openings of the house, its inner doors’, to contain some synonymous terms, particularly *פתח* and *דלת*, as both terms are regularly rendered with forms of *θύρα*. Allen offers this

²⁵ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 48, contends that it is rather normal for the translator to omit suffixes or add genitive pronouns after certain nouns.

²⁶ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 61-62. The phrase *הוא מכלות זהב* is not found in the parallel in 1 Kgs 7.

²⁷ Words in different languages rarely, if ever, have the *exact* same meaning.

²⁸ According to Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 53, this is an example of the translator’s regular technique by which he renders multiple Hebrew terms with the same Greek term, as *καθαροῦ* stood for *מרוק* in 4:16, but in 4:20 and here, it stands for *סגור*.

as an example for the ‘omission of synonyms’.²⁹ The chosen word order of the translation (καὶ ἡ θύρα τοῦ οἴκου ἢ ἔσωτέρα, ‘and the outer door of the house’) implies that the missing term is דלת.³⁰ The translator has also brought the plural פנימיות into agreement with the singular פתח and his translation, ἡ θύρα.

Concerning the translation of the final phrase ודלתי הביית להיכל זהב, ‘the doors of the house to the temple (were) gold’, Allen claims ‘criss-cross assimilation ... in the Heb texts of both Rg and Par’ since the reading in 1 Kgdms matches 2 Chr and the reading in 2 Par matches 1 Kgs.³¹ Allen’s suggestion here directly relates to the translation of ודלתי with the prepositional phrase εἰς τὰς θύρας, ‘to(ward) the doors’. Beyond Allen’s comments, though, the translator has rendered the prepositional phrase להיכל without a preposition (τοῦ ναοῦ, ‘of the temple’), bringing it into a genitive chain with τοῦ οἴκου, ‘of the house’; the head noun is τὰς θύρας. Although the translator has consistently translated the noun זהב with the noun χρυσίον, ‘gold’, here he translates זהב with the adjective χρυσᾶς, ‘golden’, which is attributive to τὰς θύρας.

Conclusions for Technical Terms

As seen above, the technical terms in the section on the temple furnishings in 2 Chr/Par 4 contain several difficulties for translation. In some cases, the translator has opted for transcribing instead of translating. At times, his translation does not communicate the same items as the MT at all. Yet other times he opts for the standard equivalents of terms. Surely some of these decisions should be attributed to a different *Vorlage*, but that solution alone cannot explain the fact that these issues occur within the context of several notable translation decisions. For example, that the LXX is missing some of the terms found in 2 Chr 4:21-22 could be the result of a different *Vorlage* than what is represented by the MT. If the omission of a couple of terms in these verses occurred in isolation, this explanation would be more satisfying. However, within the larger context of transcriptions and mistranslations, these omissions require more thought. Perhaps the issues here are text-critical. But it is worth considering that the difficult readings surrounding these technical terms are spread out over several verses and are not isolated occurrences.

²⁹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 113.

³⁰ Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 17.

³¹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 200.

Transcriptions in the Solomonic Narrative and Other Technical Terms in Nearby Passages

Given the importance of the transcriptions in the Temple Furnishings of 2 Par 4 for understanding the translation techniques used by the translator, it is worth looking at additional transcriptions in the Solomonic narrative. Several transcriptions occur throughout 2 Par 1-9, most often when the translator encounters place or people names. For example, 2 Chr 3:1 ends with אֲרָנָן הַיְבוּסִי, ‘Ornan the Jebusite’, which is translated Ὀρνὰ τοῦ Ἰεβουσαίου, ‘Orna the Jebusite’. The translation of each of these terms falls in line with their typical translations (transcriptions) in the LXX. Another example is found in 2 Par 4:17. Here, the translator deals with סְכוֹת, ‘Succoth’, and צֶרֶדָה, ‘Zeredah’, by transcribing them: Σοκχώθ, ‘Soccoth’, and Σαρηδάθα, ‘Saredatha’. The former is typical for the LXX. The latter is found only here and in 1 Kgs 11:26. There it is also a transcribed, though it is different from what is found in 2 Par 4:17. 2 Par 5:10 has Χωρήβ, ‘Choreb’, for חֶרֶב, ‘Horeb’, which follows typical conventions for dealing with חֶרֶב.

The terms χερουβίν for כְּרוּבִים and χερούβ for כְּרוּב (‘cherubim’ and ‘cherub’, respectively) occur throughout the first nine chapters of 2 Par.³² These transcriptions are fairly standard in the LXX.³³ In the Greek Pentateuch, there is preference towards χερουβίμ over χερουβίν. Another term, דְּבִיר (‘small room’ or ‘holy of holies’), occurs only sixteen times in the MT.³⁴ Fifteen of those occurrences are transcribed as δαβείρ or δαβίρ.³⁵ So again, it seems that the translator tends to follow set conventions for dealing with certain terms.

In 2 Par 5:12, the translator provides a transcription: ἐν νάβλαις καὶ ἐν κινύραις for בְּנַבְלִים וּבְנִירוֹת (‘with harps and lyres’).³⁶ Concerning the first term, נַבֵּל is transcribed in all 14 of its occurrences in Kgdms and Par. In its 13 other occurrences, it is rendered ψαλτήριον (‘stringed instrument’, 8x), ψαλμός (‘psalm’, 1x), κιθάρα (‘lyre, harp’, 1x), εὐφροσύνη (‘joy’, 1x), and ὄργανον (‘tool’, 2x). Similar statistics are found for the translation of כִּנֹּר. Of its 42 OT occurrences, 17 are transcribed. This includes all examples from Kgdms, the sole occurrence in Nehemiah, and all but one of the

³² 2 Par 3:7, 10, 11 (2x), 12 (2x), 13, 14; 5:7, 8 (2x).

³³ We are still simply transliterating this word today!

³⁴ 1 Kgs 6:5, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 31; 7:49; 8:6, 8; Psalm 28:2; 2 Chr 3:16; 4:20; 5:7, 9.

³⁵ Only the lone occurrence in the Psalter is translated.

³⁶ The translator added the preposition ἐν before the second term to make it match the two prepositional phrases preceding it.

occurrences in Par.³⁷ Translations for כנר outside of these passages include κιθάρα ('lyre, harp', 20x), ψαλτήριον ('stringed instrument', 4x), and ὄργανον ('tool', 1x). Given that the translator of 2 Par consistently transcribes נבל and כנר, especially in the context of other technical terms that he translates, and the fact that transcribing these terms is consistent in Kgdms, one might assume that the translator considered these transcriptions as sufficient to communicate their Hebrew counterparts.³⁸ Otherwise, the translator might have been unaware of difficulties that these transcriptions might cause, but felt that he had no other choice to deal with them. It is worth noting that when the terms are translated, the same few words are used to translate both. In other words, there is not clear consensus on the part of the translators for how to deal with these terms even in translation.

אלם

In 2 Par 3:4, the translator renders אלם, 'porch', with αιλάμ. Of the 48 occurrences of אלם, this is by far the most typical decision by LXX translators. Oddly, though, this is the only time in Par that the transcription is used. In the other five occurrences of אלם in Par, the translator opts instead for ναός, 'temple'. This is a surprising feature of Par. As established above, the translator regularly opted for transcription when that was the typical option in other books of the LXX.³⁹ With אלם, though, the translator of Par strays from the expected translation decision on five out of six opportunities, and, in doing so, he provides his readers with a more understandable translation in those five instances. Some important questions emerge from these data: Why did the translator transcribe the one example when for the other five he offers a translation? Is there significance to the location of the one transcription?

The transcription (αιλάμ for אלם) occurs in 2 Par 3:4 as part of the larger section on the furnishings for the temple. In a previous section, we have established that the section on temple furnishings, as exhibited by 2 Par 4, regularly features transcriptions. In that regard, the transcription for אלם is not surprising. In fact, given that αιλάμ had

³⁷ The lone translation (rather than transcription) that occurs in Par is found in 2 Par 9:11, where it is paired with νάβλας; κιθάρας και νάβλας for כנרות ונבלים.

³⁸ A similar example is found in the way that translators dealt with the Hebrew כר, 'cor'. (Clearly, we still simply transcribe this word!) It occurs eight times, with seven of those occurrences in Kgs and Chr. All seven are transcribed κόρος. The one occurrence outside of Kgs and Chr is not translated at all.

³⁹ Another translation of אלם is attested in Joel 2:17, where the translator seems to have misunderstood his *Vorlage*.

become something of a standard equivalent for אֱלֹהִים, the translator has done exactly as expected in 2 Par 3:4. It is worth noting, though, that since there are five occurrences of *ναός* for אֱלֹהִים in Par, it is likely that the translator did not consider *αἰγάμ* to be an adequate translation, at least in the five other contexts in which אֱלֹהִים is found.

The first other occurrence of אֱלֹהִים is found in 1 Chr 28:11. Here, David gives the plans for *הַפְּנִימִים וּבֵית הַכֹּפֶרֶת* and *הָאֹמֹת וְגִזְזֵיכֶם וְעִלְיֹתֵיכֶם וְחֻדְרֵיכֶם וְחֻדְרֵיכֶם וְהַבַּיִת*, ‘the porch and its houses and its treasuries and its roof chambers and its inner chambers and the house of the mercy seat’, to Solomon. In this context, David has just informed Solomon that he (Solomon) will build *בַּיִת לְמִקְדָּשׁ*, ‘a house for the sanctuary’. The presence of *בַּיִת* in the previous verse contextualizes all these house features in 1 Chr 28:11.

In 2 Chr 8:12, Solomon offers burnt offerings on the altar he built *לְפָנֵי הָאֹמֹת*, ‘before the porch’. In this context, Solomon is ordering the cult as prescribed in the Law and by his father David. There is little mention of the temple in the immediate context but given the nature of the cultic language around this use, it is clear that the אֱלֹהִים referred to is that of the temple. Similarly, in 2 Chr 15:8, Asa repairs the altar *אֲשֶׁר לְפָנֵי אֹהֶל יְהוָה*, ‘which was before the porch of the Lord’. In 2 Chr 29:7, Hezekiah laments that the ancestors of the Israelites closed *דְּלֹתֹת הָאֹמֹת*, ‘the doors of the porch’. Later in this passage, the priests and Levites work to cleanse the temple. According to 2 Chr 29:17, *בָּאוּ לְאֹהֶל יְהוָה*, ‘they came to the porch of the Lord’, and *וַיִּקְדְּשׁוּ אֶת־בַּיִת־יְהוָה*, ‘they consecrated the house of the Lord’.

In each of these instances, as mentioned above, the translator uses *ναός*, thus clarifying or interpreting אֱלֹהִים as part of the temple. In each of these contexts, one could argue that ‘temple’ is a clearer understanding. When אֱלֹהִים occurs in the Hebrew Bible, it is usually clearly a reference to a specific part of the temple, the porch. This is not always the case in Chr. Particularly troubling examples might have been those in 2 Chr 15:8; 29:17, where the MT has *אֹהֶל יְהוָה*, ‘the porch of the Lord’, a construction that is not found elsewhere. In 2 Chr 29:17, though, context should have alerted the translator to not render אֱלֹהִים with *ναός*. That the phrase *בַּיִת־יְהוָה* follows almost directly after *אֹהֶל יְהוָה* suggests that these are different referents. In 2 Par, though, *τὸν ναὸν κυρίου*, ‘the temple of the Lord’, and *τὸν οἶκον κυρίου*, ‘the house of the Lord’, are synonymous, blurring the distinction between the two. On the surface, then, it seems that the translator’s translation of אֱלֹהִים with *ναός* is necessary. This, however, is not always the case. In other instances, including those mentioned above, *ναός* does serve to clarify that

the temple is in view, not just the porch. In 2 Par 3:4, the translator opts for the standard *αιλάμ* because the context makes clear that the porch, not the whole temple, is the object of discussion. Thus, in the one instance in which the translator is certain that *מלא* does not refer to the temple as a whole, he offers the expected transcription, *αιλάμ*.

שרשרות

The Hebrew *שרשרות*, ‘chains’, occurs twice in the 2 Par 3:16 and it is transcribed the first time (*σερσερώθ*) and translated the second time (*χαλαστῶν*, ‘of chains’). The second occurrence in 3:16 is consistent with the translation in 3:5 (*χαλαστά*). The noun *χαλαστόν* only occurs in these two verses in 2 Par in the LXX. In fact, *χαλαστόν* seems to be quite rare in general, as it is seemingly unattested in Greek literature outside of these two verses. All indicators point to *χαλαστόν* as a neologism.⁴⁰ The Hebrew *שרשרת* is also quite rare, occurring around eight times in the Hebrew Bible referring to small (often decorative) chains or tassels.⁴¹ The four occurrences of the word in Exodus are rendered with *κροσσωτά*, ‘adorned with fringes’,⁴² and *κροσσούς*, ‘fringes’.⁴³ The occurrence in 1 Kgs 7:17 is not translated in 3 Kgdms 7:5. This greatly decreases the chances that the translator of 2 Par referred to either Exodus or 3 Kgdms for assistance in translating *שרשרות*. So far in this chapter, there has been no definitive proof of parallel assimilation or even assistance from parallel passages. It seems clear, then, that this would likely have been a difficult word for the translator.⁴⁴ What is quite unclear is the fact that these three occurrences in 2 Par, all within a single chapter, are not dealt with consistently. While the aim here is to avoid generalizing or oversimplifying, the inconsistency in the translation of *שרשרות* in 2 Par 3 is difficult to rationalize.⁴⁵

Allen suggests that there are a few examples like this one in Par and that this indicates ‘that the number of transliterations was originally greater than at present appears’.⁴⁶ This implies that when changes were made to the text over time, redactors

⁴⁰ There is, perhaps, a connection (as mentioned in *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘*χαλαστόν*’) with the verb *χαλάω* (‘to loosen, untie’, *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘*χαλάω*’).

⁴¹ See *DCH*, s.v. ‘*שִׁרְשָׁרָה* or *שִׁרְשָׁרָת*’; *HALOT*, s.v. ‘*שִׁרְשָׁרָת*’. According to *HALOT*, the word is also ‘onomatopoeic’ as the pronunciation of the word sounds similar to the sound that is made by chains.

⁴² *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘*κροσσωτός*’.

⁴³ *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘*κροσσοί*’.

⁴⁴ According to Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 167, ‘the translator did not know the meaning of the word’.

⁴⁵ It would be much easier to rationalize this if there was only one instance of *שרשרות* in 2 Par 3:16 and it differed from 3:5. The complication arises in that there are two occurrences in 2 Par 3:16 and they are dealt with differently.

⁴⁶ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 164-165.

retained some of the transcriptions and changed others. This only possibly makes sense if the LXX text was meant to be read alongside the Hebrew text, a notion discussed and rejected in chapter 1. If the LXX was being read on its own, there would be nothing to indicate to the reader that *σερσερώθ* and *χαλαστῶν* were translations of the same word. Lest this seem like evidence for the Interlinear Paradigm, it should be noted that even with access to and facility with the Hebrew text, the meaning of this rare word would likely have been difficult to understand, especially if the translator was unable to adequately deal with the word. Further, if *χαλαστόν* is indeed a neologism, there is even less evidence for this view.

One possible explanation from the study of rhetoric is that the translator was attempting *variatio* by avoiding the repetition of a word in a short space.⁴⁷ However, there is nothing grammatically tying *σερσερώθ* and *χαλαστόν* together. Simply put, *variatio* only works if the results make sense.⁴⁸

Another possible approach to this issue is to attempt to make sense of the uses of *χαλαστόν* rather than the use of the transcription. There is clear parallelism in this verse (clear in both the MT and the LXX), marked by *ἐποίησεν ... ἔθηκεν ... ἐποίησεν ... ἐπέθηκεν*. The rhetorical device of *homoeoteleuton* might be at play here with what follows the second and fourth items of the parallelism.

ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τῶν κεφαλῶν τῶν στύλων
ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ τῶν χαλαστῶν

This rhyming is, of course, a natural consequence of the case system in Greek. However, if the translator had used the indeclinable transcription *σερσερώθ*, this end-rhyming would have been lost. It is plausible, then, that the translator switched from the transcription to the word he used in 2 Par 3:5 in order to accomplish the rhyming. The shift from *ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ* to *ἐπέθηκεν ἐπὶ* might have drawn even more attention to the rhyming structure.

If this was an intentional attempt at *homoeoteleuton*, then the structure would have been strengthened by providing end-rhyming in parts one and three of the parallelism (after each instance of *ἐποίησεν*). This could have been accomplished by

⁴⁷ J. A. L. Lee, 'Translations of the Old Testament I. Greek', in S. E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B. C. – A. D. 400* (Leiden: Brill, 1997) 775-783, citing 776.

⁴⁸ A clearer example of *variatio* is the use of *ἔθηκεν* for the first *יָתַן* in the verse, but the compound *ἐπέθηκεν* for the second. According to J. K. Aitken, 'Linguistic Variation and the Circumstantial Participle', *JSCS* 54 (2021) 55-75, citing 60, 'To progress the study of translation technique, variation can be used as a marker of the translators' choices rather than of their competency'. This is important nuance to any discussion of variation (or *variatio*).

using *κροσσούς* as found in Exodus 28:22 and 39:15.⁴⁹ While this reading (*κροσσούς* rhyming with *ροΐσκους*) would have strengthened the end-rhyme scheme, it must be accepted that this is *not* the reading in the text. What is more likely is that the translator did not set out to create *homoeoteleuton* here. Instead, he takes advantage of the parallelism that existed with the natural translation of the verbs and used a word, perhaps one that he coined himself, that could take the genitive plural ending and ‘sounded right’ when employed in this context.⁵⁰

במה

The term *במה* occurs over 100 times in the MT. It is often used to reference a ‘high place’, specifically, a worship site. There are several translations of the term in the LXX, but it is regularly translated with *ὑψος*, ‘height’, or *ὑψηλός*, ‘high’. However, six of the seven occurrences of *במה* in 1 Sam are transcribed as *βαμά* in 1 Kgdms. The only other translator to take this approach is the one who produced Par.⁵¹

Both instances of *במה* in 1 Chr are transcribed as *βαμά* in 1 Par. The Hebrew *במה* occurs 17 times in 2 Chr. Surprisingly, it is only transcribed as *βαμά* once, in 2 Par 1:13. On 15 occasions, the translator used *ὑψηλός*, and once he used *θυσιαστήριον*, ‘altar’. A few observations are worth considering. The singular form of *במה* occurs only four times in Chr. The three instances of *βαμά* mentioned above render three of those occurrences.⁵² Apart from 2 Par 1:3, forms of *ὑψηλός* render the plural *במות*.⁵³ 2 Par 1:3 is an outlier, as the prepositional phrase (with the singular) *לַבְּמָה*, ‘to the high place’, is translated with *εἰς τὴν ὑψηλὴν*, ‘to the high (place)’. Also worth noting is that the four occurrences of the singular *במה* are found in the context of *גִּבְעוֹן*, ‘Gibeon’—so then, ‘the high place in/at Gibeon’. Given these considerations, the surprising rendering in 2 Par is not the transcription *βαμά* in 2 Par 1:13, but the translation in 2 Par 1:3. Even

⁴⁹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 167, states that the Exodus reading ‘may have slipped the translator’s memory or he may deliberately have rejected’ it here.

⁵⁰ On a few occasions in the chapters used for the present study, there seems to be euphonically motivated translation decisions.

⁵¹ The regular inclusion of the feminine article referring to *βαμά* in its infrequent occurrences in the LXX clarifies that this is not the Doric *βᾶμα* for *βῆμα*, ‘elevated surface’ or ‘altar’, which would actually have been an acceptable translation of *במה*.

⁵² In 1 Kgdms *βαμά* is regularly used for the singular *במה*. In 2 Sam *במות* occurs several times, always translated with forms of *ὑψος* in 2 Kgdms. However, 3 Kgdms twice uses forms of *ὑψηλός* for the singular *במה*. Ezekiel twice has the singular *במה*, both in Ezekiel 20:29 (once with the article and once without). The translator of Ezekiel transcribes both as *Αβαμα*. Elsewhere in Ezekiel, the plural *במות* is rendered with forms of *ὑψηλός* or *εἰδωλον*, ‘idol’.

⁵³ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 166.

though τὴν ὑψηλὴν in 2 Par 1:3 is clearer than βαμά, this represents a break from the norm—an inconsistency—for the translator. Thus, while the transcription βαμά would not have been useful to Greek readers (though the inclusion of Γαβαών might have provided enough context to suffice), the inconsistency in the renderings of במה in Par is a result of a translation where a transcription would have been expected.⁵⁴

Code-Switching

Code-switching is a method ‘whereby expressions from one language are introduced in another’.⁵⁵ This feature implies ‘some proficiency in both languages, certainly for the speaker/author’.⁵⁶ Beyond that, ‘unless the code-switch is completely accidental, it also shows that the speaker/author expects the intended audience to possess some knowledge of the language from which the code-switched material is drawn’.⁵⁷ In Gómez’s study of code-switching in Mark and Suchard’s study of the feature in Daniel, there is a marked purpose for the code-switch. For example, Gómez argues that code-switching in Mark reinforces Mark’s ‘leadership as interpreter of the Jesus tradition’.⁵⁸ By using Aramaic words transcribed in Greek, Mark establishes himself as a clear eyewitness to the events he attests.⁵⁹ Aitken finds precedent for this feature in other Egyptian translations. He argues that transliterations/transcriptions can serve ‘as a case of code-switching that maintains Egyptian identity and expresses the Egyptian nature of the legal issues through the medium of the Greek language’.⁶⁰ He continues, ‘in the Septuagint Pentateuch, transliterations are primarily for institutions or for realia that have no obvious equivalent in Greek’.⁶¹ For Aitken, then, the use of transcriptions is not due ‘to an ignorant translator or one not capable of finding suitable equivalents, ... but functions to serve the translator’s literary stratagem’. Perhaps in a section like the

⁵⁴ In a way, the use of ὑψηλός in 2 Par 1:3 creates some continuity with ὕψος at the end of 2 Par 1:1, where Solomon is said to have been made great ‘highly’ (εἰς ὕψος for הַלְמָעַל). However, given the reference to נַעֲבֹד in 2 Chr 1:3, such a connection, though clever, would likely only have been accidental. However, while the case would be difficult to make, the translator’s inconsistency in the translation of some terms makes it worth considering that he might have used ὑψηλός in 2 Par 1:3 to create a sort of literary flare.

⁵⁵ A. D. Gómez, ‘Get up! Be Opened!: Code-switching and Loanwords in the Gospel of Mark’, *JSNT* 42(3) (2020) 390-427, citing 392.

⁵⁶ B. D. Suchard, ‘The Greek in Daniel 3: Code-Switching, Not Loanwords’, *JBL* 141.1 (2022) 121-136, citing 124.

⁵⁷ Suchard, ‘Greek in Daniel’, 124.

⁵⁸ Gómez, ‘Get up!’, 414.

⁵⁹ Gómez, ‘Get up!’, 414. See also Suchard, ‘Greek in Daniel’, 134: ‘the Greek code-switches [in Daniel] are employed to subtly identify the story’s antagonists with the Hellenistic rulers of the time’.

⁶⁰ J. K. Aitken, ‘The Septuagint and Egyptian Translation Methods’, in *XV Congress*, 269-293, citing 284.

⁶¹ Aitken, ‘Septuagint and Egyptian Translation’, 284.

temple furnishings, the transcriptions are a sort of code-switching that serve to bolster the centrality and importance of the temple. Depending on the date of the translation of 2 Par, the transcriptions could intend to re-legitimize the temple in Jerusalem.

Conclusions

The above examples display a range of issues and solutions for the translator of Par—unfamiliarity with terms, following standard LXX renderings, switching between transcriptions and translations. What these examples show most clearly, though, is that what is found in his dealings with technical terms and unknown terms in 2 Chr 4 is attested elsewhere in the Solomonic narrative specifically and throughout Par generally.⁶²

The Translator’s Dealings with Other Nontechnical Terms

While several technical terms posed translation issues for the translator, evidence in this passage is varied concerning his translation of many terms. More clearly, evidence of stylistic renderings and translations that arise from confusion exist nearly side-by-side in 2 Par 4. In this section, translations of various terms and phrases will be analyzed.

Translations of ים

The Hebrew term ים, ‘sea’, occurs seven times in 2 Par 4. In six of the seven cases, ים refers to a cast basin or tub in the temple. In the other occurrence, it refers to the direction ‘west’.⁶³ The translator appropriately renders this occurrence *δυσμάς*, ‘west’. The standard rendering for ים is *θάλασσα*, ‘sea’. Five of the six remaining examples of ים in 2 Par 4 are rendered *θάλασσα*. The variation from the norm occurs in 2 Par 4:3, where the translator provides *λουτήρ*, ‘tub, basin’, for ים. When considering this, Allen proposes: ‘The translator’s desire for stylistic variety appears to account for his trick of using two different Gk words for two occurrences of the same Heb one’.⁶⁴ While the

⁶² Not all LXX translators display the same attitude towards unknown words. Glenny, *Finding Meaning*, 77, provides examples where the Amos translator avoided transcriptions, even when a transcription would have been appropriate! The place name באר־שבע, ‘Beer-sheba’, in Amos 5:5 is translated τὸ φρέαρ τοῦ ὄρκου, ‘well of the oath’. It is also possible that the transcriptions are the result of unfamiliarity with the temple. For the role of the temple in Second Temple Judaism, see P. Church, *Hebrews and the Temple: Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews*, NovTSup 171 (Leiden: Brill, 2017); J. R. Trotter, *The Jerusalem Temple in Diaspora Jewish Practice and Thought during the Second Temple Period*, JSJSup 192 (Leiden: Brill, 2019).

⁶³ Note the use of the directional –ה in the first occurrence of ים in 2 Par 4:4.

⁶⁴ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 69.

claim of stylistic variety is possibly true, a few additional factors need to be considered before drawing definitive conclusions.

It is worth noting that λουτήρ is found three times in 2 Par 4. The two occurrences other than that in 2 Par 4:3 are translations of כַּיּוֹר, ‘basin’. Both כַּיּוֹר and λουτήρ are relatively rare in the MT and the LXX, respectively, and the latter regularly occurs as a translation of the former. Semantically, λουτήρ more naturally renders כַּיּוֹר than יָ. However, given that the context of יָ in 2 Par 4 indicates a cast basin or tub, λουτήρ is certainly appropriate. The translation of יָ with λουτήρ, then, indicates that the translator is aware of the range of יָ and its use in 2 Par 4. However, given that the term כַּיּוֹר also occurs in this passage, with a regular translation of λουτήρ, the translator may have provided a confusing rendering in 2 Par 4:3. Should this be considered ‘stylistic variety’, as suggested by Allen? Perhaps. When the translator makes this decision in 2 Par 4:3, though, he may be attempting to clearly identify the ‘sea’ as a ‘tub’. Only after this does he introduce the (plural) λουτήρας, ‘tubs’, in 2 Par 4:6. As such, there is likely no confusion caused by the rendering.

Verbs of Cleansing in 2 Chr 4:6

Two different verbs for cleansing are used a total of three times in 2 Chr 4:6. The verb רָחַץ, ‘to wash’, is used twice in the infinitive form, and נָדַח, ‘to cleanse’, is used once as a finite verb. The translator renders all three of these as infinitives and uses three different terms. For the first לְרַחֵץ, ‘to wash’, the translator offers the infinitive τοῦ πλύνειν, ‘to wash’. Next, the translator renders וַיִּדְיֵחוּ, ‘they rinsed’, with καὶ ἀποκλύζειν, ‘and to wash’. Finally, the infinitive לְרַחֵץ, ‘to wash’, becomes εἰς τὸ νίπτεσθαι, ‘to wash’. Both πλύνω and νίπτω can be found as translations of רָחַץ in the LXX. The compound ἀποκλύζω, though, can only be found here in the LXX.⁶⁵ Given the proximity of these terms and translations and that there is good semantic equivalence between the terms used, it seems likely that the translator has intentionally produced *variatio* here.

Directional Terms in 2 Chr/Par 4:6-8

Two prepositional phrases occur three times in 2 Chr 4:6-8, מִיְמִין, ‘on the right’, and מִשְׁמָאל, ‘on the left’. The two occurrences in 2 Chr 4:6, 7 are translated with their standard LXX equivalents: ἐκ δεξιῶν, ‘on the right’, and ἐξ ἀριστερῶν, ‘on the left’. In 2

⁶⁵ It is not, though, a neologism. It occurs in other Greek literature outside of the LXX.

Par 4:8, the prepositional phrases are translated ἐκ δεξιῶν and ἐξ εὐωνύμων, ‘on the left’. The term εὐώνυμος in the latter is a synonym for ἀριστερός. While the terms are different, the structure and the use of the preposition are similar, so they should be considered together. Montanari mentions that the preposition ἐκ/ἐξ can function to mean ‘on the right, on the left’.⁶⁶ However, instead of providing examples, he points readers to the entries for δεξιός and ἀριστερός. The entries for these two words are also lacking, so an external example should be analyzed.

CPR.18.9 (231 BCE)⁶⁷

[Πυθοκλήης] [ὡς] [(ἐτῶν)] [..] [εὐμε]γέθης μελάγχρωσ κοιλό-
[φθαλμος] φακὸς τραχήλῳ ἐξ ἀριστερῶν.
[Μενέστρ]ατος ὡς \((ἐτῶν)/ μς μέσος μελίχρωσ μακροπρ(όσωπος)
φακὸς μῆλῳ παρὰ ῥῖνα ἐγ δεξιῶν.

Pythokles: about ... years, tall, dark-skinned, hollow eyes, a birthmark on (the) neck *on the left* (ἐξ ἀριστερῶν).

Menestratos: about 46 years, middle (aged or average height), light-skinned, long-faced, a birthmark on (the) cheek near (the) nose *on the right* (ἐγ δεξιῶν).

In the four lines provided above, both ἐκ δεξιῶν⁶⁸ and ἐξ ἀριστερῶν appear. In both instances, they refer to the location of a birthmark or mole on two different people. The standard options with regard to ‘place’ would be ‘from, out of’.⁶⁹ It would make little sense to assume that the author meant ‘out of’ or ‘from’ while referring to the location of a birthmark. Montanari also lists examples in subcategories, such as ‘*of motion*’, ‘*of succession or change*’, ‘*of separation or distinction*’, ‘*of source or position*’, and ‘*of dependence or relation*’.⁷⁰ It is under this penultimate subcategory that Montanari offers ‘on the right, on the left’ with no examples.⁷¹

Another example is found in a line of a Greek inscription from Delos (156/55-145/4 BCE).

ID 1426B 2.50-51

. . . πίνακας ὑπὸ τὴν ὀροφήν δι[η]-
νεκεῖς γραφὰς ἔχοντας ἐγ δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν . . .
. . . long planks under the ceiling having writing *on the right and the left* (ἐγ
δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν)

⁶⁶ BrillDAG, s.v. ‘ἐκ and ἐξ’.

⁶⁷ This fragmentary document includes a list of Egyptian Jews and their physical characteristics. See I. F. Fikhman, ‘The Physical Appearance of Egyptian Jews according to the Greek Papyri’, *SCI* 18 (1999) 131-138.

⁶⁸ Technically, an earlier form of ἐκ appears: ἐγ.

⁶⁹ BrillDAG, s.v. ‘ἐκ and ἐξ’.

⁷⁰ BrillDAG, s.v. ‘ἐκ and ἐξ’ (emphasis in original).

⁷¹ BrillDAG, s.v. ‘ἐκ and ἐξ’. See also CGCG, §31.8.

As above, this example similarly indicates the position of the writing, i.e. *on the right and left*. The above lines from CPR.18.9 and ID 1426B 2.50-51 serve as clear examples of positional ἐκ/ἐξ, as seen in 2 Par 4:6-8.

The Use of τίθημι for Different Verbs in 2 Par 4:6-10

The Greek verb τίθημι, ‘I put, place’, is versatile, as it can be used to communicate a variety of actions related to putting or placing.⁷² Unsurprisingly, it is found in the LXX as a translation of several different Hebrew verbs. In 2 Par 4:6, 7, 10, the translator uses τίθημι to translate נתן, ‘to put, give’. In 2 Par 4:8, though, τίθημι is the translation of the hiphil נטן, ‘to cause to rest’. Again, there is no surprise in this decision, as both נתן and נטן are communicating the same idea in these contexts. However, it is worth noting that the translator opts for the same Greek word instead of mirroring the *Vorlage*’s alternation of terms. This decision stands out even more when considered against the use of different Greek terms for a single Hebrew term in nearby verses.⁷³ In some places where the variation of terms is not expected, it occurs, while in some places where following the *Vorlage* would naturally produce such variation, the translator does not provide it.

The Translator’s Use of ἀύλή in 2 Par 4:9

The noun ἀύλή, ‘court’, is used three times in 2 Par 4:9 as a translation for two different Hebrew terms, כּוּצָר, ‘court’, and חוּצוֹת, ‘outer court’. The term כּוּצָר occurs more than 190 times in the MT and is regularly translated as ἀύλή in the LXX. The other term, חוּצוֹת, occurs only nine times in the MT. The five occurrences of חוּצוֹת in Ezekiel 43 are translated with ἱλαστήριον, a difficult term to translate that refers to a place of propitiation or expiation. The one occurrence in Ezekiel 45 is translated with ἱερόν, ‘temple’. The final three occurrences are all in 2 Chr, with two found in 2 Chr 4:9 and one found in 2 Chr 6:13. All three of these are translated with ἀύλή.

Given the spread of translations, it seems that these LXX translators were unsure about this word and its meaning. For example, the resulting translations of the five occurrences in Ezekiel 43 approach nonsensical status. NETS offers an attempt at

⁷² For a survey of τίθημι and its range of meaning, see P. L. Danove, “Deriving” and Describing Usages of Τίθημι and Τίθημι Compounds in the Septuagint and New Testament’, *BAGL* 3 (2014) 5-30.

⁷³ For example, he uses πλύνω and νίπτω for רחץ in 2 Par 4:6, and he translates שמאול as ἀριστερῶν in 2 Par 4:6, 7, but as εὐωνύμων in 2 Par 4:8.

retaining the meaning of ἱλαστήριον by translating each occurrence as ‘propitiatory’. In contrast, LES simply provides the meaning of the Hebrew עֲזָרָה, translating ἱλαστήριον with ‘ledge’. Oddly, NETS then renders ἱερόν in Ezekiel 45:19 with ‘propitiatory’, while LES offers the more appropriate ‘temple’. It is no surprise, then, that the translator of Par also offers an odd translation, though one could contend that his translation makes more sense than those offered in LXX Ezekiel. According to Allen, the translator has opted for ἀύλη as a translation of עֲזָרָה ‘because a Gk synonym would be difficult to find’.⁷⁴ Since ἀύλη for עֲזָרָה was nearby, the translator used it here out of convenience.

Order of Words Concerning Measurements

In 2 Par 4, the translator makes some inconsistent decisions regarding the order of words when translating the measurements of the temple and objects associated with it. In 2 Par 4:1, he renders עֲשָׂרִים אַמָּה אַרְבֹּעַ, ‘twenty cubits [was] its length’, with πήχεων εἴκοσι μῆκος, ‘twenty cubits [was the] length’, leaving μῆκος after the measurement. He moves εὖρος and ὕψος, though, in front of their measurements: וְעֲשָׂרִים אַמָּה רָחְבוֹ, ‘and twenty cubits [was] its width’, becomes καὶ τὸ εὖρος πήχεων εἴκοσι, ‘and the breadth of twenty cubits’, and וְעֶשֶׂר אַמּוֹת קוֹמְתוֹ, ‘and ten cubits [was] its height’, becomes ὕψος πήχεων δέκα, ‘a height of ten cubits’. In 2 Par 4:2, he reorders עֶשֶׂר בְּאַמָּה, ‘ten cubits’, to πήχεων δέκα, ‘ten cubits’. Instead of switching the order as he did in the second half of 2 Par 4:1, the translator puts διαμέτρησιν, ‘measure’, standing in place of the idiomatic מִשְׁפָּתוֹ אֶל-שְׁפָתוֹ, ‘from brim to brim’, after πήχεων δέκα. He then renders וְחֻמֶּשׁ בְּאַמָּה קוֹמְתוֹ, ‘and five cubits its height’, with καὶ πήχεων πέντε τὸ ὕψος, ‘and five cubits the height’, omitting the pronoun,⁷⁵ fronting πήχεων., and leaving ὕψος after the measurement. At the end of the verse, וְקוֹ שְׁלִשִׁים בְּאַמָּה יִסֵּב אֶתוֹ סָבִיב, ‘a measuring line of thirty cubits surrounded it around’, becomes τὸ κύκλωμα πήχεων τριάκοντα, ‘the circumference [of] 30 cubits’.⁷⁶ In 2 Par 4:3, πήχεων precedes the number of cubits and follows the thing being measured. As such, the translator inverts עֶשֶׂר בְּאַמָּה, ‘ten cubits’, when he provides πήχεις δέκα.

Some similar verses occur in 2 Par 3 and will be analyzed below to provide more context for the decisions found in 2 Par 4. In 2 Par 3:15, the translator maintains

⁷⁴ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 53.

⁷⁵ See *CGCG*, §28.4.

⁷⁶ The translator renders the idiomatic יִסֵּב אֶתוֹ סָבִיב ... וְקוֹ with τὸ κύκλωμα.

the order of two measurement phrases, translating אמות שלשים וחמש ארך, ‘35 cubits [was the] length’, with πήχεων τριάκοντα πέντε τὸ ὕψος, ‘35 cubits [was] the height’, and אמות חמס, ‘five cubits’, with πήχεων πέντε, ‘five cubits’. Likewise, in 2 Par 3:11, the translator follows the Hebrew word order: ארכם אמות עשרים, ‘a length of 20 cubits’, is translated τὸ μῆκος πήχεων εἴκοσι, ‘the length of 20 cubits’.

In order to begin to understand the order of measurement phrases in Greek outside of the LXX, some evidence from papyri and inscriptions should be considered. Two examples stand out as exemplary of the general usage found in such material. P.Mich.1.38 (~254 BCE) contains architectural plans. Four of the five occurrences of πήχεων in this document are preceded by ὕψος and followed by the number of cubits for the measurement. The other occurrence of πήχεων is not found with a term of measurement, instead simply indicating that the θύρας μονο[θύρους] πῆ(χεων) γ, ‘single paneled doors [were] of three cubits’. Even here, though, the thing that is measured in cubits precedes πήχεων. Similarly, IG XI,2 287 (250 BCE) has several examples of μῆκος πήχεων, ‘length of cubits’, followed by the number of cubits of the measurement. This order of terms seems to be fairly standard. This is in contrast to the order with towards the beginning 2 Par 4:1 (πήχεων εἴκοσι μῆκος) and two of the examples in 2 Par 4:2 (πήχεων δέκα τὴν διαμέτρησιν and πῆχεων πέντε τὸ ὕψος). The word order found in these examples is simply following Hebrew syntax. On several occasions, the word order in the MT produces natural Greek word order. On other occasions, the translator alters his text to match typical Greek word order for measurements. The examples in which the translator follows the Hebrew word order are unsurprising. The conclusion here must be that the translator inconsistently deals with the word order of terms of measurement. He does, though, consistently offer the unit of measurement before the number of the measurement, in line with the examples examined from outside of the LXX.

Pluses, Minuses, and Various Other Changes

2 Par 4:1

The construct chain מזבח נחשת, ‘altar of bronze’, is translated with the noun + attributive adjective τὸ θυσιαστήριον χαλκοῦν, ‘the bronze altar’. In addition to the word order changes in the list of measurements for the altar mentioned above, the translator has made a few changes from the MT. First, he has omitted the third singular personal pronouns (ו) from several terms. The terms ארכו, ‘its length’, רחבו, ‘its width’, and

קומתו, 'its height', are rendered μήκος, 'length', εὔρος, 'breadth', and ὕψος, 'height'. Second, the translator rendered רחבו, 'its width', with τὸ εὔρος, 'the breadth', inserting the article. Third, the conjunction is omitted before ὕψος. Other than Allen, who provides some examples of the translator of Par adding or omitting personal pronouns somewhat regularly, these translation decisions receive little attention in previous works on Par.⁷⁷

2 Par 4:2

The translator renders the prepositional phrase משפתו אל-שפתו, 'from brim to brim', with the accusative noun τὴν διαμέτρησιν, 'the measurement'. Only here is such a rendering attested, and διαμέτρησις is only elsewhere a translation of מדה, 'measurement', including in 2 Par 3:3.⁷⁸ It seems that the translator decided to simplify his translation here. Instead of a word-for-word translation, the translator opts for something that is likely in recent memory (from 2 Par 3:3) in a similar context. The translator understood the idiom and rendered it appropriately. This allows for a smoothing over that makes sense contextually.

An additional simplification of his translation occurs at the end of the verse where the phrase וקו שלשים באמה יסב אתו סביב, 'and a measuring line of thirty cubits surrounded it around', is translated καὶ τὸ κύκλωμα πήχεων τριάκοντα, 'and the circumference (was) thirty cubits'. Yet even in these changes, the translator maintains the repetition of סביב ... יסב ... סביב with κυκλόθεν ... κύκλωμα.

2 Par 4:3

Sound repetition carries over into 2 Par 4:3, where סביב סביב סובבים, 'on all sides, all around, surrounding', becomes κύκλω κυκλοῦσιν, 'circled around'. It is worth noting that the translator has omitted the first סביב in his translation, possibly considering it to be too repetitive.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 48-49.

⁷⁸ The parallel in 1 Kgdms 7:23 is rendered with a literal translation of the prepositional phrase: ἀπὸ τοῦ χείλους ἀπ'ἄνω ἕως τοῦ χείλους ἀπ'ἄνω, 'from its lip up to its lip'. It is worth noting, though, that there, עד, 'until', occurs instead of אל, 'to'.

⁷⁹ This is an example of a feature that Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 249, describes in which 'minor anomalies (minuses, pluses, and changes in word order, genre, and structure) reflect minor improvements or variations within a basically literal approach'. There is some merit to Good's conclusion here, even outside of features of the translations of verbs.

Additional translation decisions worth noting in 2 Par 4:3 include a transposition of words and the translator's reading of a participle as an indicative verb. Near the end of the verse, the translator renders **הבקר יצוקים**, 'the cattle ... cast', as **ἔχώνευσαν τοὺς μόσχους**, 'they cast calves'. This phrase contains both the transposition and the rendering of a participle with a finite, indicative verb. Allen correctly claims that it is difficult, perhaps even impossible, 'to determine at what stage the order of words was changed, whether already in the *Vorlage* or in the process of translation or in the course of Gk transmission'.⁸⁰ He also suggests that the misreading of the participle resulted from the lack of vowel letters in the translator's *Vorlage*.⁸¹ Given that the translator regularly renders Hebrew passive participles with Greek perfect participles,⁸² Allen is likely correct that the translator did not see **יצוקים** as a participle.

2 Par 4:4

It seems clear that the translation at the beginning of 2 Par 4:4 is the result of a misunderstanding or misreading. 2 Chr 4:4 has **עומד על-שנים עשר בקר**, 'it [the sea] was standing upon twelve oxen'. The translator renders this as a continuation of 2 Par 4:3, which ends with **ἐν τῇ χωνεύσει αὐτῶν**, 'in their casting'; he continues **ἣ ἐποίησαν αὐτούς, δώδεκα μόσχους**, 'for which they made them, twelve calves'. There is little available to help make sense of this. Allen suggests a marginal note that should have been attached to 2 Par 4:16, which includes the similar phrase **ἃ ἐποίησεν**, 'which he made'.⁸³ Given the difficulty in reconciling the beginnings of 2 Chr 4:4 and 2 Par 4:4, there seems to have been some corruption in the translation or transmission process.

At the end of the verse, the LXX lacks a translation of **וכל**, 'and all'. Allen sees this as reflective of the freedom for **כל** to be omitted or added in Hebrew texts, and so the omission here 'probably reflects the *Vorlage*'.⁸⁴ This omission, however, cannot be taken in isolation. Par also has **ῆσαν**, which does not reflect the MT. As a result, the LXX has a verb where the MT has a verbless clause. This is not entirely necessary but does help to clarify the clause. The focus should not only be on the omission of **כל**, as Par also lacks the conjunction leading into this clause, though some manuscripts include **καί**, still without a translation of **כל**.

⁸⁰ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 65.

⁸¹ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 77.

⁸² Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 233-234.

⁸³ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 199. Concerning another instance where Allen suggests a misplaced marginal note, De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 255, claims that such a suggestion 'makes poor sense'.

⁸⁴ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 152.

2 Par 4:5

There are several features worth discussing in this verse. For פרח שושנה, ‘lily blossom’, the translator provides a participle not motivated by the MT. The result of this addition is that rather than כוס פרח שושנה, ‘a cup [like] a lily blossom’, the translator provides διαγεγλυμμένα βλαστοὺς κρίνου, ‘engraved with the shoot of a lily’. The Greek term διαγλύφω, ‘I carve, sculpt’, occurs only four times in the LXX. The three occurrences outside of 2 Par 4:5 can all be traced to a Hebrew term that communicates engraving or carving (פתח, ‘to engrave’, in Exodus 28:11; עשה, ‘to do, make’, but contextually ‘to engrave’, in Ezekiel 41:19, 20). Rehm suggests that the inclusion of διαγεγλυμμένα reflects the *Vorlage*.⁸⁵ According to Allen, this should be rejected in favor of seeing διαγεγλυμμένα as ‘a loose’, though, I assume, misplaced, ‘equivalent for מעשה’.⁸⁶ Since מעשה is not represented in Par, this is also plausible. Yet consideration should be given to another option where the translator was unsure of what to do with the relationship between the phrase פרח שושנה and the noun כוס. He must have assumed that פרח שושנה was ‘engraved’ upon the cup in some fashion. If this is the case, it shows some willingness on the part of the translator to make changes for the sake of clarity.

The clause found at the end of the verse is מחזיק בתים שלשת אלפים יכיל, ‘holding it would hold 3,000 baths’. While there is not lexical repetition here, there is redundancy in the meaning of the participle מחזיק and the imperfect יכיל. The translator translates the participle מחזיק with the Greek participle χωροῦσα, ‘holding’. He then reads יכיל, ‘it held’, as a form of בלה, ‘to finish, end, complete’, as he provides καὶ ἐξέτελεσεν, ‘and he completed [it]’. One option for understanding this is that the translator’s *Vorlage* read ויכל, as Rehm suggests.⁸⁷ Another option is that the translator’s *Vorlage* matched the MT and he misread the *Vorlage* or assumed that the *Vorlage* needed correcting. This could have been the result of the aforementioned redundancy of מחזיק and יכיל. Whether intentional or not, this decision has created some sense of repetition with 2 Par 4:11, which has καὶ συνετέλεσεν, ‘and he finished/completed (it)’.

⁸⁵ Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 27.

⁸⁶ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 131.

⁸⁷ Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 59. See also Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 78.

2 Par 4:10

First, Par has τοῦ οἴκου, ‘of the house’, after ἀπὸ γωνίας, ‘from the corner’, for מכתף, ‘from the corner’. Allen considers this to reflect the *Vorlage*, with הַבַּיִת, ‘the house’, dropping out at some point in the MT tradition.⁸⁸ The translator then inserts the preposition ἐκ, ‘from’, before δεξιῶν, ‘right’, for הַיְמָנִית. While ימני can certainly mean ‘right’, here it should be understood directionally as ‘south’ or ‘southern’. The translator, though, deals with it literally. It seems that for translator, to put something on the ‘right’ would have been redundant with קְדָמָה, ‘to the east’. To make sense of this, the translator inserted ὡς, ‘as’, before πρὸς ἀνατολάς, ‘to the east’, for קְדָמָה. The translator ends the verse with the preposition, functioning adverbially, κατέναντι, ‘before, opposite’.⁸⁹ This is likely meant to represent מִמּוֹל, ‘from before’, though of the nine occurrences of מִמּוֹל in the MT, it is only translated with κατέναντι one other time. If κατέναντι does represent מִמּוֹל, then the translation lacks a representation of נֹגְבָה, ‘towards the south’, a decision that Allen suggests is the result of the translator seeing נֹגְבָה as inconsistent with קְדָמָה.⁹⁰ LXX translators often used κατέναντι for נֹגְד, ‘before, opposite’, or לִפְנֵי, ‘before’, and Par’s translator is no exception. It should at least be considered as a possibility that rather than seeing נֹגְבָה as inconsistent with קְדָמָה, the translator may have read נֹגְבָה as a form of נֹגְד.

2 Par 4:13

Many of the details of this verse have been addressed above. Apart from those changes, the Par has the verb ἐστίν, ‘it is’, after the relative pronoun at the end of the verse where MT has a verbless relative clause. While this does provide clarity, it is not necessitated by either Greek or Hebrew grammar. It is interesting that the translator has opted for the present tense ἐστίν, especially given his propensity for using aorist verbs within the narrative.

The translator renders the prepositional phrase עַל־פְּנֵי, ‘on the face of, before’, with ἐπάνω. The Greek term ἐπάνω usually conveys position on top of or above, or it can refer to ‘before’ in the sense of time (rather than location).⁹¹ Very rarely does ἐπάνω

⁸⁸ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 138. See also Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 70.

⁸⁹ See *CGCG*, §31.2 for the preposition appearing as an adverb.

⁹⁰ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 117.

⁹¹ *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘ἐπάνω’.

translate על־פני in the LXX.⁹² This translation decision could have slightly affected the reader's understanding of the location of the basins on the pillars.

2 Par 4:16

There are a few noteworthy translation decisions here besides those mentioned above. Par has καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν, 'and he brought up', after חורם, 'Hiram'. Allen suggests καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν as a misreading of אביי, perhaps reading ויבא, 'and he brought', instead.⁹³ This is a plausible explanation. The translator has inserted the relative pronoun before ἐποίησεν, 'he made', for עשה, 'he made'. Allen sees this as attempted assimilation to Kgs/Kgdms,⁹⁴ a claim that has above been established as lacking, unless the assimilation happened in the translator's *Vorlage*. Also possible is that the placement of the verb led the translator to consider and include a relative clause referring to all the things that were made. In conjunction with his inserted καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν, this relative pronoun actually works to produce a coherent sentence with a relative clause ('the robes, ladles, etc., which Hiram made, he also delivered to King Solomon').

A final striking translation decision in this verse is the translation of the prepositional phrase לַבַּיִת, 'to the house', with the prepositional phrase ἐν οἴκῳ, 'in the house'. The translation again makes sense when considered along with the other decisions in this verse. In 2 Chr 4:16, the only verb is עשה, so Hiram Abi 'made' the listed items for Solomon *for* the house of the Lord. Since 2 Par 4:16 adds καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν, Hiram made the items and he delivered them *to* Solomon *in* the house of the Lord. 2 Par, then, uses ἐν to identify the location of Solomon when the items were delivered in contrast to 2 Chr which specifies that the items were made not just for Solomon, but for the house of the Lord.

2 Par 4:17

At the end of this verse, the translator may have misread the בין ... ובין, 'between x and y', structure, as he renders the first בין with ἐν οἴκῳ, 'in the house'. According to Rehm, the translator has mistaken ו for ת.⁹⁵ Allen rejects Rehm's conclusion, suggesting instead that the Greek reading is a result of Aramaic influence; the translator read בנין,

⁹² Notably, this happens four times in the first seven chapters of LXX Genesis.

⁹³ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 127. See also Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 59, who suggests that rather than a misreading, the *Vorlage* had ויבא, which is also plausible.

⁹⁴ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 199.

⁹⁵ Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 59.

‘building’.⁹⁶ While neither of these options accounts for the preposition ἐν, given that the LXX (and even Par, in particular) regularly provides ἀνά μέσον, ‘between’, for one or both of the occurrences of בין in a וּבֵין ... בֵּין construction, the translator has likely misread his *Vorlage* here.

2 Par 4:19

Here, Par has a couple of changes, at least with respect to the MT. For the relative clause אשר בית, ‘which were (in/of) the house’, the translator has provided the genitive οἴκου, ‘of the house’. For Allen, the use of the genitive here contrasts the ‘ambivalent attitude’ of the translator, who usually opts for the ‘mechanical translation’ of relative clauses.⁹⁷ In the same clause, the translator renders בית האלהים, ‘house of God’, with οἴκου κυρίου, ‘house of the Lord’. The translator’s decision here reflects 1 Kgs 7:48 (בית יהוה, ‘the house of the Lord’). Although Allen considers this to be evidence of assimilation to Kgs, it could just as easily reflect a different *Vorlage* or simply indicate a misreading on the part of the translator that produced Par.⁹⁸

2 Par 4:20

Only a few small changes are noteworthy here. Par does not have the 3rd person plural pronoun on its rendering of נרתיהם, ‘their lamps’, with τοὺς λύχνους, ‘the lamps’.⁹⁹ The translator then renders the preposition + infinitive לבערם, ‘for their burning’, with the genitive τοῦ φωτός, ‘of the light’. Allen suggests interference from a ‘similar catalogue of sanctuary furniture’ in Exodus.¹⁰⁰ Zipor is critical of Allen’s suggestion here, asking: ‘But what was the problem the translator faced which compelled him to search for an appropriate expression in the Book of Exodus where, incidentally, the list given is not an exactly similar catalogue of sanctuary (sic) implements’.¹⁰¹ Zipor’s criticism is important, especially in light of Allen’s follow up claim about a better translation of a similar Hebrew phrase later in Par.¹⁰² Zipor suggests an alternate reading in the *Vorlage* which would match the Hebrew of Exodus 35:14, leading to the same translation.¹⁰³

⁹⁶ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 150.

⁹⁷ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 50.

⁹⁸ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 200.

⁹⁹ See *CGCG*, §28.4 on the acceptability of leaving off the possessive pronoun here.

¹⁰⁰ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 58.

¹⁰¹ Zipor, ‘Greek Chronicles’, 570.

¹⁰² Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 58.

¹⁰³ Zipor, ‘Greek Chronicles’, 570.

Conclusions

The evidence above has shown some peculiar results of the translator's work on the temple furnishings in 2 Chr 4. A careful analysis has revealed that the translator dealt with unknown words and phrases with a variety of approaches. At times he found (what he considered to be) rough equivalents. In other instances, he made a guess based on context, occasionally evincing some familiarity with or memory of similar contexts in the Pentateuch. Still other times he simply provided a transcription instead of any attempted translation. Evidence from other translated material requires some thought be given to the possibility that the translator was making use of code-switching in the transcriptions. Technical terms, including some architectural terms, seem to have given the translator the most trouble. However, he also seems to have had difficulty with rendering even familiar terms in what might have been an unfamiliar context.

Additions, omissions, and other changes range from providing clarity to potentially creating confusion. In contrast, though, some renderings that at first seem odd are confirmed as normal when compared against evidence from papyri and inscriptions roughly contemporary with or preceding the production of Par. In 2 Par 4, then, it is fair to conclude that the translator was not always consistent in his translation of individual words or phrases. On the macro level, 2 Par 4 reflects a translator who indeed, in Allen's words, 'is not a precisionist'.¹⁰⁴ Allen's words are accurate here, but in large part his conclusions have been too general, as seen in the examples provided above.

¹⁰⁴ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 53.

Chapter 4:

Translation Technique in the Account of the Temple Dedication Ritual

Translation of the Dedication Ritual Text in the MT and the LXX

2 Chr 5:1-6:13	2 Chr 5:1-6:13 (Translation)	2 Par 4:22b-6:13	2 Par 4:22b-6:13 (Translation)
<p>5:1 ותשלם כל- המלאכה אשר-עשה שלמה לבית יהוה ויבא שלמה את- קדשי דויד אביו ואת- הכסף ואת-הזהב ואת-כל-הכלים נתן באצרות בית האלהים:</p>	<p>5:1 All the work that Solomon did for the house of the Lord was completed. And Solomon brought in the holy things of David, his father, and the silver and the gold and all the articles he put in the treasuries of the house of God.</p>	<p>4:22b-5:1 καὶ συνετελέσθη πᾶσα ἡ ἐργασία, ἣν ἐποίησεν Σαλωμῶν ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου. καὶ εἰσήνεγκεν Σαλωμῶν τὰ ἅγια Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ τὸ χρυσίον καὶ τὰ σκεύη ἔδωκεν εἰς θησαυρὸν οἴκου κυρίου.</p>	<p>4:22b-5:1 All the work, which Solomon did in the house of the Lord was completed. Solomon brought all of the holy things of David, his father, the silver and the gold, and the articles he put into the treasury of the house of the Lord.</p>
<p>5:2 אז יקהיל שלמה את-זקני ישראל ואת- כל-ראשי המטות נשיאי האבות לבני ישראל אל-ירושלם להעלות את-ארון ברית-יהוה מעיר דויד היא ציון:</p>	<p>5:2 Then Solomon summoned the elders of Israel and all the leaders of the tribes, the chiefs of the fathers for the sons of Israel to Jerusalem to bring up the ark of the covenant of the Lord from the city of David, which is Zion.</p>	<p>5:2 Τότε ἐξεκλησίασεν Σαλωμῶν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους Ἰσραὴλ καὶ πάντας τοὺς ἄρχοντας τῶν φυλῶν τοὺς ἡγουμένους πατριῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τοῦ ἀνεύγκαι κιβωτὸν διαθήκης κυρίου ἐκ πόλεως Δαυὶδ, αὕτη Σιών.</p>	<p>5:2 Then Solomon summoned the elders of Israel and all the leaders of the tribes, the rulers of the families of the sons of Israel to Jerusalem to bring up the ark of the covenant of the Lord from the city of David, which is Zion.</p>
<p>5:3 ויקהלו אל-המלך כל-איש ישראל בחג הוא החדש השבעי:</p>	<p>5:3 All the men of Israel assembled to the king at the feast, which was in the seventh month.</p>	<p>5:3 καὶ ἐξεκλησιάσθησαν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα πᾶς ἀνὴρ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, οὗτος ὁ μῆν ἑβδομος.</p>	<p>5:3 All the men of Israel assembled to the king in the festival, which was in the seventh month.</p>

5:4 ויבאו כל זקני ישראל וישאו הלויים את־הארון:	5:4 All the elders of Israel came and the Levites lifted up the ark.	5:4 καὶ ἦλθον πάντες οἱ πρεσβύτεροι Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ἔλαβον πάντες οἱ Λευῖται τὴν κιβωτὸν	5:4 All the elders of Israel came, and all the Levites lifted the ark.
5:5 ויעלו את־הארון ואת־אהל מועד ואת־כל־כלי הקדש אשר באהל העלו אתם הכהנים הלויים:	5:5 And he brought up the ark and the tent of meeting and all the articles of holiness which were in the tent. The priestly Levites brought them up.	5:5 καὶ ἀνήνεγκαν τὴν κιβωτὸν καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου καὶ πάντα τὰ σκεύη τὰ ἅγια τὰ ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ, καὶ ἀνήνεγκαν αὐτὴν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευῖται.	5:5 And they brought up the ark and the tent of the testimony and all the holy articles, the ones in the tent, and the priests and Levites brought them up.
5:6 והמלך שלמה וכל־עדת ישראל הנועדים עליו לפני הארון מזבחים צאן ובקר אשר לא־יספרו ולא ימנו מרב:	5:6 King Solomon and all the congregation of Israel, the ones assembled before him, were before the ark sacrificing sheep and cattle which were not numbered and were not countable from the greatness.	5:6 καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμὼν καὶ πᾶσα συναγωγὴ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι καὶ οἱ ἐπισυνηγμένοι αὐτῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῆς κιβωτοῦ θύοντες μόσχους καὶ πρόβατα, οἳ οὐκ ἀριθμηθήσονται καὶ οἳ οὐ λογισθήσονται ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους.	5:6 King Solomon and all the congregation of Israel and all the fearers and their gathered ones were before the ark sacrificing cattle and sheep, which will not be counted and which will not be calculated from the plenty.
5:7 ויביאו הכהנים את־ארון ברית־יהוה אל־מקומו אל־דביר הבית אל־קדש הקדשים אל־תחת כנפי הכרובים:	5:7 The priests brought the ark of the covenant of the Lord to its place, to the inner sanctuary of the house, to the holy of holies, under the wings of the cherubim.	5:7 καὶ εἰσήνεγκαν οἱ ἱερεῖς τὴν κιβωτὸν διαθήκης κυρίου εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς εἰς τὸ δαβείρ τοῦ οἴκου εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων ὑποκάτω τῶν πτερύγων τῶν χερουβίν,	5:7 The priests brought in the ark of the covenant of the Lord to its place, to the dabeir of the house, to the holy of holies, under the wings of the cherubim.
5:8 ויהיו הכרובים פרשים כנפים על־מקום הארון ויכסו הכרובים על־הארון ועל־בדיו מלמעלה:	5:8 The cherubim were spreading wings over the place of the ark and the cherubim covered over the ark and over its poles from above.	5:8 καὶ ἦν τὰ χερουβίν διαπεπετακότα τὰς πτέρυγας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον τῆς κιβωτοῦ, καὶ συνεκάλυπτεν τὰ χερουβίν ἐπὶ τὴν κιβωτὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀναφορεῖς αὐτῆς ἐπάνωθεν·	5:8 The cherubim were spreading their wings over the place of the ark, and the cherubim covered over the ark and over its poles from above.

<p>5:9 ויאריכו הבדים ויראו ראשי הבדים מן הארון על-פני הדביר ולא יראו החוצה ויהי-שם עד היום הזה:</p>	<p>5:9 The poles were long and the ends of the poles were seen from the ark at the face of the inner sanctuary, but they were not seen from the outside. It is there until this day.</p>	<p>5:9 και ὑπερεῖχον οἱ ἀναφορεῖς, καὶ ἐβλέποντο αἱ κεφαλαὶ τῶν ἀναφορέων ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων εἰς πρόσωπον τοῦ δαβείρ, οὐκ ἐβλέποντο ἔξω· καὶ ἦσαν ἐκεῖ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης.</p>	<p>5:9 And the poles extended out and the heads of the poles were seen from the holies in the face of the dabeir; they were not seen outside. And they were there until this day.</p>
<p>5:10 אין בארון רק שני הלחות אשר-נתן משה בחרב אשר כרת יהוה עם-בני ישראל בצאתם ממצרים:</p>	<p>5:10 There was nothing in the ark except the two tablets which Moses put at Horeb, where the Lord made [a covenant] with the sons of Israel when they came out of Egypt.</p>	<p>5:10 οὐκ ἦν ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ πλὴν δύο πλάκες, ἃς ἔθηκεν Μωσῆς ἐν Χωρήβ, ἃ διέθετο κύριος μετὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῷ ἐξελθεῖν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου.</p>	<p>5:10 There was nothing in the ark except two tablets, which Moses put in Horeb, which the Lord ordained with the sons of Israel when they came out from Egypt.</p>
<p>5:11 ויהי בצאת הכהנים מן הקדש כי כל-הכהנים הנמצאים התקדשו אין לשמור למחלקות:</p>	<p>5:11 And it happened in the priests' coming out from the Holy place, for all the priests who were present had consecrated themselves, there was not the keeping to divisions,</p>	<p>5:11 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐξελθεῖν τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων – ὅτι πάντες οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ εὐρεθέντες ἡγιασθησαν, οὐκ ἦσαν διατεταγμένοι κατ' ἐφημερίαν,</p>	<p>5:11 And it happened in the priests' coming out from the holies, that all the priests who were found were consecrated. They were not arranged according to division.</p>
<p>5:12 והלויים המשררים לכלם לאסף להימן לידתון ולבניהם ולאחיהם מלבשים בוץ במצלתים ובנבלים וכנרות עמדים מזרח למזבח ועמהם כהנים למאה ועשרים מחצררים בחצרות:</p>	<p>5:12 and to all the singing Levites, to Asaph, to Heman, to Jeduthan, and to their brothers and their tribesmen, clothed in fine linen, with cymbals and with harps, and lyres were standing east with regard to the altar and with them were 120 priests, trumpet players,</p>	<p>5:12 καὶ οἱ Λευῖται οἱ ψαλτωδοὶ πάντες τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἀσάφ, τῷ Αἰμάν, τῷ Ἰδιθούμ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτῶν, τῶν ἐνδεδυμένων στολὰς βυσσίνας, ἐν κυμβάλοις καὶ ἐν νάβλαις καὶ ἐν κινύραις ἐστηκότες κατέναντι τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ μετ' αὐτῶν ἱερεῖς</p>	<p>5:12 All the singing Levites, to the sons of Asaph, to Aiman, to Idithoum and to their sons and to their brothers, those clothed in fine linen robes, with cymbals and with nablais and with harps were standing before the altar and with them were 120 priests</p>

		ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι σαλπίζοντες ταῖς σάλπιγξιν,	trumpeting with trumpets.
5:13 ויהי כאחד למחצרים ולמשררים להשמיע קול-אחד להלל ולהדות ליהוה וכהרים קול בחצצרות ובמצלתים ובכלי השיר ובהלל ליהוה כי טוב כי לעולם חסדו והבית מלא ענן בית יהוה:	5:13 It was as one for the trumpeters and for the singers to be heard with one voice for praise and for thanksgiving to the Lord, and when the sound rose with trumpets and with cymbals and with all the instruments of the song, and in praise to the Lord, For he is good, for his steadfast love is forever, and the house, the house of the Lord, was filled with a cloud.	5:13 καὶ ἐγένετο μία φωνὴ ἐν τῷ σαλπίζειν καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλτωδεῖν καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀναφωνεῖν φωνῇ μιᾷ τοῦ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι καὶ αἰνεῖν τῷ κυρίῳ – καὶ ὡς ὑψωσαν φωνὴν ἐν σάλπιγξιν καὶ ἐν κυμβάλοις καὶ ἐν ὄργανοις τῶν ᾠδῶν καὶ ἔλεγον Ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι ἀγαθόν, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ οἶκος ἐνεπλήσθη νεφέλης δόξης κυρίου,	5:13 There was one voice in the trumpeters and in the singers and in the one voice crying out to acknowledge and to praise the Lord, and as they raised a sound with trumpets and with cymbals and with instruments of songs, and they said: Acknowledge the Lord, for he is good, for his mercy is forever. The house was filled with a cloud of the glory of the Lord.
5:14 ולא-יכולו הכהנים לעמוד לשרת מפני הענן כיי-מלא כבוד-יהוה את-בית האלהים:	5:14 The priests were not able to stand to serve from the presence of the cloud, for the glory of the Lord filled the house of God.	5:14 καὶ οὐκ ἠδύναντο οἱ ἱερεῖς τοῦ στήναι λειτουργεῖν ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς νεφέλης, ὅτι ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ δόξα κυρίου τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ.	5:14 The priests were not able to stand to serve from the presence of the cloud, for the glory of the Lord filled the house of God.
6:1 אז אמר שלמה יהוה אמר לשכון בערפל:	6:1 Then Solomon said, 'The Lord (is) said to dwell in darkness	6:1 τότε εἶπεν Σαλωμών Κύριος εἶπεν τοῦ κατασκηνώσαι ἐν γνόφῳ·	6:1 Then Solomon said, 'The Lord said to dwell in darkness
6:2 ואני בניתי בית- זבל לך ומכון לשבתך עולמים:	6:2 and I built a lofty house to you and a place for you to dwell forever'.	6:2 καὶ ἐγὼ ᾠκοδόμηκα οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἅγιόν σοι καὶ ἔτοιμον τοῦ κατασκηνώσαι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.	6:2 and I built a house for your name, holy to you and prepared to dwell forever'.

6:3 ויסב המלך את-פניו ויברך את כל-קהל ישראל וכל-קהל ישראל עומד:	6:3 The king turned his face and blessed the whole congregation of Israel and the whole congregation of Israel was standing.	6:3 Καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐλόγησεν τὴν πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ πᾶσα ἐκκλησία Ἰσραὴλ παρειστήκει.	6:3 The king turned his face and blessed the whole congregation of Israel, and the whole congregation of Israel had been standing.
6:4 ויאמר ברוך יהוה אלהי ישראל אשר דבר בפיו את דוד אבי ובידיו מלא לאמר:	6:4 He said, 'Blessed is the Lord, God of Israel, who spoke with his mouth to David, my father, and with his hand fulfilled it, saying,	6:4 καὶ εἶπεν Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, ὃς ἐλάλησεν ἐν στόματι αὐτοῦ πρὸς Δαυὶδ τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ ἐν χερσὶν αὐτοῦ ἐπλήρωσεν λέγων	6:4 He said, 'Blessed is the Lord, God of Israel, who spoke with his mouth to David, my father, and with his hand fulfilled it, saying,
6:5 מן-היום אשר הוצאתי את-עמי מארץ מצרים לא-בחרתי בעיר מכל שבטי ישראל לבנות בית להיות שמי שם ולא-בחרתי באיש להיות נגיד על-עמי ישראל:	6:5 "From the day when I brought my people out from the land of Egypt, I did not choose in a city from all the tribes of Israel to build a house to put my name there and I did not choose in a man to put a prince before my people, Israel.	6:5 Ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας, ἧς ἀνήγαγον τὸν λαόν μου ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, οὐκ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν πόλει ἀπὸ πασῶν φυλῶν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι οἶκον τοῦ εἶναι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν ἀνδρὶ τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἡγούμενον ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν μου Ἰσραὴλ.	6:5 "From the day, when I brought my people out from the land of Egypt, I did not choose in a city from all the tribes of Israel to build a house for my name to be there and I did not choose for a man to be leader over my people, Israel.
6:6 ואבחר בירושלם להיות שמי שם ואבחר בדוד להיות על-עמי ישראל:	6:6 I have chosen in Jerusalem to put my name there and I have chosen in David to put over my people, Israel."	6:6 καὶ ἐξελεξάμην τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ γενέσθαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν Δαυὶδ ὥστε εἶναι ἐπάνω τοῦ λαοῦ μου Ἰσραὴλ.	6:6 I have chosen Jerusalem for my name to be there and I have chosen in David so that he would be over my people, Israel."
6:7 ויהי עם-לבב דוד אבי לבנות בית לשם יהוה אלהי ישראל:	6:7 It was with the heart of David, my father, to build a house for the name of the Lord, God of Israel.	6:7 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ καρδίαν Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ,	6:7 It was upon the heart of David, my father, to build a house to the name of Lord, God of Israel.

6:8 ויאמר יהוה אל־ דויד אבי יען אשר היה עס־לבבך לבנות בית לשמי הַטיבות כי היה עס־לבבך:	6:8 The Lord said to David, my father, “Because it was with your heart to build a house to my name, you did well for it was with your heart.	6:8 καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Δαυὶδ τὸν πατέρα μου Διότι ἐγένετο ἐπὶ καρδίαν σου τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί μου, καλῶς ἐποίησας ὅτι ἐγένετο ἐπὶ καρδίαν σου·	6:8 The Lord said to David, my father, “Because it was upon your heart to build a house to my name, you did well for it was upon your heart.
6:9 רק אתה לא תבנה הבית כי בנך היוצא מחלצ־ך הוא־ יבנה הבית לשמי:	6:9 However, you will not build a house, for your son who will go out from your loins, he will build a house for my name.”	6:9 πλὴν σὺ οὐκ οἰκοδομήσεις τὸν οἶκον, ὅτι ὁ υἱός σου, ὃς ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος σου, οὗτος οἰκοδομήσει τὸν οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί μου.	6:9 However, you will not build a house, for your son, who will come out from your loins, this one will build a house to my name.”
6:10 ויקם יהוה את־ דברו אשר דבר ואקום תחת דויד אבי ואשב על־כסא ישראל כאשר דבר יהוה ואבנה הבית לשם יהוה אלהי ישראל:	6:10 The Lord fulfilled his word which he spoke and I have risen in place of David, my father, and I sit on the throne of Israel just as the Lord spoke and I have built the house for the name of the Lord, God of Israel.	6:10 καὶ ἀνέστησεν κύριος τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, ὃν ἐλάλησεν, καὶ ἐγενήθη ἂντι Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρός μου καὶ ἐκάθισα ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον Ἰσραὴλ, καθὼς ἐλάλησεν κύριος, καὶ ᾠκοδόμησα τὸν οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ	6:10 The Lord established this word, which he spoke, and I came in place of David, my father, and I sat upon the throne of Israel, just as the Lord spoke, and I built the house to the name of the Lord, God of Israel.
6:11 ואשים שם את־ הארון אשר־שם ברית יהוה אשר כרת עם־בני ישראל:	6:11 I put there the ark where there is the covenant of the Lord which he made with the sons of Israel.	6:11 καὶ ἔθηκα ἐκεῖ τὴν κιβωτόν, ἐν ἧ ἐκεῖ διαθήκη κυρίου, ἣν διέθετο τῷ Ἰσραὴλ.	6:11 I put there the ark, in which there is the covenant of the Lord, which he arranged with Israel.
6:12 ויעמד לפני מזבח יהוה נגד כל־ קהל ישראל ויפרש כפיו:	6:12 He stood before the altar of the Lord opposite the whole congregation of Israel and he spread his hands,	6:12 Καὶ ἔστη κατέναντι τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κυρίου ἔναντι πάσης ἐκκλησίας Ἰσραὴλ καὶ διεπέτασεν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ,	6:12 He stood before the altar of the Lord in the presence of the whole congregation of Israel and he spread his hands,
6:13 כי־עשה שלמה כיוור נחשת ויתנהו בתוך העזרה חמש אמות ארכו וחמש	6:13 for Solomon made a bronze platform and he put it in the midst of	6:13 ὅτι ἐποίησεν Σαλωμών βάσιν χαλκῆν καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὴν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς	6:13 for Solomon made a bronze basin and put it in the midst of the

אמות רחבו ואמות שלוש קומתו ויעמד עליו ויברך על-ברכיו נגד כל-קהל ישראל ויפרש כפיו השמימה:	the outer court, five cubits (was) its length, and five cubits (was) its width, and three cubits (was) its height, and he stood on it. He knelt on his knees before the whole congregation of Israel and he spread his hands heavenward.	αὐλῆς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, πέντε πήχεων τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς καὶ πέντε πήχεων τὸ εὖρος αὐτῆς καὶ τριῶν πήχεων τὸ ὕψος αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔστη ἐπ' αὐτῆς καὶ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰ γόνατα ἔναντι πάσης ἐκκλησίας Ἰσραὴλ καὶ διεπέτασεν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν	court of the temple, five cubits (was) its length, and five cubits (was) its width, and three cubits (was) its height, and he stood upon it. He fell on his knees in the presence of the whole congregation of Israel and he spread his hands towards heaven.
--	--	--	---

The Translation of הוּא and הִיא

The 3rd person singular personal pronouns הִיא, ‘she’, and הוּא, ‘he’, are versatile, functioning in several ways syntactically.¹ In apposition with a noun, they can function similarly to the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, ‘who, which’, and their identical demonstrative pronouns.² Given the versatility of these pronouns, it is worth giving attention to how the translator deals with them, especially since a few examples are found in 2 Chr 5.

Towards the end of 2 Chr 5:2, the feminine singular pronoun הִיא occurs in this context: מעִיר דָּוִד הִיא צִיּוֹן, ‘from the city of David, which is Zion’. The feminine pronoun is used because the antecedent, עִיר, is feminine. The translator renders the phrase at the end of the verse ἐκ πόλεως Δαυὶδ, αὕτη Σιών, ‘from the city of David—this is Zion’, using the feminine singular demonstrative αὕτη for הִיא. As was the case with עִיר, the Greek term πόλις is feminine. The pronoun αὕτη, then, agrees with its antecedent. This use of the demonstrative αὕτη is somewhat standard in the LXX for הִיא.

An example of the masculine singular pronoun הוּא is found in the next verse, 2 Chr 5:3. The translator renders the phrase בַּחֹג הוּא הַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁבִיעִי, ‘at the feast, which is the seventh month’, with ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, οὗτος ὁ μῆν ἑβδόμος, ‘in the festival, this is the seventh month’. The masculine pronoun הוּא is used here as it agrees with the antecedent חֹג, ‘feast’, which is also masculine. The translator used the masculine οὗτος, certainly to directly translate the masculine הוּא. This, unfortunately, does not work in

¹ GKC, §136a, categorizes these as true demonstrative pronouns.

² JM, §146c-d. See also GKC, §136a.

the context of 2 Par 5:3. The translation of the masculine אֱוֹרָה is the noun ἑορτή, which is feminine. There is grammatical disagreement between the pronoun οὗτος and its antecedent ἑορτή.³

Naturally, rendering the masculine אֱוֹרָה with the masculine οὗτος will also produce grammatically correct Greek on some occasions. For example, the translator uses οὗτος for אֱוֹרָה in 2 Par 6:9, where the antecedent is בֵּן, ‘son’, for אֱוֹרָה, ‘son’, both of which are masculine. Here, though, the translator would have been better of using the personal pronoun αὐτός rather than the demonstrative to render the resumptive use of אֱוֹרָה, which he does accurately a few verses later in 2 Par 6:32.

These translation decisions likely point to a translator who, at least in these instances, was not translating at the clause level, paying attention to the grammatical gender of the pronouns in relation to their antecedents, but at the word level.⁴ Providing a feminine noun for a masculine noun is unavoidable, as nouns inherently possess grammatical gender. The translator neglects the thing he does have control over in simply rendering a masculine pronoun with a masculine pronoun without reference to the gender of the antecedent.

The Translation of the Relative Pronoun

The Hebrew relative pronoun is translated several different ways in this section of Par. In what follows, several examples of the translations of Hebrew relative pronouns and the use of Greek relative pronouns will be analyzed.

In 2 Par 5:5, the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, ‘who, which’, is translated with the neuter article τὰ.⁵ The article, then, substantivizes the prepositional phrase ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ, ‘in the tent’, bringing the prepositional phrase into the preceding attributive phrase. By using the article in this way, the translator strays from a direct equivalent (relative pronoun for relative pronoun) without sacrificing functionality or meaning. While both Chr and Par present equivalent meanings, they do so with different forms.

In 2 Par 5:6, a single use of the relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר becomes two separate relative pronouns, both of which are nominative masculine plural creating clear

³ CGCG, §50.8.

⁴ This is contra Mulroney’s view on the translator of OG Habakkuk. Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 36 claims, ‘I maintain that the translator had a comprehensive (sentence level and higher) understanding of his text’. He continues, ‘the translator was not working atomistically’. At least here, but certainly beyond (as we will see) the translator that produced Par seems to work ‘atomistically’.

⁵ According to Smyth, §1099-1105, the article, which was ‘originally a demonstrative pronoun’, can function under certain circumstances as a relative pronoun.

parallelism between the two groups. A single relative clause becomes two parallel relative clauses. The relative clause **אשר לא יספרו ולא ימנו**, ‘which are not counted and are not numbered’, is translated *οἱ οὐκ ἀριθμηθήσονται καὶ οἱ οὐ λογισθήσονται*, ‘which will not be counted and which will not be calculated’. This adds little more than a simple clarification, though one is not likely necessary here. Indeed, ‘Greek generally avoids the use of repeated relative pronouns in successive clauses referring to the same antecedent’.⁶ It is worth considering whether this change may have been a stylistically motivated change. The natural rhyming that occurs as a result of the parallel future passives (*-θησονται*) might have been euphonicly enhanced by paralleling the relative pronoun.⁷

The Hebrew relative pronoun occurs twice in 2 Chr 5:10. For the first, which refers to **הלחות**, ‘the tablets’, Par has *ἃς*, ‘which’, which agrees with its referent *πλάκες*, ‘tablets’. For the second relative pronoun, the nearest referent is **הרוב**, ‘Horeb’, which would imply that **אשר** should be translated ‘where’. The translator, though, renders this with *ἃ*, ‘which’, the neuter plural accusative relative pronoun. There is no clear referent for this pronoun in the immediate context. There is only one other LXX occurrence of *Χωρήβ*, ‘Horeb’, followed by a relative pronoun. It is found in the parallel to 2 Par 5:10 in 3 Kgdms 8:9. There, the translation is the same as in 2 Par 5. According to Muraoka, the use of the neuter relative pronoun in a situation like this is somewhat regular in the Greek of the LXX. This is likely a case of what he calls ‘generic reference’ in which the neuter relative pronoun is ‘antecedentless’, ‘used parenthetically to refer to a general situation mentioned immediately before’.⁸ If this is the case here, the translator uses *ἃ* to refer to the whole of the content of the ark and its placement in Horeb.

In 2 Par 6:8, the translator renders the conjunctive **יען אשר**, ‘because’, with *διότι*, ‘because’. In doing so, the translator has rejected a literal translation of each of the constituents **יען**, ‘because’, and **אשר**, ‘which’, in favor of the more direct translation of the combined terms. A direct translation of both the **יען** and **אשר** is fairly standard in the LXX. For **יען אשר** translators regularly opt for *ἀνθὶ ὧν*, ‘because’. In 2 Par 1:11, which

⁶ *CGCG*, §50.9.

⁷ Such a change is not *necessarily* conscious. See Dhont, ‘Translation Technique’, 25, who claims that ‘translation involves a multidimensional decision-making process—*partly conscious, partly unconscious*—regarding how to interpret the source text and how to render it’ (emphasis added). See also T. A. W. van der Louw, ‘Linguistic or Ideological Shifts? The Problem-oriented Study of Transformations as a Methodological Filter’, *Collegium* 11 (2012) 23-41, citing 25, ‘transformations are not necessarily applied consciously’.

⁸ *SSG*, §17ia. See also *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘ὅς, ἡ, ὅ’; *CGCG*, §50.7.

represents the only other occurrence of *יען אשר* in 2 Chr, the translator makes this very decision. The use of *ἀνεὶν ὧν* to communicate ‘because’ is attested outside of the LXX.⁹ These two examples in 2 Par are spread out, but they show that the translator has not considered *ἀνεὶν ὧν* to be the only option, even though it is the most attested in the LXX. Most importantly for the present analysis of the translation of the relative pronoun in this section of 2 Par, the translator does not feel *required* to use a relative pronoun for *אשר* in *יען אשר* in 2 Par 6:8.

In 2 Chr 6:11, *אשר-שם*, literally ‘which there’, occurs. Simply put, the presence of *שם* after *אשר* marks the relative pronoun clearly as referring to place, and a good translation would be ‘in which’.¹⁰ The translator provides *ἐν ᾗ*, ‘in which’, referring to *τῆς κιβωτῶν*, ‘the ark’. The translator then translates the ‘retrospective adverb’¹¹ *שם* with the demonstrative adverb *ἐκεῖ*, ‘there’. This decision is taken several times in the LXX. According to *CGCG*, ‘relative pronouns’, like *ᾗ* here, ‘adjectives and adverbs are frequently anticipated or followed by a demonstrative pronoun, adjective or adverb’.¹² As such, it is not abnormal to have both the relative pronoun and the demonstrative adverb.

As seen in the above examples, the translator does not take a ‘one size fits all’ approach to the translation of the relative pronoun *אשר*. Instead, he is willing to use Greek constituents other than just the relative pronoun, regularly providing some nuance that is available in Greek. Some of the changes are simple, such as inserting an additional pronoun to create parallel clauses. Others are complex, like using a single Greek term to indicate cause rather than literally representing the relative pronoun. Ultimately, this section of Par exhibits variation in the translation of the relative pronoun.

The Translations of Forms of *קדש הקדשים* in 2 Chr 5:7 and Beyond

The phrase *קדש הקדשים*, ‘holy of holies’, occurs several times in the MT. Naturally, the case of the Greek translation of the first (anarthrous, singular) *קדש* will change based on the relationship of the term with the words around it. Since this is a necessary feature of Greek nouns, that is not considered a change in the translation. The second (articular,

⁹ See Sophocles, *Oed. col.*, 953; *Ant.* 1068; Aristophanes, *Plut.*, 435.

¹⁰ JM, §158j.

¹¹ JM, §158j.

¹² *CGCG*, §50.5.

plural) **קדשים** is consistently translated $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$, ‘of the holies’. As such, the translation of this term will not be discussed below.

The translations of the phrase in the Pentateuch provide a range of options for dealing with the phrase. The first two are found in Exodus 26:33, 34. Here, the translator uses the singular articular $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$, ‘of the holy’, and $\tau\tilde{\omega} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega$, ‘in the holy’, respectively, for **קדש**. Likewise, the translator renders **קדש** in Numbers 18:10 with the singular articular $\tau\tilde{\omega} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega$. Another example is found in Numbers 4:4, where the translator renders **קדש** with the singular anarthrous $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$, ‘holy’. In Numbers 4:19, **קדש** is translated with the plural articular $\tau\grave{\alpha} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$, ‘the holies’. The same translation decision occurs in Leviticus 21:22.

There are several other occurrences of **קדש קדשים** outside of Chr. Three of those are found in 1 Kgs. The first of the three is found in 1 Kgs 6:16. Here, the translator uses the singular articular $\tau\delta \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$, ‘the holy’. The term **קדש** in 1 Kgs 7:50 is translated with the singular anarthrous $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$, ‘of holy’. The third is in 1 Kgs 8:6 where **קדש** is translated with the plural articular $\tau\grave{\alpha} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$. There are four occurrences of the phrase **קדש קדשים** in Ezekiel. The first is in Ezekiel 41:4. There, the translator uses the singular articular $\tau\delta \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$. Each of the two occurrences in Ezekiel 42:13 and the single occurrence in Ezekiel 44:13 are translated with the plural articular $\tau\grave{\alpha} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$. In Ezra 2:63 and Nehemiah 7:65, **קדש** is rendered with the singular articular $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$.

In 1 Par 6:34, the translator uses the plural anarthrous $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$, ‘holies’, to translate **קדש**. The phrase occurs twice in 2 Chr 3:8, 10, where both are translated with the singular articular $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ and $\tau\tilde{\omega} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega$, respectively. Three verses have the plural articular translation $\tau\grave{\alpha} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$: 2 Par 4:22; 5:7;¹³ and 31:14. These translation decisions suggest that there was not a standard method for translators when dealing with **קדש קדשים**. While there seems to be a preference towards the plural articular $\tau\grave{\alpha} \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha$, there is not consistency in employing it as a translation. Even within Par, there is not consistency with the translation of the phrase. Surely the lack of examples complicated the translation. However, one would expect that a translator with familiarity with the temple would also be familiar with this section of the temple. If so, it would follow that the translators would know what that temple section is called. It is possible, then, that

¹³ The translation of the rest of 2 Par 5:7 rules out parallel assimilation.

singular or plural, articular or anarthrous, as long as the terms are present, the translation is acceptable.¹⁴

The Translations of Forms of אב in 2 Chr

In 2 Par 5:2, the translator uses *πατριῶν*, ‘of the families’, as a translation for האבות, ‘the fathers’. Given the prevalence of the word in 2 Chr, occurring 121 times, understanding the translation in 2 Par 5:2 warrants an analysis of the translation of forms of אב, ‘father’. Of these 121 occurrences, only 10 of them are translated with *πατριά*, ‘family, clan’, rather than *πατήρ*, ‘father’. None of the instances of *πατήρ* are translations of אב with the article. There are, however, four examples of לְאָבֹתֵינוּ, ‘to/for the father’, and two examples of כְּאָבֹתֵינוּ, ‘as/according to the father’, both of which are marked as articular. Five of these are translated with *πατήρ*; the sixth instance is not represented in Par at all. Of the six examples of articular אב, all plural, four are translated with *πατριῶν* (*πατριά*) and the other two are translated with *πατριάρχων* (*πατριάρχης*, ‘patriarch’).¹⁵ There are five instances in 2 Chr of לְבֵית אֲבוֹתַי, ‘for/according to the house of the fathers’, all rendered with *κατ’ οἴκους πατριῶν*, ‘according to the houses of the fathers’. Finally, there is only one instance of singular אב translated with *πατριά* (2 Par 35:5). This instance is preceded by בֵּית.

The following table shows the distribution of word forms translated with *πατριά* in 2 Par and includes words that precede forms of אב in the MT.

Table 4.1

πατριά in 2 Par

<i>πατριά</i> (10x)	<p>רָשֵׁי הָאֲבוֹת (2) (1:2; 23:2)</p> <p>נְשִׂאֵי הָאֲבוֹת (1) (5:2)</p> <p>לְבֵית אֲבוֹת (5) (17:4; 25:5; 31:7; 35:4, 12)</p> <p>בֵּית אֲב (1) (35:5)</p> <p>בֵּית הָאֲבוֹת (1) (35:5)</p>
---------------------	--

¹⁴ This is complicated by the fact that the Hebrew phrase can refer to different specific places or things. See H. S. Gehman, “*Ἄγιος* in the Septuagint, and its relation to the Hebrew Original”, *JTS* 4 (1954) 337-348, esp. 346-347.

¹⁵ Forms of *πατριάρχης* occur three times total in Par: twice as mentioned above, and once (2 Par 23:20) as a translation of שָׂרֵי, ‘captains, leaders’.

The translator consistently rendered האבות with something other than πατήρ (either πατριά or πατριάρχης). Further, he was sensitive to the phrase –בית(ל), translating it all but one time with some form of πατριά.¹⁶ This is evidence that the translator understood the different uses of אב in Hebrew, referring at times to one's father, but also to lineage or tribe.

The Choice of ἀγαθόν for טוב in 2 Par 5:13

Variations of a phrase that occurs in 2 Chr 5:13 can be found throughout the OT. The phrase in question is כִּי טוֹב כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֶסֶדוֹ, 'for he is good, for his steadfast love is forever'. As noted by Allen, in all three instances of this phrase in Chr, the translator has rendered טוב with the neuter ἀγαθόν, 'good'.¹⁷ As such, rather than agreeing with κυρίω, 'to the Lord', it must refer to ἔλεος, 'mercy', for חֶסֶד. The phrase then becomes, according to Allen's suggestion, Ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίω, ὅτι ἀγαθόν, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ, 'Acknowledge the Lord, for [his mercy] is good, for his mercy is forever'.

Allen's suggestion here is worthy of consideration. Syntactically and contextually the nearest (stated) referent for ἀγαθόν is ἔλεος. However, Allen goes on to claim: 'Doubtless this interpretation was inspired by the phrase כִּי־טוֹב חֶסֶדךָ in Psalm 69.17; 109.21'.¹⁸ While these two Psalms could be considered as part of the background for the translator's decision in Par, it is too much to claim this with such confidence (i.e., 'doubtless'). Rather than stating this as factual, it should simply be considered as an option for understanding the translator's decision. In addition, this option ignores the clearer parallel in Psalm 136:1 (LXX 135:1). There, the translator offers ὅτι χρηστός, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ, 'for he is good, for his mercy is forever', where the MT has כִּי טוֹב כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֶסֶדוֹ, 'for he is good, for his steadfast love is forever'. Allen's proposal would be strengthened if there was evidence that the translator was regularly influenced by the Greek version of Psalms.

¹⁶ The only exception is found in 2 Par 21:13 where בית־אבִיךָ, 'the house of your fathers', is translated as υἱοὺς τοῦ πατρὸς σου, 'sons of your father'. This is simply a misreading of the *Vorlage*, or it might reflect a different *Vorlage* than the MT. Based on the other examples in 2 Par, one would expect that if the translator read בית, he would have rendered אב with πατριά. Due to the translator's reading בן, 'son', instead of בית (whether justified by the *Vorlage* or not), this does not count against his consistency with –בית אב(ל).

¹⁷ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 125. The other passages are 1 Par 16:34 and 2 Par 7:3.

¹⁸ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 125.

There is another option worth considering. It is likely that the translator considered the first כִּי to be causal ('because, for'). The particle כִּי is the most common conjunction for the causal clause in Hebrew.¹⁹ It is possible that the translator then took the second כִּי as marking a substantival clause.²⁰ In English, then, כִּי טוֹב כִּי לְעוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ might reflect this understanding by being represented as 'for it is good *that* his steadfast love is forever'. If this was the translator's understanding, he might still use ὅτι for כִּי both times, as seen in Par. Since ὅτι can be used in both 'causal clauses'²¹ and 'indirect declarative clauses',²² this understanding is plausible.

The Use of the Pluperfect Indicative for a Qal Participle

2 Chr 6:3 ends with the Qal participle עומד, 'standing', as the verbal idea of the clause וְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל עוֹמֵד, 'And all Israel (was) standing'. The translator rendered this participle with the pluperfect active indicative παρειστήκει, 'he had been standing'. There are a total of three pluperfect indicatives in Par, all of which translate active participle forms Good summarizes the use of the pluperfect in Par:

In narrative, the two forms have slightly different nuances. The force of the participles in Hebrew is probably best understood as simultaneous to the main verb, [sic] the pluperfect stresses the resultant state of the action relative to the action of the main verb (in the past time), e.g., "the men went down ... the army *had* already *encamped*" (1 Chr 11:15; so also 2 Chr 6:3). Perhaps the pluperfect was used to emphasize the change in topic.²³

In order to assess Good's claim here, two things should be considered: 1) whether a change in topic is indicated in the context and 2) whether this is normal in the LXX in general.

The two examples under consideration are 1 Par 11:15 and 2 Par 6:3.²⁴ In his example above, he seems to see the change in topic as a minor shift—'the men' to 'the army'. By extension, in the example in 2 Par 6:3 he would see a shift from 'the king' to 'the whole assembly'. Although the shift is minor, it is still a change nonetheless. Topic shifts are not uncommon in verbless (participle) clauses. The fronted subject followed by the participle is 'marked' to provide *background* information in which a situation,

¹⁹ JM, §170d.

²⁰ JM, §157a.

²¹ CGCG, §48.2.

²² CGCG, §41.2-6.

²³ Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 217 (emphasis in original).

²⁴ The third pluperfect in Par is in reported speech in 2 Par 18:18. Good was not considering this example when he made the statement above. See Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 217.

circumstance, or event is depicted that occurs simultaneously with the sequence of actions expressed in the preceding foreground clause'.²⁵

Of course, not all Qal participles are translated with the pluperfect in the LXX. Likewise, not all pluperfects in the LXX are translations of Qal participles. However, it is true that in some situations, LXX translators used the pluperfect for Qal participles. If Good is correct, there would need to be some precedent for the pluperfect being used to indicate a shift in topic.

A Qal participle is used in Gen 2:10.

ונהר יצא מעדן להשקות את־הגן ומשם יפרד והיה לארבעה ראשים:

A river (was) flowing from Eden to water the garden, and from there it divided and was four divisions.

Here, there is a clear shift in topic. This is indicated by the verbless clause that begins the verse. The focus changes from what יהוה אלהים, 'the Lord, God', was doing in the previous verses to a description of what the river was doing. Thus, the fact that the flow of the narrative was halted for information about the river at least in some regard represents a topic shift. In light of Good's claims concerning 2 Par 6:3, one might expect that such a clear case of a topic shift would motivate the use of the pluperfect. However, the translator renders the participle יצא, 'flowing', with a present indicative, ἐκπορεύεται, 'went out'. Of course, this is not meant to imply that the pluperfect would have been the expected rendering based on the function of the participle. Rather, the choice of the pluperfect here would seem obvious if Good's claim is correct.

An example from 2 Par will help to illustrate the point. The Qal participle בונה occurs in 2 Chr 2:8.

ולהכין לי עצים לרב כי הבית אשר־אני בונה גדול והפלא:

To prepare for me much timber for the house which I am building is great and amazing.

Here, the topic shifts from עבדי, 'my servants', to אני, 'I'.²⁶ In the LXX, the verse in question is 2 Par 2:9. The translator retains the shift from οἱ παῖδες σου, 'your servants',²⁷ in 2 Par 2:8 to ἐγώ, 'I', in 2 Par 2:9. If following Good's proposal, one

²⁵ E. van Wolde, 'The Verbless Clause and Its Textual Function', in C. L. Miller (ed.), *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches*, LSAWS 1 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999) 321-336, citing 330 (emphasis in original). See also *IBHS* §37.6b, 'the predicate participle approximates the prefix conjugation [imperfect], but distinguishes itself by emphasizing a durative circumstance'.

²⁶ Technically, there is an intermediate topic shift from עבדי, 'my servants', to הבית, 'the house', to אני, 'I'.

²⁷ The MT reads עבדי עם־עבדיך, 'my servants with your servants'. The translator inverts the order of these, translating the phrase with οἱ παῖδες σου μετὰ τῶν παιδῶν μου, 'your servants with my servants'. Either way, the subjects of 2 Chr 2:8/2 Par 2:9 are 'servants'.

would expect the participle בונה, ‘building’, to be translated with a pluperfect. Instead, the translator uses the present indicative οἰκοδομῶ, ‘I will build’. Of course, the perfective-stative aspect of the pluperfect does not make sense in this context, since from the speaker’s point of view, the house is not yet completed.

Both examples above show clear instances in which a participle is used in the MT and a change in topic is present.²⁸ In fairness to Good and his proposal, it does not seem that he intends to convey that the pluperfect always, or even often, emphasizes topic shift. In fact, in his introduction to the pluperfect tense, he does not mention topic shifts at all.²⁹ Perhaps his statement concerning topic changes was simply an attempt to make sense of the translator’s (limited) use of the pluperfect, in each case translating an active participle. However, this claim lacks some weight due to examples of active participles in clear topic shift scenarios that are not translated with the pluperfect. Ultimately, Good’s first claim, ‘the pluperfect stresses the resultant state of the action relative to the action of the main verb’,³⁰ would be sufficient to explain the aspectual influence of the pluperfect on the verse(s) in question. Rather than stating that ‘the pluperfect was used to emphasize the change in topic’,³¹ it is better to simply state that the translator was sensitive to the option of using the pluperfect, with its perfective-stative aspect, to represent the sense of his source text. It might be said, then, that the translator was focused more on the *function* of the story in Hebrew than on the *form*, at least rigidly speaking. Of course, the translator does follow the form of his Hebrew source often. However, here, he does allow some literary flourishing to shine through in order to offer some natural Greek to render the sense of the Hebrew participle.

Pluses, Minuses, and Various Other Changes

2 Par 5:1

Par does not include a conjunction before τὸ ἀργύριον, ‘the silver’. Allen considers this to be an example of haplography, since the previous word, אביו, ‘his father’, ends with י.³² Allen’s conclusion is likely correct. It is worth considering, then, the effect that this omission has on the reading of the verse. Where 2 Chr 5:1 communicates that Solomon brought in (1) holy things, *and* (2) silver, *and* (3) gold, *and* (4) utensils, 2 Par 5:1

²⁸ At the least, a topic change similar in force to the examples Good cites (Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 217).

²⁹ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 64.

³⁰ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 217.

³¹ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 217.

³² Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 129.

instead offers that Solomon brought in holy things: (1) silver, and (2) gold, and (3) utensils. The translation suggests that the silver, gold, and utensils are parts of the larger category of ‘holy things’.

The phrase **וְאֵת כָּל־הַכֵּלִים**, ‘and all the utensils’, is translated **καὶ τὰ σκεύη**, ‘and the utensils’. Rehm suggests **כָּל** in the MT is an example of dittography, and so the *Vorlage* of the MT and the LXX might have read **וְאֵת הַכֵּלִים**.³³ In contrast, Allen considers Par or its *Vorlage* to have been assimilated to the parallel in 1 Kgs, which has **וְאֵת הַכֵּלִים**.³⁴ The adjective **כָּל** regularly modifies the noun **כֵּלִי** in 2 Chr—always when the plural absolute **כֵּלִים** is used. While the reading in Par does match 1 Kgs, it is more likely that Par simply reflects its *Vorlage*.³⁵ At the end of 2 Par 5:1, the translator renders **הָאֱלֹהִים**, ‘(of) God’, with **κυρίου**, ‘of the Lord’. Again, Allen argues for assimilation to Kgs.³⁶ As stated in the previous chapter, the interchangeability of **κύριος** and **θεός** means there is not enough to suggest assimilation here.

The translator renders the plural **אֲצֵרוֹת**, ‘treasuries’, with the singular **θησαυρόν**, ‘treasury’. Allen theorizes that the former may have been abbreviated without **וְ-** in the *Vorlage* of Par, which would have led to the singular rendering in Par.³⁷ Given that the plural form of **θησαυρός** occurs regularly for **אֲצֵרוֹת** in Par, Allen is likely correct.

2 Par 5:2

In 2 Chr 5:2 the preposition **ל** is used with one of its common functions, to designate possession or relation: **גְּשִׁיאי האבות לבני ישראל**, ‘the chiefs of the fathers of/for the sons of Israel’.³⁸ The translator apparently understood this relationship, as he avoids a direct translation (a preposition for a preposition) in favor of the more natural genitive: **τῶν ἡγουμένων πατριῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ**, ‘the rulers of the families of the sons of Israel’.

2 Par 5:4

There is a plus found in this verse. Par has the adjective **πάντες**, ‘all’, qualifying **οἱ Λευῖται**, ‘the Levites’. As previously mentioned, Allen considers **כָּל** to be among a group of words that are added and omitted freely. As such, he sees **πάντες** not as an

³³ Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 70.

³⁴ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 200.

³⁵ BHS suggests manuscript evidence lacking **כָּל**.

³⁶ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 200.

³⁷ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 89.

³⁸ JM, §133d.

addition, but as reflective of the *Vorlage*.³⁹ This suggests that כל has fallen out in the MT. In a situation like the one here, it might be that the translator considered כל to distribute to both זקני, ‘the elders’, and הלויים, ‘the Levites’.

There is one other instance in 2 Par where πᾶς has entered the text in a similar context. In 2 Par 34:12, the translator renders the Hebrew כל מבין כל והלויים, ‘and the Levites, all the skillful ones’, with καὶ πᾶς Λευίτης συνίω, ‘and every skillful Levite’. Here, he moves πᾶς and changes the plural והלויים to the singular Λευίτης. This then, does not qualify as the same scenario as the example in 2 Par 5:4, where πάντες occurs without an equivalent in the MT.

Another interesting change occurs in 2 Par 30:22 concerning these same words. 2 Chr 30:22 has על־לב כל־הלויים, ‘on the heart of all the Levites’. The translator renders this ἐπὶ πᾶσαν καρδίαν τῶν Λευιτῶν, ‘on every heart of the Levites’. It can be concluded, then, that at various points in the translation process, the translator moved his translation of כל to a different spot in the clause or כל moved at an earlier point in the transmission process and Par reflects its *Vorlage*.

2 Par 5:5

The first change here is subtle. The translator has rendered the construct noun + absolute noun בלי הקדש, ‘the utensils of holiness’, with the noun + adjective τὰ σαεὺη τὰ ἅγια, ‘the holy utensils’. This is a normal way of dealing with some construct nouns where an adjective is available for the translator. Similar examples can be found throughout the LXX.⁴⁰

Par has the conjunction καί, ‘and’, before ἀνήνεγκαν, ‘they brought up’, for העלו, ‘they brought up’. Rehm suggests a misreading, where וי (ועלו, ‘and they brought up’) would have been read as ה in the MT or the translator of Par read ויעלו instead of העלו.⁴¹ Another possibility is that the translator was bringing the end of the sentence into agreement with the first part of the sentence, repeating καὶ ἀνήνεγκαν for both ויעלו and העלו. The object of העלו is אתם, ‘them’. The translator offers instead the 3rd person singular αὐτήν, in context, ‘it’. Again, Rehm suggests a misreading here (אתה for אתם).⁴² However this reading was introduced, the nearest possible antecedent is σακηγή,

³⁹ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 152-153.

⁴⁰ See, for example, Numbers 4:15; 3 Kgdms 8:4; Jeremiah 52:18; Ezekiel 27:13.

⁴¹ Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 70.

⁴² Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 59. See also Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 121.

‘tent’. So then the meaning of the verse changes from the ark, the tent, and the utensils of holiness being brought up to the tent being brought up. Perhaps this was deemed acceptable since in the previous clause, the holy utensils are said to have been in the tent. By bringing the tent up, these would have been included.

2 Chr 5:5 ends with *הכהנים הלויים*, ‘the Levitical priests’, which is translated with *οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευῖται*, ‘the priests and the Levites’. BHS suggests a possible reading of *הכהנים והלויים*, ‘the priests and the Levites’, based on other versions (like the LXX) and the parallel in Kgs. Allen includes this in a section on words, like the conjunction here, that are easily added or deleted in the transmission or translation process, whether in the *Vorlage*, the MT, or the LXX.⁴³ In Deuteronomy 27:9, the same phrase, *הכהנים הלויים*, occurs and is translated in the LXX with two articular nouns, not separated with the conjunction: *οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ Λευῖται*, ‘the priests, the Levites’. In contrast, *הכהנים הלויים* in Joshua 8:33 is translated, like 2 Par 5:5, with *οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ Λευῖται*. Given that in Greek both *ἱερεύς* and *Λευίτης* are nouns, the translation in 2 Par 5:5 describes two groups, priests and Levites, rather than a type of priests—Levitical priests.

2 Par 5:6

A potentially theologically significant plus is found in 2 Par 5:6. In the New Testament book of Acts, the term *οἱ φοβούμενοι*, ‘the ones who fear’, is coupled on several occasions with *τὸν θεόν*, ‘God’, to designate a group of Gentile worshipers of the Jewish God, also known as ‘God-fearers’. Allen has identified the addition of *οἱ φοβούμενοι* after *πᾶσα συναγωγή Ἰσραήλ*, ‘the whole congregation of Israel’, in 2 Par 5:6 as ‘an interpretative gloss on the next phrase’.⁴⁴ Since what follows *πᾶσα συναγωγή Ἰσραήλ* would be repetitive if referring to the same group, perhaps the translator assumed *הנועדים עליו*, ‘the ones assembled before him’, was a different group and added *οἱ φοβούμενοι* theologically. Michael Bird sees the inclusion of *οἱ φοβούμενοι* as a distinguished category from *πᾶσα συναγωγή Ἰσραήλ*, ‘highlighting the universal relevance of the temple as a house of prayer for the nations’.⁴⁵ Both Allen and Bird, then, consider the addition of *οἱ φοβούμενοι* in 2 Par 5:6 to reflect some sort of theological or ideological view of the translator. Rehm offers a textual explanation for

⁴³ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 154. According to Allen, ‘it would not be worth the labour to sift through the evidence to try to assess the variation of the *Vorlage* in the use of the conjunction’.

⁴⁴ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 41.

⁴⁵ M. F. Bird, *Crossing Over Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2010) 49.

the issue at hand. According to Rehm, this is likely an instance in which the translator read הַנּוֹעֲדִים הַנּוֹרְאִים, ‘the ones fearing, the ones assembled’, due to a ‘double writing or confusion of letters’ which, over time, remained in the text for the translator.⁴⁶

It is difficult to assess these opposing views, as both require rather substantial assumptions. Rehm’s view assumes a textual variant that is not attested elsewhere in Hebrew manuscripts. It is difficult to accept Rehm’s proposal without textual data to back it up. For the former view, held by Allen and Bird, one must assume a level of intentionality, creativity, and willingness to insert theologically motivated renderings in the translation. A more convincing case could be made if there were theologically motivated translations throughout, or at least more regularly. This does not rule out the claims of Allen and Bird, but this claim must be held up against the rest of Par. However, in the context of the following phrase, it is logical to consider οἱ φοβούμενοι as a qualification added by the translator to show οἱ ἐπισυνηγμένοι αὐτῶν, ‘their gathered ones’, to be a different group than πᾶσα συναγωγή Ἰσραήλ. The addition of the conjunction before οἱ φοβούμενοι and οἱ ἐπισυνηγμένοι suggest that the translator was already adding to the text here for clarification. One need not necessarily claim ‘theology’ here. It might be simpler than that. Van der Louw considers some renderings to be ‘pretty convincing instances of interpretation and modification of the source text, which unmistakably point to the *world view, ideology or theology* of the translator or of *his audience*’.⁴⁷ So van der Louw offers three categories, rather than lumping all such additions into the category ‘theology’. In addition, van der Louw clarifies that it is not only the translator that must be considered, but also his audience.

The translator goes on to render the prepositional phrase וְלִפְנֵי, ‘before him’, with the genitive plural personal pronoun αὐτῶν, ‘of them’. For the Chronicler, וְלִפְנֵי refers to the position of הַנּוֹעֲדִים, which serves as a further descriptor of כָּל עַדְתַּיִשְׂרָאֵל: ‘the whole congregation of Israel, the ones gathered before him [Solomon]’. For the translator, αὐτῶν modifies οἱ ἐπισυνηγμένοι, ‘their gathered ones’, which is closely tied to οἱ φοβούμενοι, discussed above (‘all the fearers and their gathered ones’). The compounding of translation decisions (inserting οἱ φοβούμενοι, adding the conjunction between these ‘different groups’, etc.) may have led to changing וְלִפְנֵי to αὐτῶν, as its function changed in the translation.

⁴⁶ Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 27.

⁴⁷ Van der Louw, ‘Linguistic or Ideological Shifts?’, 36-37 (emphasis added).

In addition to the changes above, a small change occurs towards the end of the verse, as *μόσχους καὶ πρόβατα*, ‘cattle and sheep’, is a transposition of *צאן ובקר*, ‘sheep and cattle’. As mentioned before, Allen claims that it is ‘impossible to determine at what stage the order of words was changed’ in cases like this one.⁴⁸ While ‘impossible’ might be too strong a word, it is certainly out of the purview of the present work to assess the timing of this change. As is common in the LXX, these singular collective nouns *צאן* and *בקר* are translated as plurals.

A final noteworthy change occurs when the imperfect verbs *יספרו*, ‘they are counted’, and *ימנו*, ‘they are numbered’, are translated with Greek future passive verbs *ἀριθμηθήσονται*, ‘they will be counted’, and *λογισθήσονται*, ‘they will be calculated’. According to Allen, these are examples of imperfects which are ‘mechanically’ translated as Greek futures.⁴⁹ Good considers the future tense verbs here to be ‘equivalent to subjunctives in purpose clauses’ due to their use in ‘narrative subordinate clauses’.⁵⁰ Good’s data do reflect the tendency for the Greek future to be the standard translation of Hebrew imperfect forms.⁵¹

2 Par 5:8

A simple plus can be found in this verse. Par has the genitive plural pronoun *αὐτῶν* after *τὰς πτέρυγας*, ‘their wings’. Allen includes this example in a section on the idiomatic addition of possessive pronouns, which ‘are freely added’.⁵² He considers this to be an example of ‘cases, which seem to be merely liberties taken by the translator in amplifying the Heb’.⁵³ While this is a simple addition that does clarify the relation between *τὰς πτέρυγας* and *χερουβίν* (even if that relationship did not need to be clarified), it is doubtful that the translator was attempting to ‘amplify’ the *Vorlage*. It is likely a simple clarification.

2 Par 5:9

The changes in 2 Par 5:9 might be traced back to text critical issues. For the prepositional phrase *מן־הארון*, ‘from the ark’, Par has *ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων*, ‘from the holies’. Then, the singular *ויהי*, ‘and it is/was’, in the MT is represented with the plural *καὶ ἦσαν*,

⁴⁸ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 64.

⁴⁹ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 42.

⁵⁰ Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 226.

⁵¹ Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 224.

⁵² Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 48.

⁵³ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 48.

‘and they were’. Allen suggests a marginal note that read *הארון*, which a scribe brought into the text where *הקדש*, ‘the holy (place)’, should have been.⁵⁴ In this process, a scribe then assumed that *הארון* was the subject and corrected *ויהיו* to *ויהי* because *הארון* is singular.⁵⁵ The subject here is actually the plural *הבדים*, ‘poles’. If Allen is correct, and there is good reason to believe that he is here, then Par preserves the proper reading and the MT contains a corruption.⁵⁶ Alternatively, Par simply produces a more intelligible reading than that of Chr. Of course the poles would be seen from the ark; they were part of the ark. By changing *מִן־הָאֲרוֹן* to *ἐκ τῶν ἁγίων*, the translator clarifies that it was from the holy place that the poles on the ark could be seen.

2 Par 5:10

There is a single plus in this verse. At the end of the verse, *ממצרים*, ‘from Egypt’, is translated with *ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου*, ‘from the land of Egypt’. Allen considers this to again represent parallel assimilation.⁵⁷ For the other five occurrences of the prepositional *ממצרים* in 2 Chr, the translator simply offers *ἐξ Αἰγύπτου*. In none of those cases, though, is the Exodus event in view. In roughly half of the references to the Exodus event in Deuteronomy, specifically in texts that reference Israel being ‘brought out’ or ‘coming out’ (*יצא*) of Egypt, the prepositional phrase that is used is *מארץ מצרים*, ‘from the land of Egypt’. It is possible, then, that the translator was not assimilating to the parallel in Kgs. Instead, he may have been influenced by a regular quasi-formulaic Hebrew construction, especially when the Exodus event is in view.

2 Par 5:12

The first change worth noting here is the addition of *τοῖς υἱοῖς*, ‘to the sons’, after *πάντες*, ‘all’, for *לכלם*, ‘to all of them’. As has been the case on several occasions, Allen considers this to be an example of a misplaced marginal note by a scribe. In his view, *בני* should have been applied in 2 Chr 6:11, but instead is applied here in the *Vorlage* of Par.⁵⁸

⁵⁴ See 1 Kgs 8:8, which might show the reading in Par’s *Vorlage*.

⁵⁵ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 145

⁵⁶ While Allen often considers parallel assimilation in cases like this, he does not offer that as an option here. Per usual, I do not consider parallel assimilation as a viable option here.

⁵⁷ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 200.

⁵⁸ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 150.

Of the ~74 occurrences of מזרח, ‘east, sunrise’, in the MT, only here is it translated with the preposition κατέναντι, ‘before’. According to Allen, this represents a paraphrase resulting from the translator’s knowledge of the ‘topography of the Temple’.⁵⁹ It could be the case the translator is in fact familiar with the layout of either the Jerusalem temple or one of the temples in Egypt.⁶⁰ That the translator paraphrased מזרח as κατέναντι does not necessarily prove that he had first-hand knowledge of a Jewish temple, whichever one that may be. As suggested in the previous chapter, it is possible that the translator was unfamiliar with the temple and its furnishings. Nowhere else in the MT is מזרח used in a context like the one found here, מזרח למזבח, ‘east with respect to the altar’. It could be that the translator deemed the cardinal direction מזרח to be inadequate in a context like this one, where a prepositional phrase would be appropriate. To be clear, the translator has certainly paraphrased here, but the paraphrasing that he does is not necessarily due to physical, topographical familiarity.

2 Par 5:13

Near the beginning of the verse, Par does not represent כ, ‘as’, translating כאחד, ‘as one’ with μία φωνή, ‘one voice’. The noun φωνή is also a plus with respect to the MT. According to Allen, this is one of several occasions in which the translator ‘makes a deliberate and persistent’ effort ‘to avoid clumsy Heb prepositions in favour of a more elegant, or at least a more natural, Gk rendering’.⁶¹ Allen claims an additional example of this avoidance in 2 Par 5:13 where the translator renders ובהלל ליהוה, ‘and in praise to the Lord’, with και ἔλεγον Ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίῳ, ‘and they said, “Acknowledge the Lord...”’. Here, ἔλεγον is a plus. In neither case is Allen’s view substantiated or necessary. It would be much clearer to simply state that in these cases the translator has interpreted his *Vorlage*, potentially with the intent to produce clarity in his translation. Further, it seems inaccurate to refer to the Hebrew prepositions as ‘clumsy’ and worth avoiding. Rather, it would be more accurate to claim that that the translator was avoiding a clumsy Greek rendering of normal Hebrew prepositions. In fact, to call either clumsy is unnecessary and unhelpful.

⁵⁹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 52.

⁶⁰ See C. A. Eberhart, ‘Leontopolis, Onias und die Septuaginta: Einflüsse und Auswirkungen’, in *Die Septuaginta — Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen*, 40-57; R. Hayward, ‘The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration’, *JJS* 33.1 (1982) 429-443; S. G. Rosenberg, ‘The Jewish Temple at Elephantine’, *NEA* 67.1 (2004) 4-13.

⁶¹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 44.

There are two additional prepositional phrases toward the beginning of 2 Chr 5:13 that the translator deals with indirectly. He renders למחצרים ולמשררים, ‘for the trumpeters and for the singers’, with ἐν τῷ σαλπίζειν καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλτωδεῖν, ‘while they trumpeted and while they sang’. Allen suggests Aramaic influence with the initial מ on these terms.⁶² As in the preceding paragraph, Allen’s suggestion should not be outright denied or ignored. However, the translation decisions here do not necessitate agreeing to Allen’s conclusions. It could be that the translator has chosen the ἐν τῷ + infinitive construction with temporal force in mind, as reflected in the translation above.⁶³ Finally, if the translator considered both למחצרים ולמשררים to be infinitives, it is unlikely that he would have used the preposition ἐν for ל. Instead, the translator more likely would have used a simple infinitive.

Two verbal changes are worth noting near the middle of this verse, where the translator renders the infinitive with prefixed pronoun וכהרים, ‘in the raising’, with the finite verb form ὡς ᾤψωσαν, ‘as they raised’. According to Good, it is quite normal in Par for an aorist indicative in a subordinate clause to translate כ + infinitive.⁶⁴ He suggests the influence of spoken rabbinic Hebrew, wherein כ or ב + ‘an infinitive construct is replaced by an indicative form’.⁶⁵ The translator inserts the finite verb ἔλεγον, ‘they said’ before the imperative ἐξομολογεῖσθε, ‘acknowledge’, for the ב + infinitive בהלל, ‘in praise’. According to Good’s data, this is the only instance in Par where a present imperative serves as the translation of an infinitive construct. The addition of ἔλεγον and the use of the imperative suggests that ‘the infinitive is treated [by the translator] as a reported command’.⁶⁶

At the end of 2 Par 5:13, the translator offers δόξης κυρίου, ‘the glory of the Lord’, as a translation of בית יהוה, ‘the house of the Lord’. Both Allen and the editors of BHS suggest that the translator’s decision might have come as a result of synthesizing the end of 2 Chr 5:13 (הבית מלא ענן, ‘the house was filled with a cloud’) and the statement of the house’s filling in 2 Chr 5:14 (מלא כבוד יהוה את־בית, ‘the glory of the Lord filled the house’).⁶⁷ It is important, though, to consider that by making this

⁶² Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 126.

⁶³ The article substantivizes the infinitive; the preposition, then, may communicate time (*CGCG*, §31.8). See also *CGCG*, §51.38: ‘The articular infinitive is often best translated into English by a gerund’. Thus, an alternative simple understanding of the phrases in question could be, ‘in the trumpeting and in the singing’.

⁶⁴ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 179.

⁶⁵ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 179.

⁶⁶ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 186.

⁶⁷ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 92. Whether such a synthesis was intentional is not stated.

translation decision, the translator has opted to exclude the repetition of בית in 2 Chr 5:13.

והבית מלא ענן בית יהוה

‘and the house, the house of the Lord, was filled with a cloud’

While it is surely possible that this decision was made by mistake, it is also possible that the translator made the shift from בית יהוה to δόξης κυρίου here to provide clear agreement between the filling statements in 2 Par 5:13 and 14. In this instance, it seems that the translator is not simply translating word-by-word, but rather he is attentive to context.⁶⁸

2 Par 6:2

In 2 Chr 6:2, Solomon claims that he built בית-זבל לך, ‘a house fit for you’. The term זבל can refer simply to a ‘dwelling place’ or as used here with בית, ‘house’, it specifies a quality of a dwelling place (‘a lofty house’ or ‘a house fit for you’).⁶⁹ There are only five occurrences of זבל in the Hebrew Bible. Each of these are translated differently in the LXX, displaying the lack of a standard equivalent for the term. The translator of 2 Par has inserted an additional phrase (τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ‘for your name’) between his translation of οἶκον for בית and ἅγιόν σοι, ‘holy to you’, for זבל לך. Rogers considers this to be anti-anthropomorphic, with the translator inserting τῷ ὀνόματί σου and deleting זבל לך to tone down the anthropomorphism.⁷⁰ This understanding fails to consider ἅγιόν σοι as a translation of זבל לך, as noted above. Allen suggests that ἅγιόν σοι for זבל לך reflects Isaiah 63:15 and might have been a modification to account for the fact that God’s dwelling had already been established with בית.⁷¹ In addition, the claim of anti-anthropomorphism fails to consider the rest of the context here. Indeed, just two verses later in 2 Par 6:4, the translator provides Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ, ὃς ἐλάλησεν ἐν στόματι αὐτοῦ πρὸς Δαυὶδ τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ ἐν χερσὶν αὐτοῦ ἐπλήρωσεν, ‘Blessed is the Lord, God of Israel, who spoke *with his mouth* to David, my father, and *with his hands* fulfilled it’.⁷² Ultimately, though, the translation decision in 2 Par 6:2 is not actually an

⁶⁸ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 90. If this is the case, then at least here, the translator of Par is more ‘comprehensive’ in his approach. See Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 36. This contrasts observations made previously.

⁶⁹ DCH, s.v. ‘זבל’.

⁷⁰ Rogers, ‘Old Greek’, 22.

⁷¹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 122.

⁷² Rogers fails to mention this verse in his analysis. In general, the anti-anthropomorphism identified by Rogers is based on selective evidence and his conclusions are difficult, if not impossible, to maintain.

issue of anthropomorphism. Rather, like 2 Par 2:6 discussed in chapter 2 above, this might have to do with the translator’s possible avoidance of insinuating that anything can contain God.

Allen offers an alternate explanation for the addition of τῷ ὀνόματί σου, claiming a copying error from the end of 2 Chr 6:9, which would have been ‘in the next column’.⁷³ Another option is that rather than making a copying or transmission error, the translator is simply adding τῷ ὀνόματί σου to bring 2 Par 6:2, 9 into agreement with one another. As such, 2 Par 6:2 points forward to 2 Par 6:9.

As the adjective ἅγιόν, ‘holy’, modifies οἶκον, ‘house’, the translator uses the adjective ἔτοιμον, ‘prepared’, to modify οἶκον. As a result, Solomon built a house, holy to the Lord’s name and prepared for dwelling. This differs from the MT, where the מבון, ‘prepared place’, parallels בית, ‘house’. More clearly, in the MT Solomon describes his temple project as a *house* for the Lord and a *prepared place* for the Lord to dwell. In Par, though, Solomon built a house that is *holy* and *prepared*. The use of the adjective ἔτοιμον for the noun מבון is well-attested in the LXX. In addition to this attestation, the decision to render זבל with the adjective ἅγιόν helps to create a paralleling of adjectives referring to οἶκον. The noun with the adjectives following and spaced out creates a nice rhyming pattern as well.

Finally, Par lacks the pronoun at the end of the infinitive לשבת, ‘for your dwelling’. It has instead τοῦ κατασκηνοῦσαι, ‘to dwell’. While Rogers uses this as additional evidence for his proposed anti-anthropomorphism,⁷⁴ Allen rightly suggests that YHWH is clearly the implied subject here, even though the pronoun is missing.⁷⁵ As such, the pronoun was either deemed unnecessary or it was unintentionally omitted with little to no effect on the meaning of the verse.

2 Par 6:3

Near the middle of 2 Chr 6:3, את כל־קהל, ‘all the congregation’, is translated τὴν πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν, ‘all the congregation’. Later in the verse, the similar וכל־קהל occurs. This time, though, it is translated καὶ πᾶσα ἐκκλησία. Noticeably, the translation of the former is articular and the latter is anarthrous. It could be that the translator provides a

⁷³ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 36.

⁷⁴ Rogers, ‘Old Greek’, 22.

⁷⁵ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 122.

translation of the direct object marker by including the accusative article.⁷⁶ Again, this is not absolutely *necessary* as the noun itself takes the accusative case ending, marking it as the direct object. However, it confirms the ‘definiteness’ of the noun and provides a translation of the marker **τῆς**. The translator takes the noun following a direct object marker as definite, and so makes the Greek noun definite with the article. Peters claims that ‘Greek speakers employed the article because it entered into a meaningful relationship with the head term, which was a necessary function for establishing meaning’.⁷⁷ He suggests that the use of the article makes the head term ‘concrete’, at least from the perspective of the speaker. From a discourse perspective, this functions to give more ‘salience’ to the head term or to foreground it.⁷⁸ While the suggestion is certainly interesting, it is more difficult to determine whether this feature would be employed in the LXX since it is a translation. Peters confesses that a discussion including the LXX was ‘beyond the scope’ of his work.⁷⁹ This is complicated by the fact that in this very verse the same phrase (πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν Ἰσραηλ/πᾶσα ἐκκλησία Ἰσραηλ) is once articular and once anarthrous. Peters has an example similar to this from the New Testament. In John 1:1, θεός occurs twice, but only the first instance is articular. Peters argues that this is ‘a meaningful choice’ in which the first occurrence characterizes θεός ‘as concrete, as belonging to experience of an actual person’.⁸⁰ The second instance characterizes θεός ‘as abstract . . . θεός now performs a different function in the discourse’.⁸¹ He continues: ‘Without the article, θεός must be interpreted in the abstract sense: god, deity, pertaining to divine’.⁸² Whether Peters is correct about John 1:1 is not important here. However, his *conclusions* can be assessed, as they have bearing on 2 Par 6:3. Ultimately, his conclusion does not make sense for the phrases τὴν πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν Ἰσραηλ and πᾶσα ἐκκλησία Ἰσραηλ. The translation would have gained nothing from making the first use as ‘concrete’ and the second as ‘abstract’. Even the suggestion that the articular τὴν πᾶσαν ἐκκλησίαν Ἰσραηλ would be foregrounded does not seem defensible here. It might be concluded, then, that the use of the article here

⁷⁶ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 40, claims ‘this trait could be merely a Gk device to aid understanding’.

⁷⁷ R. D. Peters, *The Greek Article: A Functional Grammar of δ-items in the Greek New Testament with Special Emphasis on the Greek Article*, LBS 9 (Leiden: Brill, 2014) 227-228.

⁷⁸ Peters, *Greek Article*, 229.

⁷⁹ Peters, *Greek Article*, 237-238.

⁸⁰ Peters, *Greek Article*, 238.

⁸¹ Peters, *Greek Article*, 239.

⁸² Peters, *Greek Article*, 239.

simply reflects a strategy that the translator employs at times to deal with the Hebrew direct object marker, which definitizes the noun that it precedes.

The translator, however, does not always use this strategy for dealing with the direct object marker. For example, in 2 Par 5:2 the translator offers τοῦ ἀνευέγκαι κιβωτόν, ‘to bring up an ark’, for לְהַעֲלוֹת אֶת־אֲרוֹן, ‘to bring up the ark’. Notice that the MT has the direct object marker אֶת before אֲרוֹן. The translator uses the anarthrous κιβωτόν. At first glance, it seems that there is no omission here, since there is no article on אֲרוֹן in the MT. The eight other occurrences of κιβωτός in 2 Par 5 include the article. Unsurprisingly, this usually reflects the articular הָאֲרוֹן, with or without the direct object marker. However, in contrast to the example in 2 Par 5:2, the translator uses the articular τῆν κιβωτόν in 2 Par 5:7 for the definite, but anarthrous אֶת־אֲרוֹן in the MT. The example in 2 Par 5:7 is much more in line with the norms of Greek. The article is used in Greek when ‘it refers to someone/something that is identifiable’.⁸³ Further, ‘the lack of an article in prose is normally significant’.⁸⁴ The surprising rendering, then, is not the articular τῆν κιβωτόν in 2 Par 5:7, but the anarthrous τοῦ ἀνευέγκαι κιβωτόν in 2 Par 5:2. While it seems that the translator typically renders a noun that follows the Hebrew direct object marker + (articular or anarthrous) noun with an articular accusative, he does not consistently employ this strategy.⁸⁵

2 Par 6:4

Related to the discussion in the previous verse is the use of πρὸς, ‘to’, in 2 Par 6:4 where the direct object marker is found in the MT. The use of πρὸς here is likely motivated by the presence of the verb ἐλάλησεν, ‘he spoke’. The Hebrew verb דָּבַר, ‘to speak’, occurs 33 times in 2 Chr with a variety of markers for the recipient of the speech. To mark the recipient of דָּבַר, the Chronicler uses the direct object marker אֶת or prepositions like לְ, ‘to’, אֶל, ‘to’, עַל, ‘upon’, and עִם, ‘with’. Unsurprisingly, the translator deals with these by using various Greek terms. The question, then, is whether he does so consistently. The following chart shows the distribution of the translations of these terms when they follow דָּבַר to mark the recipient of speech.

⁸³ CGCG, §28.1.

⁸⁴ CGCG, §28.2.

⁸⁵ See K. J. Turner, ‘A Study of Articulation in the Greek Ruth’, *BIOSCS* 34 (2001) 95-114, esp.

Table 4.2

Translations of terms marking the recipient of speech after דָּבַר in 2 Chr

אֶת	πρός 6:4; 18:23
	dative case 10:10
לְ	dative case 6:15, 16, 17
עִם	πρός 9:1
לְאֵל	πρός 10:3, 9, 10, 14; 18:15; 33:18
	dative case 10:7 (2x); 18:12; 25:16; 34:22
	περί 10:15
	ἐπί 32:19; 33:10 (2x)
עַל	ἐπί 18:22; 23:3; 30:22; 32:6, 16

There are a few observations that can be made from the data in this chart. There is an obvious preference towards לְאֵל to mark the recipient of speech in 2 Chr. The translator did not deem it necessary to render לְאֵל the same way in each of its uses in these contexts. This is even the case when לְאֵל shows up several times over the space of just a few verses. For example, in 2 Par 10, לְאֵל is translated with πρὸς four times, a dative pronoun twice, and περί once. In general, πρὸς is the most common translation for לְאֵל in these contexts, but other translations are common as well.⁸⁶ Ultimately, the Hebrew construction is varied, and the translation of this construction is inconsistent.

2 Par 6:6

The translator renders the second occurrence of the לְ + infinitive לְהִיּוֹת, ‘to be’, with ὥστε εἶναι, ‘so that he would be’. The particle ὥστε, ‘so that, in order that’, occurs only twice in all of Par. In contrast, it is used quite regularly outside of Par, occurring roughly 178 times in the LXX, regularly as a translation of the לְ + infinitive construction. By including ὥστε, the translator clearly marks this infinitive as indicating result.⁸⁷ It is striking that the parallel uses of לְהִיּוֹת in this verse are translated

⁸⁶ According to *CGCG*, §31.8, πρὸς is quite appropriate in these contexts. See also *CGCG*, §30.37 on the dative case used normally in this way.

⁸⁷ Smyth, §2011; *SSG*, §30bb; *CGCG*, §46.7.

differently. For the first use of *להיות*, the translator provides the simple infinitive *γενέσθαι*, ‘to be’. Given these complexities, the structure of the verse in the LXX and the MT should be analyzed more fully, specifically the clauses around each infinitive.

ואבחר בירושלם להיות שמי שם

καὶ ἐξελεξάμην τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ γενέσθαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ

ואבחר בדויד להיות על-עמי ישראל

καὶ ἐξελεξάμην ἐν Δαυὶδ ὥστε εἶναι ἐπάνω τοῦ λαοῦ μου Ἰσραήλ

The translator may have been unsure of the use of the preposition *ב*, ‘in, with’, in the respective clauses. There is no corresponding preposition in his translation of the first clause, even though it occurs before the name of a place: *ἐξελεξάμην τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ*, ‘I have chosen Jerusalem’. In the second clause, he includes a translation of the preposition before a person’s name: *ἐξελεξάμην ἐν Δαυίδ*, ‘I have chosen in David’. One would expect the opposite; *ἐν* before *Ἱερουσαλήμ* rather than *Δαυίδ*.

What seems to have complicated this verse most for the translator is the inclusion of the preposition *על*, ‘over, upon’, in the second clause, a parallel for which is not found in the first. Because of this preposition, the subject of the infinitive *להיות* must be ‘David’. The second half of the verse, then, communicates: ‘I have chosen David to be over my people, Israel’. This contrasts the first half of the verse where *שמי*, ‘my name’, which *follows* the infinitive *להיות*, is the subject of the infinitive, communicating ‘I have chosen (for) my name to be there in Jerusalem’. Perhaps the translator’s inclusion of *ἐν* before *Δαυίδ* led to *ὥστε* being inserted, since the prepositional phrase *ἐν Δαυίδ* could hardly serve as a subject of this infinitive, since the preposition implies that *Δαυίδ* is dative. The resulting translation might communicate ‘I have chosen in David so that (he) would be over my people, Israel’. Grammatically, this is still a difficult reading. In this reading, *ἐν Δαυίδ* is the object of the verb *ἐξελεξάμην*, ‘I have chosen’. The verb *ἐκλέγω* usually takes an accusative or double accusative object(s).⁸⁸ That the verb is a compound of *ἐκ* + *λέγω*, decreases the likelihood that a prepositional phrase beginning with *ἐν* would normally serve as the object. This reading may have been complicated for later editors and translators, as there is evidence from several manuscripts that omit the preposition or replace it with an accusative article.

⁸⁸ *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘ἐκλέγω’.

2 Par 6:9

Instead of providing a participle for the Hebrew participle הַיֹּצֵא, ‘the one who will go out’, the translator opts for a relative pronoun with a future infinitive verb ὃς ἐξελεύσεται, ‘who will go out’. This is one of four examples of the Hebrew active participle being translated with a future indicative verb in Greek; it is the only time that an attributive participle is treated this way.⁸⁹ Naturally, this attributive use lends itself to being translated with a relative clause. Good speculates that ‘the fact that the following verbs are future tense forms influenced the translator’s decision to use a future’.⁹⁰ It would be more accurate to say that the general context demanded a future tense verb, if one was going to be used. It is surprising that the translator uses the relative pronoun with a future tense verb over a Greek participle, especially given that Greek participles account for over half of the translations of Hebrew participles in Chr. As Good stated, though, the context of future action likely demanded this construction, as the present, aorist, or perfect participle might have been deemed insufficient in this context.

2 Par 6:10

The noun + third masculine singular enclitic pronoun דְּבַרְוֹ, ‘his word’, is rendered τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, ‘this word’. Thus, rather than the Lord fulfilling ‘his word’, Par communicates that the Lord fulfilled or established ‘this word’, namely, the direct speech from the Lord quoted by Solomon in the previous verses. This change clarifies the relationship between the ‘word’ in 6:10 and what was spoken by the Lord in 6:8-9.

The translator varies his translation of קוּם, ‘to stand up’, in 2 Chr 6:10. The subject of the first instance is ‘the Lord’ and the object is ‘his word’. As such, קוּם is communicating the establishing of the Lord’s word. Here, the translator uses ἀνέστησεν, ‘set up’ or ‘established’, which, along with ἵστημι and its other compound forms, is regularly used for קוּם in the LXX. With the second occurrence of קוּם, the subject is ‘I’ (Solomon), thus וְאִנִּי תַחַת דָּוִד means ‘and I have risen in place of David’. For this, though, the translator has opted for something other than one of the standard renderings for קוּם; he uses ἐγενήθην, ‘I came’. The whole phrase, then, is translated ἐγενήθην ἀντὶ Δαυὶδ, ‘I came in place of David’. A couple of interpretative options arise from the translator’s decision here. It is possible that the translator varied his approach to קוּם in this verse due to the proximity of the occurrences in order to create *variatio*. More

⁸⁹ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 158.

⁹⁰ Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 158.

likely, the translator understood that קום has a range of meaning and he used two different words to translate it here because of the different subjects and objects of each occurrence. As such, ἐγενήθη for אקום does not evince a misreading but rather a conscious decision by the translator.

2 Par 6:13

Allen notes the addition in Par of τοῦ ἱεροῦ, ‘of the temple’, after τῆς αὐλῆς, ‘the court’, for העזרה, ‘the outer court’. According to Allen, this addition is for clarity.⁹¹ What is less certain is why the translator felt that the text was unclear and needed the addition of τοῦ ἱεροῦ to clarify which outer court he was referring to. Since so much of the nearby context, including in this verse, has centered on the temple’s construction, filling, and dedication, it would be surprising for the translator to have felt that the context lacked clarity. However, if the translator was working at the word or clause level, rather than the larger discourse level, he may have felt that the context needed clarification.

After Solomon stood on the bronze platform, ויברך על ברכיו, ‘he knelt on his knees’. Here, both the verbal ברך, ‘kneel’, and the nominal ברך, ‘knee’, occur. The verb ברך with the meaning of ‘kneel’ occurs only three times in the MT. Each occurrence is translated differently in the LXX. Reference to the nominal ברך, ‘knee’, is absent in the two occurrences outside of 2 Chr. In Psalm 94:6 LXX (MT 95:6), the translator uses κλαίω, ‘to weep’ for ברך. In this context, the translator had to render three consecutive verbs that each deal with bowing or kneeling. As such, it seems that the translator had to be creative in rendering the three, leading him to translate ברך as κλαίω. In Genesis 24:11, the object of the causative ויברך, ‘he caused to kneel’, is הגמלים, ‘the camels’. The translator surely considered ‘kneeling camels’ to be ‘resting camels’, as he renders the verb ברך with ἐκοίμισεν, ‘he caused (them) to lie down’.

Given these other examples, the translator’s decision in 2 Par 6:13 can be understood contextually. Since ברכיו, ‘his knees’, are explicitly stated as the things on which Solomon knelt, the translator can render that literally with τὰ γόνατα, ‘the knees’. He seemingly felt it unnecessary to render the possessive pronoun given that the context

⁹¹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 110. Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 75, claims that the addition of elements in the target text ‘has been known from times immemorial and was especially popular in Antiquity’.

would indicate that it was Solomon's knees that Solomon knelt upon.⁹² The translator sacrifices the repetition of *על ברכיו* ויברך, 'he knelt on his knees', for *ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὰ γόνατα*, 'he fell on the knees', though a different repetition, namely that of the *ἐπ* sound is introduced. The choice of *πίπτω*, 'I fall', might reflect the common use of the word in the LXX in worshipful contexts.

Conclusions

Along with several minor changes in this section, some major translation decisions were discussed above. The translator dealt with relative pronouns in a variety of ways. He chose a Greek indicative verb for a Hebrew participle. On one occasion, he used a masculine pronoun to refer to a feminine noun. Even so, this section of the text contains fewer significant, notable translation decisions than the section discussed in the previous chapter and the section to be discussed in the next chapter. Part of the reason for the smaller scale of issues can certainly be attributed to the subgenre of this section. The present section contains a 'report of ritual' and a 'report of Solomon's address' in the form of simple narrative.⁹³ The previous section contained difficult technical terms. The translations of these technical terms, discussed thoroughly in the previous chapter, made that section ripe for discussion of the translator's techniques. In a similar way, the next section, Solomon's prayer of dedication for the temple, exhibits several noteworthy features of translation techniques.

Important to the discussion is the nuancing of Allen's regular recourse towards claiming parallel assimilation. This view has been dealt with regularly in this chapter; it is not a sustainable claim. *If* the translator did have an assimilating tendency, he was certainly inconsistent with that approach or the assimilation happened in his *Vorlage*.

Even though there are fewer discussion-worthy decisions in this section, there have been multiple instances of translation decisions discussed above. This is significant. No sizeable section of translated text is free of translation decisions that need to be analyzed in order to begin to understand the translator's techniques. To gloss over a section as 'clear enough' is insufficient in the pursuit of understanding the LXX translators.

⁹² On the acceptability of this use of the article, see *CGCG*, §28.4: 'In many cases, if a noun with article refers to something whose possessor or origin is obvious (usually the subject), Greek uses only the article where English would use a possessive pronoun'.

⁹³ De Vries, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 254.

Chapter 5:

Translation Technique in Solomon's Prayer of Dedication

Translation of Solomon's Prayer of Dedication in the MT and the LXX

2 Chr 6:14-42	2 Chr 6:14-42 (Translation)	2 Par 6:14-42	2 Par 6:14-42 (Translation)
<p>14 ויאמר יהוה אלהי ישראל איך-כמוך אלהים בשמים ובארץ שמר הברית והחסד לעבדיך ההלכים לפניך בכל-לבם:</p>	<p>14 And he said, 'Lord, God of Israel, there is no god like you in heaven or on earth, keeping the covenant and the faithfulness to your servants who go before you with all their hearts,</p>	<p>14 και εἶπεν Κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁμοίός σοι θεὸς ἐν οὐρανῶ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, φυλάσσω τὴν διαθήκην καὶ τὸ ἔλεος τοῖς παισίν σου τοῖς πορευομένοις ἐναντίον σου ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ.</p>	<p>14 And he said, 'Lord, God of Israel, there is no god like you in heaven and on the earth, keeping the covenant and the mercy to your servants who go before you with the whole heart,</p>
<p>15 אשר שמרת לעבדך דויד אבי את אשר-דברת לו ותדבר בפֿיך ובידך מלאת כיום הזה:</p>	<p>15 which you kept with your servant, David, my father, what you spoke to him. You spoke with your mouth and with your hand you fulfilled it this day.</p>	<p>15 ἃ ἐφύλαξας τῷ παιδί σου Δαυὶδ τῷ πατρί μου, ἃ ἐλάλησας αὐτῷ λέγων, καὶ ἐλάλησας ἐν στόματί σου καὶ ἐν χερσίν σου ἐπλήρωσας ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη.</p>	<p>15 which you kept for your servant, David, my father, what you spoke to him saying. You spoke with your mouth and with your hand you fulfilled it as this day.</p>
<p>16 ועתה יהוה אלהי ישראל שמר לעבדך דויד אבי את אשר דברת לו לאמר לא-יכרת לך איש מלפני יושב על-כסא ישראל רק אס-ישמרו בניך את-דרכם ללכת בתורתך כאשר הלכת לפני:</p>	<p>16 Now Lord, God of Israel, keep for your servant David, my father, what you spoke to him, saying, "A man will not be excluded to you from before me sitting upon the throne of Israel only if your sons keep their way, to walk in my law just as you walked before me."</p>	<p>16 και νῦν, κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, φύλαξον τῷ παιδί σου τῷ Δαυὶδ τῷ πατρί μου ἃ ἐλάλησας αὐτῷ λέγων Οὐκ ἐκλείψει σοι ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ προσώπου μου καθήμενος ἐπὶ θρόνου Ἰσραὴλ, πλὴν ἐὰν φυλάξωσιν οἱ υἱοί σου τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι ἐν τῷ νόμῳ μου, ὡς ἐπορεύθης ἐναντίον μου.</p>	<p>16 Now, Lord, God of Israel, keep for your servant, David, my father, what you spoke to him saying, "A man will not be gone from my presence who is sitting on the throne of Israel, only if your sons keep their way, to walk in my law as you walked before me."</p>

17 ועתה יהוה אלהי ישראל יאמן דברך אשר דברת לעבדך לדויד:	17 Now Lord, God of Israel, let your word, which you spoke to your servant, David, be reliable.	17 και νῦν, κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, πιστωθήτω δὴ τὸ ῥῆμά σου, ὁ ἐλάλησας τῷ παιδί σου τῷ Δαυίδ.	17 Now Lord, God of Israel, let your word, which you spoke to your servant, David, indeed be faithful.
18 כי האמנם ישב אלהים את-האדם על-הארץ הנה שמים ושמי השמים לא יכלכלוך אף כיהבית הזה אשר בניתי:	18 Indeed, does God truly dwell with man on earth? Behold, heaven and the heaven of heaven cannot contain you, how much less this house which I built.	18 ὅτι εἰ ἀληθῶς κατοικήσει θεὸς μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; εἰ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐκ ἀρκέσουσίν σοι, καὶ τίς ὁ οἶκος οὗτος, ὃν ᾠκοδόμησα;	18 For if God will truly dwell with men on the earth, if heaven and the heaven of heavens will not be sufficient for you, then what is this house, which I built?
19 ופנית אל-תפלת עבדך ואל-תחנתו יהוה אלהי לשמע אל-הרנה ואל-התפלה אשר עבדך מתפלל לפניך:	19 So turn your attention to the prayer of your servant and to his plea, Lord my God, to listen to the cry and to the prayer which your servant is praying before you	19 καὶ ἐπιβλέψῃ ἐπὶ τὴν προσευχὴν παιδός σου καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν δέησίν μου, κύριε ὁ θεός, τοῦ ἐπακοῦσαι τῆς δεήσεως καὶ τῆς προσευχῆς, ἧς ὁ παῖς σου προσεύχεται ἐναντίον σου σήμερον,	19 So look upon the prayer of your servant and upon my request, Lord God, in order to listen to the request and the prayer which your servant prays before you today
20 להיות עיניך פתחות אל-הבית הזה יומם ולילה אל-המקום אשר אמרת לשום שמך שם לשמוע אל-התפלה אשר יתפלל עבדך אל-המקום הזה:	20 so that your eyes will be open towards this house day and night, towards the place which you intended to put your name, in order to listen to the prayer which your servant prays towards this place.	20 τοῦ εἶναι ὀφθαλμούς σου ἀνεωγμένους ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον, ὃν εἶπας ἐπικληθῆναι τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐκεῖ, τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι τῆς προσευχῆς, ἧς ὁ παῖς σου προσεύχεται εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον.	20 so that your eyes will be open upon this house day and night, to this place, where you ordered that your name be invoked there, in order to hear the prayer which your servant prays to this place.
21 ושמעת אל-תחנוני עבדך ועמך ישראל אשר יתפללו אל-המקום הזה ואתה תשמע ממקום שבתך מן-השמים ושמעת וסלחת:	21 So listen to the pleas of your servant and your people, Israel, which they pray towards this place. You will listen from the place of your dwelling, from heaven, and	21 καὶ ἀκούσῃ τῆς δεήσεως τοῦ παιδός σου καὶ λαοῦ σου Ἰσραὴλ, ἃ ἂν προσεύξωνται εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον, καὶ σὺ εἰσακούσῃ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τῆς κατοικήσεώς σου ἐκ	21 So you will listen to the request of your servant and your people, Israel, whatever they might pray to this place, and you will hear in this place of your dwelling, from heaven, and

	you will hear and forgive.	τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀκούσῃ καὶ ἴλεως ἔσῃ.	you will hear and you will be merciful.
22 אִם־יַחַטֵּא אִישׁ לְרַעְהוּ וּנְשֹׂא־בּוֹ אֱלֹהִים לְפָנַי מִזְבֵּחַךְ בַּבַּיִת הַזֶּה:	22 If a man sins against his neighbor and a curse is imposed on him and he comes to curse before your altar in this house,	22 ἐὰν ἀμάρτη ἀνὴρ τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ, καὶ λάβῃ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἄρᾶν τοῦ ἀρᾶσθαι αὐτόν, καὶ ἔλθῃ καὶ ἀράσῃται κατέναντι τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ,	22 If a man sins against his neighbor, and he takes upon him a curse in order to curse him, and if he goes and curses before the altar in this house,
23 וְאַתָּה תִּשְׁמַע מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְעָשִׂיתָ וּשְׁפַטְתָּ אֶת־עַבְדֶּיךָ לְהַשִּׁיב לְרָשָׁע לְתַתּוֹ דְרָכֹוֹ בְרֵאשׁוֹ וּלְהַצְדִּיק צְדִיק לְתַתּוֹ לֹו כְּצַדִּיקוֹ:	23 then you will hear from heaven and act and judge your servants, to repay the guilty by putting his way upon his own head and vindicating the righteous to give to him according to his righteousness.	23 καὶ σὺ εἰσακούσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ποιήσεις καὶ κρινεῖς τοὺς δούλους σου τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι τῷ ἀνόμῳ καὶ ἀποδοῦναι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, τοῦ δικαιοῦσαι δίκαιον τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ.	23 then you will hear from the heaven of heaven and act and judge your slaves in order to render what is due to the lawless and render his ways to his own head, in order to vindicate the righteous, in order to render to him according to his righteousness.
24 וְאִם־יִגָּף עַמְּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל לְפָנַי אֲוִיב כִּי יַחַטְאוּ־לְךָ וְשָׁבוּ וְהוֹדוּ אֶת־שִׁמְךָ וְהִתְפַּלְלוּ וְהִתְחַנְּנוּ לְפָנֶיךָ בַּבַּיִת הַזֶּה:	24 If your people Israel are struck by an enemy because they sinned against you, and they turn and praise your name and pray and plead before you in this house,	24 καὶ ἐὰν θραυσθῇ ὁ λαός σου Ἰσραὴλ κατέναντι τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, ἐὰν ἀμάρτωσίν σοι, καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἐξομολογήσωνται τῷ ὀνόματί σου καὶ προσεύξωνται καὶ δεηθῶσιν ἐναντίον σου ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ,	24 If your people Israel are broken before the enemy, if they sinned against you, and they turn around and confess your name and pray and they make requests before you in this house,
25 וְאַתָּה תִּשְׁמַע מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְסָלַחְתָּ לְחַטָּאת עַמְּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהַשִּׁיבוּתֶם אֵלַי־הָאֲדָמָה אֲשֶׁר־נָתַתָּה לָהֶם וּלְאֲבֹתֵיהֶם:	25 then you will hear from heaven and forgive the sin of your people, Israel, and bring them back to the land which you gave to them and to their fathers.	25 καὶ σὺ εἰσακούσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἴλεως ἔσῃ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τοῦ λαοῦ σου Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἀποστρέψεις αὐτούς εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν ἔδωκας αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν.	25 then you will hear from heaven and be merciful (with respect) to the sins of your people, Israel, and bring them back into the land which you gave to them and to their fathers.

<p>26 בהעצר השמים ולא־יהיה מטר כי יחטאו־לך והתפללו אל־המקום הזה והודו את־שמך מחטאתם ישובו כי תענם:</p>	<p>26 When heaven is shut up and there is no rain because they sinned against you, and they pray toward this place and praise your name and they turn from their sin when you humble them,</p>	<p>26 ἐν τῷ συσχεθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ μὴ γενέσθαι ὑετόν, ὅτι ἁμαρτήσονται σοι, καὶ προσεύξονται εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον καὶ αἰνέσουσιν τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέψουσιν, ὅτι ταπεινώσεις αὐτούς,</p>	<p>26 When heaven is closed up and there is no rain, because they sinned against you, and they will pray to this place and praise your name and they turn back from their sins, for you will humble them,</p>
<p>27 ואתה תשמע השמים וסלחת לחטאת עבדיך ועמד ישראל כי תורם אל־הדרך הטובה אשר ילכו־בה ונתתה מטר על־ארצך אשר־נתתה לעמך לנחלה:</p>	<p>27 then you will hear from heaven and forgive the sin of your servants and your people Israel when you lead them into the good way in which they should walk, and you will give rain upon your land, which you gave to your people for an inheritance.</p>	<p>27 καὶ σὺ εἰσακούσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἴλεως ἔσῃ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις τῶν παίδων σου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι δηλώσεις αὐτοῖς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀγαθὴν, ἐν ἧ ἑπορεύσονται ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ δώσεις ὑετὸν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν σου, ἣν ἔδωκας τῷ λαῷ σου εἰς κληρονομίαν.</p>	<p>27 and you will hear from heaven and be merciful (with respect) to the sins of your servants and your people Israel for you will reveal to them the good way, in which they will walk (in it), and you will grant rain upon your land, which you gave to your people for an inheritance.</p>
<p>28 רעב כִּי־יהיה בארץ דבר כִּי־יהיה שדפון וירקון ארבה וחסיל כי יהיה כי יצר־לו אויביו בארץ שערי־ו כל־נגע וכל־מחלה:</p>	<p>28 If there is a famine in the land, if there is pestilence or scorching or mildew or locust, if there is locust, if their enemies besiege them in land at their gates, every plague, or every disease,</p>	<p>28 λιμὸς ἐὰν γένηται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, θάνατος ἐὰν γένηται, ἀνεμοφθορία καὶ ἴκτερος, ἀκρίς καὶ βροῦχος ἐὰν γένηται, ἐὰν θλίψῃ αὐτὸν ὁ ἐχθρὸς κατέναντι τῶν πόλεων αὐτῶν, κατὰ πᾶσαν πληγὴν καὶ πᾶν πόνον,</p>	<p>28 If there is a famine upon the land, if there is death, heavy wind, and pallor, if there is locust and locust larva, if the enemy afflicts them before their cities, according to every wound and every distress,</p>
<p>29 כל־תפלה כל־תחנה אשר יהיה לכל־האדם ולכל עמד ישראל אשר ידעו איש נגעו ומכאבו ופרש כפיו אל־הבית הזה:</p>	<p>29 every prayer, every plea which is made by any man or by all your people Israel, who each, knowing his plague and his suffering and is stretching out his hands towards this house,</p>	<p>29 καὶ πᾶσα προσευχὴ καὶ πᾶσα δέησις, ἐὰν γένηται παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ σου Ἰσραήλ, ἐὰν γινῶ ἄνθρωπος τὴν ἀφῆν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μαλακίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ διαπετάσῃ τὰς</p>	<p>29 and every prayer, and every request, if it comes about by every man and all your people Israel, if a man knows his plague and his weakness and he extends his hands to this house,</p>

		χειρας αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον,	
30 ואתה תשמע מן השמים מכון שבתך וסלחת ונתתה לאיש ככל-דרכיו אשר תדע את-לבבו כי אתה לבדך ידעת את-לבב בני האדם:	30 then you will hear from heaven, the place of your dwelling, and forgive and give to each according to all his ways, whose heart you know, for you, you alone, know the heart of the children of man,	30 καὶ σὺ εἰσακούσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐξ ἐτοίμου κατοικητηρίου σου καὶ ἰλάσῃ καὶ δώσεις ἀνδρὶ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἂν γνῶς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, ὅτι μόνος γινώσκεις τὴν καρδίαν υἱῶν ἀνθρώπων,	30 then you will hear from heaven, from your prepared place of dwelling, and you will be merciful and give a man according to his ways, as you know his heart, for only you know the heart of the sons of men,
31 למען ייראוך ללכת בדרכיך כל-הימים אשר-הם חיים על-פני האדמה אשר נתתה לאבתינו:	31 in order that they might fear you and walk in your ways all the days that they live on the face of the land which you gave to our fathers.	31 ὅπως φοβῶνται τὰς ὁδοὺς σου πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, ἃς αὐτοὶ ζῶσιν ἐπὶ προσώπου τῆς γῆς, ἧς ἔδωκας τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν.	31 so that they might fear your ways all the days, which they live upon the face of the land, which you gave to our fathers.
32 וגם אל-הנכרי אשר לא מעמד ישראל הוא ובא מארץ רחוקה למען שמך הגדול וידך החזקה וזרועך הנטויה ובאו והתפללו אל-הבית הזה:	32 So also concerning the foreigner who is not from your people Israel comes from a distant land for the sake of your great name and your strong hand and your outstretched arm, when they come and pray toward this house,	32 καὶ πᾶς ἀλλότριος, ὃς οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ σου Ἰσραὴλ ἐστὶν αὐτὸς καὶ ἔλθῃ ἐκ γῆς μακρόθεν διὰ τὸ ὄνομά σου τὸ μέγα καὶ τὴν χειρὰ σου τὴν κραταιὰν καὶ τὸν βραχίονά σου τὸν ὑψηλὸν καὶ ἔλθωσιν καὶ προσεύξωνται εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον,	32 Every foreigner, who is not from your people Israel he also might come from a far away land on account of your great name and your mighty hand and your raised up arm and they should come and pray to this place,
33 ואתה תשמע מן השמים ממכון שבתך ועשית ככל אשר-יקרא אליך הנכרי למען ידעו כל-עמי הארץ את-שמך וליראה אתך כעמד ישראל ולדעת כי-שמך נקרא על-הבית הזה אשר בניתי:	33 and you will hear from heaven, from the place you dwell, and you will do according to all for which the foreigner calls to you, so that all the people of the earth will know your name and fear you, as do your people Israel and that they would know that	33 καὶ εἰσακούσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐξ ἐτοίμου κατοικητηρίου σου καὶ ποιήσεις κατὰ πάντα, ὅσα ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃταί σε ὁ ἀλλότριος, ὅπως γνῶσιν πάντες οἱ λαοὶ τῆς γῆς τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ τοῦ φοβεῖσθαί σε ὡς ὁ λαός σου Ἰσραὴλ καὶ	33 and you will hear from heaven, from your prepared dwelling place, and you will do according to all, whatever the foreigner appeals to you, so that all the people of the earth might know your name and fear you, as your people Israel and know

	your name is proclaimed upon this house which I built.	τοῦ γινῶναι ὅτι ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά σου ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦτον, ὃν ᾠκοδόμησα.	that your name has been invoked upon this house which I built.
34 כִּי־יֵצֵא עַמְךָ לְמִלְחָמָה עַל־אוֹיְבָיו בְּדֶרֶךְ אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁלַחם וְהִתְפַּלְּלוּ אֵלֶיךָ דֶּרֶךְ הָעִיר הַזֹּאת אֲשֶׁר בָּחַרְתָּ בָּהּ וְהִבִּיתָ אֲשֶׁר־בְּנִיתִי לְשִׁמְךָ:	34 If your people go out to battle against their enemies by the way which you send them out, and they pray to you in the direction of this city which you have chosen and the house which I built for your name,	34 ἐὰν δὲ ἐξέλθῃ ὁ λαός σου εἰς πόλεμον ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ ἐν ὁδῷ, ἣ ἄποστελεῖς αὐτούς, καὶ προσεύξωνται πρὸς σὲ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς πόλεως ταύτης, ἣν ἐξελέξω ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ οἴκου, οὗ ᾠκοδόμησα τῷ ὀνόματί σου,	34 Now if your people go out to battle against their enemy by the way which you will send them, and (if) they pray to you according to the way of this city, which you chose (in it), and of the house which I built for your name,
35 וְשָׁמַעְתָּ מִן־שָׁמַיִם אֶת־תְּפִלָּתָם וְאֶת־תַּחֲנֻנָּתָם וְעָשִׂיתָ מִשְׁפָּטָם:	35 then you will hear from heaven their prayer and their plea, and you will carry out their cause.	35 αἰ ἀκούσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῆς δεήσεως αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς προσευχῆς αὐτῶν καὶ ποιήσεις τὸ δίκαιωμα αὐτῶν.	35 then you will hear from heaven their request and their prayer and you will accomplish their justice.
36 כִּי יַחְטְאוּ־לְךָ כִּי אֵין אָדָם אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יַחְטָא וְאֵנָּפֶת בָּם וְנִתְּתָם לִפְנֵי אוֹיֵב וְשָׁבוּם שׁוֹבִיָּהֶם אֶל־אַרְץ רְחוֹקָה אוֹ קְרוֹבָה:	36 If they sin against you (for there is not a person who does not sin) and you are angry with them and you give them over before an enemy, and they are taken captive, carried away to a land far or near,	36 ὅτι ἁμαρτήσονται σοι, ὅτι οὐκ ἔσται ἄνθρωπος, ὃς οὐχ ἁμαρτήσεται, καὶ πατάξεις αὐτούς καὶ παραδώσεις αὐτούς κατὰ πρόσωπον ἐχθρῶν καὶ αἰχμαλωτεύσουσιν οἱ αἰχμαλωτεύοντες εἰς γῆν ἐχθρῶν εἰς γῆν μακρὰν ἢ ἐγγύς	36 For they will sin against you (for there is not a person who does not sin) and you will strike them and hand them over according to the face of enemies, and the ones who take captives will take them captive into the land of enemies, to a land far away or near,
37 וְהָשִׁיבוּ אֶל־לִבָּבָם בְּאַרְץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבוּ־שָׁם וְשָׁבוּ וְהִתְחַנְּנוּ אֵלֶיךָ בְּאַרְץ שְׁבוּיָם לֵאמֹר חָטְאָנוּ הָעוֹיְנוּ וְרָשָׁעוּ:	37 and they turn their heart in the land to which they are taken captive, and they repent and plead to you in the land of their captivity saying, "We sinned, gone astray, and acted wickedly,"	37 καὶ ἐπιστρέψουσιν καρδίαν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτῶν, οὗ μετήχθησαν ἐκεῖ, καὶ γε ἐπιστρέψουσιν καὶ δεηθῶσίν σου ἐν τῇ αἰχμαλωσίᾳ αὐτῶν λέγοντες Ἠμάρτομεν ἠδικήσαμεν ἠνομήσαμεν,	37 and should they turn back their heart in their land, where they were relocated there, and also turn back and make request of you in their captivity saying, "We sinned, we did wrongly, we were lawless,"

<p>38 ושבּו אליך בכל־ לבם ובכל־נפשם בארץ שבים אשר־ שבו אתם והתפללו דרך ארצם אשר נתתה לאבותם והעיר אשר בחרת ולבית אשר־בנית לשמך:</p>	<p>38 and they return to you with all their heart and with all their soul in the land of their captivity to which they were taken captive, and they pray in the direction of their land which you gave to their fathers and the city which you chose and to the house which I built for your name,</p>	<p>38 και ἐπιστρέψωσιν πρὸς σὲ ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ ψυχῇ αὐτῶν ἐν γῇ αἰχμαλωτευσάντων αὐτοὺς καὶ προσεύξωνται ὁδὸν γῆς αὐτῶν, ἧς ἔδωκας τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ τῆς πόλεως, ἧς ἐξελέξω, καὶ τοῦ οἴκου, οὗ ᾠκοδόμησα τῷ ὀνόματί σου,</p>	<p>38 and should they turn back to you with the whole heart and with all their soul in the land where they are taken captive and they pray in the direction of their land which you gave to their fathers, and of the city which you chose, and of the house which I built for your name,</p>
<p>39 ושמעת מן־ השמים ממכון שבתך את־תפלתם ואת־ תחנוניהם ועשית משפטם וסלחת לעמך אשר חטאו־ לך:</p>	<p>39 then you will hear from heaven, from the place of your dwelling, their prayers and pleas and carry out their cause and forgive your people who sinned against you.</p>	<p>39 και ἀκούσῃ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐξ ἐτοιμοῦ κατοικητηρίου σου τῆς προσευχῆς αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς δεήσεως αὐτῶν καὶ ποιήσεις κρίματα καὶ ἴλεως ἔσῃ τῷ λαῷ τῷ ἁμαρτόντι σοι.</p>	<p>39 then you will hear from heaven, from your prepared dwelling place, their prayer and their request and you will bring about judgments and you will be merciful to the people who sinned against you.</p>
<p>40 עתה אלהי יהו־ נא עיניך פתחות ואזניך קשבות לתפלת המקום הזה:</p>	<p>40 Now, my God, let your eyes be opened and your ears be attentive to the prayers of this place.</p>	<p>40 και νῦν, κύριε, ἔστωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ἀνεωγμένοι καὶ τὰ ᾠτά σου ἐπήκοα εἰς τὴν δέησιν τοῦ τόπου τούτου.</p>	<p>40 Now, Lord, let your eyes be open and your ears be attentive to the request of this place.</p>
<p>41 ועתה קומה יהוה אלהים לנוחך אתה וארון עזך כהניך יהוה אלהים ילבוש תשועה וחסידיך ישמחו בטוב:</p>	<p>41 Now arise, Lord God, to your resting place, you and the ark of your strength. Let your priests, Lord God, clothe themselves with salvation and your faithful ones rejoice in goodness.</p>	<p>41 και νῦν ἀνάστηθι, κύριε ὁ θεός, εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν σου, σὺ καὶ ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς ἰσχύος σου. οἱ ἱερεῖς σου, κύριε ὁ θεός, ἐνδύσαιντο σωτηρίαν, καὶ οἱ υἱοί σου εὐφρανθήτωσαν ἐν ἀγαθοῖς.</p>	<p>41 Now arise, Lord God, to your place of rest, you and the ark of your strength. Let your priests, Lord God, clothe themselves with salvation, and your sons rejoice in good.</p>
<p>42 יהוה אלהים אל־ תשב פני משיחך זכרה לחסדי דויד עבדך:</p>	<p>42 Lord God, do not turn away the face of your anointed one.</p>	<p>42 κύριε ὁ θεός, μὴ ἀποστρέψῃς τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ χριστοῦ σου,</p>	<p>42 Lord God, do not turn away the face of your anointed one.</p>

	Remember the faithfulness for David your servant’.	μνήσθητι τὰ ἑλέγη Δαυὶδ τοῦ δούλου σου.	Remember the mercies of David your slave’.
--	--	---	--

The Translation of the ל Preposition

The translation of prepositions in the LXX has seen little attention.¹ This trend is disappointing, especially considering the wealth of information that can be gleaned from assessing this language feature. In both Hebrew and Greek, prepositions have a wide range of meanings and uses. In addition to having prepositions, Greek has a case system, which in certain situations can function similarly to prepositions. It is important to consider if the translator is rigid with his rendering of Hebrew prepositions in the LXX. The translation of ל, ‘to, for’, has been chosen here because it has great potential for overlap with the Greek case system—specifically, the dative case. As a result, when the translator encounters ל he is often presented with a variety of legitimate translation options.

In 2 Chr 6:14-42 the preposition ל occurs 59 times. Some of these occurrences are forms like לפני, ‘before, in the presence of’, and לבד, ‘alone, only’. These forms are made up of a preposition + noun or adverb, respectively, that have formed a ‘frozen union’.² As such, the use of ל in these forms should not be separated out from the resultant term. Forms like a preposition on an infinitive are somewhat formulaic, so they will be dealt with separately. The forms that deserve the most attention, though, are the occurrences of ל in which its function is simply that of a preposition attached to a noun, pronoun, proper name, or adjective. There are 35 such occurrences of ל in 2 Chr 6:14-42. Of these 35, 28 are translated with the dative case³ and four are translated with the preposition εἰς, ‘to, towards’. While it might seem that this is an obvious choice, the use of the dative should be considered as the translator’s decision to stray from a simple,

¹ Some works are certainly worth noting. See Sollamo, *Hebrew Semiprepositions*. Sollamo focuses on ‘semiprepositions’, a term that refers to ‘combinations of a preposition and a noun but whose function is prepositional’ (1). Some examples include לפני, בעיני, and בכי. See also, Sollamo, ‘Some “Improper” Prepositions’, 773-782; L. F. Motz, ‘Semitic Influence in the Use of New Testament Greek Prepositions: The Case of the Book of Revelation’, *BAGL* 6 (2017) 44-66; R. A. Martin, *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974; repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004). Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 43-44, provides a brief discussion of prepositions in 2 Par.

² *IBHS*, §11.3.1a; *JM*, §102d.

³ Many have noted the shift towards using prepositions more regularly in Hellenistic Greek than in previous times. See *SSG*, §26a; Smyth, §1636-1665. The LXX might be caught between this shift. See also Aitken, ‘Language of the Septuagint’, 122, ‘we should recognize in Greek of this time the decline in the dative case in favour of prepositional phrases’.

direct translation option (preposition for preposition), such as *πρός*, ‘toward’, or *εἰς*, ‘to, toward’, taking advantage of the flexibility of the Greek language. As mentioned in a previous chapter, this is noted by Allen: ‘The translator also makes deliberate and persistent efforts to avoid clumsy Heb prepositions in favour of a more elegant, or at least a more natural, Gk rendering’.⁴ In other words, a word-for-word translation would have been expected to use a Greek preposition for a Hebrew preposition. Below, we will first analyze the use of the dative case and the preposition *εἰς* as translations of the preposition *ל* in the prayer of dedication section. This is followed by analysis of the uses of the formulaic forms listed above, followed by discussions of some examples of *ל* when it is not rendered with the dative case or the preposition *εἰς*.

The Dative Case

According to *CGCG*, ‘the main function of the dative is to mark non-obligatory modifiers’.⁵ Of such modifiers, the dative regularly occurs to mark the indirect object of a verb. This is seen clearly in the way it is used to translate the preposition *ל* in the prayer of dedication section. For example, the dative occurs often with verbs of speaking to indicate the one(s) to whom the something is being said.⁶ The dative is used four times in the prayer of dedication in this scenario (2 Par 6:15, 16, 17 [twice; the second is in apposition to the first]). Similarly, the dative occurs regularly to identify the indirect object of the verb *δίδωμι*, ‘I give’, and its compound forms.⁷ This happens eight times in the prayer of dedication (2 Par 6:23 [twice], 25 [twice], 27, 30, 31, 38).

There are several cases of what is likely a ‘dative of advantage’ in the prayer of dedication.⁸ The dative is used for *ל* three times after the verb *φυλάσσω*, ‘I guard, keep’ (2 Par 6:14, 15, 16). Solomon praises God who keeps his covenant and mercy ‘for his servants’. Similarly, Solomon recounts God’s promise that ‘a man will not depart for you from before me’ (*Οὐκ ἐκλείψει σοι ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ προσώπου μου*), where the dative of advantage translates the ‘*ל* of benefit’ (2 Par 6:16).⁹

On five occasions, the dative case translates *ל* to mark the person sinned against with the verb *ἁμαρτάνω*, ‘I sin’ (2 Par 6:22, 24, 26, 36, 39). The instance in 2 Par 6:22 sees a dative article used to substantivize an adverb, *τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ*, ‘to his

⁴ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 44.

⁵ *CGCG*, §30.36.

⁶ *CGCG*, §30.37.

⁷ *CGCG*, §30.37.

⁸ *CGCG*, §30.49.

⁹ *DCH*, s.v. כרת.

neighbor’, for *יהגל*, ‘to his neighbor’. Three times the dative is used for *ל* to reference the thing for which Solomon anticipates God’s mercy (2 Par 6:25, 27, 39). There are examples of the ‘dative of means’ (2 Par 6:29 [twice]).¹⁰

The final two instances where a *ל* is translated with a dative are in identical relative clauses: *οὗ ἠκοδόμησα τῷ ὀνόματί σου*, ‘which I built for your name’ (2 Par 6:34, 38). One could argue for interpreting these as either ‘means’ or ‘circumstance’,¹¹ or perhaps even another category. What is clear, though, is that the dative is used naturally in these contexts.

The Preposition εἰς

The use of the preposition *εἰς* is not surprising as a semantic equivalent for *ל*, as the two have considerable semantic overlap. The Greek preposition *εἰς* is often used in a spatial sense, but it has extended meanings as well.¹² The preposition *εἰς*, as a translation of *ל*, is used in its spatial and abstract senses in the prayer of dedication.¹³ In the first instance of the preposition, *εἰς* is used in the abstract sense: *ἣν ἔδωκας τῷ λαῷ σου εἰς κληρονομίαν*, ‘which you gave to your people for an inheritance’ (2 Par 6:27). Similarly, Solomon poses a conditional statement where *εἰς* marks the ‘goal’:¹⁴ *ἐὰν δὲ ἐξέλθῃ ὁ λαός σου εἰς πόλεμον*, ‘if your people go out to battle’ (2 Par 6:34). The other two instances of *εἰς* for *ל* are spatial. In 2 Par 6:40, Solomon requests that God’s ear be ‘attentive towards the prayer of this place’ (*ἐπήκοα εἰς τὴν δέησιν τοῦ τόπου τούτου*). Solomon continues in 2 Par 6:41, ‘rise, Lord God, into your place of rest’ (*ἀνάστηθι, κύριε ὁ θεός, εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν σου*).

The Translation of מאל and ל with Other Infinitives

The preposition *ל* is regularly found attached to the infinitive construct form of a verb. Perhaps the most common combination of such is the formulaic *מאל*, ‘saying’, used after a finite verb of speaking to introduce the direct or reported speech. It is consistently translated with a form of the Greek participle *λέγων*, ‘saying’, and

¹⁰ *CGCG*, §30.44.

¹¹ *CGCG*, §30.44.

¹² *CGCG*, §31.8.

¹³ *CGCG*, §31.8.

¹⁴ *CGCG*, §31.8.

unsurprisingly, that holds true in all of 2 Par, including the two occurrences of לֵאמֹר in the prayer of dedication.¹⁵

There are 13 other instances in the prayer of dedication where the preposition לְ is attached to an infinitive construct. The infinitive construct with a prefixed לְ is rather versatile and can indicate several different functions for the infinitive.¹⁶ For all but three of these, the translator has used the genitive articular infinitive (τοῦ + infinitive). Whether the τοῦ + infinitive construction captures the possible meanings of לְ + infinitive is complicated. In general, the articular infinitive is simply a substantivized infinitive, functioning in some ways like the English gerund, that uses specific cases in line with the function of the substantivized infinitive in the sentence.¹⁷ Cowe considers this sort of translation decision to be evidence that a ‘literal translation technique’ has led to a ‘divergence from the accepted norms of Greek syntax’.¹⁸ In the LXX, τοῦ before an infinitive sometimes ‘appears to be serving as a grammatical marker of the attached infinitive in the manner of Engl. *to*’.¹⁹ At first, this seems to be a divergence from its typical use in Classical Greek after a ‘genitive-governing preposition or in an infinitive with final value’.²⁰ As such, there is no ‘functional opposition recognizable between a bare inf. and a τοῦ inf.’ in the LXX.²¹ There is some evidence, though, predating the LXX of this construction being used outside of its typical ‘genitive or ablative’ use in line with some ways it is used in the LXX.²² Ultimately, by the time Par was produced, the translator surely considered the genitive articular infinitive to function appropriately for a range of uses of the לְ + infinitive construction.

The translator does not include a translation of לֵלֶכְתָּ, ‘to go, walk’, in 6:31. Another instance not translated with the genitive articular infinitive is לְשׂוּם, ‘to set’, translated in 2 Par 6:20 with ἐπικληθῆναι, ‘to call on’. In contrast to the others, this instance is not a ‘purpose’ or ‘result’ infinitive. Since this should likely be considered a

¹⁵ According to Aitken, ‘Language of the Septuagint’, 122, ‘this feature is possible in Greek but its frequency in the Septuagint is generated by the Hebrew idiom’.

¹⁶ *IBHS*, §36.2.3c, ‘Infinitive clauses with לְ are of various types. Some of these types are analogous to those formed with other prepositions, that is, purpose, result, and temporal clauses. Others reflect the distinctiveness of the לְ combination, that is, gerundive, modal, and immanent clauses’.

¹⁷ *CGCG*, §51.38-49.

¹⁸ S. P. Cowe, ‘1 and 2 Supplements: To the Reader’, in *NETS*, 342-348, citing 343.

¹⁹ *SSG*, §30d.

²⁰ *SSG*, §69h.

²¹ *SSG*, §30d.

²² *SSG*, §30c-d. See also E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*, Band II.I Satzlehre (Berlin and Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1926) 322.

complementary infinitive, the translator has used the simple infinitive.²³ This is contextually appropriate and reflects the translator's sensitivity to the meaning of the text. He does not feel obligated to provide a translation for the ל with the infinitive, instead focusing on producing a rendering in Greek that communicates the meaning of the Hebrew construction. Likewise, the first occurrence of לתת, 'to give, put', in 2 Chr 6:23 is rendered with a simple infinitive, ἀποδοῦναι, 'to give back'. The use of this Hebrew infinitive is to indicate the means by which something will take place.²⁴ It is possible that the translator understood this as indicating purpose or result, and so he left the infinitive bare.²⁵

Other Translations of ל

In 2 Par 6:28, the translator has rendered לו, 'to him', with the accusative αὐτόν, 'him'. The Hebrew verb in this clause, צרר, means 'to wrap (up), envelop'. However, when in the Hiphil stem, often with the object preceded by ל, the word means 'to besiege'.²⁶ The Greek verb θλίβω takes an accusative object, which is, of course, normal. Instead of producing wooden, literal renderings for each lexeme, the translator has adapted his translation to the demands of the Greek language. As with the verb in 2 Chr 6:28, in 6:42 the verb זכר, 'to remember', can use the preposition ל to introduce the object. The translator, understanding that Greek does not demand a prepositional phrase here, translates the object of the verb μιμνήσκω, 'I remember', with the accusative τὰ ἐλέη, 'the mercies'.

In 2 Par 6:38, the translator renders לבית, 'to the house', with the genitive τοῦ οἴκου, 'of the house'. To understand the translator's decision here, careful attention should be given to the structure of the verse.

והתפללו דרך ארצם ... והעיר ... ולבית ...

And they pray in the direction of their land ... and the city ... and (they pray) towards the house ...

The noun דרך is the head noun in a construct chain with both ארצם and העיר. The preposition ל serves in way similar to דרך here, 'they pray in the direction ... and towards ...'. The translator seems to understand the similar function of דרך and ל, that

²³ See *CGCG*, §51.

²⁴ See *IBHS*, §36.2.3.e: 'gerundive, explanatory or expegetical'.

²⁵ On the final-consecutive infinitive, see *CGCG*, §51.16; *SSG*, §30ba.

²⁶ *DCH*, s.v. 'צרר'.

is, both refer to the direction in which the people pray. He uses *ὁδόν*, ‘way’, as the head noun for three genitives: *γῆς*, ‘of land’, *τῆς πόλεως*, ‘of the city’, and *τοῦ οἴκου*. In many ways, this simplifies the relationships in the text and clearly connects *οἴκου* to *ὁδόν*, the object of *προσεύχωνται*, ‘they might pray’, rather than segmenting *τοῦ οἴκου* off with a preposition. The translator has opted for a rendering that fits well contextually.

Conclusions for the Translation of the Preposition לְ

As seen above, the translator deals with the preposition לְ in the prayer of dedication with clear awareness of the context. For the most part, he handles the translation of the Hebrew preposition carefully, taking advantage of some flexible features in Greek, like the case system, in order to contextually render the preposition. He does not feel tied to replicating Hebrew prepositional phrases with Greek prepositional phrases, only doing so when it provides additional clarity. The translator, then, is more concerned with meaning than form in his rendering of the preposition לְ.

The Translation of פְּנֵי לְ

Since the Hebrew פְּנֵי לְ occurs eight times in the prayer of dedication passage, it is worth considering the variation in the translation of this preposition. Half of those occurrences are translated with *ἐναντίον*, ‘in front of’. According to Sollamo, the preposition *ἐναντίον* occurs at a higher frequency in the LXX than in other contemporary literature. This, however, does not mean that the use of the preposition is necessarily a Semitism. In fact, a more careful qualification is this: *ἐναντίον* is used in the LXX in ways similar to usage in other literature but may occur in uncommon syntactic situations in the LXX that are clearly reflective of the structure of the Hebrew text.²⁷ Each instance of *ἐναντίον* in the prayer of dedication is a translation of פְּנֵי לְ with an attached personal pronoun. As such, *ἐναντίον* is followed by a genitive personal pronoun when it occurs in this passage.

On two occasions in the prayer of dedication, פְּנֵי לְ is translated with *κατέναντι*, ‘facing’. This is a compound of *κατά* + *ἐναντι*. As *ἐναντι*, ‘before, in the presence of’, is ‘nearly synonymous with *ἐναντίον*’ in the LXX,²⁸ the compound form also finds semantic overlap with *ἐναντίον*. Therefore, the two occur in similar contexts. The two occurrences of *κατέναντι* are in 2 Par 6:22, 24 and in both instances there is a referent

²⁷ Sollamo, ‘Some “Improper” Prepositions’, 779-781

²⁸ Sollamo, ‘Some “Improper” Prepositions’, 780-781.

other than a personal pronoun. This is a noticeable difference when compared to the use of *ἐναντίον* in this passage. However, a cursory look at the use of *ἐναντίον* and *κατέναντι* in 2 Par outside of the prayer of dedication shows that this is likely not a ‘rule’ that the translator is following, as *κατέναντι* is at times used to translate *לפני* + a personal pronoun (for example, 2 Par 2:5) and *ἐναντίον* is used to translate *לפני* without a personal pronoun (for example, 2 Par 10:6). In fact, there is no clear distinction between the use of these two words (and others) for *לפני* in 2 Par, especially outside of this passage. Therefore, that *κατέναντι* translates *לפני* with a referent that is not a personal pronoun and *ἐναντίον* is used when the object of *לפני* is a personal pronoun in the prayer of dedication is probably a coincidence.

Once in the prayer of dedication, *מלפני*, ‘from before’, occurs and is translated with *ἀπὸ προσώπου μου*, ‘from my face’ (2 Par 6:16). The use of *ἀπό* or *ἐκ*, ‘from, out of’, with *προσώπου* to translate *מלפני* is fairly standard in the LXX. For the translator of 2 Par, *ἀπὸ προσώπου* is the preferred option for rendering *מלפני*, as he uses it for six of the eight occurrences of *מלפני* in 2 Par. According to Katrin Hauspie, *ἀπὸ προσώπου* does not occur ‘as a prepositional phrase ... outside the LXX’.²⁹ She claims that in using *ἀπὸ προσώπου* for *מלפני*, the translator has copied the Hebrew ‘on the formal level’ resulting in ‘a formally unusual expression’ that can still be considered acceptable ‘as long as the local sense’ rather than the causal sense of *ἀπό* is intended or, at least, understood.³⁰

The final occurrence of *לפני* in this passage is found in 6:36. In this occurrence, the translator uses *κατὰ πρόσωπον*, ‘according to a face’. As was the case with *κατέναντι* above, *κατὰ πρόσωπον* is another common rendering of *לפני*. The different options for *לפני* are seemingly used synonymously.³¹ In general, the translator seems to have certain tendencies for rendering the different combinations of words connected to or surrounding *לפני*, but he does not follow these tendencies in a mechanical fashion.

Παῖς and Δοῦλος as Translations of עבד

The Hebrew noun *עבד*, ‘servant, slave’, occurs 11 times in Solomon’s prayer of dedication. Of these 11, nine are translated with the Greek *παῖς*, ‘servant, slave’ (2 Par

²⁹ K. Hauspie, ‘Prepositional Phrases in the Septuagint of Ezekiel’, in *Scripture in Transition*, 89-105, citing 92.

³⁰ Hauspie, ‘Prepositional Phrases’, 93.

³¹ See Hauspie, ‘Prepositional Phrases’, 95.

6:14, 15, 16, 17, 19[2x], 20, 21, 27). The other two are translated with δοῦλος, ‘slave, servant’ (2 Par 6:23, 42). Jong-Hoon Kim has noted some observations on the translation of עבד in Sam-Kgs.³² According to Kim, the following can be observed: ‘Die Ur-Septuaginta unterscheidet je nach Redemodus: παῖς beschreibt die Zugehörigkeit von Menschen zu einem höher Gestellten, während δοῦλος als höflich-demütige (Selbst-)Bezeichnung verwendet wird’.³³ Kim suggests that δοῦλος is used most often in direct/reported speech, while παῖς most often occurs in descriptive narrative contexts. Benjamin G. Wright argues that while the earliest translations (like the Pentateuch) avoid δοῦλος, later translators used ‘words for slaves as they know them to be used in their contemporary socio-cultural environment’.³⁴ Given Wright’s claim, Par would either need to be proven to be roughly contemporary with the LXX Pentateuch (a tall task) or heavily influenced by the translation decisions of the LXX Pentateuch in order to explain the translator’s seeming avoidance of δοῦλος.³⁵ Arie van der Kooij claims that in secular literature παῖς is ‘a general term for servant or slave’ and δοῦλος refers to ‘someone unfree from the political point of view’.³⁶ For van der Kooij, this accounts for the infrequent usage of the latter in the Greek Pentateuch. In a similar study on OG Isaiah, van der Kooij observes παῖς as ‘servant, both of a king and of the Lord, conveying the connotation of someone holding a position of honour and glory’ and δοῦλος as ‘slave, referring in a number of passages ... to foreigners being subject to others, or alternatively, to someone having a lower status in comparison to παῖς’.³⁷ These claims should be assessed in light of the 11 occurrences of עבד in Solomon’s prayer of dedication.

³² See J.-H. Kim, ‘Die Wiedergabe von עבד mit δοῦλος oder παῖς in der Septuaginta der Samuel- und Königebücher’, in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, 391-403.

³³ Kim, ‘Die Wiedergabe von עבד’, 403. (‘The original Septuagint differentiates depending on the mode of speech: παῖς describes the belonging of people to someone of a higher rank, while δοῦλος is used as polite-humble (self-)designation’.)

³⁴ B. G. Wright, ‘Ebed/Doulos: Terms and Social Status in the Meeting of Hebrew Biblical and Hellenistic Roman Culture’, *Semeia* 83-84 (1998) 83-111, citing 107.

³⁵ As mentioned above in chapter 1, Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 22-23 uses the translation of עבד as evidence for the reliance of the translator of Par on the LXX Pentateuch.

³⁶ A. van der Kooij, ‘Servant or Slave?: The Various Equivalent of Hebrew ‘Ebed in the Septuagint of the Pentateuch’, in M. K. H. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Ljubljana, 2007* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008) 229-242, citing 240.

³⁷ A. van der Kooij, ‘Servant or Slave: The Various Equivalent of Hebrew ‘Ebed in the Old Greek of Isaiah’, in *Die Septuaginta – Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen*, 259-271, citing 269.

As stated above, it is the case in all of Par, and reflected clearly in the prayer of dedication section, that the translator prefers *παῖς* as a translation of *עבד* over *δοῦλος*.³⁸ In this section, all 11 of the occurrences of *עבד* are within reported speech, since this is a record of Solomon praying. The four times that *עבד* occurs in 2 Par 6:19-21 are all self-designated, that is, Solomon is referring to himself as *עבד*. All four of these are translated with forms of *παῖς*. Given Kim's claim, the expected translation here would be *δοῦλος*, for polite-humble self-designation.³⁹

The first instance of *δοῦλος* for *עבד* in this prayer section is found in 2 Par 6:23. The context here is quite negative, where *τοὺς δούλους* refers to those who sin and curse before the altar. Solomon calls on God: '... judge your slaves in order to render what is due to the lawless' (*κρινεῖς τοὺς δούλους σου τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι τῷ ἀνόμῳ*). Wright speculates that the translators of the Pentateuch may have avoided *δοῦλος* because it could be considered 'derogatory or insulting'.⁴⁰ This suggestion would account for the use of *δοῦλος* in 2 Par 6:23, given the negative context. However, it falls short of explaining the second occurrence of *δοῦλος* in the prayer of dedication. This second instance comes in 6:42, at the very end of the prayer of dedication. Solomon ends his prayer by asking the Lord to remember the mercies of David, 'your slave' (*τοῦ δούλου σου*). Just before this, Solomon referred to David as God's 'anointed one' (*τοῦ χριστοῦ σου*). Clearly, the context is not negative, as in 2 Par 6:23, so that cannot explain the use of *δοῦλος* here. Further, Solomon refers to David using *παῖς* instead of *δοῦλος* three times in this prayer section.⁴¹ This suggests the translator was not aiming for a consistent translation option in this section for *עבד* referring to David. This example also clearly disqualifies van der Kooij's semantic explanation that *δοῦλος* is used for a slave in a 'prisoner of war' situation. That is not to say that van der Kooij was incorrect concerning the Pentateuch and Isaiah. His claims, though, do not extend to the use of *παῖς* and *δοῦλος* in Par.

The translator of Par was not influenced here by the translation of Kgdms. In the parallel passage (3 Kgdms 8), the translator has a clear preference for *δοῦλος* as the

³⁸ There is actually a high concentration of the word *עבד* in this section, as it contains 11 of 71 occurrences in 1-2 Chron.

³⁹ Kim, 'Die Wiedergabe von *עבד*', 403. Kim does suggest that the Kaige recension of Kgdms drops this distinction, instead opting to distinguish between *παῖς* and *δοῦλος* based primarily on social status.

⁴⁰ Wright, 'Ebed/Doulos', 93.

⁴¹ Specifically, in 2 Par 6:15, 16, 17.

translation of עבד. In fact, when עבד occurs in Solomon's prayer of dedication in 3 Kgdms, it is either translated with δοῦλος or not translated at all.

One possible explanation for the translator's switching between παῖς and δοῦλος for עבד is the rhetorical device *variatio*.⁴² This feature is most noticeable when the 'variation' occurs in a short space,⁴³ but can also be found 'on a wider scale than the range of a few verses or a chapter or two'.⁴⁴ *Variatio* is quite common and easy to spot in a translated text when the reader has access to the source text, as a single word in the source is translated with multiple words in the target language.⁴⁵ While *variatio* would explain both instances of δοῦλος in 2 Par 6 better than the other options above, it does not necessarily account for the predominance of παῖς as the preferred translation of עבד. In fact, it would seem that if the translator was trying to produce 'variation', δοῦλος would occur more often than it does here. For example, παῖς occurs four times in 6:14-17 and four times in 6:19-21. In other words, if the translator deemed 'variation' to be necessary or stylistically important, one would expect it to occur in these verses with a high concentration of עבד. Of course, *variatio* does not necessitate some arbitrary number of occurrences of a given word option in order to be successful, but it would be more clearly evident if δοῦλος occurred with higher frequency.

Although it is true that both the Pentateuch and Par contain παῖς more than δοῦλος, this does not require that the translator of Par followed the translators of the Pentateuch. Even using Gerleman's statistics, δοῦλος occurs more in Par than in the Pentateuch, while Par has fewer uses of παῖς.⁴⁶ The Pentateuch, while considerably longer than Par, has five fewer occurrences of δοῦλος than Par. The fact that both παῖς and δοῦλος occur in nearly identical contexts in Par is evidence that the translator was not attempting to avoid δοῦλος. Thus, the argument that the translation of the Pentateuch influenced the uses of παῖς and δοῦλος in Par is insufficient to explain the occurrences in Par.

Wright offers the following conclusion regarding the translation of 'slave terms' in the LXX:

⁴² Lee, 'Translations of the Old Testament', 776-778.

⁴³ Lee, 'Translations of the Old Testament', 776.

⁴⁴ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 57.

⁴⁵ Lee, 'Translations of the Old Testament', 777; Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 84.

⁴⁶ Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 23. According to Gerleman, the Pentateuch has παῖς 102 times and δοῦλος three times. In Par, παῖς is used 58 times and δοῦλος is used eight times.

Jewish writers in the Second Temple period are using words for slaves as they know them to be used in their contemporary socio-cultural environment, that is, that the main terms for slaves can be roughly synonymous even though in individual uses some distinction of function might be intended.... *Doulos*, of course, appears with great frequency in the later translations where *all the major terms for slaves serve broadly as synonyms*.⁴⁷

While his conclusions do not account for the overwhelming preference towards *παῖς* in 2 Par 6, specifically his claim that later writings contain *δοῦλος* more regularly, through his insistence on the ‘increasing interchangeability of these terms for slaves’, Wright provides a viable explanation for the uses of *δοῦλος* in this passage.⁴⁸ Clearly stated, *δοῦλος* and *παῖς* are synonyms and the translator uses them interchangeably in the prayer of dedication in 2 Par 6. To account for the preference towards one word over the other, Lee offers helpful insight: ‘Individual speakers of a language like different words, without being able to say why, or even being conscious of making a choice’.⁴⁹

Δικαίωμα and Κρίμα as Translations of משפּט

The Hebrew *משפּט*, ‘judgment, justice’, occurs only twice in this passage. In 2 Par 6:35, the translator has rendered *משפּט* with *δικαίωμα*, ‘justice’. Just a few verses later, in 6:39, the translator uses *κρίμα*, ‘judgment’, to translate *משפּט*. In all of 2 Chr, this Hebrew noun occurs only 13 times. Eight of these are translated with *κρίμα*, four with *κρίσις*, ‘judgment’, and only once is *משפּט* translated with *δικαίωμα*.⁵⁰

Allen deals directly with the translation of *משפּט* in 2 Par 6 in his section ‘Different Gk for the same Heb words’.⁵¹ He attributes the translation decisions found here to a translator who is ‘not content to repeat his own Gk equivalent, but searches instead for an alternative way of expressing the original’, in this case, the use of a synonym.⁵² Of course, Allen is describing here the rhetorical practice of *variatio*. There is merit to the suggestion that the LXX translators do, at times, use different Greek

⁴⁷ Wright, ‘Ebed/Doulos’, 107-108 (emphasis added).

⁴⁸ Wright, ‘Ebed/Doulos’, 108.

⁴⁹ Lee, *Greek of the Pentateuch*, 42-43. Lee also states that ‘linguistic variation may be due to nothing more than personal taste’. See also D. Büchner, ‘“You Shall Not Give of Your Seed to Serve an Archon”: Lev 18,21 in the Septuagint’, in *Translating a Translation*, 183-196. Regarding a translation choice in Lev, Büchner, 189, claims that the rendering may have been done ‘without any communicative purpose in mind ... because it may simply be accounted for by his love for variation’. It should be noted that Büchner goes on to offer a better understanding, but the option still stands.

⁵⁰ Similarly, in 1 Chr there are nine occurrences of the Hebrew noun: six are rendered *κρίμα*, and three are rendered *κρίσις*.

⁵¹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 55.

⁵² Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 55. It is Allen’s suggestion that *κρίμα* and *δικαίωμα* are synonyms.

words for a single Hebrew word for stylistic purposes. What Allen's suggestion lacks, though, is 1) an explanation for why this alternative rendering occurs here when the translator does not use the same strategy in other sections of 2 Par where the Hebrew text has multiple occurrences of משפט in close proximity, and 2) rationale for the translator's use of δικαίωμα, which is only here a translation of משפט in Par, over κρίσις, which is more common than δικαίωμα.

There are two places in 2 Chr other than 2 Chr 6:35, 39 where משפט occurs multiple times within the span of a single chapter.⁵³ In 2 Chr 4, temple furnishings are discussed and twice (4:7, 20) משפט is used with reference to how the lamps were made for the temple. In both instances, the translator has used κρίμα. Given the nearly identical contexts and referents in the two verses, it is unsurprising that κρίμα is the translation of both, perhaps with the purpose of clearly linking the two descriptions.

The Hebrew משפט occurs three times in 2 Chr 19. In 2 Chr 19:6 and 19:8, משפט is translated with κρίσις. In 2 Chr 19:10, it is translated with κρίμα. While there is clear overlap in the meaning of these terms, the first two (2 Chr 19:6, 8) seem to more clearly reference judgment, particularly with/for the Lord. In contrast, משפט is used in 2 Chr 19:10 in the context of תורה, 'law', מצוה, 'commandment', and חק, 'statute'. Thus, the context is legal or juridical. Adding an additional layer to this discussion, outside of 2 Par 6:35, δικαίωμα shows up only one other time in all of Par; that occurrence is here in 2 Par 19:10 as the translation of חק.

The Semantics of Κρίμα, Κρίσις, and Δικαίωμα and Their Relation to משפט

Having surveyed the statistical translation data, it is now important to explore the nuances of each of these equivalents for משפט in 2 Par.⁵⁴ According to Hertrich, the meaning of משפט changed over the course of its use in the Old Testament and it ranges in usage from a legal term meaning 'judgment' to a relational term with 'ethical and religious meaning'.⁵⁵ The complexity of the Hebrew term is important to consider in attempting to understand its translations into Greek. The table below contains the

⁵³ Of course, the translator was not working with chapter and verse numbers, but they are useful to create boundaries for the present analysis.

⁵⁴ For a brief survey of this topic, see S. H. Blank, 'The LXX Renderings of Old Testament Terms for Law', *HUCA* 7 (1930) 259-283, esp. 270-275. See also Aitken, *No Stone Unturned*, 107: 'Appreciation of the translation technique and of the selection of words by the translators can only happen once the meanings and connotations of the words are known'.

⁵⁵ V. Hertrich, 'The OT Term משפט', *TDNT* 3:923-933, esp. 927.

English glosses for κρίμα, κρίσις, and δικάϊωμα from three lexicons commonly used in biblical studies.

Table 5.1

κρίμα, κρίσις, and δικάϊωμα in *GELS*, *BrillDAG*, and *BDAG*

	κρίμα	κρίσις	δικαίωμα
<i>GELS</i>	1) 'law-suit' 2) 'sentence' 3) 'just, fair decision' 4) 'justice as a moral quality or principle' 5) 'injunction to be observed' 6) 'that which rightly belongs to sbd [somebody]' 7) 'fair claim' 8) 'rule of conduct and practice accepted as generally applicable' ⁵⁶	1) 'acting as judge' 2) 'sentence' 3) 'a decision taken' 4) 'an act of uprightness' 5) 'moral, ethical integrity' 6) 'a court proceeding' 7) 'standing in society' 8) 'interpretation' 9) 'decisive settling of an issue' 10) 'contention and dispute' ⁵⁷	1) 'ordinance' 2) 'state of not being guilty' 3) 'that which one can rightfully claim as one's share and entitlement' 4) 'act which is just and fair' ⁵⁸
<i>BrillDAG</i>	1) 'matter for judgment, question' 2) 'litigation, lawsuit, action' 3) 'decision, judgment' 4) 'condemnation, sentence' 5) 'judging, judgment' 6) 'decree, resolution' 7) 'prescription, law' 8) 'justice, right' ⁵⁹	1) 'separating' 2) 'choice' 3) 'judgment' 4) 'capacity for judgment, discernment' 5) 'interpretation' 6) 'judgment, trial' 7) 'charge' 8) 'condemnation' 9) 'justice' 10) 'outcome, resolution' 11) 'dispute, quarrel, contest' 12) 'class, category' 13) 'crisis, critical phase' ⁶⁰	1) 'act of justice' 2) 'reparation' 3) 'claim of a right, just complaint' 4) 'judgment, sentence, penalty' 5) 'ordinance, decree' 6) 'justification' 7) 'rectitude' ⁶¹
<i>BDAG</i>	1) 'dispute, lawsuit' 2) 'decision, decree' 3) 'judging, judgment'	1) 'judging, judgment' 2) 'court' 3) 'right' ⁶³	1) 'regulation, requirement, commandment'

⁵⁶ *GELS*, s.v. 'κρίμα'.

⁵⁷ *GELS*, s.v. 'κρίσις'.

⁵⁸ *GELS*, s.v. 'δικαίωμα'.

⁵⁹ *BrillDAG*, s.v. 'κρίμα'.

⁶⁰ *BrillDAG*, s.v. 'κρίσις'.

⁶¹ *BrillDAG*, s.v. 'δικαίωμα'.

⁶³ *BDAG*, s.v. 'κρίσις'.

	4) 'judicial verdict' 5) 'justice' ⁶²		2) 'righteous deed' ⁶⁴
--	---	--	-----------------------------------

Muraoka's (*GELS*) glosses are careful approximations of contextually appropriate renderings of these Greek words in the LXX. While helpful for translation, this strategy neglects engagement with extrabiblical sources. Even so, this does help display the overlap in the meanings for these terms, especially *κρίμα* and *κρίσις*. In addition, Muraoka provides a survey of the way that these terms are used in the LXX. While BDAG does include reference to ancient works outside of Bible, it is mostly focused on English glosses for study and interpretation of the New Testament. Montanari's *BrillDAG* is quite thorough, providing English glosses for Greek words based on their contexts in all types of literature, including the LXX and New Testament, but not for the sole purpose of providing glosses for words only in the LXX or New Testament contexts. Each of these three can be helpful in determining the meaning of words, but it is important to keep in mind the purpose or aims of each lexicon.⁶⁵

According to Moisés Silva, the terms *κρίμα* and *κρίσις* are quite similar in meaning in the LXX. Both mean 'decision' or 'judgment', but in the LXX, as both terms render *טפשמ*, they take on an additional sense, 'commandment' or 'law'.⁶⁶ The frequency of *κρίμα* in the LXX is 'in striking contrast to its rare use' outside of the Bible.⁶⁷ Further, he claims, 'where *טפשמ* refers to a *legal* judgment or the like, the LXX normally transl. with *κρίμα* ... or *κρίσις*'.⁶⁸ Silva's observations are consistent with the information gathered from the lexicons (see Table 5.1 above). Silva describes the use of *δικαίωμα* in the LXX as being of 'special interest', rarely rendering *קדצ*, and in the LXX mostly meaning 'commandment, ordinance, decree' as a rendering of *קח* and its cognates and *טפשמ* when used in the sense of 'commandment'.⁶⁹ This use, according to Silva, should be seen as a Semitism,⁷⁰ as outside of the LXX, *δικαίωμα* usually means "judgment," esp. in the negative sense of "condemnation, penalty, punishment" in the context of 'setting something right'.⁷¹ According to Quell, the frequent translation of

⁶² BDAG, s.v. 'κρίμα'.

⁶⁴ BDAG, s.v. 'δικαίωμα'.

⁶⁵ Bons, *Historical and Theological Lexicon*, would be quite helpful for this study. Unfortunately, only the first volume of four is currently available.

⁶⁶ M. Silva (ed.), 'κρίνω', *NIDNTE* 2:744-750, citing 745-746.

⁶⁷ Silva (ed.), 'κρίνω', *NIDNTE* 2:745.

⁶⁸ M. Silva (ed.), 'δικαιοσύνη', *NIDNTE* 1:723-741, citing 726 (emphasis added).

⁶⁹ Silva (ed.), 'δικαιοσύνη', *NIDNTE* 1:726.

⁷⁰ Silva (ed.), 'δικαιοσύνη', *NIDNTE* 1:726.

⁷¹ Silva (ed.), 'δικαιοσύνη', *NIDNTE* 1:724.

משפט with κρίμα and κρίσις does ‘only partial justice’ to the meaning of משפט by laying ‘the emphasis on its active sense as an act of judgment’ when δίκη and its cognates ‘best express the character of משפט ... as a norm’.⁷² Some examples of δικαίωμα in Aristotle will be helpful in this discussion. In *Nic. Eth.* 5.7.7, Aristotle says δικαίωμα δὲ τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος, ‘δικαίωμα is the correction of an injustice’. Similarly in *Rhet.* 1373b, he juxtaposes ἀδικήματα and δικαιώματα, ‘unjust acts’ and ‘just acts’, in the context of righting a wrong.⁷³

Analyzing the Translations of משפט in 2 Par

In this section, the uses of משפט outside of the prayer of dedication will be considered before moving on to the two examples within 2 Chr 6.

In 2 Chr 4:7, 20; 8:14; 30:16; 35:13 משפט is used to indicate order or specification.⁷⁴ The lampstands in 2 Chr 4:7, 20 are made כמשפט, ‘according to specification’ or ‘as prescribed’. Solomon, in 2 Chr 8:14, set up the divisions of the priests כמשפט דויד, ‘as specified by David’. In 2 Chr 30:16, the priests took their positions כמשפטם, ‘as ordered/specified’. The Passover lamb is roasted כמשפט, ‘as prescribed’, in 2 Chr 35:13. Three of these instances are translated with κρίμα (2 Chr 4:7, 20; 30:16) and two with κρίσις (2 Chr. 8:14; 35:13). As indicated above by Table 5.1, neither κρίμα nor κρίσις typically communicate what משפט is communicating in these passages. It is not that the resulting translation is nonsensical, but it does fail to carefully render the contextual meaning of משפט. In addition, the use of κρίμα and κρίσις introduces a legal or juridical meaning that is not communicated in these contexts with משפט. As such, LES has done well by rendering each instance in these three examples as ‘according to the/their judgment’.⁷⁵ This translation decision in LES preserves some of the awkwardness of rendering משפט with κρίμα.

On three occasions in 2 Chr (7:17; 19:10; 33:8), משפט refers to ‘rules’ or ‘commands’. In all three verses, משפט is used in close proximity to חק, ‘statutes’. In each of these, משפט has been rendered κρίμα. As seen above in Table 5.1, these are

⁷² G. Quell, ‘δίκη, δίκαιος, κτλ’, *TDNT* 2:174-178, esp. 174-175.

⁷³ See also Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1359a.

⁷⁴ In each of these instances משפט is immediately preceded by the preposition כ, ‘according to specification’ or ‘as specified’.

⁷⁵ NETS has rendered the 4:7, 20 with ‘according to their prescription’ and ‘as prescribed’ respectively, 8:14 with ‘according to David’s judgment’, 30:16 with ‘according to their judgment’, and 35:13 with ‘according to the rule’. While at least the first two more accurately communicate the Hebrew text, they gloss over the constraints of κρίμα, smoothing out the translation.

instances in which *δικαίωμα*, in the LXX sense of ‘ordinance’, would likely more clearly communicate the meaning of *משפט*. This is, of course, in contrast to typical Greek usage as described by Silva, but it is more consistent with the use in the LXX.⁷⁶ Given that *משפט* is used with *קה* in these passages, it is unsurprising that the translator did not use *δικαίωμα*, as it is typically used to translate *קה*. However, only in one of these verses (2 Par 19:10) does the translator actually use *δικαίωμα* for *קה*, opting for *πρόσταγμα*, ‘order, command’, in the other two verses. Of course, he would need an alternate translation choice for *משפט* if *קה* was consistently translated with *δικαίωμα*, but that is not the case in 2 Par. Again, preserving the awkwardness of the translation decision, LES has rendered *κρίμα* with ‘judgment’ in these three verses.

The uses of *משפט* in 2 Chr 9:8; 19:6, 8 contain some overlap in meaning. In these three verses, *משפט* refers to ‘judgment’ or ‘justice’. In 2 Chr 9:8, the queen of Sheba proclaims that God made Solomon king over Israel *לעשות משפט וצדקה*, ‘to do/execute justice and righteousness’ (*τοῦ ποιῆσαι κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνη*). This is the only instance in 2 Chr where *משפט* and *צדקה* occur together, though the pairing of the two is common in the Hebrew Bible. Here, the translator uses *κρίμα* for *משפט* as the *δίκη* word group is standardly used for *צדק* and its cognates.⁷⁷ As mentioned above, citing Quell, *κρίμα* only tells part of the story here, as it places ‘the emphasis on ... an act of judgment’ whereas *משפט* and *צדק* are more formulaic for ‘justice’ and ‘righteousness’.⁷⁸ The two examples in 2 Chr 19 both clearly refer to ‘judgment’. For both of these, the translator uses *κρίσις*. These two are, perhaps, the most contextually appropriate translations of *משפט* in 2 Par.

Having established the range of translations for *משפט* in 2 Par, the final two occurrences, found in the prayer of dedication passage, can be analyzed. In these two examples (2 Chr 6:35, 39), *משפט* occurs in the same context: Solomon prays that the Lord will hear the prayer and the plea of his people *ועשית משפטם*, ‘and maintain/uphold their cause’.⁷⁹ As mentioned above, the translator has used *δικαίωμα* in 2 Par 6:35 and *κρίμα* in 2 Par 6:39. The suggestion by Allen that this is simply *variatio* should be

⁷⁶ Silva (ed.), ‘δικαιοσύνη’, *NIDNTTE* 1:724-726.

⁷⁷ Quell, ‘δίκη, δίκαιος, κτλ’, *TDNT* 2:174-175.

⁷⁸ Quell, ‘δίκη, δίκαιος, κτλ’, *TDNT* 2:174-175.

⁷⁹ For some examples of English translations, NIV: ‘uphold’; ESV, NASB, NRSV: ‘maintain’; NET: ‘vindicate them’.

considered,⁸⁰ but needs to be tested against other options, especially considering that *δικαίωμα* is so rare in 2 Par.

While the context of *משפט* in each of these verses is similar, the surrounding context is a bit different. In 2 Chr 6:34-35, Solomon's prayer concerns God's people going out to battle against an enemy, praying to God, and God hearing and responding by carrying out their *משפט*. In contrast, 2 Chr 6:36-39 is concerned with God's people sinning and repenting, praying and pleading to God. In this context, Solomon prays that God would carry out their *משפט* and forgive them. Even though repentance is mentioned here, the context of 2 Chr 6:39 can be seen as more negative in general than that of 2 Chr 6:35. More clearly, it could be that the translator read 2 Chr 6:39 as Solomon asking God to carry out judgment (because of the sin), but also to forgive the people. Worth noting is that Par lacks a translation of the personal pronoun from *משפטם* here, perhaps indicating that it is not 'their' *משפט* that the Lord should administer, but *משפט* in the sense of 'judgment'. If the translator is reading 2 Chr 6:39 in this way, the use of the more negative judgment term *κρίμα* makes more sense. However, this assumes that the translator is being more deliberate with contextualizing his translation here than we have seen in his other renderings of *משפט* in 2 Par. This conclusion also assumes that the translator considered *δικαίωμα* to be a more positive term for 'judgment' or 'justice'. While *δικαίωμα* can have positive implications, this is usually in the context of 'correcting a wrong', as in Aristotle's definition in *Nic. Eth.* 5.7.7. The context of 2 Chr 6:35 concerns prayers for a prosperous battle, with no relation to 'correcting a wrong'. Therefore, the translator uses *δικαίωμα* in a context that is neither consistent with normal LXX usage nor the typical meaning of the word outside of the LXX.

In light of the discussion above, I will propose three options for understanding the use of *δικαίωμα* and *κρίμα* for *משפט* in 2 Par 6. The first, and least likely, option is that the translator was not overly concerned with style or semantics. In this view, there is little (or even no) conscious decision made to vary the terms for *משפט* in the prayer of dedication. This option is only mentioned because this is regularly an option when dealing with LXX translation decisions. The second option is to follow Allen's conclusion that the translator varied his approach to *משפט* in this passage for stylistic or rhetorical purposes. While this is certainly a possibility, it lacks coherence with his

⁸⁰ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 55.

methods for dealing with **משפט** elsewhere. Particularly concerning is Allen’s suggestion that *δικαίωμα* and *κρίμα* are synonymous terms.⁸¹ There may be some merit to this suggestion if one is only examining the use of the terms in the LXX, but even there, the terms are not as similar as Allen seems to suggest.⁸² The third option is that the translator felt that the context of the two verses demanded a different term be used for **משפט**. Whether the terms chosen accurately communicate what the translator intended is a different matter. With this approach, the translator would not have simply employed the rhetorical device *variatio*. The use of two different terms for one Hebrew word would have been semantically, not stylistically, motivated. The rarity of *δικαίωμα* not only as a translation of **משפט** but also in Par as a whole would suggest that the translator did not ‘accidentally’ choose it as a rendering here. While either of the latter two options are possible explanations for the translations of **משפט** in 2 Par 6, option three offers a simple, viable conclusion for these translations.

The Translation of **סלח**

On five occasions in Solomon’s prayer of dedication, the Hebrew verb **סלח**, ‘to forgive’, occurs.⁸³ Each time, **סלח** is a Qal perfect 2nd person singular in a *waw* + perfect construction. While Hebrew grammarians take several approaches to this construction, we will follow the explanation offered by Joüon-Muraoka, treating these as functionally successive, ‘mainly used for future action subsequent to another action’.⁸⁴ The translator deals with these verbs in two ways, even though the Hebrew forms are the same each time. As was the case with translating **עבד**, one of these methods for dealing with **סלח** seems to be preferred over the other. Four of the five instances of **סלח** (again, all **וסלחת**) are translated *ἰλεως ἔσῃ* (nominative adjective + future indicative 2nd person singular of *εἰμί*), ‘you will be merciful’.⁸⁵ This is not without precedent in ancient literature. In a papyrus fragment from the early second century BCE, *εἰ μὲν ἔτι οἱ θεοὶ εἰλωσ⁸⁶ αὐτοῖς ἐστίν* (‘If indeed the gods are still merciful towards them’) is found.⁸⁷ In 2 Par 6:30, the translator has opted instead for *ἰλάσῃ* (future indicative 2nd person singular of

⁸¹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 55.

⁸² Again, see table 5.1.

⁸³ 2 Chr 6:21, 25, 27, 30, 39. This verb only shows up one other time in all of 2 Chr (7:14).

⁸⁴ JM, §119c.

⁸⁵ 2 Par 6:21, 25, 27, 39.

⁸⁶ *εἰλωσ* is a form of *ἰλεως*.

⁸⁷ P.Tebt. 3.1.750, lines 12-13.

ἰλάσκομαι), ‘you will be merciful’. Allen suggests that this reading is the result of parablepsis where ἰλεως ἔσῃ became ἰλεση which became ἰλάση.⁸⁸

As the translator approached חָלַס, he was clearly not influenced by the Pentateuch. Of the 20 occurrences of this Hebrew verb in the Pentateuch, 13 are translated with ἀφίημι, ‘to let go, forgive’, which is not found in Par as a translation for חָלַס. The construction most commonly found in Par (ἰλεως + εἰμί) is only found once in the Pentateuch. In contrast, 3 Kgdms has ἰλεως ἔσῃ for חָלַס each time the latter occurs, including the use in the 3 Kgdms 8:39, which parallels 2 Par 6:30. There are three occurrences of ἰλάσκομαι for חָלַס in 4 Kgdms. However, none of these are translations of the *waw* + perfect form חָלַסוּ.

Whereas the translation of עָבַד seemed to more closely reflect the Pentateuch over Kgdms, the translation of חָלַס reflects Kgdms over the Pentateuch. That is not to say that in either situation the translator of Par was directly influenced by either the Pentateuch or Kgdms. In fact, the more likely conclusion regarding the translation of חָלַס is similar to that of עָבַד. The translator saw both ἰλεως ἔσῃ and ἰλάση as options for translating חָלַסוּ, likely considering the two to be synonymous.

Ἀκούω and Its Compound Forms as Translations of שָׁמַע

The Hebrew verb שָׁמַע, ‘to hear’, occurs 12 times in Solomon’s prayer of dedication and is translated with three different Greek forms: ἐπακούω, ‘I hear, listen to’ (1x), ἀκούω, ‘I hear’ (5x), and εἰσακούω, ‘I hear, listen to’ (6x). Generally, these three Greek terms could be considered roughly synonymous. Paul Danove has suggested that both εἰσακούω and ἐπακούω (along with ὑπακούω) are marked for +response, which would indicate ‘a preference for these verbs over ἀκούω when the presence of a response is to be stressed’.⁸⁹ There is, of course, no differentiation in the Hebrew term used, as שָׁמַע can communicate ‘hear, listen to’ and ‘hear (and respond to)’.⁹⁰ The translation of שָׁמַע in Solomon’s prayer of dedication will be assessed below in order to determine whether a distinction is intended by the translator.

The first two occurrences of שָׁמַע in the prayer of dedication are infinitive construct with the ל preposition (לְשָׁמַע, ‘to hear’). Both are translated with the τοῦ +

⁸⁸ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 46.

⁸⁹ P. Danove, ‘A Comparison of the Usage of ἀκούω and ἀκούω-Compounds in the Septuagint and New Testament’, *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 14 (2001) 65-85, citing 84.

⁹⁰ *DCH*, s.v. ‘שָׁמַע’.

infinitive construction. In the first instance, found in 2 Par 6:19, the translator uses τοῦ ἐπακοῦσαι, ‘to hear’, with the object of the hearing being τῆς δεήσεως καὶ τῆς προσευχῆς, ‘the request and the prayer’.⁹¹ Given Danove’s suggestion about response, it would seem logical to suggest that Solomon is praying to God, anticipating that God will not only hear, but respond. However, this idea loses traction when the translation of the second infinitive construct is examined. In the very next verse (2 Par 6:20), the infinitive construct is found again. Here, though, the translator opts for τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι, ‘to hear’. The context here is similar to that of the previous verse. The object of Solomon’s request that God would hear is τῆς προσευχῆς, ‘the prayer’. Given the similarity in objects, one would expect that the same translation would be given for שמע. Here, it seems most likely that the translator considered ἀκούω and ἐπακούω as synonymous, as there is no clear distinction between the two. A possible explanation for the use of ἐπακούω in 2 Par 6:19 is that the translation here is rhetorically or euphonicly motivated. The compound ἐπακοῦσαι might be meant to mimic the ἐπ sound of first verb in the verse, ἐπιβλέψῃ, ‘you will look’. This will be considered along with other rhetorical features found in 2 Par 6:19 in the section below entitled ‘The Structure and Rhetoric of 2 Par 6:19’.

Of the remaining 10 occurrences of שמע in Solomon’s prayer of dedication, six are translated with εἰσακούω. In each of these instances, εἰσακούω is a translation of the imperfect form שמעת, ‘you will hear’. Further, these six instances are the only instances of שמע in the imperfect tense in the prayer of dedication. The Hebrew verb שמע in the imperfect tense is found elsewhere in 2 Chr 7:14 and is also translated with εἰσακούω.⁹² The examples of εἰσακούω in the prayer of dedication are found in 2 Par 6:21, 23, 25, 27, 30, and 33. In each, the imperfect שמעת is used (rather than the regular waw + perfect in this section) because the clause begins with ואתה, ‘and you’, redundantly stating the subject implied by the verb.⁹³ The translator renders each of these imperfect verbs with the future εἰσακούσῃ, ‘you will hear’.

⁹¹ For a helpful discussion of the impact of the case of the object with ἀκούω, see K. Hauspie, ‘Ἀκούω dans le livre d’Ézéchiel: Étude sémantique en vue d’une traduction française et anglaise’, in F. G. Martínez and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005) 177-192.

⁹² There is a waw + imperfect instance of שמע in 2 Chr 20:9, which is translated with the future ἀκούσῃ.

⁹³ In all but one of these, the translator provides καὶ σὺ, ‘and you’, for ואתה, ‘and you’. In 6:33, the translator omits the nominative pronoun σὺ.

Aside from the infinitive in 2 Par 6:20, there are four occurrences of ἀκούω. Each of these four are translations of the *waw* + perfect *שמעו*, ‘and you will hear’. The translator renders these with the future ἀκούση, ‘you will hear’. These can be found in 2 Par 6:21 (2x), 35, and 39. As was the case with the infinitives discussed above, in one instance (2 Par 6:35) the object of the ‘hearing’ is τῆς δεήσεως αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς προσευχῆς αὐτῶν, ‘their request and their prayer’. Therefore, the suggestion that there is an implication of an anticipated response would lead to an expectation for a compound form, rather than the simple ἀκούω. This further reinforces that the translator is not using the compound forms to indicate that a response is expected, as Danove suggests.

Given the evidence, it seems that the translator’s choice for rendering שמע was motivated by the tense of the Hebrew verb, rather than being affected by contextual semantic or syntactic demands. The imperfect form שמעת is highly concentrated in this prayer of dedication passage, but is used quite rarely outside of this section. The rarity of this form in 2 Chr likely influenced the translator’s decision for rendering the verb in these instances. He likely chose to reflect the tense shift in Hebrew with a lexical shift in Greek because there would be no tense shift in Greek between the imperfect and the *waw* + perfect following an imperfect in Hebrew. Both of these Hebrew tenses communicate ‘future action’, so the translator renders both with Greek futures. To reflect the tense shift in Hebrew, the translator uses ἀκούω for the Hebrew perfect and εἰσακούω for the Hebrew imperfect.

The only additional occurrence of εἰσακούω in 2 Par is found in 34:21, where the translator has read שמעו where the MT has שמרו. The translator here uses the aorist εἰσήκουσαν for the Hebrew perfect. Contextually, the aorist works well for the Hebrew perfect, and this decision is made with regularity.⁹⁴ What is striking, though, is that outside of this example, εἰσακούω occurs only in the future tense as a translation of the Hebrew imperfect. This is even more striking when considered against the prayer of dedication in 2 Par 6 and the other instance in 2 Par 7:14, where εἰσακούω seemed to have been chosen to reflect in some way the switch from the *waw* + perfect to the imperfect. That the translator used εἰσακούω when translating a perfect in 2 Par 34:21 is inconsistent with the use of εἰσακούω in 2 Par 6-7.

⁹⁴ See Good, *Septuagint’s Translation*, 205.

The Structure and Rhetoric of 2 Par 6:19

There are several peculiarities in 2 Par 6:19. One, discussed above, has to do with the translation of *שמע* with *ἐπακούω*, a surprising decision given the rare nature of *ἐπακούω*. As briefly mentioned above, this may have been a decision motivated by the use of *ἐπιβλέπω*, ‘I look upon’, in the beginning of the verse. If this is the case, it could be considered a type of *anaphora*. Lee defines *anaphora* as the ‘repetition of the same word(s) at the beginning of successive clauses’.⁹⁵ Even though there is not the repetition of a *word* here, the use of the preposition *ἐπί* in the compound verbs is repetitive.

Another interesting choice made by the translator is the use of *δέησις*, ‘request’, for both *תחנה*, ‘plea’, and *רנה*, ‘cry’. Although only nine of the 33 occurrences of *רנה* in the LXX are rendered with *δέησις*, this is the most common translation option. Six of these nine are in Psalms, two are in Jeremiah, and one is in 2 Par. In the verse parallel to 2 Par 6:19 in 3 Kgdms (8:28), the translator uses *τέρψις*, ‘joy’, for *רנה*.⁹⁶ With some regularity, *δέησις* renders *תחנה* (~13 of the 25 occurrences), with a high concentration (~six of 13) in Solomon’s prayer of dedication in 3 Kgdms. From a purely semantic perspective, *δέησις* more accurately renders *תחנה* than *רנה*, though both are regularly attested. It is striking, though, that the translator has chosen *δέησις* for both words in a single verse, especially when other options for each were available. Although a simple misreading should be considered as an explanation for what has happened here, the fact that *רנה* is rendered with *δέησις* nine times shows some level of equivalence in the minds of the translators.

To complicate matters, there are two instances in the prayer of dedication in which *δέησις* renders *תפלה*, ‘prayer’, which is usually translated with *προσευχή*, ‘prayer’. The first instance, in 2 Par 6:35, is rather simple to deal with. The Hebrew text has *ואת־תחנונתם ואת־תפלתם*, ‘their prayer and their plea’, as the objects of the verb *ושמע*, ‘and you will hear’. Par simply has the inverted word order, rendering the objects as *τῆς δεήσεως αὐτῶν καὶ τῆς προσευχῆς αὐτῶν*, ‘their request and their prayer’.⁹⁷ While this is no cause for major concern, it is odd that these terms are switched here.

⁹⁵ Lee, ‘Translations of the Old Testament’, 779.

⁹⁶ The Hebrew *רנה* can be a cry of joy or of lament, so it seems the translator of 3 Kgdms understands it to refer to the former. See Matlock, *Discovering the Traditions*, 68, who sees this as a translation decision that ‘enhances Solomon’s position in the text by indicating his joy in praying to his Lord and by elevating his religious piety’.

⁹⁷ The translator of 3 Kgdms has made the same decision in the parallel verse there. However, the influence of 3 Kgdms on the translator of 2 Par in this verse is unlikely, considering the two have gone in different directions with the translation of several other words here.

Not only has a standard rendering been established prior to this verse, but when תפלה and תחנה occur together elsewhere in this passage, תפלה comes first. More striking is the translation of תפלה with δέσις in 2 Par 6:40.⁹⁸ Here, תפלה is not used as a double object of a verb with תחנה. Given that there is some semantic overlap between δέσις and προσευχή, it is fair to conclude that the translator did not follow his previously established standard equivalents in 2 Par 6:19.

One possible explanation for both the translation of שמע with ἐπακούω and the double use of δέσις is that the translator was highlighting *chiasmus*.

A καὶ ἐπιβλέψη

B ἐπὶ τὴν προσευχὴν παιδός σου

C καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν δέσιν μου

D κύριε ὁ θεός, τοῦ ἐπακοῦσαι

C^I τῆς δεήσεως

B^I καὶ τῆς προσευχῆς, ἧς ὁ παῖς σου προσεύχεται

A^I ἐναντίον σου σήμερον

This is probably best described as a loose form of *chiasmus*, since there are not *exact* parallels at every point. However, some of the translation decisions in this verse make the most sense if the translator was in some way attempting to mirror or parallel certain ideas. If this is the case, the repetition of the ἐπί sound in A, B, C, and D would highlight the beginning and pivot point of the *chiasmus*.

In a way, this proposed example of *chiasmus* in 2 Par 6:19 mirrors the structure present in 2 Chr 6:19.

A ופנית

B אלתפלת עבדך

C ואלתחנתו

D יהוה אלהי לשמע

C^I אלהרנה

B^I ואלהתפלה אשר עבדך מתפלל

A^I לפניך

Because of the lexical connection between the verb פנה, ‘turn’, and לפני, ‘before’,⁹⁹ 2 Chr A and A^I mirror one another more clearly than the same points in 2 Par. This is not

⁹⁸ See Hanhart, *Paralipomenon*, 69, on the possibility of προσευχή for δέσις here.

⁹⁹ Of course, this is formed from ל + the noun form פנה.

to say that there is no connection between A and A^I in 2 Par. The connection is found in meaning rather than form ('look upon' that which is 'before you'). For C and C^I, the connection is made more explicit in 2 Par than in 2 Chr due to the translator's use of *δέησις* for both *תחנה* and *רנה*. In the end, the structure of 2 Par 6:19 builds on the loose *chiasmus* of 2 Chr 6:19.¹⁰⁰

If 2 Par 6:19 is not an example of *chiasmus*, then the translation decisions made could still point to a simple paralleling of parts of the verse. This would also be marked by both the repetition of the preposition *ἐπί* on the compound verbs and the use of *δέησις*. Either way, the translation of 2 Par 6:19 exhibits features that are best explained by rhetorically (or perhaps more precisely, euphonically) motivated translation decisions resulting in a loose *chiasmus* or, at the very least, clear parallelism. Allen offers a different option for the use of *δέησις*. Concerning this example and others like it, Allen suggests, 'If the meaning can be [sic] adequately brought out simply by repeating a word, why should he make the effort to ransack his vocabulary for another word?'¹⁰¹ In other words, Allen sees the use of *δέησις* to translate two different Hebrew words as an easy option when the translator is not in an 'active frame of mind'.¹⁰² While Allen's conclusion neglects the other features of 2 Par 6:19 pointed out above, it should still be considered as an option, as the translator has made similar decisions elsewhere.¹⁰³

The euphony goes beyond what is mentioned above. In addition to the repetition of *ἐπ* sounds in A-D, there is end rhyming with line B and line C. A different end rhyme comes to line D and line B^I. Some of this is motivated by direct translation, but is worth noting, nonetheless. This is a rich, important verse. Perhaps this led the translator towards creativity in his rendering.

Pluses, Minuses, and Various Other Changes

2 Par 6:15

The first plus in this passage occurs in 2 Par 6:15, where Par has the participle *λέγων*, 'saying', after *ἐλάλησας αὐτῷ*, 'you spoke to him'. This participle is used regularly to indicate that what follows is the content of reported speech, usually preceded by an

¹⁰⁰ It would be difficult, and likely impossible, to prove that the translator consciously made his decision with the goal of producing or enhancing a chiasmic structure for this verse. It is more likely that this is a matter of euphony, where the translator may have made certain decisions that were pleasing to the ear. These euphonic choices may have been such because they highlighted a paralleling structure. For a discussion of euphony in written literature in the ancient world, see Mulrone, *Translation Style*, 79-84.

¹⁰¹ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 53-54.

¹⁰² Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 54.

¹⁰³ See Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 53-55 for other examples.

indicative verb of speaking. In the LXX, λέγων is most often a direct translation of the Hebrew לאמר, ‘saying’, which functions in the same way. The addition of λέγων in 2 Par 6:15 seems to occur due to interference from 2 Par 6:16 with which 2 Par 6:15 shares some similarities.

15 אשר שמרת לעבדך דויד אבי את אשר דברת לו ותדבר בפיו ובידך מלאת כיום הזה:

16a ועתה יהוה אלהי ישראל שמר לעבדך דויד אבי את אשר דברת לו לאמר

In the text above, the similar phrases are underlined. If this is a case of homoioteleuton, it is odd that the translator was able to continue after his addition of λέγων in 6:15 and accurately render the rest of the verse.

15 ἃ ἐφύλαξας τῷ παιδί σου Δαυὶδ τῷ πατρί μου, ἃ ἐλάλησας αὐτῷ λέγων (+), καὶ ἐλάλησας ἐν στόματί σου καὶ ἐν χερσίν σου ἐπλήρωσας ὡς ἡ ἡμέρα αὕτη.

16a καὶ νῦν, κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, φύλαξον τῷ παιδί σου τῷ Δαυίδ τῷ πατρί μου ἃ ἐλάλησας αὐτῷ λέγων

If that were the case, surely the translator saw his mistake and could have corrected it. Given the near exact similarity in the structure of the following verse, which includes לאמר, homoioteleuton is a good explanation for the inclusion of λέγων in 2 Par 6:15.¹⁰⁴

2 Par 6:17

In 2 Par 6:17, the particle δή, ‘indeed, really’, appears after the verb πιστωθήτω, ‘may it be established’. This Greek particle is a regular rendering of the Hebrew particle of entreaty אג, ‘please’.¹⁰⁵ In BHS, 2 Chr 6:17 has a text critical note mentioning that a few manuscripts and the parallel verse in 1 Kgs (8:26) suggest the inclusion of אג. It could be the case that the translator’s *Vorlage* included אג, so he included δή here as a translation, following the norms of translating the Hebrew particle. While δή is not a clear semantic equivalent for אג, the LXX translators have adopted it as such,¹⁰⁶ and so the translator’s inclusion of the particle in 2 Par 6:17 is following the normal, established translation convention for אג and contexts where אג would be expected.

¹⁰⁴ See Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 36.

¹⁰⁵ אג is often found ‘attached to imperatives or jussives for politeness’ sake’ (*DCH*, s.v. ‘אג’).

¹⁰⁶ Perhaps the reason the translators adopted the policy of translating אג with δή is the use of δή with verbs in ancient Greek works, especially tragedies, to communicate ‘an emotional factor of great importance’ (J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, 2nd ed. [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934], 214). See also Lee, *Greek of the Pentateuch*, 96-98.

2 Par 6:18

2 Chr 6:18 contains an initial question ('Does God truly dwell ...?') and a statement ('Behold heaven ... how much less ...!'). The translator encounters the interrogative ה in this verse and renders it with εἰ, introducing a conditional clause. He goes on, though, to render הנה with εἰ in the second part of the verse. The translator transforms the structure of the verse to be a conditional sentence with a double protasis, marked by the two instances of εἰ, and a single apodosis, marked by καί ('If God truly dwells ..., if heaven ..., then what is this house ...?').

In the second protasis, the verb כּוּל, 'contain', is translated with ἀρκέω, 'I am sufficient'. Only here and in the parallel verse in 3 Kgdms does ἀρκέω translate כּוּל in the LXX. Allen claims that 2 Par 6:18 'is an echo of the parallel in Rg'.¹⁰⁷ While he is certainly correct that 3 Kgdms 8:27 makes the same decision, translating כּוּל with ἀρκέω, there are other translation decisions there that are not reflected in 2 Par 6:18. For example, where both 1 Kgs 8:27 and 2 Chr 6:18 have כּי אַף, 'how much more', 3 Kgdms 8:27 has πλὴν καί, 'except also', and 2 Par 6:18 has καὶ τίς, 'and what', neither of which *exactly* represents the MT. If the translator relied upon 3 Kgdms for the translation of כּוּל, why not also for כּי אַף? At the end of 3 Kgdms 8:27, the translator inserts τῷ ὀνόματί σου, which is not found in 1 Kgs 8:27 or 2 Chr 6:18. 2 Par 6:18 does not contain this addition.

Other than these two verses, the Pilsal of the verb כּוּל occurs in a similar context only in 2 Chr 2:5, discussed in chapter two above. There, the translator translates כּוּל with φέρω, inserting αὐτοῦ τὴν δόξαν, 'who can bear his glory'. While it is unlikely that the translator of 2 Par used 3 Kgdms 8:27 for assistance here, this might be a *theological* echo.¹⁰⁸ It might not have been in the theological milieu of either translator to even imply that anything, heaven included, could 'contain' God.¹⁰⁹ Perhaps the language of the insufficiency of heaven rather than heaven's inability to contain God was a part of religious jargon for both translators, so they provide the same translation in their similar contexts. Yet another possibility is that the translator of 2 Par was aware of the parallel passage in 3 Kgdms, and he followed the lead of the translator on the translation of כּוּל because of the theological 'consequences' of a literal translation. At

¹⁰⁷ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 122.

¹⁰⁸ Indeed, Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 122, deals with this translation as a potential 'trace of theological bias'.

¹⁰⁹ This would help to explain a similar decision made in 2 Par 2:5.

that point, the other features that the translator of 2 Par ignores are inconsequential, so he need not replicate the full text of 3 Kgdms. While it does not seem that the translator relied on 3 Kgdms for other issues in this passage, he may have at least been culturally or theologically aware of the phrase δ οὐρανὸς καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐκ ἀρκέσουσίν σοι and felt it appropriate in this context.

2 Par 6:19

The Greek version of this verse contains a plus, a minus, and an additional change worth noting. Where 2 Chr 6:19 has תַּחֲנַתוֹ, ‘his plea’, Par has provided τὴν δέησίν μου, ‘my request’.¹¹⁰ In Hebrew, the antecedent of the pronoun is עַבְדְּךָ, ‘your servant’. Solomon here is referring to himself as the servant of God and is consistent in continuing that with תַּחֲנַתוֹ. While the translator at first follows the lead of his source, rendering עַבְדְּךָ with παιδός σου, ‘your servant’, he makes a change with the choice of pronoun, switching to the 1st person. Solomon goes on to clearly state his addressee יהוה אלהי, ‘Lord my God’. Par does not have the 1st person pronoun, providing κύριε ὁ θεός, ‘Lord God’, as the translation here.¹¹¹

There are a few options for understanding the change and omission in this verse. One possibility is that the translator was aware of the switch to the 1st person with the pronoun on אלהי and simply moved that switch up to the preceding use of a pronoun (on תַּחֲנַתוֹ). Nothing is lost here, as עַבְדְּךָ and the pronoun on תַּחֲנַתוֹ are both clearly referring to Solomon. Rendering those παιδός σου and τὴν δέησίν μου does not change the meaning of the text. It simply underscores the self-referential nature of παιδός σου. Another possibility is that the translator misread his *Vorlage*. Perhaps the translator read the ו as a י on תַּחֲנַתוֹ, which would clearly lead to a 1st person pronoun instead of a 3rd person pronoun.¹¹² This does not provide an explanation for the omission of the pronoun after ὁ θεός. If he did not read the consonantal אלהי as having the 1st person pronoun, he would be looking for a final noun for the construct chain.¹¹³ The other possibility has to do with the *Vorlage* that the translator used. Allen suggests that the

¹¹⁰ While several manuscripts attest the 3rd person pronoun, notably, this reading (with the 1st person pronoun) is attested in P.Sinai Gr. 1. See Albrecht, ‘Ein griechischer Papyrus-Codex’, 291.

¹¹¹ Again, see Albrecht, ‘Ein griechischer Papyrus-Codex’, 291.

¹¹² Brotzman and Tully, *Textual Criticism*, 119-120.

¹¹³ See Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 87, for the possibility that this translation decision is the result of ‘a scribal omission’ of the ם at the end of אלהי.

fact that both 2 Par 6:19 and 3 Kgdms 8:28 have τὴν δέησίν μου suggests that both translators are working from a text that reads תַּחֲנֹנִי.¹¹⁴

At the end of the verse, the translator adds σήμερον, ‘today’, which is attested in both 1 Kgs 8:28 and 3 Kgdms 8:28. According to Allen, the interference in 2 Par could be a result of either 1 Kgs or 3 Kgdms.¹¹⁵ It is plausible that there is interference from the parallel passage in the *Vorlage* of 2 Par 6:19, so that the *Vorlage* had הַיּוֹם, ‘today’.

2 Par 6:20

In this verse, the translator has added τοῦτον, ‘this’, after the first instance of τὸν τόπον, ‘the place’, where the Hebrew has הַמְּקוֹם, ‘the place’. The end of the verse has הַמְּקוֹם הַזֶּה, ‘this place’, which the translator also renders τὸν τόπον τοῦτον. This is likely an instance in which the translator draws the first הַמְּקוֹם into agreement with הַמְּקוֹם הַזֶּה at the end of the verse.¹¹⁶ The place is specified as ‘this place’ at the end of the verse, so the translator makes that specification earlier in the verse. Alternatively, the translator read ahead or his *Vorlage* had הַזֶּה after both, possibly due to misreading.

There is an inversion of word order towards the end of this verse. The Hebrew, according to the norms of the language, has יִתְפַּלֵּל עַבְדְּךָ, ‘your servant prays’. The translator has instead placed the subject before the verb: ὁ παῖς σου προσεύχεται, ‘your servant prays’. Usually, the translator sticks to the Hebrew word order since Greek is flexible enough to accommodate various word order structures. However, he does not always do so, as is seen here.¹¹⁷ Such a straying from this literal word order shows that the translator does not always feel tied to following the Hebrew. In this verse, there is likely something else motivating the word order. In the previous verse, there is a similar relative clause. Where the Hebrew has אֲשֶׁר עַבְדְּךָ מִתְפַּלֵּל, ‘which your servant prays’, the translator follows with ἧς ὁ παῖς σου προσεύχεται, ‘which your servant prays’, maintaining the word order but exchanging the participle מִתְפַּלֵּל for an indicative προσεύχεται. The Greek rendering here, ἧς ὁ παῖς σου προσεύχεται, is identical to what the translator does with אֲשֶׁר יִתְפַּלֵּל עַבְדְּךָ in 2 Par 6:20. In 2 Par 6:19, the translator has rendered a participle with an indicative. In 2 Par 6:20, he inverts the word order of the subject and verb. In doing this, he brings the relative clause in both 2 Par 6:19 and 6:20

¹¹⁴ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 119.

¹¹⁵ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 201.

¹¹⁶ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 62.

¹¹⁷ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 39. For other examples, see Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 132-134.

into agreement. It is likely that after producing ἤς ὁ παῖς σου προσεύχεται in 2 Par 6:19, it felt natural to repeat the word order in 2 Par 6:20.

2 Par 6:21

2 Chr 6:21 contains the prepositional phrase ממקום, ‘from the place’. Another common construction communicating the same thing in the Hebrew text is מן־המקום, ‘from the place’. The prepositional phrase is almost always translated, as expected, with ἐκ τοῦ τόπου, ‘from the place’. The typical, standard translation of the preposition מן is ἐκ or ἀπό, ‘from’. Surprisingly, in 2 Par 6:21 the translator has translated ממקום with ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, ‘in the place’. Later in this verse, the preposition מן is translated with ἐκ. It is likely that there was some confusion over the initial letter, which the translator may have taken as כּ.¹¹⁸ This preposition would, of course, more naturally be rendered with ἐν.

2 Par 6:23

For מן־השמים, ‘from the heavens’, Par has ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ‘from the heaven of heaven’. Of course, in 2 Par 6:18, the translator offers ὁ οὐρανὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, but there, it is accurately a translation of שמי השמים. Further, other instances of שמים are not rendered doubly in the rest of this passage. Most likely, 2 Par 6:23 contains a case of dittography, as Allen suggests.¹¹⁹ Allen attributes this to a corruption in the transmission of the Greek text, rather than an issue of the *Vorlage*.¹²⁰

In this verse, the translator renders both להשיב, ‘to repay’, and לתת, ‘to give’, (2x) with (τοῦ) ἀποδοῦναι, ‘to repay’. What the Hebrew text communicates with all three infinitives is the repaying of deeds upon the guilty and the righteous. Contextually, all three renderings in 2 Par 6:23 are appropriate. For the Hiphil infinitive להשיב the translator uses three different verbs in 2 Par, each fitting the context appropriately. The verb נתן is usually translated with δίδωμι, ‘to give’, but the compound ἀποδίδωμι fits better here.

It could be the case that the ἀποδοῦναι repetition was appealing to the translator because of the δα- repetition that occurs by naturally rendering the Hebrew at the end of the verse (δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον ... δικαιοσύνην for בצדקתו ... כצדק צדיק). As seen in

¹¹⁸ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 110.

¹¹⁹ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 38-39.

¹²⁰ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 1.

other sections above, the translator is not opposed to making decisions for stylistic purposes and, whether consciously or otherwise, his translation here may have been influenced by a desire for euphony.

With two of the three ל + infinitives here, the translator uses the genitive articular infinitive, indicating purpose.¹²¹ The other instance is rendered with a simple infinitive, indicating means. The translator renders these infinitives in a contextually sensitive way in order to accurately communicate the meaning of the text.

2 Par 6:24

The Greek verb θραύω, typically meaning ‘I break, shatter’, translates הִגַּד, ‘to strike’. The Hebrew verb occurs eight times in 2 Chr, and this is the only time that the translator renders it with θραύω. Usually (five of eight times), he uses the natural semantic equivalent, πατάσσω, ‘I strike’. The remaining two are translated with τροπώω, ‘put to flight’. While πατάσσω is the clearer equivalent for הִגַּד, especially given the preference towards πατάσσω in 2 Par, θραύω does have some semantic overlap with הִגַּד.¹²²

After accurately translating ׀א, ‘if’, with ἐάν, ‘if’, at the beginning of the verse, the translator renders the causal ׀, ‘for’, with the conditional ἐάν, introducing a second protasis to the conditional sentence. As a result, Israel is not struck by an enemy *because* they sinned against God. Instead, 2 Par suggests a simple double protasis: 1) if the people are broken, and 2) if the people sinned. The translator made a similar decision in 2 Par 6:18, but there he used εἰ, ‘if’, rather than ἐάν. The switch here is likely a result of the translator carefully choosing between the type of conditional statement he intends. In 2 Par 6:18, the ‘neutral’ conditional is used, in which ‘the speaker gives no indication of the likelihood of the realization of the action in the protasis’.¹²³ The shift to the ‘prospective’ conditional in 2 Par 6:24 would indicate that the ‘fulfilment of the condition’ is ‘very well possible/likely’.¹²⁴ While this helps to explain the shift from εἰ to ἐάν, it does not offer an explanation for the creation of a double protasis. At times, ׀ can be used for the protasis of a conditional, so it is likely that the translator has understood the ׀ in 2 Chr 6:24 as marking the protasis.¹²⁵ It is interesting, then, that just

¹²¹ See *CGCG*, §51.46.

¹²² It only translates הִגַּד elsewhere in the LXX in 2 Kgdms 12:15, where the Lord strikes the child of David and Bathsheba.

¹²³ *CGCG*, §49.4. See also, Smyth, §2298.

¹²⁴ *CGCG*, §49.6. Smyth, §2322, argues that this construction actually provides a ‘more vivid future’ condition, whether actually more vivid, or simply portrayed as more vivid by the writer.

¹²⁵ *IBHS*, §38.2.d.

two verses later, the same כִּי clause occurs: כִּי יַחֲטְאוּ-לָךְ, ‘because they sin against you’. In this instance (2 Par 6:26) the translator instead opts for the causal ὅτι, a decision that would be appropriate in 2 Par 6:24 as well. It seems that in 2 Par 6:24, then, the translator was attempting to work carefully in the context of the conditional marked by ׀ at the beginning of the verse. As a result, he continued the conditional, as he did in 2 Par 6:18.¹²⁶

2 Par 6:26

The translator has provided ὅτι, ‘for, because’, for כִּי in כִּי יַחֲטְאוּ-לָךְ, ‘because they sinned against you’. There is another כִּי clause later in the verse as well. There, the translator also uses ὅτι. In this instance, though, כִּי is likely not causal, but temporal. While כִּי is versatile enough to encompass both meanings (‘because’ and ‘when’), ὅτι is typically causal.¹²⁷ There is ambiguity between causal and temporal uses of כִּי,¹²⁸ and in contexts like the one here in 2 Chr 6:26, either is viable. As a result, the translator interpreted כִּי as causal, translating it with ὅτι.

2 Par 6:27

There is a plus early on in this verse as the translator renders השמים, ‘the heavens’, with the prepositional phrase ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ‘from heaven’. The BHS editors suggest inserting מן, ‘from’, before השמים in this verse, bringing it into agreement with ancient versions and translations. The parallel passage in 1 Kgs regularly omits מן (though 3 Kgdms provides ἐκ), so Allen once again suggests that the Hebrew text of 1 Kgs ‘has infiltrated into MT here by assimilation’.¹²⁹ Whether this is the case or not, the translator includes ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in his translation to clearly communicate the meaning

¹²⁶ There is, perhaps, theological motivation behind the double protasis here. It is possible that the translator is, in a small way, pushing back against the possible perception of immediate and inevitable divine retribution (i.e., instead of the people being struck by enemies as a result of sin, the translator assumes that being struck by enemies and sinning are two separate activities). See B. E. Kelly, ‘“Retribution” Revisited: Covenant, Grace and Restoration’, in M. P. Graham (ed.), *Chronicler as Theologian*, JSOTSup 371 (London: T&T Clark, 2003) 206-227; E. Ben Zvi, ‘A Sense of Proportion: An Aspect of the Theology of the Chronicler’, *SJOT* 9 (1995) 37-51.

¹²⁷ See *CGCG*, §48.2. On the translation of כִּי with ὅτι and the main uses of ὅτι, see Aejmelaeus, ‘OTI causale in Septuagintal Greek’, in *On the Trail*, 11-29; ‘OTI recitativum in Septuagintal Greek’, in *On the Trail*, 31-41.

¹²⁸ A. Aejmelaeus, ‘Function and Interpretation of כִּי in Biblical Hebrew’, *JBL* 105.2 (1986) 193-209, citing 198.

¹²⁹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 218.

of the text. If the Hebrew text from which he worked looked like 2 Chr in the MT, then this is indeed a plus, but a necessary one.

The translator makes a few interesting decisions in the כִּי clause in this verse. This is the clause in question from the MT and the LXX:

כִּי תוֹרֵם אֶל־הַדֶּרֶךְ הַטּוֹבָה

‘For you will lead them to the good way’

ὅτι δηλώσεις αὐτοῖς τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν ἀγαθὴν

‘For you will make clear to them the good way’

First, he renders ירה with δηλώω. Second, he provides the dative αὐτοῖς for the 3rd person plural object suffix. Third, the preposition לֵא is not translated like-for-like (i.e., with a preposition).

The various uses of the verb root ירה include ‘to throw’, ‘to water’, ‘to teach’, and ‘to lead’.¹³⁰ Only the first three are attested in HALOT,¹³¹ and many English translations follow by using ‘teach’ for ירה in 2 Chr 6:27.¹³² However, with לֵא, the fourth option, ‘to lead’, makes the most sense: ‘you will lead them *into*’. If this is correct, it also helps to explain the object suffix. The Greek δηλώω typically means ‘to make evident’, ‘to explain’, or ‘to reveal’.¹³³ There is semantic overlap, then, with ירה in ‘to teach’ and, metaphorically, ‘to lead’, though the overlap does not indicate a one-to-one correspondence. With δηλώω, though, the object is no longer ‘them’ but ‘the way’. As such, the translator renders הדרך with the accusative τὴν ὁδόν, omitting a translation for לֵא. In contrast to the structure in Hebrew, the indirect object becomes αὐτοῖς ‘to them’. Therefore, the translator, understanding ירה as an act of explanation or revelation, must restructure the clause in Greek, which results in the alteration or omission of certain constituents.

A plus can be found in the phrase which follows the כִּי clause, as the translator renders the relative pronoun אשר, ‘which’, with ἐν ᾗ, ‘in which’. The translator has done this because this relative clause ends with בה, ‘in it’. The translator also renders בה with ἐν αὐτῇ, ‘in it’. Later, in 2 Par 6:34, the translator renders the relative clause אשר בחרת בה ‘by/in which you have chosen’ with ἣν ἐξελέξω ἐν αὐτῇ, ‘which you have chosen in

¹³⁰ See *DCH*, s.v. ‘ירה’.

¹³¹ *HALOT*, s.v. ‘ירה’.

¹³² For example: NIV, ESV, NASB, NRSV.

¹³³ See *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘δηλώω’; *BDAG*, s.v. ‘δηλώω’; *LSJ*, s.v. ‘δηλώω’.

it'; he does not duplicate the preposition ἐν at the beginning of the clause. This indicates that the translator does not seem obligated to repeat the prepositional phrase.

2 Par 6:28

There are several listed terms in this verse with which the translator deals with varying degrees of accuracy. Several of those will be assessed here. For the Hebrew שדפון, 'scorching', the translator provides ἀνεμοφθορία, 'harmful/heavy wind'. The Hebrew term occurs only five times in the Hebrew Bible but finds four different renderings in the LXX. As in 2 Par 6:28, שדפון is translated with ἀνεμοφθορία in Deuteronomy 28:22. In the parallel verse in 3 Kgdms 8:37, the translator opts for the more semantically appropriate ἐμπυρισμός, 'burning'. In Amos 4:9, שדפון is rendered πύρωσις, 'burning'. There is a text critical issue in Haggai 2:17, where בשדפון ובירקון, 'with scorching and with mildew', is rendered ἐν ἀφορία καὶ ἐν ἀνεμοφθορία, 'with failed crops and heavy wind'. Given the slight semantic overlap between ירקון, 'disease of grain' and ἀφορία, 'failed crops', discussed below, and that there is precedent in the LXX for ἀνεμοφθορία as a translation of שדפון, it is likely that this translation represents a transposition. Bickerman suggests that the term ἀνεμοφθορία belonged 'to the vocabulary of Greek magic' and so it would have been a word at least available to the translators.¹³⁴ As discussed above, Gerleman sees Pentateuchal influence on the translator of Par, a claim which would make sense of the use of ἀνεμοφθορία in 2 Par 6:28.¹³⁵ While this conclusion is perhaps given too broadly by Gerleman, it is likely the case that the translator was familiar with the Greek Pentateuch.¹³⁶ Tov echoes this, citing ἀνεμοφθορία as a technical term that the translator of 2 Par would have borrowed from Greek Deuteronomy.¹³⁷ Therefore, while ἀνεμοφθορία does not translate the meaning of שדפון as accurately as the other two terms found in the LXX, the translator's decision had precedent, and given the rare nature of the Hebrew term, it is plausible that the translator relied on the Pentateuch for the translation, or at least he was aware of the translation in the Pentateuch. However, as will be seen below, it is difficult to assume

¹³⁴ E. J. Bickerman, 'The Septuagint as a Translation', *PAAJR* 28 (1959) 1-39, citing 20. Bickerman misspells the term as ἀνεμφθορία. Also, his conclusion only proves that the term is not a neologism. It says nothing about whether it should translate שדפון.

¹³⁵ Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 22.

¹³⁶ Whether such familiarity would have helped with this specific term is unknown.

¹³⁷ E. Tov, 'The Septuagint Translation of the Torah as a Source and Resource for the Post-Pentateuchal Translators', in *Textual Developments: Collected Essays, Volume 4*, VTSup 181 (Leiden: Brill, 2019) 341-356, citing 349.

widespread reliance on the Greek Pentateuch even for this verse alone. An alternative explanation for ἀνεμοφθορία is that it describes ‘the actual experience of the damage caused by the onset of the dessicating [sic] east wind’.¹³⁸ If true, this option would bring it more in line with the meaning of שדפון.

Another rare Hebrew term in this verse is ירקון, which describes a ‘disease of grain’,¹³⁹ ‘pale(ness)’,¹⁴⁰ or ‘mildew’.¹⁴¹ The lone Pentateuchal occurrence of ירקון is found in Deuteronomy 28:22 and is rendered in the LXX with ὠχρός, an adjective meaning ‘pale, yellowish’.¹⁴² The translator of 3 Kgdms does not provide a translation of ירקון in 8:37, which is parallel to 2 Par 6:28. As mentioned above, there is likely a switching of terms in the translation of Haggai 2:17. Therefore, ἀφορία is likely the rendering of ירקון in that verse. Like ὠχρός, ἀφορία is only found here in the LXX and refers to the ‘failure to produce’, at times, referencing a harvest.¹⁴³ In 2 Par 6:28, ירקון is rendered ἴατερος, which can be used figuratively to mean ‘pallor’ or ‘rust’.¹⁴⁴ This translation is also found in Jeremiah 37:6 (MT Jeremiah 30:6) and Amos 4:9. So then, half of the six occurrences of ירקון are translated with ἴατερος. While other translation options existed, all three of the renderings in the LXX work similarly to describe some condition of paleness, which, in context, applies to the harvest. That ירקון in 2 Chr 6:28 is not translated with ὠχρός as in Deuteronomy 28:22 would suggest that the translator has not relied on the Greek Pentateuch for this technical term. Instead, he considered ἴατερος as a viable option for ירקון.

The Hebrew term חסיל occurs six times in the MT and is somewhat difficult to define. *DCH* glosses it simply as ‘locust’, but this is unsatisfactory given its use with ארבה, ‘locust’, in 2 Chr 6:28.¹⁴⁵ *HALOT* distinguishes חסיל from ארבה, glossing the former as a ‘certain stage in the life cycle of locust or cockroach’.¹⁴⁶ For ארבה, the translator of 2 Par follows the standard set throughout the LXX by using ἀκρίς, ‘locust’.¹⁴⁷ When dealing with חסיל, though, he translates differently than the other

¹³⁸ *HALOT*, s.v. ‘שדפון’.

¹³⁹ *HALOT*, s.v. ‘ירקון’; *DCH*, s.v. ‘ירקון’.

¹⁴⁰ *HALOT*, s.v. ‘ירקון’; *DCH*, s.v. ‘ירקון’.

¹⁴¹ *DCH*, s.v. ‘ירקון’.

¹⁴² *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘ὠχρός’. This is the only time ὠχρός is used in the LXX.

¹⁴³ *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘ἀφορία’.

¹⁴⁴ *BrillDAG*, s.v. ‘ἴατερος’.

¹⁴⁵ *DCH*, s.v. ‘חסיל’.

¹⁴⁶ *HALOT*, s.v. ‘חסיל’.

¹⁴⁷ 18 of the 24 occurrences of ארבה are translated with ἀκρίς.

renderings in the LXX. Of the six occurrences of לִסִּיל in the MT, four, including the parallel in 1 Kgs 8:37, are translated with ἐρυσίβη, ‘blight’, and one is not translated. The final occurrence is in 2 Chr 6:28, where it is translated with βροῦχος, ‘locust larva’.¹⁴⁸ This Greek term occurs nine times in the LXX, translating a few different Hebrew terms that are mostly synonymous with ‘locust’. By translating לִסִּיל with βροῦχος, then, the translator of 2 Par makes a more accurate, contextually appropriate decision in straying from the more typical translation in the LXX (ἐρυσίβη). It is, of course, possible that the translator was unaware of passages in which לִסִּיל had been rendered ἐρυσίβη. However, both Gerleman and Allen suggest that there is harmonization between 2 Par 6 and 3 Kgdms 8 (or their *Vorlagen*), which, if true, likely would have influenced the translation here.¹⁴⁹ Whether aware of 3 Kgdms 8 or not, the translator produces a faithful and accurate translation of לִסִּיל in 2 Par 6:28 that distinguishes לִסִּיל from אֲרָבָה.

The translator uses πλῆγῆ, ‘wound, blow’,¹⁵⁰ for נָגַע, ‘plague, blow’,¹⁵¹ in this verse, a decision which is only found elsewhere in Exodus 11:1 even though נָגַע occurs nearly 80 times in the Hebrew Bible. The standard equivalent for נָגַע is ἀφή,¹⁵² which has the standard meaning of ‘touch’ but has some extended meanings like ‘wound’ and ‘plague’,¹⁵³ making it appropriate for נָגַע. In fact, in 2 Par 6:29, the translator renders נָגַע with ἀφή. The translator uses πλῆγῆ four other times in 2 Par, each time as a translation of מָכָה, ‘blow, wound, plague’,¹⁵⁴ or מַגֵּפָה, ‘plague’,¹⁵⁵ which is typical in the LXX. The Greek ἀφή more clearly renders נָגַע, but it is possible that the translator used πλῆγῆ due to the context of the afflicting from the enemy.

Another rare word is found in 2 Chr 6:28 in מַחֲלָה, ‘sickness, disease’,¹⁵⁶ which only occurs four times in the Hebrew Bible. In 2 Par 6:28 and its parallel verse, 3 Kgdms 8:37, מַחֲלָה is translated πόνος, ‘toil, distress’.¹⁵⁷ The other two occurrences are

¹⁴⁸ BrillDAG (s.v. ‘βροῦχος’) lists this as an alternate spelling of βροῦχος.

¹⁴⁹ Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint*, 37-38; Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 200. I have rejected this claim throughout the present study.

¹⁵⁰ BDAG, s.v. ‘πλῆγῆ’; BrillDAG, s.v. ‘πλῆγῆ’.

¹⁵¹ HALOT, s.v. ‘נָגַע’; DCH, s.v. ‘נָגַע’.

¹⁵² For example, all 61 instances of נָגַע in Leviticus are translated with ἀφή.

¹⁵³ BrillDAG, s.v. ‘ἀφή’.

¹⁵⁴ HALOT, s.v. ‘מָכָה’; DCH, s.v. ‘מָכָה’.

¹⁵⁵ HALOT, s.v. ‘מַגֵּפָה’; DCH, s.v. ‘מַגֵּפָה’.

¹⁵⁶ HALOT, s.v. ‘מַחֲלָה’; DCH, s.v. ‘מַחֲלָה’.

¹⁵⁷ BDAG, s.v. ‘πόνος’.

in Exodus 15:26, where מחלה is translated νόσος, ‘disease, sickness, plague’,¹⁵⁸ and Exodus 23:25, where מחלה is translated μαλακία, ‘weakness, infirmity’.¹⁵⁹ As was the case with the translation of נגע, it is possible that the translator considered πόνος more appropriate than a more direct translation, like νόσος or μαλακία, in light of the immediately preceding context of being afflicted by an enemy.

In addition to these semantic decisions, there are a few other translation decisions in 2 Par 6:28 that should be considered. Where 2 Chr has אויביו, ‘his enemies’, 2 Par has the singular ὁ ἐχθρός, ‘the enemy’, without the 3rd person pronoun. Following that, בארץ שעריו, ‘in the land of its gates’, is translated κατέναντι τῶν πόλεων αὐτῶν, ‘before their cities’. There are several differences between the LXX and the MT. It is unlikely that these differences would have come about due to misreading, so it is plausible that the *Vorlage* contained this reading. Finally, כל־נגע, ‘every plague’, is rendered κατὰ πᾶσαν πληγὴν, ‘according to every wound’, suggesting that the translator read ככל, ‘according to every’, or had this in his source text.¹⁶⁰

2 Par 6:29

This verse begins with כל־תפלה כל־תחנה, ‘every prayer, every plea’. Par has καί, ‘and’, twice in this translation, producing καὶ πᾶσα προσευχὴ καὶ πᾶσα δέησις, ‘and every prayer and every request’. This carries on the nouns preceded by כל and linked by the conjunction at the end of the previous verse. Allen considers this to be an example of an omission in the MT that was in the *Vorlage* of Par.¹⁶¹ In addition to this plus, the translator renders the two occurrences of the relative pronoun אשר, ‘which’, with εἴαν, ‘if’, linking this verse as a continuation of the conditional statement that begins in the previous verse (‘for if famine comes about in the land ... and if a prayer or plea comes about ...’). As mentioned above, נגע, ‘plague, blow’, is translated ἀφή, ‘touch, wound’, here in contrast to the use of πληγὴ, ‘wound, blow’, in the previous verse.

2 Par 6:30

Preceding the translation of מכון שבתך, ‘the place of your dwelling’, Par has ἐξ, ‘from’. This decision brings this phrase in 2 Chr 6:30 into agreement with 2 Chr 6:33, 39,

¹⁵⁸ BrillDAG, s.v. ‘νόσος’.

¹⁵⁹ BrillDAG, s.v. ‘μαλακία’.

¹⁶⁰ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 131.

¹⁶¹ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 154.

which has מִמְכוֹן שְׁבַתְךָ, ‘from the place of your dwelling’, turning an appositional phrase into a prepositional phrase. As suggested by Allen, ἐξ ἐτοίμου κατοικητηρίου σου, ‘from your prepared dwelling place’, for מִמְכוֹן שְׁבַתְךָ in 2 Chr 6:30 likely represents a case of haplography in the MT.¹⁶²

This same phrase מִמְכוֹן שְׁבַתְךָ is translated with ἐτοίμου κατοικητηρίου σου. While the difference is subtle, the choice of ἔτοιμος for מִמְכוֹן is worth noting. However, on 11 of the 17 occasions in which מִמְכוֹן appears in the MT, ἔτοιμος or a related term is used. Further, since κατοικητηρίου σου without ἐτοίμου would accurately capture the meaning of מִמְכוֹן שְׁבַתְךָ, the use of ἔτοιμος, instead of the redundant τόπος, provides a contextual translation of מִמְכוֹן, while retaining a constituent for a constituent.

For the prepositional phrase כְּכָל־דַּרְכָיו, ‘according to all his ways’, the translator offers κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ, ‘according to his way’. Par does not have a translation for the MT’s כָּל. According to Allen, this is just one of many examples in Par in which כָּל has either been added or omitted, and he claims that this decision ‘probably reflects the *Vorlage*’.¹⁶³ There is another difference between the MT and the LXX in the כִּי clause at the end of the verse: כִּי אַתָּה לְבַדְךָ יָדַעַת, ‘for you, you alone know’, is translated ὅτι μόνος γινώσκει, ‘for you alone know’. According to Allen, ‘There comes a point in LXX study when it is very difficult to decide whether omissions go right back to the Heb *Vorlage* or merely as far as the pen of the translator. ... When the subject of a verb is clear from the context, Par often lacks the subject expressed in MT. This feature accords with the succinctness of Gk’.¹⁶⁴

2 Par 6:31

A significant difference between the MT and the LXX is found in the first few words of this verse. Here, the phrase in the MT יִירְאוּךָ לָלֶכֶת בְּדַרְכֶיךָ, ‘they might fear you and walk in your ways’, is represented φοβῶνται τὰς ὁδοὺς σου, ‘they might fear your ways’ in the LXX. This rendering does not have the 2nd person singular pronoun on יִירְאוּךָ, the infinitive לָלֶכֶת, and the preposition ב which are represented in the MT. While many pluses and minuses have little impact on meaning, the omissions here leave the Greek text communicating something different than that of the Hebrew. Instead of ‘they will fear you (and) walk in your ways’, 2 Par 6:31 communicates, ‘they might fear your

¹⁶² Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 127.

¹⁶³ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 152.

¹⁶⁴ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 119

ways'. Allen suggests that this may be a case of the translator not clearly recognizing spacing between words and instead of reading *ללכת בדרכיך*, he may have read *לכתב דרכיך*, 'they might fear all to write your ways'. If this was the case, *לכתב* would have been 'incomprehensible' and thus 'was omitted' producing *φοβῶνται πάσας ὁδούς σου*, 'they might fear all of your ways'.¹⁶⁵ One problem with this solution is that it assumes the less attested *πάσας ὁδούς σου* over *τὰς ὁδούς σου*. The manuscript evidence for this phrase is complicated as well. While some manuscripts attest *πάσας ὁδούς σου*, others have *φοβῶνται σε του πορευεσθαι εν πασαις ταις ὁδοις σου*, 'to fear you, to walk in all your ways'.¹⁶⁶ Further, given that the translator accurately renders the surrounding context, it seems that if he considered the text carefully here, he would have been able to figure out the word divisions that were necessary. However, Allen's conclusion does offer some sense of working out this difference and he rightly rejects the claim made by Rogers that the omission was due to an avoidance of anthropomorphism.¹⁶⁷

2 Par 6:32

At the beginning of this verse, *וגם*, 'and also', is translated simply with *καί*, 'and'. Allen suggests that while this looks like a simple omission of *וגם*, it is actually 'a case of a marginal note being attached to the wrong column', as *ו*, 'and', is rendered *καί γε*, 'and indeed', in 2 Par 6:37.¹⁶⁸ As Allen has noted, though, the translation of *וגם* with *καί γε* is not typical in Par. Therefore, his attempt at explaining *καί* for *וגם* in 2 Par 6:32 and *καί γε* for *ו* in 2 Par 6:37 seems lacking. If nothing else, this would seem to be quite inconsistent on the part of the translator or an editor of either Par or its *Vorlage* to provide a 'correction', albeit in the wrong column, here but not in all cases of *וגם* in Par.

Immediately following *וגם*, the MT has *אל־הנכרי*, 'regarding the foreigner'. In this context, the preposition *אל* is not communicating directional movement but reference ('with respect to' or 'concerning'). Instead of translating the preposition *אל*, the translator provides *πᾶς*, 'all, every'. Again, Allen attributes this reading to a 'misplaced marginal gloss, which displaced *אל*'.¹⁶⁹ According to Allen, this marginal note would have been intended to add *כל*, 'all', before *בני*, 'sons', in 2 Chr 6:30 to

¹⁶⁵ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 105.

¹⁶⁶ See Hanhart, *Paralipomenon*, 166.

¹⁶⁷ Rogers, 'Old Greek', 23-24.

¹⁶⁸ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 146. The addition of *γε* in 2 Par 6:37 will be dealt with below.

¹⁶⁹ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 201.

harmonize that verse with 1 Kgs 8:39.¹⁷⁰ As above, Allen's suggestion does at least offer an answer to an otherwise difficult rendering. Another option is that the translator has simply misread his *Vorlage* or his *Vorlage* had this reading.

For זרועך הנטויה, 'your outstretched arm', the translator provides τὸν βραχίονά σου τὸν ὑψηλόν, 'your raised up arm'. Allen calls this a 'frequent rendering', citing several examples.¹⁷¹ At the very end of the verse, the MT has the prepositional phrase אל-הבית הזה, 'to this house'. The translator has rendered this phrase with εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον, 'to this place'. This is odd since the translator has regularly rendered בית with οἶκος, 'house', in this chapter. While 1 Kgs 8:42 agrees with 2 Chr 6:32 (אל-הבית הזה), 3 Kgdms 8:42 agrees with 2 Par 6:32 (εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον). Strikingly, though, the translator of 3 Kgdms 8:41-42 has produced a translation that only minimally translates 1 Kgs 8:41-42, at least, in the form we have it now. Either this is a situation in which both translators worked from *Vorlagen* that shared a reading that is absent from the MT (Chr and Kgs) or both translators made the same mistake with rendering אל-הבית הזה.

2 Par 6:33

As noted above, Par does not have a translation for the אתה, 'you', at the beginning of the verse, rendering ואתה תשמע, 'and you will hear', with καὶ εἰσακούσῃ, 'and you will hear'. Again, in all other instances of ואתה in this section, the translator uses καὶ σύ, 'and you'.

Later in the verse, the MT has בִּישְׁמֵךְ נִקְרָא, 'that your name is proclaimed', which the translator has rendered ὅτι ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά σου, 'that your name has been invoked'. While there is no change in meaning with this decision, it is notable that the order of the subject and verb has been reversed in 2 Par. As Allen has noted, it is often the case that 'it is impossible to determine at what stage the order of words was changed, whether already in the *Vorlage* or in the process of translation or in the course of Gk transmission'.¹⁷² It is also worth noting that the translator has used the perfect tense ἐπικέκληται for נִקְרָא, which is a careful rendering.¹⁷³

¹⁷⁰ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 201.

¹⁷¹ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 125-126. See, for example, Deuteronomy 7:19; 9:29; 11:2; Isaiah 14:26, 27.

¹⁷² Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 64.

¹⁷³ See Good, *Septuagint's Translation*, 216.

2 Par 6:34

The discourse marker $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is rare in 2 Par. Besides the occurrence here, it occurs in 2 Par 32:8 as a translation of the conjunction ו , ‘and’.¹⁷⁴ Here in 2 Par 6:34, though, there is no Hebrew conjunction to motivate the inclusion of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$. Although he is not dealing directly with this passage, Fresch convincingly argues that $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is used to provide a certain structural ‘segmentation within the discourse’.¹⁷⁵ He goes on to say that by using $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, ‘the translator ... must have been aware of the surrounding context and willing to encode his conception of the discourse structure in the translation, even though it did not lexically match the Hebrew *Vorlage*’.¹⁷⁶ Fresch continues: ‘the use of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ evinces a desire on the part of the translator not just to render the syntactic and semantic components of his *Vorlage* but also to faithfully represent it and to create a structured text in genuine Greek idiom’.¹⁷⁷ While Fresch’s conclusions are strongly supported, they should be cautiously applied to the interpretation of 2 Par 6:34. This caution is due to the rare nature of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in 2 Par. With that said, the use of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ here does not have any clear motivation other than to mark a development or shift in the discourse of the prayer.¹⁷⁸ Therefore, this plus in the LXX produces, in Fresch’s words, ‘genuine Greek’.¹⁷⁹ This supports some on-going observations in this unit (the prayer of dedication) of the translator’s sensitivity to the text.

Later in the verse, the translator renders והתפללו אליך דרך , ‘and they pray to you (in) the direction’, with $\text{καὶ προσεύξωνται πρὸς σὲ κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν}$, ‘and they pray to you according to the way’. Here, the preposition κατὰ is a plus with respect to the MT, providing clarity to the translation.

2 Par 6:36

At the beginning of 2 Chr 6:36 there is a כִּי clause, with כִּי , ‘if’ in this context, marking the protasis of a conditional.¹⁸⁰ The translator, though, seems to understand כִּי

¹⁷⁴ I agree with Fresch, ‘Discourse Markers’, 70, that there is ‘no lexical equivalent’ for this discourse marker ‘in Hebrew’. It does seem, though, that the translator notices ו , but feels that καί would not do justice to the context.

¹⁷⁵ Fresch, ‘Discourse Markers’, 72.

¹⁷⁶ Fresch, ‘Discourse Markers’, 70.

¹⁷⁷ Fresch, ‘Discourse Markers’, 71. Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 41, claims that ‘ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is idiomatically added’.

¹⁷⁸ See S. E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2010) 28-36, especially 31. Even if his *Vorlage* had a conjunction, the use of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ to translate the conjunction would still be noteworthy.

¹⁷⁹ Fresch, ‘Discourse Markers’, 71.

¹⁸⁰ GKC, §159n.

differently, as he translates it with *ὅτι*, ‘for’. Further, instead of *ἐάν* + subjunctive, the translator uses a future tense verb, *ἀμαρτήσονται*, ‘they will sin’. Therefore, the phrase *כִּי יַחַטְאוּ לְךָ*, ‘if they sin against you’, becomes *ὅτι ἀμαρτήσονται σοι*, ‘for they will sin against you’. While the translator does slightly change the meaning of the original here, his decision does bring this first clause into clear agreement with the parenthetical *ὅτι οὐκ ἔσται ἄνθρωπος, ὃς οὐχ ἀμαρτήσεται*, ‘for there is not a person who does not sin’. It is not a matter of ‘if they sin’, since ‘there is not a person who does not sin’.

Where the MT has *וְאַנְפֹתָם בָּם*, ‘and you are angry with them’, Par has *καὶ πατάξεις αὐτούς*, ‘and you will strike them’. Par lacks a translation of the preposition *ב* because the verb *πατάσσω* does not need a preposition to introduce its object. Of the 14 times *בָּנָם* occurs in the MT, only here is it translated with *πατάσσω*. After surveying several options for explaining this decision, Allen correctly concludes that this is likely ‘an attempt to make sense of a phrase which was not understood’.¹⁸¹ It is difficult to suggest that the translator used the parallel passages in 3 Kgdms 8 while translating here. Indeed, in most cases it is easier to claim that he did not use the parallels. Here, though, it is worth mentioning that 3 Kgdms 8:46 has *καὶ ἐπάξεις ἐπ’ αὐτούς*, ‘and you bring them’, for the same clause. There are, of course, similarities between the inflected forms *πατάξεις* and *ἐπάξεις*. The similar forms are not enough to make the case that the translator relied on 3 Kgdms 8, as there are many divergences from that passage throughout 2 Par 6.

There is a plus near the end of the verse, where Par has *εἰς γῆν ἐχθρῶν*, ‘into the land of enemies’, which does not reflect the MT. Allen suggests that this may be ‘a conflation with [1] Ki [8:46] *אֶל-אֶרֶץ הָאֹיִב*’.¹⁸² Two things are worth noting here. First, 3 Kgdms 8:46 does not contain a translation for *הָאֹיִב*, ‘the enemy’. This suggests that the translator was not reliant on 3 Kgdms 8:46. Second, 1 Kgs 8:46 has *אֶל-אֶרֶץ הָאֹיִב אוֹ קְרוֹבָה*, ‘to the land of the enemy, far or near’, but 2 Par 6:36 has *εἰς γῆν ἐχθρῶν εἰς γῆν μακρὰν ἢ ἐγγύς*, ‘to a land of enemies, to a land far away or near’, with *εἰς γῆν* repeated. Of course, this is what Allen is suggesting—that the translator’s *Vorlage* contained a conflation of 1 Kgs 8:46 and 2 Par 6:36. While this is certainly possible, Rehm’s conclusion that this is simply a plus supplied by the translator based on the

¹⁸¹ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 32.

¹⁸² Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 178.

context for clarification ought to be considered as well.¹⁸³ In either case, this can be seen as a plus when considering the MT and the LXX.

2 Par 6:37

In the first clause of this verse, והשיבו אל-לבבם, ‘and they turn (with reference to) their heart’,¹⁸⁴ the translator does not provide a translation of the preposition אל because his chosen verb, ἐπιστρέφω, ‘I turn back’, does not need a preposition to introduce its object. Likewise, where the MT has והתחננו אליך, ‘and they plead to you’, the translator does not need to provide a translation for the preposition אל. Instead, he uses the genitive σου, ‘of you’, as the object of δεηθῶσιν, ‘they make request’.

The connection between ושיבו ... והשיבו, ‘and they turn ... and they repent’, is made even clearer by the repetition not only of the lexeme, but also of form in 2 Par of καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν ... καὶ γε ἐπιστρέψωσιν, ‘they might turn back ... and also they might turn back’. The addition of γε could function to highlight this repetition. That is, they are turning back their heart and also in their turning back, they are making a request of God. So, it is plausible to see γε as a conscious addition by the translator to highlight the repetition and the building of the ‘turning back’ image in this verse rather than the addition being a misplaced marginal note.¹⁸⁵

2 Par 6:39

There are three features in this verse that warrant discussion. First, as mentioned above, the translator does not render the 3rd person plural pronoun on משפטם, ‘their cause’, as he translates it with κρίματα, ‘judgments’. Given that he uses the plural κρίματα, it is likely that the translator assumed משפטים, or the latter was in the *Vorlage*.¹⁸⁶ Second, the 2nd person singular pronoun on לעמך, ‘to your people’, in the MT is not found in Par. The translator renders this simply with τῷ λαῷ, ‘to the people’. Perhaps the translator felt that it was already clearly understood that the ‘people’ in question were the Lord’s people. If this is the case, he would not need to render the 2nd person pronoun.¹⁸⁷ Third, the translator does not translate the relative pronoun אשר, ‘which’,

¹⁸³ Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 100.

¹⁸⁴ Klein, *2 Chronicles*, 97, suggests that the Hebrew והשיבו אל-לבבם should be understood idiomatically as ‘[if] they have a change of heart’. See also *HALOT*, s.v. ‘שוב’.

¹⁸⁵ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 146.

¹⁸⁶ See Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 71; Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, 59.

¹⁸⁷ As above, see *CGCG*, §28.4: ‘if a noun with article refers to something whose possessor or origin is obvious ... Greek uses only the article where English would use a possessive pronoun’.

with a Greek relative pronoun. Instead, he uses the participle ἀμαρτόντι attributively, resulting in τῶ λαῶ τῶ ἀμαρτόντι σοι, ‘the people who sinned against you’.¹⁸⁸ As noted above, Allen describes the translator’s attitude towards relative clauses as ‘ambivalent’.¹⁸⁹ However, here we see the other side to that in Allen’s suggestion that ‘side by side with this mechanical translation there goes an avoidance of relative clauses in favour of a less clumsy expression in Gk’.¹⁹⁰

2 Par 6:40

At the beginning of the verse the translator has supplied καὶ νῦν, ‘and now’, where MT has simply עתה, ‘now’. As such, καὶ should be seen as a plus.¹⁹¹ Immediately following this, the MT has אלהי, ‘my God’. The translator has appropriately chosen the vocative case in his translation, but he renders אלהי with κύριε, ‘Lord’. Uncertainty regarding whether the *Vorlage* read יהוה, ‘Lord’, or אלהים, ‘God’, is somewhat common when comparing Chr to Par. According to Allen, it is likely that ‘these cases are to be traced back to a divergent *Vorlage*’.¹⁹² The suggestion, then, is that the translator’s *Vorlage* had יהוה. This would also explain the absence of the 1st person singular suffix. Allen goes on to say that ‘it is reasonable to conclude ... that [κύριος] is never the translator’s loose equivalent for אלהים’.¹⁹³

One other small minus is worth noting here. Whereas Par included δῆ, ‘indeed’, in 2 Par 6:17 where נ, ‘please’, was not in the MT, here it is not found where נ occurs, though several manuscripts include δῆ here.

2 Par 6:41

Near the end of this verse וחסידים, ‘and your faithful ones’, becomes καὶ οἱ υἱοί σου, ‘and your sons’. These terms are not semantically related, and this does not seem to be an instance of an intentional change on the part of the translator. Likewise, it would be difficult to explain this change as resulting from a misreading of the text. According to Allen, this is one of ‘a large number of miscellaneous corruptions influenced by

¹⁸⁸ It could be that the translator omitted the 2nd person pronoun because he used an attributive participle rather than the relative clause.

¹⁸⁹ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 50.

¹⁹⁰ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 50.

¹⁹¹ Several Greek manuscripts omit the conjunction, bringing the clause in line with the MT.

¹⁹² Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 147.

¹⁹³ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 147.

elements in the context'.¹⁹⁴ Given that the other subject in this part of 2 Par 6:41 is οἱ ἱερεῖς, 'the priests', the context that caused confusion might have been 2 Par 7:2-3, where οἱ ἱερεῖς and οἱ υἱοί are mentioned together as groups that are responding to Solomon's prayer.¹⁹⁵ It might follow, then, that the translator may have harmonized (even accidentally) here.

Conclusions

As seen above, the translation of Solomon's prayer of dedication exhibits interesting features compared to the rest of the sections analyzed for the present study. At times, the translator provides very direct translations of his *Vorlage*. In contrast, though, it is observed above that the translator carefully renders a relative clause with an attributive participle in 2 Par 6:39. Evidence gathered above, for instance, from the translator's dealings with עבד, משפט, and סלח, show us that he has a tendency to be inconsistent. Even with these inconsistencies, the translation works, at times with careful quality shining through. This quality can be seen in the translator's regular use of the dative case for the preposition ל, his creation of parallel protases for conditional statements, and, though only occurring once, his insertion of the discourse marker δέ. Overall, the translation communicates faithfully the translator's source.

As with previous chapters, Allen's observations have been helpful for beginning to understand features of the translation of the prayer of dedication. Often, though, his observations lack necessary nuance, an issue I have considered when offering options for interpretation above. It is also important to note that the translator often exhibits elevated style in the prayer of dedication section, where we see stylistic decisions that could come from the importance of the content of this unit to the translator.

¹⁹⁴ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 10.

¹⁹⁵ Allen, *Textual Criticism*, 12.

Chapter 6:

Conclusions

After reading the classic *The Lord of the Rings*, a woman by the name of Eileen Elgar criticized the main character, Frodo, and his failure to be able to destroy the ring in Mount Doom. For Eileen, Frodo's failure at Mount Doom made him a failure as a hero. A true hero, it would follow, would finish the task for which he set out. J. R. R. Tolkien's response to Eileen is quite interesting.

Frodo indeed 'failed' as a hero, as conceived by simple minds: he did not endure to the end; he gave in, ratted. I do not say 'simple minds' with contempt: they often see with clarity the simple truth and the absolute ideal to which effort must be directed, even if it is unattainable. Their weakness, however, is twofold. They do not perceive the complexity of any given situation in Time, in which an absolute ideal is enmeshed. They tend to forget that strange element in the World that we call Pity or Mercy.... We are finite creatures with absolute limitations.¹

For Tolkien, then, Frodo is no less heroic because of his unwillingness to destroy the ring when he reached Mount Doom. His heroism is found in the journey, even if his 'absolute limitations' kept him from perfectly executing the task at hand. Often, we too think in terms of an 'absolute ideal' with respect to the LXX translators.² Like the simple-minded reader of *The Lord of the Rings*, we fail to see the complexity of the translation process as it occurred in a time and place much different than our own. In our moment, we look back at the translators with unrealistic expectations, imposing our understanding of 'success' and 'failure' upon them.³ It can only be said that the LXX was successful in accomplishing its most basic goal—to provide in Greek the Holy Scriptures. Perhaps what must be altered is our understanding of the purpose and goal of

¹ J. R. R. Tolkien, *The Letters of J. R. R. Tolkien*, ed. H. Carpenter (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981) 326. This fascinating exchange was brought to my attention through L. Coutras, *Tolkien's Theology of Beauty: Majesty, Splendor, and Transcendence in Middle-earth* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016) 173. Similarly, the legendary Tottenham Hotspur manager Bill Nicholson once said, 'It is better to fail aiming high than to succeed aiming low. At Spurs we set our sights very high, so that even failure will have in it an echo of glory' ('Bill Nicholson', <https://www.nationalfootballmuseum.com/halloffame/bill-nicholson/>; accessed May 2022). The task of the translators was certainly a lofty goal. Their efforts, while 'imperfect' certainly contain an 'echo of glory'.

² This is not an entirely modern idealism. The Letter of Aristeas attests an ancient idealistic view towards the LXX. There, though, the purpose is to legitimize the translation. See also Philo, *Mos.* 2.37-40. For a recent analysis of these sources and the idealism of LXX studies, see Wright, 'Septuagint'.

³ See the quote above in chapter 2 from Greenspoon, 'At the Beginning', 168, where he suggests that 'we must admit that such reconstructions [i.e. imposing modern translation strategies on the LXX translators] are simplistic'.

the LXX. In the process, we should remember that the LXX translators, like Frodo Baggins, were ‘finite creatures with absolute limitations’.⁴

Contributions of This Study

Earlier conclusions about the translation techniques in Par in previous studies were not always clearly substantiated. Those studies used speculative, scattered evidence. Here, I have offered clear examples of certain patterns observed within smaller textual units, thus providing a more cohesive sampling of the translator’s techniques in Par. In some ways, the above research confirms some earlier remarks about Par. Even when confirming previous scholarship, I have offered rationale for their conclusions and tested their conclusions against other options, which were often overlooked in those studies.

Expanding Allen’s The Greek Chronicles

At this point it is clear that Leslie Allen’s two-volume *The Greek Chronicles* has been the predominant conversation partner for the present study. Throughout his work, Allen makes several claims that resonate with the above observations from 2 Par 4-6. It is important to note that Allen is not solely attempting to analyze translation technique; only a small part of *The Greek Chronicles* deals with such matters. His claims discussed below are found in such sections.

According to Allen, ‘the translator is not a precisionist. He is literal up to a point, but his literalness is not for its own sake’.⁵ Allen makes this claim in the context of the translator using the same Greek word for different Hebrew words. The present study has confirmed this, especially in discussions of syntax. The translator typically follows the Hebrew word order, not just for the sake of doing so, but because it typically produces acceptable Greek.

Allen continues: ‘If ... [the translator] is in a more active frame of mind and desires to enliven his narrative by varying his style, he has no scruples whatsoever’.⁶ Again, Allen makes this claim in the same context as above. What he means by this, then, is that the translator can go into ‘autopilot’, repeating the same Greek word for multiple Hebrew words, but he can also be more precise than that. The evidence from the previous chapters, though, could expand Allen’s claim beyond the use of the same

⁴ Tolkien, *Letters*, 326.

⁵ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 53.

⁶ Allen, *Translator’s Craft*, 54.

Greek for different Hebrew words. Particularly interesting is Allen's comment about the translator's 'active frame of mind'. However, it would be difficult to explain how one observes whether the translator is in an 'active frame of mind'. Surely, with the task of translating Scripture at hand, the translator does not undertake his duty without careful thought. What Allen seems to mean here is that sometimes the translation contains literary flourishing that is not necessitated by the translator's *Vorlage*. At other times, the translation feels tied closely to the *Vorlage*. While this is observable in the present study, it cannot be proven to necessitate a conclusion based on the translator's level of focus on his project.

Allen gives a few examples of how the translator dealt with the same Hebrew word or phrase occurring more than once over the span of several verses. He claims that at times 'the translator first gives a literal rendering and then a looser one'.⁷ He then shows examples of other times when 'the first instance is rendered rather loosely, then at a second occurrence of the same word the translator falls back on a literal equivalent'.⁸ Allen goes on to make a major claim about the translator based on these observations.

These last two ways of ringing the changes are interesting as an epitome of the translator's general style. They show how differently his mind worked at different times, now lighting upon the literal, now preferring paraphrase. These opposing traits are here worked out within narrow bounds over and over again. This phenomenon confirms that, strange as it appears at first sight, one and the same person is responsible for stilted literal renderings and for more sophisticated paraphrase, both of which styles have been profusely illustrated earlier in this chapter.⁹

Here, tucked away in his section on translation techniques, Allen begins to get to the heart of the issues at hand.

As established earlier, the purpose of this study is not to undo or override the work of Leslie Allen. In many ways, *The Greek Chronicles* paved the way for the present study. At times, though, the evidence from the text of 2 Par has gone against Allen's suggestions. Examples of such are noted throughout the previous chapters. The purpose of interacting regularly with Allen's work is to provide nuance and expansion to what he has already done. Allen's claims needed clearer evidence and analysis of more cohesive units. Further, Allen wrote *The Greek Chronicles* in a time when the literal/free dichotomy was still seen as the normative approach towards understanding

⁷ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 56.

⁸ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 56.

⁹ Allen, *Translator's Craft*, 57.

the Septuagint translators. What Allen started can be taken further, and I have made an effort towards doing that here. We move now to some conclusions regarding the translator that produced Par.

An Inconsistent Translator

The translator that produced 2 Par was inconsistent in his approach to various words and phrases.¹⁰ By ‘inconsistent’ I mean ‘at variance, discordant’, rather than the more pessimistic ‘incompatible’.¹¹ Inconsistency alone is not a claim about quality; it should not be considered ‘good’ or ‘bad’. In a way, even the rhetorical strategy of *variatio*, which has been referenced several times throughout the present study, is ‘inconsistent’, in that the nature of *variatio*, especially as observable in translated literature, means that a given word or phrase is translated differently in any given instances. We will turn here to some observations from the previous chapters to see examples of this inconsistency.

The prime example of inconsistency in 2 Par is the translator’s dealing with שרשרות, ‘chains’ in 2 Par 3. For the three occurrences of the term in 2 Par 3, the translator has two strategies. The first is to translate the term with *χαλαστόν*, ‘chain’, as he does in 2 Par 3:5 and for the second occurrence of שרשרות in 2 Par 3:16. Between these two translations, we find the transcription *σερσερωθ* for the first occurrence of שרשרות in 2 Par 3:16. If the translator was aiming for consistently rendering the term, that is, giving the same translation for the word each time it occurred, he would have either always translated or always transcribed שרשרות. Thus, the translator, in his dealing with שרשרות, is inconsistent. Similar observations were made with terms like גלות, ‘basins’, בתרות, ‘capitals’, and במה, ‘high place’, in 2 Par 4. Often with these terms, though, he simply transcribes, which may not have been helpful for his readers unless they knew well the Hebrew terms that were being transcribed.¹²

In 2 Par 5, we observed an inconsistency on the part of the translator regarding the representation of the direct object marker אַת. The translator displays a tendency

¹⁰ There is some overlap here with S. Olofsson, ‘Consistency as a Translation Technique’, *SJOT* 6.1 (1992) 14-30. Olofsson, though, is primarily concerned with moving the discussion forward on terms like ‘consistent’ and ‘stereotyped’ for the sake of clarity.

¹¹ *Oxford English Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. ‘Inconsistent’. See J. Cook, ‘Contextuality and the Septuagint’, *HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 75(3) (2019) <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v75i3.5029>. Concerning the Greek version of Proverbs, Cook, 2, claims that ‘some individual lexical items are rendered consistently, but many are varied. This translation technical approach can be described as one of *diversity* and *unity*’ (emphasis in original).

¹² Beyond this, though, the code-switching may be at play in these situations. If so, it is likely that the translator was producing Par for a community that would have been familiar with these Hebrew terms. By transcribing the terms, the translator could have been drawing attention to the temple and its structure.

towards representing the definiteness of a noun following תא with an accusative article, whether the noun that follows תא is articular or anarthrous. The inconsistency with rendering the direct object marker this way is seen in 2 Par 5:2, where the translator renders תא־תא, ‘the ark’, with (anarthrous) κιβωτόν, ‘ark’. In 2 Par 5:7, though, the translator renders the same object, תא־תא, with the articular τὴν κιβωτόν, ‘the ark’. A consistent translator would have either always or never used the accusative article when תא is present in the *Vorlage*.¹³

In 2 Par 6, the translator used παῖς, ‘servant, slave’, and δοῦλος, ‘slave, servant’, interchangeably as translations of עבד, ‘slave, servant’. In contrast to some other studies on the use of παῖς and δοῦλος for עבד, it seems that the translator of Par simply had a preference towards using παῖς.¹⁴ However, since עבד occurs 11 times in the prayer of dedication and nine times it is rendered with παῖς and two times it is rendered with δοῦλος, this should be considered an inconsistency on the part of the translator, though it is an inconsistency that could have stylistic motivation (like producing *variatio*).

Not all inconsistencies should be considered to be negative. The translation of שמע, ‘to hear’, in the prayer of dedication provides a clear example of inconsistency with stylistic flourish. When the translator encounters the imperfect שמעת, ‘you will hear’, he renders it with εἰσακούσῃ, ‘you will hear’. He translates the *waw* + perfect שמעו, ‘you will hear’, with ἀκούσῃ, ‘you will hear’. On the one hand, the translator can be seen as inconsistent in his rendering of the verb שמע. Sometimes he uses compound forms of ἀκούω; other times he simply uses ἀκούω. On the other hand, the translator consistently uses εἰσακούω for the Hebrew imperfect and ἀκούω for the Hebrew perfect.¹⁵

These examples are representative of a clear observation from 2 Par 4-6 and related passages: the translator of 2 Par inconsistently employs his ‘translation techniques’. We observed earlier the likelihood that the translator lacked a ‘system’ for

¹³ Once again I should mention: this is not a statement about quality. Whether it is ‘right’ that the translator represents the direct object marker with an accusative article is less important than the fact that he does so inconsistently. Again, see *CGCG*, §28.1-2 on the necessity of the article in these situations.

¹⁴ See Lee, *Greek of the Pentateuch*, 42-43.

¹⁵ As we observed in a previous chapter, the translator is inconsistent when he uses εἰσακούω for a perfect verb in 2 Par 34:21.

translating. Even so, he has certain tendencies that he does not always follow consistently.¹⁶

Concluding Remarks

The translator of 2 Par is one whose primary concern seems to be communicating meaning. Sometimes the meaning may be obscured by the use of transcriptions or neologisms. Other times, quality Greek literary flare shines through.¹⁷ Occasionally, both of these features are found in the same verse.¹⁸ To say that 2 Par is simply rigid, overly literal, or translationese is an overstatement and oversimplification. At the end of the day, the translator gets the job done.¹⁹

Recommendations for Further Study

The next step in studying the translation techniques used by the translator in 2 Par involves taking a similar approach to the one used in the present study and applying it to other units of the text. By applying this eclectic approach to other sections of the Solomonic narrative and 2 Par more generally, a fuller picture of the translator that produced this work will continue to surface. Beyond 2 Par, this eclectic approach to smaller textual units can be applied throughout the LXX, leading to more careful conclusions about the translators. Further research is also necessary for drawing more definite conclusions concerning the provenance of Par. The translator's apparent unfamiliarity with the temple structure is the main contribution of the present study to this research question. The conversation deserves to be continued in future studies.

¹⁶ According to Lee, *Greek of the Pentateuch*, 268, the method of the translators of the Pentateuch can be described 'in terms of the translators' "control" of the Hebrew original and their freedom to choose how to render it'. If the translator that produced Par is like those that produced the LXX Pentateuch, it would be worth considering the translator's choices for careful and complicated renderings.

¹⁷ See Mulrone, *Translation Style*, 202: 'The translator's personal technique can be seen from grammatical choices, but also by his attempts to integrate rhetorical flourish'.

¹⁸ See Aejmelaesus, 'Translation Technique', 60: '[The LXX translators] employ excellent free renderings and helplessly literal, Hebraistic renderings of one and the same Hebrew expression almost side by side'.

¹⁹ See Mulrone, *Translation Style*, 199: 'The Septuagint as a Greek document does in fact communicate on its own two feet'. See also Lee, *Greek of the Pentateuch*, 257: 'The translation [of the Pentateuch] is a *Greek* text with a *Hebraic flavour*' (emphasis in original).

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, A. 'Function and Interpretation of כִּי in Biblical Hebrew'. *JBL* 105.2 (1986) 193-209.
- . *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. and exp. ed. ConBet 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- . 'OTI *causale* in Septuagintal Greek'. Pages 11-29 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. and exp. ed. ConBet 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- . 'OTI *recitativum* in Septuagintal Greek'. Pages 31-41 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. and exp. ed. ConBet 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- . 'The Origins of the *Kaige* Revision'. Pages 285-311 in *Scriptures in the Making: Texts and their Transmission in Late Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by R. Hakola, J. Orpana, and P. Huotari. CBET 109. Leuven: Peeters, 2022.
- . 'The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint'. Pages 43-57 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. and exp. ed. ConBet 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- . 'Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator'. Pages 59-69 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. and exp. ed. ConBet 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- . 'Übersetzungstechnik und theologische Interpretation: Zur Methodik der Septuaginta-Forschung'. Pages 223-239 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. and exp. ed. ConBet 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- . 'What We Talk About When We Talk About Translation Technique'. Pages 205-222 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. and exp. ed. ConBet 50. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- Aitken, J. K. 'Linguistic Variation and the Circumstantial Participle'. *JSCS* 54 (2021) 55-75.
- . *No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary*. Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible 5. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2014.
- . 'The language of the Septuagint and Jewish–Greek identity'. Pages 120-134 in *The Jewish–Greek Tradition in Antiquity and the Byzantine Empire*. Edited by J. K. Aitken and J. C. Paget. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- . 'The Origins of KAI ΓΕ'. Pages 21-40 in *Biblical Greek in Context: Essays in Honour of John A. L. Lee*. Edited by J. K. Aitken and T. V. Evans. BTS 22. Leuven: Peeters, 2015.

- . ‘The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch’. Pages 507-521 in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies*. Edited by J. K. Aitken, K. J. Dell and B. A. Mastin. BZAW 420. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.
- Albrecht, F. ‘Ein griechischer Papyrus-Codex der Chronikbücher (Ra 880, P.Sinai Gr. 1, *ineditum*)’. *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 64.2 (2018) 279-293.
- Allen, L. C. ‘Further Thoughts on an Old Recension of Reigns in Paralipomena’. *HTR* 61.3 (1968) 483-491.
- . *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text. Part I: The Translator’s Craft*. VTSup 25. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- . *The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text. Part II: Textual Criticism*. VTSup 27. Leiden: Brill, 1974.
- Aristophanes. *Plutus*.
- Aristotle. *Rhetorica*.
- Ausloos, H. and B. Lemmelijn. ‘Content-Related Criteria in Characterising the LXX Translation Technique’. Pages 357-376 in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*. Edited by W. Kraus and M. Karrer. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Backfish, E. H. P. *Hebrew Wordplay and Septuagint Translation Technique in the Fourth Book of the Psalter*. LHBOTS 682. London: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Barr, J. ‘Common Sense and Biblical Language’. *Bib* 49.3 (1968) 377-387.
- . ‘Did the Greek Pentateuch Really Serve as a Dictionary for the Translation of Later Books?’. Pages 523-543 in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. van Peursen. OLA 118. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- . ‘The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations’. *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternahmens* 15 (1979) 279-325.
- Barthélemy, D. *Les Devanciers d’Aquila: Première publication intégrale du text des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le Désert de Juda*. VTSup 10. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Bauer, W. *A Greek – English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd Ed. Revised and edited by F. W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Beck, J. A. *Translators as Storytellers: A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique*. StBibLit 25. New York: Peter Lang, 2000.

- Ben Zvi, E. 'A Sense of Proportion: An Aspect of the Theology of the Chronicler'. *SJOT* 9 (1995) 37-51.
- . 'The Authority of 1-2 Chronicles in the Late Second Temple Period'. *JSP* 3 (1988) 59-88.
- Bickerman, E. J. 'The Septuagint as a Translation'. *PAAJR* 28 (1959) 1-39.
- 'Bill Nicholson'. <https://www.nationalfootballmuseum.com/halloffame/bill-nicholson/>; accessed May 2022.
- Bird, M. F. *Crossing Over Sea and Land: Jewish Missionary Activity in the Second Temple Period*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2010.
- Blank, S. H. 'The LXX Renderings of Old Testament Terms for Law'. *HUCA* 7 (1930) 259-283.
- Blenkinsopp, J. 'Kiriath-Jearim and the Ark'. *JBL* 88(2) (1969) 143-156.
- Boda, M. J. 'Gazing through the Cloud of Incense: Davidic Dynasty and Temple Community in the Chronicler's Perspective'. Pages 215-145 in *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography*. Edited by P. S. Evans and T. F. Williams. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2013.
- Bons, E. 'A Sample Article: ΚΤΙΖΩ – ΚΤΙΣΙΣ – ΚΤΙΣΜΑ – ΚΤΙΣΤΗΣ'. Pages 173-187 in *Septuagint Vocabulary: Pre-History, Usage, Reception*. Edited by J. Joosten and E. Bons. SCS 58. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- , ed. *Historical and Theological Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Vol. 1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- . 'Septuagint Studies between Past and Future: State of the Art and New Perspectives'. Pages 3-17 in *Die Septuaginta — Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen*. Edited by E. Bons, M. Geiger, F. Ueberschaer, M. Sigismund, and M. Meiser. WUNT 444. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- Bons, E., and J. Joosten, eds. *Die Sprache der Septuaginta/The Language of the Septuagint*. LXX.H Band 3. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.
- Boyd-Taylor, C. 'A Place in the Sun: The Interpretative Significance of LXX-Psalms 18:5c'. *BIOCS* 31 (1998) 71-105.
- . 'In a Mirror, Dimly—Reading the Septuagint as a Document of Its Times'. Pages 15-31 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden. SCS 53. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- . *Reading Between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies*. BTS 8. Leuven: Peeters, 2011.

- . ‘Toward the Analysis of Translational Norms: A Sighting Shot’. *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 27-46.
- Brock, S. P. ‘Lucian *Redivivus*: Some Reflections on Barthèlemey’s *Les devanciers d’Aquila*’. Pages 176-181 in *Studia Evangelica V*. Edited by F. L. Cross. TU 103. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1968.
- Brotzman, E. R., and E. J. Tully. *Old Testament Textual Criticism: A Practical Introduction*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Büchner, D. “‘You Shall Not Give of Your Seed to Serve an *Archon*’: Lev 18,21 in the Septuagint’. Pages 183-196 in *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism*. Edited by H. Ausloos, J. Cook, F. García Martínez, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- Chesterman, A. *Reflections on Translation Theory: Selected Papers 1993-2014*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2017.
- Church, P. *Hebrews and the Temple: Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and in Hebrews*. NovTSup 171. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Clancy, F. ‘The Chronicler’s *Vorlage*, Kalimi verses Auld’. *SJOT* 33.1 (2019) 95-110.
- Clines, D. J. A., ed. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. 8 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-2011.
- Cook, J. ‘Contextuality and the Septuagint’. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 75(3) (2019) <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v75i3.5029>.
- . ‘Interpreting the Septuagint’. Pages 1-22 in *Congress Volume Stellenbosch 2016*. Edited by L. Jonker, G. Kotzé, and C. M. Maier. VTSup 177. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- . ‘Interpreting the Septuagint – Exegesis, Theology and/or Religionsgeschichte?’. Pages 591-606 in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*. Edited W. Kraus and M. Karrer. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- . ‘Towards understanding the Septuagint’. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 76(4) (2020) <https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v76i4.6280>.
- . ‘Translating the Septuagint: Some Methodological Considerations’. Pages 9-33 in *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism*. Edited by H. Ausloos, J. Cook, F. G. Martínez, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- Correia, E. ‘La place et le sens des livres des Chroniques dans les canons bibliques’. *FoiVie* 109.4 (2010) 49-59.
- Coutras, L. *Tolkien’s Theology of Beauty: Majesty, Splendor, and Transcendence in Middle-earth*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

- Cowe, S. P. 'To the Reader of 1 and 2 Supplements'. Pages 342-348 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Edited by A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Danove, P. 'A Comparison of the Usage of ἀκούω and ἀκούω-Compounds in the Septuagint and New Testament'. *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 14 (2001) 65-85.
- . "'Deriving" and Describing Usages of Τίθημι and Τίθημι Compounds in the Septuagint and New Testament'. *BAGL* 3 (2014) 5-30.
- Dell'Acqua, A. P. 'Le vocabulaire de la Septante à la lumière des papyrus'. Pages 1-13 in *The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and its Hellenistic Background*. Edited by E. Bons, P. Pouchelle, and D. Scialabba. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- Denniston, J. D. *The Greek Particles*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1934.
- De Vries, S. J. *1 and 2 Chronicles*. FOTL 11. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- De Waard, J. "'Homophony" in the Septuagint'. *Bib* 62.4 (1981) 551-561.
- Dillard, R. B. *2 Chronicles*. WBC 15. Dallas: Word, 1987.
- . 'The Literary Structure of the Chronicler's Solomon Narrative'. *JSOT* 30 (1984) 85-93.
- Dhont, M. 'Multicausality in Septuagint Studies'. *JSCS* 54 (2021) 43-53.
- . 'Septuagint Translation Technique and Jewish Hellenistic Exegesis'. Pages 21-33 in *The T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*. Edited by W. A. Ross and W. E. Glenny. London: T&T Clark, 2021.
- . *Style and Context of Old Greek Job*. JSJSup 183. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Driver, G. R. 'Once Again Abbreviations'. *Text* 4.1 (1964) 76-94.
- Duke, R. K. 'Recent Research in Chronicles'. *CurBR* 8.1 (2009) 10-50.
- Eaton, M. R. 'The Intractable Servant of the Septuagint: Translating 'ebed'. *BT* 48.1 (1997) 114-122.
- Eberhart, C. A. 'Leontopolis, Onias und die Septuaginta: Einflüsse und Auswirkungen'. Pages 40-57 in *Die Septuaginta — Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen*. Edited by E. Bons, M. Geiger, F. Ueberschaer, M. Sigismund, and M. Meiser. WUNT 444. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- Emde Boas, E. van, A. Rijksbaron, L. Huitink, and M. de Bakker. *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Eusebius. *Praeparatio evangelica*.
- Even-Zohar, I. 'Polysystem Theory'. *Poetics Today* 11.1 (1990) 9-26.

- Fernández Marcos, N. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by W. G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Fikhman, I. F. 'The Physical Appearance of Egyptian Jews according to the Greek Papyri'. *SCI* 18 (1999) 131-138.
- Fresch, C. J. 'Discourse Markers in the Septuagint and Early *Koine* Greek with Special Reference to the Twelve'. PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2015.
- . 'Is There an Emphatic *μέν*? A Consideration of the Particle's Development and its Function in *Koine*'. *NTS* 63 (2017) 261-278.
- Gallagher, E. L. 'The End of the Bible? The Position of Chronicles in the Canon'. *TynBul* 65.2 (2014) 181-199.
- . 'The Septuagint's Fidelity to Its *Vorlage* in Greek Patristic Thought'. Pages 663-676 in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010*. Edited by M. K. H. Peters. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Gauthier, R. X. 'Toward an LXX Hermeneutic'. *JNSL* 35/1 (2009) 45-74.
- Gehman, H. S. 'Αγίος in the Septuagint, and its relation to the Hebrew Original'. *VT* 4 (1954) 337-348.
- . 'The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek'. *VT* 1.2 (1951) 81-90.
- Gerleman, G. *Studies in the Septuagint II. Chronicles*. Lunds Universitets Arsskrift 43/3. Lund: Gleerup, 1946.
- Gesenius, F. W. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by E. Kautzsch and Sir A. E. Cowley. 2nd English ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Glenny, W. E. *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. VTSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . 'The Septuagint and Biblical Theology'. *Themelios* 41.2 (2006) 263-278.
- . 'The Septuagint and Theology'. Pages 313-327 in *The T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*. Edited by W. A. Ross and W. E. Glenny. London: T&T Clark, 2021.
- Good, R. '1-2 Chronicles (Paraleipomena)'. Pages 167-177 in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. Edited by J. K. Aitken. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- . *The Septuagint's Translation of the Hebrew Verbal System in Chronicles*. VTSup 136. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Greenspoon, L. 'At the Beginning: The Septuagint as a Jewish Bible Translation'. Pages 159-169 in *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and*

- Prospect*. Edited by R. J. V. Hiebert. SCS 56. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- . “‘It’s All Greek to Me’”: Septuagint Studies Since 1968’. *CurBS* 5 (1997) 147-174.
- . ‘The Septuagint and/in Popular Culture’. *BIOSCS* 36 (2003) 61-74.
- Gutt, E. A. ‘On the Significance of the Cognitive Core of Translation’. *The Translator* 11.1 (2005) 25-49.
- Hanhart, R., ed. *Paralipomenon liber II*. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum vol. VII, 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014.
- Harl, M. ‘La Bible d’Alexandrie I. The Translation Principles’. Pages 181-197 in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Oslo, 1998*. Edited by B. A. Taylor. SCS 51. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.
- Harris, R. L. ‘Chronicles and the Canon in New Testament Times’. *JETS* 33/1 (1990) 75-84.
- Hauspie, K. ‘Ἀκούω dans le livre d’Ézéchiel: Étude sémantique en vue d’une traduction française et anglaise’. Pages 177-192 in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust*. Edited by F. G. Martínez and M. Vervenne. BETL 192. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
- . ‘Prepositional Phrases in the Septuagint of Ezekiel’. Pages 89-105 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on the Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. Edited by A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . ‘Transcriptions of Hebrew Words’. Pages 172-181 in *Die Sprache der Septuaginta/The Language of the Septuagint*. Edited by E. Bons and J. Joosten. LXX.H Band 3. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.
- Hayward, R. ‘The Jewish Temple at Leontopolis: A Reconsideration’. *JJS* 33.1 (1982) 429-443.
- Jobes, K. H. ‘Relevance Theory and the Translation of Scripture’. *JETS* 50/4 (2007) 773-797.
- Jobes, K. H. and M. Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.
- Johnson, B. J. M. ‘Reading the Septuagint: The Hermeneutical Problem of a Translated Text’. Pages 20-40 in *Authoritative Texts and Reception History: Aspects and Approaches*. Edited by D. Batovici and K. de Troyer. BIS 151. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- Jones, A. ‘Was King Saul Choked by an Evil Spirit?: A Study of πνίγω’. *BN* 190 (2021) 59-68.

- Jones, J. B. *Translation and Style in the Old Greek Psalter: What Pleases Israel's God*. Septuagint Monograph Series 1. Leiden: Brill, 2022.
- Jonker, L. C. 'From Paraleipomenon to Early Reader: The Implications of Recent Chronicles Studies for Pentateuchal Criticism'. Pages 217-254 in *Congress Volume Munich 2013*. Edited by C. M. Maier. VTSup 163. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- . 'From Pentateuch to Chronicles: What does the End (Chronicles) of the Hebrew Bible Canon Imply for the Understanding of the Beginning (Pentateuch)?'. *BZ* 59.1 (2015) 39-53.
- . 'Reforming History: The Hermeneutical Significance of the Books of Chronicles'. *VT* 57.1 (2007) 21-44.
- Joosten, J. 'Pillars of the Sacred: Septuagint Words Between Biblical Theology and Hellenistic Culture'. *SVÄ* 83 (2018) 1-15.
- . 'Reflections on the "Interlinear Paradigm" in Septuagintal Studies'. Pages 163-178 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. Edited by A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . 'The Interplay Between Hebrew and Greek in Biblical Lexicology: Language, Text, and Interpretation'. Pages 209-223 in *Biblical Lexicology: Hebrew and Greek*. Edited by E. Bons, J. Joosten, and R. Hunziker-Rodewald. BZAW 443. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015.
- . 'The Vocabulary of the Septuagint and Its Historical Context'. Pages 1-11 in *Septuagint Vocabulary: Pre-History, Usage, Reception*. Edited by J. Joosten and E. Bons. SCS 58. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- . 'To See God: Conflicting Exegetical Tendencies in the Septuagint'. Pages 187-299 in *Die Septuaginta: Texte – Kontexte – Lebenswelten*. Edited by M. Karrer and W. Kraus. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- . 'Translating the Untranslatable: Septuagint Renderings of Hebrew Idioms'. Pages 59-70 in *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by R. J. V. Hiebert. SCS 56. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.
- Joüon, P. and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. SubBib 27. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2006.
- Kalimi, I. *The Reshaping of ancient Israelite History in Chronicles*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005.
- . *The Retelling of Chronicles in Jewish Tradition and Literature: A Historical Journey*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- Kartveit, M. 'The Temple of Jerusalem as the Centre of Affairs in the Book of Chronicles: Memories of the Past and Contemporary Social Setting'. Pages 229-

242 in *Centres and Peripheries in the Early Second Temple Period*. Edited by E. Ben Zvi and C. Levin. FAT 108. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Kelly, B. E. “Retribution” Revisited: Covenant, Grace and Restoration’. Pages 206-227 in *Chronicler as Theologian*. Edited by M. P. Graham. JSOTSup 371. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

Kim, J.-H. ‘Die Wiedergabe von עֲבָד mit δοῦλος oder παῖς in der Septuaginta der Samuel- und Königebücher’. Pages 391-403 in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*. Edited by W. Kraus and M. Karrer. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Kim’s Convenience. Season 2, episode 3. ‘House Guest’. Directed by P. Wellington. Aired October 10, 2017, on CBC Television.

Kittel, G., G. W. Bromiley, and G. Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

Klein, R. W. *2 Chronicles: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

———. ‘Supplements in the Paralipomena: A Rejoinder’. *HTR* 61.3 (1968) 492-495.

Kleinig, J. W. ‘Recent Research in Chronicles’. *CurBS* 2 (1994) 43-76.

Kalimi, I. ‘Paranomasia in the Book of Chronicles’. *JSOT* 67 (1995) 27-41.

Knobloch, F. W. “Transcription Technique” and the Text of Greek Genesis’. *BIOSCS* 35 (2002) 97-109.

Knoppers, G. N. ‘The Relationship of the Deuteronomistic History to Chronicles: Was the Chronicler a Deuteronomist?’. Pages 307-341 in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*. Edited by M. Nissinen. VTSup 148. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Knoppers, G. N. and P. B. Harvey, Jr. ‘Omitted and Remaining Matters: On the Names Given to the Book of Chronicles in Antiquity’. *JBL* 121/2 (2002) 227-243.

Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, M. E. J. Richardson, and J. J. Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1994-2000.

Kreuzer, S. ‘B or not B? The Place of Codex Vaticanus in Textual History and in Septuagint Research’. Pages 69-96 in *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint*. Edited by J. Cook and H.-J. Stipp. VTSup 157. Leiden: Brill, 2012) 69-96.

———. ‘Kaige and “Theodotion”’. Pages 449-458 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*. Edited by A. G. Salvesen and T. M. Law. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

———. “Lukian redivivus” or Barthélemy and Beyond?’. Pages 243-261 in *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010*. Edited by M. K. H. Peters. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

- . *The Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology in the Septuagint*. SCS 63. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- . ‘Toward the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and the Kaige Recension)’. Pages 113-128 in *The Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology in the Septuagint*. SCS 63. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Kugelmeier, C. ‘Bibel, Papyri Und Philosophen: Beobachtungen Zur Geschichte Hellenistischer Abstractbegriffe’. Pages 25-44 in *Septuagint Vocabulary: Pre-History, Usage, Reception*. Edited by J. Joosten and E. Bons. SCS 58. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Lee, J. A. L. *The Greek of the Pentateuch: Grinfield Lectures on the Septuagint 2011–2012*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.
- . ‘The *Onoma* Rule’. *NovT* 56 (2014) 411-421.
- . ‘Translations of the Old Testament I. Greek’. Pages 775-783 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B. C. – A. D. 400*. Edited by S. E. Porter. Leiden: Brill; Atlanta: SBL Pres, 1997.
- Lemmelijn, B. ‘Free and Yet Faithful. On the Translation Technique of LXX Exod 7:14-11:10’. *JNSL* 33/1 (2007) 1-32.
- Leuchter, M. ‘The Cult at Kiriath Yearim: Implications from the Biblical Record’. *VT* 58 (2008) 526-543.
- Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones, and R. McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Lust, J. ‘Syntax and Translation Greek’. *ETL* 77.4 (2001) 395-401.
- . ‘Translation Greek and Lexicography of the Septuagint’. *JSOT* 59 (1993) 109-120.
- Mäkipelto, V. ‘The Septuagint and the Major Recensions’. Pages 161-174 in *The T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*. Edited by W. A. Ross and W. E. Glenny. London: T&T Clark, 2021.
- Mardaga, H. ‘*Hapax Legomena*: A Neglected Field in Biblical Studies’. *CurBR* 10(2) (2012) 264-274.
- Matlock, M. D. *Discovering the Traditions of Prose Prayers in Early Jewish Literature*. LSTS 81. London: Bloomsbury, 2012.
- Martin, R. A. *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974. Repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004.

- Mayser, E. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*. Band II.I Satzlehre. Berlin and Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1926.
- Meynadier, B. 'Eléments de lexicographie compare des Règles et des Paralipomènes'. Pages 37-51 in *La Septante en Allemagne et en France: Textes de la Septante à traduction double ou à traduction très littérale*. Edited by W. Kraus and O. Munnich. OBO 283. Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- McLay, R. T. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . 'Why Not a Theology of the Septuagint?'. Pages 607-620 in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*. Edited by W. Kraus and M. Karrer. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Montanari, F. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. 3rd Ed. M. Goh and C. Schroeder, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Moş, L. F. 'Semitic Influence in the Use of New Testament Greek Prepositions: The Case of the Book of Revelation'. *BAGL* 6 (2017) 44-66.
- Mulroney, J. A. E. *The Translation Style of Old Greek Habakkuk: Methodological Advancement in Interpretative Studies of the Septuagint*. FAT 2.86. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.
- Muraoka, T. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- . *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.
- Myers, P. 'Septuagint Transcriptions and Phonology'. Pages 37-62 in *The T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*. Edited by W. A. Ross and W. E. Glenny. London: T&T Clark, 2021.
- Nida, E. A. 'Communication and Translation'. *BT* 23.3 (1972) 309-316.
- . 'Formal Correspondence in Translation'. *BT* 21.3 (1970) 105-113.
- . 'Implications of Contemporary Linguistics for Biblical Scholarship'. *JBL* 91.1 (1972) 73-89.
- . 'Principles of Translation as Exemplified by Bible Translating'. *BT* 10.4 (1959) 148-164.
- . 'Translating Means Communicating: A Sociolinguistic Theory of Translation II'. *BT* 30.3 (1979) 318-325.
- Olofsson, S. 'Consistency as a Translation Technique'. *SJOT* 6.1 (1992) 14-30.
- . *Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis: Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version*. ConBOT 57. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Oxford English Dictionary. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Pajunen, M. S. 'The Saga of Judah's Kings Continues: The Reception of Chronicles in the Late Second Temple Period'. *JBL* 163.3 (2017) 565-584.

Pearce, S. 'Contextualising Greek Chronicles'. *Zutot* 1.1 (2001) 22-27.

Pennington, J. T. "'Heaven' and 'Heavens' in the LXX: Exploring the Relationship Between שָׁמַיִם and οὐρανός'. *BIOSCS* 36 (2003) 39-59.

Perkins, L. 'The Translation of מועד /אהל משכן/שכן and שכן in Greek Exodus'. *JSCS* 48 (2015) 8-26.

Peters, R. D. *The Greek Article: A Functional Grammar of δ-items in the Greek New Testament with Special Emphasis on the Greek Article*. LBS 9. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Philo. *De vita Mosis II*.

Pietersma, A. 'A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint'. Pages 337-364 in *Bible and computer: the Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference: proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique 'From alpha to byte,' University of Stellenbosch 17-21 July, 2000*. Edited by J. Cook. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

———. 'LXX and DTS: A New Archimedean Point for Septuagint Studies?'. *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 1-11.

———. 'Translating a Translation with Examples from the Greek Psalter'. Pages 169-182 in *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism*. Edited by H. Ausloos, J. Cook, F. G. Martínez, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.

Pietersma, A., and B. G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Rabassa, G. 'If This Be Treason: Translation and Its Possibilities'. *The American Scholar* 44(1) (1974) 29-39.

———. 'No Two Snowflakes are Alike: Translation as Metaphor'. Pages 1-12 in *The Craft of Translation*. Edited by J. Biguenet and R. Schulte. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Rajak, T. *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Rehm, M. *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik, Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 13,3*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1937.

- Rogers, V. M. 'The Old Greek Version of Chronicles: A Comparative Study of the LXX with the Hebrew Text from a Theological Approach'. PhD diss., Princeton University, 1954.
- Rösel, M. 'Nomothesis: The Understanding of the Law in the Septuagint'. Pages 343-363 in *Tradition and Innovation: English and German Studies on the Septuagint*. SCS 70. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018.
- . 'The Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates, the Temple in Leontopolis, and the Importance of the History of Israelite Religion in the Hellenistic Period'. Pages 3-28 in *Tradition and Innovation: English and German Studies on the Septuagint*. SCS 70. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018.
- . 'Towards a "Theology of the Septuagint"'. Pages 239-252 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden. SCS 53. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- . *Tradition and Innovation: English and German Studies on the Septuagint*. SCS 70. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018.
- Rosenberg, S. G. 'The Jewish Temple at Elephantine'. *NEA* 67.1 (2004) 4-13.
- Runge, S. E. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2010.
- Schenker, A. 'Paraleipomenon I and II / 1–2 Chronica / 1–2 Chronicles'. Pages 213-221 in *Introduction to the LXX*. Edited by S. Kreuzer. Translated by D. A. Brenner and P. Altmann. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2019.
- Shenkel, J. D. 'A Comparative Study of the Synoptic Parallels in I Paraleipomena and I-II Reigns'. *HTR* 62.1 (1969) 63-85.
- Silva, M. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2014.
- Smyth, H. W. *Greek Grammar*. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Sollamo, R. *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint*. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae.: Dissertationes humanarum litterarum 19. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979.
- . 'Some "Improper" Prepositions, Such as ENΩΠΙION, ENANTION, ENANTI, etc., in the Septuagint and Early Koine Greek'. *VT* 25.4 (1975) 773-782.
- . 'The Study of Translation Technique'. Pages 161-171 in *Die Sprache der Septuaginta/The Language of the Septuagint*. Edited by E. Bons and J. Joosten. LXX.H Band 3. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2016.
- . 'Translation Technique as a Method'. Pages 35-41 in *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early*

Judaism. Edited by H. Ausloos, J. Cook, F. G. Martínez, B. Lemmelijn, and M. Vervenne. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.

Sophocles. *Antigone*.

———. *Oedipus coloneus*.

Talshir, Z. 'The Reign of Solomon in the Making: Pseudo-Connections Between 3 Kingdoms and Chronicles'. *VT* 50.2 (2000) 233-249.

Thackeray, H. St. J. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

The Lexham English Septuagint. 2nd ed. Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2020.

Tiño, J. 'An Elaboration of Some Theological Issues of Second Temple Judaism in Chronicles and Jubilees'. *CV* 59.1 (2017) 25-47.

Tolkien, J. R. R. *The Letters of J. R. R. Tolkien*. Edited by H. Carpenter. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1981.

Toury, G. 'A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?'. *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 13-25.

———. *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012.

Tov, E. 'Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?'. Pages 203-218 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. 'The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint'. Pages 239-246 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. 'The Septuagint Translation of the Torah as a Source and Resource for the Post-Pentateuchal Translators'. Pages 341-356 in *Textual Developments: Collected Essays, Volume 4*. VTSup 181. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

———. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Rev. and exp. 3rd ed. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2015.

———. 'Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint'. Pages 257-769 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

———. 'Three Dimensions of Words in the Septuagint'. Pages 85-94 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

- Trebolle, J. 'Kings (MT/LXX) and Chronicles: The Double and Triple Textual Tradition'. Pages 483-501 in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by R. Rezetko, T. Lim, and B. Aucker. VTSup 113. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Trotter, J. R. *The Jerusalem Temple in Diaspora Jewish Practice and Thought During the Second Temple Period*. JSJSup 192. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Turner, K. J. 'A Study of Articulation in the Greek Ruth'. *BIOSCS* 34 (2001) 95-114.
- Vahrenhorst, M. "'Mehr al sein Wörterbuch": Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis des 2. Chronikbuches zum Pentateuch'. Pages 52-63 in *La Septante en Allemagne et en France: Textes de la Septante à traduction double ou à traduction très littéraire*. Edited by W. Kraus and O. Munnich. OBO 283. Fribourg: Academic Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- van der Kooij, A. 'On the Use of ἀλλόφυλος in the Septuagint'. Pages 401-408 in *XV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Munich, 2013*. Edited by W. Kraus, M. N. van der Meer, and M. Meiser. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.
- . 'Servant or Slave: The Various Equivalent of Hebrew 'Ebed in the Old Greek of Isaiah'. Pages 259-271 in *Die Septuaginta – Themen, Manuskripte, Wirkungen*. Edited by E. Bons, M. Geiger, F. Ueberschaer, M. Sigismund, and M. Meiser. WUNT 444. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.
- . 'Servant or Slave?: The Various Equivalent of Hebrew 'Ebed in the Septuagint of the Pentateuch'. Pages 229-242 in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana, 2007*. Edited by M. K. H. Peters. SCS 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- van der Louw, T. A. W. 'Linguistic or Ideological Shifts? The Problem-oriented Study of Transformations as a Methodological Filter'. *Collegium* 11 (2012) 23-41.
- . *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- van Keulen, P. S. F. *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2-11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2-11*. VTSup 104. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- van Wolde, E. 'The Verbless Clause and Its Textual Function'. Pages 321-326 in *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches*. Edited by C. L. Miller. LSAWS 1. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1999.
- Vianès, L. 'Chronicles/Paralipomena'. Pages 235-243 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*. Edited by A. G. Salvesen and T. M. Law. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

- . ‘Peuples exotiques et routes de l’encens dans les livres des Paralipomènes’. *Sem Clas* 11 (2018) 195-200.
- Wagner, J. R. *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics*. Waco: Baylor University Press; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Waltke, B. K. and M. P. O’Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wegner, P. D. *A Student’s Guide to Textual Criticism of the Bible: Its History, Methods & Results*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2006.
- Wright, B. G. ‘Ebed/Doulos: Terms and Social Status in the Meeting of Hebrew Biblical and Hellenistic Roman Culture’. *Semeia* 83-84 (1998) 83-111.
- . ‘The Septuagint as a Hellenistic Greek Text’. *JSJ* 50 (2019) 497-523.
- . ‘Translation as Scripture: The Septuagint in Aristeas and Philo’. Pages 47-61 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*. Edited by W. Kraus and R. G. Wooden. SCS 53. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Wyckoff, E. J. ‘When Does Translation Become Exegesis? Exodus 24:9-11 in the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint’. *CBQ* 74.4 (2012) 675-693.
- Yamaga, T. ‘Anti-Treaty Theology of the Chronicler and His View of History’. Pages 227-306 in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010*. Edited by M. Nissinen. VTSup 148. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Ziegert, C. ‘Kultur und Identität. Wörtliches Übersetzen in der Septuaginta’. *VT* 67.4 (2017) 648-665.
- Zipor, M. ‘The Greek Chronicles’. *Bib* 61.4 (1980) 561-571.