# Durham E-Theses

## Long Doublets in the Septuagint of the Book of Proverbs With a history of the research on the Greek translations

CUPPI, LORENZO

# Long Doublets in the Septuagint of the Book of Proverbs

## With a history of the research on the Greek translations

## Lorenzo Cuppi

### Thesis submitted for the Doctoral degree

### Department of Theology and Religion

### University of Durham (UK)

### 2011

# Table of contents

**Abstract**

The present research is divided into two main parts. In the first one the history of the studies on the Septuagint translation of the book of Proverbs is addressed; particular attention is given to the recent works by Johann Cook, and by David-Marc d'Hamonville.

In the second part long doublets found in the translation are dealt with (Prov. 2.21; 3.15; 14.22; 15.6). These doublets have been traditionally seen as additions inserted by an early Jewish *Revisor* or via the hexaplaric recension in order to drive the version closer to the so-called Proto-Masoretic Text. The study aims to show that in 3.15 (where both the *qere* and the *ketiv* readings are preserved by the two renderings), 14.22, and 15.6 the translation technique of the first translator of Proverbs can be detected. He seems to be interested in preserving the polysemy of the Hebrew text by means of the double translation. However, in verse 2.21 the translation technique of Theodotion has been recognised in the doublet, and this addition has been tentatively ascribed to an early contact with the καίγε recension rather than to a late insertion from the Hexapla.

Thus, if in most of the cases the doublets do not seem to stem from an early Jewish *Revisor*, in a few instances they may depend on an early exposure to the Jewish recension identified by modern scholars with the name καίγε.

# Abbreviations

BDB      Brown, F., Driver, S.R., and Briggs, C.A., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907).

*BHK*      Kittel, R. (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937).

*BHS*      Elliger, K, and Rudolph, W. (eds.), W., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

*BHQ*      Waard, J. de (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica Quinta: Proverbs* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008).

*BIOSCS*      *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*

*BZ*      *Biblische Zeitschrift*

*HALOT*      Koehler, L., and Baumgartner, W., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

IOSCS      International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies

*JBL*      *Journal of Biblical Literature*

*JNSL*      *Journal of Northwest Semitic Language*s

LSJ      Liddell, H.G., and Scott, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996).

LXX      Septuagint

MT      Masoretic Text

*PG*      *Patrologia Graeca*

*RB*      *Revue Biblique*

*ThLL*      *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*

*VT*      *Vetus Testamentum*

*ZAW*      *Zeitschrift für die altestestamentliche Wissenschaft*

**Declaration**

Some of the material contained in section 2.1-2.4 has previously been submitted for a BAH degree in the University of Bologna.

**Statement of Copyright**

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

**Acknowledgements**

I wish to thank here my previous and present supervisors and teachers of oriental languages: Camillo Neri, Giandomenico Cova, Loren Stuckenbruck, Stuart Weeks, and Robert Hayward. Without their incommensurable help and support this work would have not been written. Thanks are due also to the many institutions which supported my studies in these years: the University of Bologna, the University of Göttingen, the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen, the Theologisches Stift in Göttingen, the University of Durham, the Ustinov College in Durham, the University of Tübingen, the University of Oxford, the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies.

*Parentibus meis*

*In utraque fortuna*

**Introduction**

The present research began some seven years ago while I was still studying in Bologna for the BAH degree. The love for this topic led me to travel around Europe, and it is with some emotion that I close with these lines this long, if not continuous, period of my life.

The research has been divided in two main parts. In the first one I address, in the form of a bibliographical review, the history of the studies on the Septuagint translation of the book of Proverbs. In the first section I am dealing with text critical studies, in the second with the attempts to set the cultural world of the translator. In the third and fourth sections I treat major works which were published in the last 15 years: the monograph of Johann Cook, and the French translation of David-Marc d'Hamonville, and the related issues.

In the second part I focus on the question of the long doublets which are found in the translation. After having clarified the subject, the procedure, and the tools in a preface, I deal with the relevant cases of Prov. 2.21; 3.15; 14.22; 15.6.

In my BAH thesis, and during my sojourns at the Septuaginta-Unternehmen, I inspected also other doublets, but considerations of space and time convinced me that a careful and deep study would have been better to focus on the most instructive and clear examples. It is my hope that the argumentation will prove convincing.

As for the style guide, I followed closely the second edition of *The Sheffield Manual*[1] recommended by my department. However, for bibliographical entries I preferred to use the department's internal style guide in two cases: (1) I consistently avoided the abbreviations 'p.' and 'pp.' before the page numbers, and (2) when referring to a single volume of a work, I used the abbreviation 'vol.' followed by the Arabic numeral instead of the Roman numeral alone (i.e. 'vol. 4' and not simply 'IV').

---

1. Cf. David J.A. Clines, *The Sheffield Manual for Authors & Editors in Biblical Studies. Second Edition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2005).

# A History of the Research on the Greek Translation of the Book of Proverbs

## 1.1. Text Critical Studies

### 1.1.1. From the Reformation to the First World War

At the very end of the 16th century we find what is probably the first contribution to the study of the Greek translation of the book of Proverbs. The Flemish scholar Ioannes Drusius[1] in 1599 published a critical commentary on the Old Testament in which many of the questions posed by the Hebrew Scriptures were resolved by means of emendations based on the LXX. The author dealt with the text of Proverbs in some 45 cases. It is worth noting that Drusius was also interested in collecting the fragments of the three later Greek translators – Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion – and that this collection achieved posthumous publication[2].

In 1649, among the works of the Theatin clergyman Luigi Novarini, Antonio Agelli's posthumous commentary to the book of Proverbs[3] was eventually published. In his commentary we find for the first time a number of critical notes which were to be

---

1. I. Drusius, *Quaestionum Ebraicarum libri tres. In quibus innumera Scripturae loca explicantur aut emendantur* (Franeker: apud Aegidium Radaeum, 1599). This is the revised and augmented edition, the first one having been published in 1583. Johannes van den Driesche (Oudenaarde 1550 – Franeker 1616) had to leave the Flanders and move to England in 1567 because of his Protestant belief. He studied Hebrew in Cambridge, and in 1572 was appointed professor of oriental languages in Oxford. In 1576 he could return to the Low Countries where he taught oriental languages in Leiden until 1585, and later on Hebrew in Franeker until his death.

2. I. Drusius (ed.), *Veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum vetus Testamentum fragmenta, collecta, versa et notis illustrata* (Arnheim: Janssonius, 1622).

3. A. Agelli, 'Commentarius in Proverbia Salomonis', in Luigi Novarini, *Variorum opusculorum tomus*, vol. 3 (Verona: Typis Rubeanis, 1649). Agelli (Sorrento 1532 – Rome 1608), who was also a Theatin father, was an important biblical scholar of the Counter-Reformation movement, and had been a member of the board for the publication of the Sistine edition of the LXX.

proposed again by later commentators.

After these pioneering works, more than a century intervened before another scholar took interest in these matters. In 1709, the Prussian John E. Grabe[4], published in Oxford the fourth volume of his monumental edition of the Alexandrian codex, embellishing it with critical observations in the introductions and in the margins.

Somewhat later, the German philologist Peter Wesseling[5], in a book devoted to many critical problems of Greek and Latin literature, dealt with three cases (6.3; 14.22; 30.20) from the Greek version of Proverbs. Then, after more than 40 years, Georg J. L. Vogel[6] supplied Albert Schultens's Latin version and commentary of the Hebrew Proverbs with some critical observations concerning the Greek text[7]. But the first comprehensive critical commentary on the Greek Proverbs was produced by Johann G. Jäger[8], who dealt with the whole book and whose explanations happen to be still valid. In his introduction, he explicitly refers to the work of Schulten and Vogel (cf. 2-3) whose critical observations he aims to integrate.

In the beginning of the new century Johann F. Schleusner[9] published a critical commentary on the whole LXX, in which he devotes to the book of Proverbs around 60 pages.

But it is with Paul de Lagarde that modern research begins: in 1863 the father of the

---

4. J.E. Grabe (ed.), *Septuginta interpretum tomus ultimus [IV], continens* Psalmorum, Jobi, *ac tres* Salomonis *libros, Cum Apocrypha ejusdem, nec non* Siracidae Sapientia*; Ex antiquissimo MS. Codice Alexandrino accurate descriptos* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1709).

5. P. Wesseling, *Observationum variarum libri duo, in quibus multi veterum auctorum loci explicantur atque emendantur* (Amsterdam: Wetstenius & Smith, 1727), 150-151. The author deals with the LXX at the pages 147-151.

6. A. Schultens, and G.J.L. Vogel (ed.), *Versio integra Proverbiorum Salomonis, et in eadem commentarius* (Halle: J.J. Curt, 1769).

7. Vogel's observations are found between square brackets.

8. J.G. Jäger, *Observationes in Proverbiorum Salomonis versionem Alexandrinam* (Meldorf: Boie, 1788). Jäger was born in a village close to Meißen in Saxony in 1731. In 1750 he entered the University of Leipzig where he studied philology and ancient languages with Johann August Ernesti and Johann Jakob Reiske. From 1772 to 1813 he was rector of the gymnasium in Meldorf. He died in 1818.

9. J.F. Schleusner, *Opuscula critica ad Versiones Graecas Veteris Testamenti pertinentia* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1812), 260-319. Schleusner (Leipzig 1759 – Wittenberg 1831) is particularly famous among the LXX scholars for his Latin lexicon to the Greek Old Testament.

Septuaginta-Unternehmen published his critical notes[10]. Although highly conjectural, they still deserve attention for their synthesis of the predecessors, knowledge of the Hebrew language, and brilliant penetration. The monograph is particularly important for Old Testament criticism since here the author formulates his famous 'drei axiome':

> 1) die manuscripte der griechischen übersetzung des alten testaments sind alle [...] das resultat eines eklektischen verfahrens: darum muß, wer den echten wiederfinden will, ebenfalls eklektiker sein. [...] 2) wenn ein vers oder verstheil in einer freien und in einer sklavisch treuen übertragung vorliegt, gilt die erstere als die echte. 3) wenn sich zwei lesarten nebeneinander finden, von denen die eine den masoretischen text ausdrückt, die andre nur aus einer von ihm abweichenden urschrift erklärt werden kann, so ist die letztere für ursprünglich zu halten.[11]

De Lagarde was actually convinced that a *Revisor* (cf. *passim*) had interpolated the original text of Proverbs.

A critical commentary on the text of the book of Proverbs was also the subject of the doctoral thesis of Antoine J. Baumgartner[12], which analyses every verse of the book in all the versions from the Hebrew; particular attention is devoted to the LXX. Especially relevant are the observations offered in the conclusions.

> Comment l'interprète grec parviendra-t-il à reproduire, dans sa langue, la pensée concentrée que le sage hébreu a coulée dans un moule si restreint? Ce n'est

---

10. P. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863). Cf. also P. de Lagarde, *Mittheilungen*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1884), 19-26; here the author publishes again the introduction of the *Anmerkungen*, and defends one of the main points of his thesis, namely that 'alle hebräischen Handschriften des alten Testaments aus einem einzigen Exemplare stammen' (22).

11. Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 3.

12. A.J. Baumgartner, *Étude critique sur l'état du texte du livre des Proverbes d'après les principales traductions anciennes* (Leipzig: Drugulin, 1890).

évidemment pas en la traduisant telle quelle, en lui conservant sa brièveté native, son cachet sémitique prononcé, car, alors il risquerait de ne pas rendre compréhensible le sens des maximes qu'il a pour but d'interpréter. Il ne traduira pas, il paraphrasera, il interprétera conformément au génie de l'esprit et de l'idiome grecs. [...] Le littéralisme ne sera plus la règle, il deviendra l'exception. L'interprète aura produit une oeuvre *littéraire*; c'était en définitive, la seule chose qu'il pût produire dans ce cas particulier. Le problème de l'originalité du texte se posera donc, ici, d'une tout autre façon. Les additions de mots ou de phrases que présentera une semblable traduction, ne seront pas distinguées du texte grec, aussi facilement qu'elles l'étaient dans le premier cas; ce n'est que lorsqu'on se trouvera en présence d'une adjonction plus considérable, celle d'un stiche ou d'un verset entier, par exemple, que l'on sera amené à se poser la question de l'originalité du texte que l'on aura ainsi sous les yeux.[13]

The very well balanced observations about the state of the *Vorlage* are also interesting.

Il faut convenir qu'il existe, dans cette version, des différences de texte qu'il n'est pas possible d'expliquer par la supposition habituelle d'une erreur de lecture, ni par l'hypothèse facile d'un mss. original incorrect ou incomplet. Ceci nous porte à supposer que, dans certains passages de la traduction, nous avons les indices de l'existence d'un texte original qui, dans telle ou telle de ses parties, devait différer de l'hébreu massorétique. Mais, après l'étude que nous avons faite, nous ne nous croyons pas obligé de supposer un texte bien essentiellement différent du nôtre.[14]

---

13. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 249.

14. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 250.

Further on Baumgartner offers a list of 17 elements which he considers 'règles de lecture et d'interprétation' even 'principes herméneutiques [...] préoccupations littéraires'[15] which have driven the work of the translator(s). Among these principles some seem particularly relevant for the present investigation: 'Le traducteur rend souvent par deux mots un terme d'une signification importante pour la phrase entière et sur lequel il importe de mettre particulièrement l'accent'[16]. Verbs are added in order to clarify the meaning of a sentence and adjectives to specify the sense of a noun. Sometimes it seems like that the translator did not understand the parent text: 'Des termes ont été rendus approximativement par le trad. grec, qui semble ne les avoir pas bien compris'[17]. According to Baumgartner the translator is a man of letters:

> on reconnaît fréquemment, dans la traduction alexandrine, l'influence des classiques grecs, à l'emploi de beaucoup de mots étrangers au langage habituel de la LXX, comme aussi de phrases entières qui peuvent être regardées comme des réminiscences classiques. Ainsi que nous l'avons fait remarquer plus haut, le traducteur grec est avant tout un littérateur; il fait oeuvre d'artiste plus encore que de savant, et il ne manquera jamais l'occasion de rapprocher sa traduction de quelque passage emprunté à ses auteurs favoris[18].

Finally the writer also detects 'la transformation des distiques synthétiques en distiques antithétiques'[19].

Baumgartner also offers a list of elements which may have caused the faulty translations. First of all he maintains that the *Vorlage* was written in *scriptio continua* as

---

15. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 250.
16. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 251. It may be interesting to note that 5 out of the 6 examples reported by the author are among those which were to be considered doublets by Charles T. Fritsch (cited below at fn. 51).
17. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 252.
18. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 253.
19. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 253.

long as we find in the translation two words read as one, or one divided in two words. The author also ascribes to the *scriptio continua* the stichometric errors, as we find final or initial words in two different stichs in the MT and in the translation[20]. But this appears to me just a matter of which stichs division the parent text was using and not properly of *scriptio continua*. The writer then lists the lack of vocalisation as a major cause of mistaken renderings[21]. Another feature with which we are faced is the exchange of consonant order, especially for the roots עבר and ערב. Baumgartner takes it as a consequence of carelessness[22], but as we find this feature also in the biblical manuscripts from Qumran and in some translations of Symmachus, I would be inclined to take it as an interpretative technique. Shortly after the author accounts for the double translations: in his opinion these are later insertions of glosses or marginal readings[23]. He also acknowledges that sometimes the translator might have understood a Hebrew root as if it were Aramaic or Syriac, but, according to his opinion, one should not abuse this argument as, for instance, de Lagarde did[24]. Furthermore, against de Lagarde's opinion, Baumgartner thinks that the text could have been amended by Jewish scribes, particularly in the Pharisaic tradition, certainly not by Christians[25].

Another interesting topic faced by the writer is the question of the additions whose character would be Semitic.

De même que, au moment de la formation du livre des Proverbes, les compilateurs ont ajouté à la fin du livre un fragment (XXXI, 9-31) qui n'a pas de rapport bien étroit avec le reste de l'ouvrage auquel il a été réuni, fragment qui nous a été heureusement conservé par ce moyen-là; de même aussi, les interprètes grecs, à l'époque où ils faisaient leur traduction, ont pu avoir entre les

---

20. Cf. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 254.
21. Cf. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 254-255.
22. Cf. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 255.
23. Cf. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 255.
24. Cf. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 255-256.
25. Cf. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 257.

mains tel recueil non-canonique qui leur paraissait digne d'être conservé; ils ont dû le disséquer de telle façon que ses parties le plus importantes ont pu être ajoutées par eux à la suite de tel ou tel passage biblique, à la place qui leur semblait convenir mieux. Il est même permis d'aller plus loin. Ces recueils non-canoniques, dont se serait servi le traducteur grec des Proverbes, existaient peut-être déjà au temps d'Ézéchias, au moment où ses "gens" (XXV, 1) compilèrent notre livre actuel. Leur travail ne se borna pas à "recueillir", à "mettre en ordre"; le sens du mot העתיקו ferait supposer qu'un triage fut opéré par les אנשי חזקיה dans la quantité de productions gnomiques qu'ils avaient à leur disposition. Une partie, jugée digne d'entrer dans la collection, soit parce que les proverbes qui la composaient étaient considérés comme venant de Salomon lui-même, soit parce qu'ils présentaient des garanties d'antiquité et d'authenticité bien réelles, une partie forma notre livre actuel des Proverbes. Mais on peut supposer également que d'autres fragments d'une origine douteuse furent mis de côté par les compilateurs du temps d'Ézéchias, comme n'étant pas dignes d'entrer dans le recueil canonique.[26]

Thus, according to Baumgartner, some of the fragments which the companions of king Hezekiah had left out, could be those which we found in the Greek additions. An interesting support to this view is given by the Byzantine chronicler Michael Glycas 'd'après lequel Ézéchias, en collectionnant les Proverbes et le Psaumes, se serait livré à un travail de triage et aurait retranché et brulé certains fragments'[27].

Finally Baumgartner deals also with the omissions.

On ne peut pas dire [...] que le traducteur a chercé à *abréger* le texte qu'il avait

---

26. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 260-261.

27. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 261. The author appears to refer to the passage found in *Annales*, II (*PG* 158, 349A-C, l. 5-15; 28-32) which however does not mention the book of Proverbs nor any παροιμίαι or παραβολαί.

sous les yeux: il aurait plutôt fait le contraire, car il n'avait aucune raison de rendre d'une manière plus concise des maximes qui, au point de vue de l'esprit grec, l'étaient déja trop [...]. Les omissions semblent avoir eu, dans la pluplart des cas, une cause tout extérieure. Les passages qui manquent dans le grec sont souvent d'entre les plus intéressants, de ceux dont on pourrait le moins supposer qu'ils n'ont pas toujours existé dans le texte hébreu. Il est donc vraisemblable d'admettre que le mauvais état du mss. sur lequel a été faite la version grecque des Proverbes, état dont on possède des preuves surabondantes dans les innombrables erreurs de lecture que l'on rencontre, a été la principale raison de ces omissions.[28]

In 1913 the Salesian priest Giacomo Mezzacasa[29] published a revised edition of the thesis presented in 1908 at the Pontifical Biblical Institute, on the Alexandrian additions found both in Greek and in Sahidic manuscripts. The study is rooted in the theological question raised by the numerous LXX additions, and the author claims that if the translation is taken in its own right it can be shown that its *Vorlage* did not differ substantially from the Hebrew text which was used by the Masoretes: 'Così abbiam cercato di fare noi coi LXX, togliendo e distinguendo tutto quello che era stato aggiunto, per fare apparire l'antico testo che risultò non diseguale né differente dal disegno tracciato l'ultima volta dai Masoreti.'[30] In other words the differences and additions, in Mezzacasa's view, either originate from a variant reading of the same Hebrew text, or from a (later?) inner Greek insertion. These conclusions oversimplify

---

28. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 263-264.

29. G. Mezzacasa, *Il libro dei Proverbi di Salomone*. *Studio critico sulle aggiunte greco-alessandrine* (Rome: Istituto Biblico Pontificio, 1913). Giacomo Mezzacasa (1871-1955) was among the first pupils of St. Giovanni Bosco, the educator of the street children in 19th century Turin. He was the first Italian who graduated in the Pontifical Biblical Institute. In 1915 he was appointed to the board who edited don Bosco's work. He was responsible for the religious writings. In 1921 Mezzacasa published an Italian translation and commentary to the Book of Proverbs. He taught Holy Scriptures in the Seminary of Turin from 1932 to 1949.

30. Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 105.

the matter, and are probably depending on the theological bias that there is only one inspired text, although in Mezzacasa's view it is not fully represented either by the LXX or the MT[31]. The book is divided in three parts. The first one is devoted to clarifying the genesis of variant reading in the MT, the Vulgate, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, in the New Testament, and finally in the LXX. Here Mezzacasa expresses the view that the *Vorlage* was not written in the ancient Hebrew script[32]. He also agrees with those who consider the Targum of Proverbs to depend on the Peshitta, and the Peshitta to be related to the LXX also[33]. The second part is mainly devoted to the additions found in Greek and Sahidic: among these a number of doublets are discussed. Mezzacasa also argues that some material may derive from Origen's Hexapla, or even from a pre-Hexaplaric recension[34]. The third part is a concise text-critical commentary, verse by verse, to the Greek text of Proverbs, and to the Sahidic additions. On the whole, Baumgartner and Mezzacasa show a less speculative attitude to the Hebrew text than Lagarde had.

In the meantime three short notes were published by Johann Göttsberger. The first one aimed to correct an error in the *Concordance to the Septuagint* of Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath on 1.7[35], and the second signalled a mistake in the work of de Lagarde on 3.18b[36]. The third note envisaged a codicological solution to the doublets occurring in 2.19b-c and 4.10b-c[37].

Moreover, in the last part of the 19th century, a couple of critical and exegetical commentaries of the Hebrew Proverbs were published. Franz Delitzsch offered a short

---

31. Cf. Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 4-7, and 33.

32. Cf. Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 37. Mezzcasa explicitly refers to some readings which, in Lagarde's view, had originated in the Palaeo-Hebrew script. For a detailed and balanced, although outdated by the discoveries in the Judean desert, discussion cf. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 272-282.

33. Cf. Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 26.

34. Cf. Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 96-103, esp. 98.

35. J. Göttsberger, 'Miszelle zu Prv 1,7 nach der LXX", *BZ* 2 (1904), 14.

36. J. Göttsberger, 'Zu Prv 3,18ᵇ nach LXX', *BZ* 3 (1905), 139.

37. J. Göttsberger, 'Textkritik und Kolumnenschreibung', *BZ* 4 (1906), 118.

introduction to the Greek version[38], presenting in an appendix[39] a list of double translations, and finally proposing a retroversion[40] of the Greek parts lacking in the MT. Crawford H. Toy[41] argued the utility of the Greek Proverbs for recovering the Hebrew text which 'is not in good condition'[42], and thought that the different order of the chapters was already typical of the Hebrew *Vorlage* followed by the translator: 'this arrangement is manifestly inferior to that of our Hebrew text [...]. But it does not follow that the malarrangement is due to the caprice of a Greek translator'[43]. Every section of the book then ends with a detailed textual commentary.

Two critical editions of the Hebrew consonantal text were also published at the turn of the century. Gustav Bickell's[44] edition is based on his theory of Hebrew metrics. In his highly hypothetical reconstruction of the original text the author is often referring to the LXX. August Müller and Emil Kautzsch, in an appendix[45], dealt with additional lines and hemistichs in the LXX version. A list of doublets is also given[46]. Anyway, in the opinion of the authors, 'the cases in which [the LXX] seems to have preserved some משלים which formed part of the original Hebrew text of the Book of Proverbs (*cf.* **11**, 16; **27**, 20.21) are exceptional'[47].

Finally, a couple of years before the First World War began, Henry St. J. Thackeray[48] devoted a paper to the prosody of the Greek Proverbs, particularly aiming

---

38. F. Delitzsch, *Das salomonische Spruchbuch* (Leipzig, Dörfling und Franke, 1873), 38-40.

39. Cf. Delitzsch, *Spruchbuch*, 540.

40. Cf. Delitzsch, *Spruchbuch*, 542-547.

41. C.H. Toy, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899).

42. Toy, *Proverbs*, xxxi.

43. Toy, *Proverbs*, xxxiii.

44. G. Bickell, 'Kritische Bearbeitung der Proverbien', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 5 (1891), 79-102, 191-214, 271-299.

45. A. Müller and E. Kautzsch (eds.), *The Book of Proverbs: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text with Notes* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901), 70-85.

46. Cf. Müller and Kautzsch, *Proverbs*, 70.

47. Cf. Müller and Kautzsch, *Proverbs*, 70.

48. H.St.J. Thackeray, 'The Poetry of the Greek Book of Proverbs', *The Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1912), 46-66.

to demonstrate how much the acknowledgment of the 'versification pervading the Greek version serves a practical purpose of some importance in textual criticism'[49]. The contribution remains particularly persuasive in showing that hexametric endings (*versus paroemiaci*) and iambic trimeters, both employed for proverbs in Greek language, are 'largely represented in the Greek book of Proverbs'[50].

## 1.1.2. Studies after the Second World War

After a period of apparent lack of interest between the two World Wars, the renowned LXX scholar Charles T. Fritsch[51], devoted a paper to the study of the double translations in the LXX of Proverbs which attracted interest and was eventually republished in the famous collection edited by Sidney Jellicoe in 1974[52]. Fritsch[53] pointed out 76 double translations arguing that, on every single occasion, the doublet nearer to the MT was inserted by the Hexaplaric recension. He noted[54] that in 31 occurrences the Syro-Hexaplar preserved some Origenian critical signs from the fifth column of the Hexapla in coincidence with the double translations, leaving, however, 45 of them without any mark. From this he argued, against what had been stated by Henry B. Swete[55] 'that [the] S[yro-]H[exaplar] did not "scrupulously" retain all of the Origenian signs'[56]. Unfortunately, the main effect of this paper was to produce the

---

49. Thackeray, 'Poetry', 65.

50. Thackeray, 'Poetry', 47.

51. C.T. Fritsch, 'The Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs in the Syro-Hexaplar of Proverbs', *JBL* 72 (1953), 169-181.

52. Cf. S. Jellicoe (ed.), *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (New York: Ktav Publ. House, 1974), 356-368.

53. Cf. 'Hexaplaric Signs', 170.

54. Cf. Fritsch, 'Hexaplaric Signs', 171.

55. H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914), 112: 'The Origenic signs were scrupulously retained'.

56. Fritsch, 'Hexaplaric Signs', 171.

common opinion that the text of the LXX of Proverbs edited by Alfred Rahlfs[57] was quite unreliable, as will be seen in more detail in the introduction to the second part of this study.

The following year, a really interesting paper by Hans P. Rüger[58] deals with the doublet attested in 31.30b-c. The stich b, according to the aforementioned de Lagarde's axiom, should be regarded as the most ancient one, because it is the farthest from the MT. As previously proposed by Toy[59], נבונה can have been replaced by יראת יהוה. Such a strange substitution is actually attested in Sir. 16.4a: H^A, B1 ירא ייי, Pesh ܗܢܝ ܠ ܚ [ H^B2 נ[ב]ון, LXX συνετοῦ, Vulg *sensato*; and in Sir. 9.15a: H^A נבון, LXX συνετῶν, Vulg *sensu*] Pesh ܕܚܝܠ ܠܐܠܗܐ[60]. Rüger's article opens a little window on the history of the text in its formation, on the importance of the text interpretation for the transmission of the text itself, and on the manner in which the Greek translator worked, since I suspect[61] this to be a double translation. It seems that the translator was aware of the two different readings and decided to render both of them side by side. If so, in that passage he produced a literal version of a different *Vorlage*. Yet, it remains under consideration whether he collected the two readings or he found them in his Hebrew original.

With the new decade another commentary to the Hebrew Proverbs appeared. William McKane[62] devoted a section of his introduction to the LXX of Proverbs. In proposing corrections to the MT based on the Greek text, he proves to be aware of the lesson of Gerleman and therefore he pays attention to the style and aims of the translator.

James Barr[63] too, in a paper published in the same decade, pays attention to the

---

57. Cf. A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935).

58. H.P. Rüger, 'Zum Text von Prv. 31,30', *Die Welt des Orients* 5 (1969-70), 96-99.

59. Cf. Toy, *Proverbs*, 550: 'read אֵשֶׁת בִּינָה (cf. 30²) or אשה נבנה (cf. 1⁵)'.

60. Cf. Rüger, 'Prv. 31,30', 98.

61. Line c may not be an Hexaplaric intrusion, because the particle δέ is avoided by both θ´ and α´, as will be seen in more detail in the second part of this study.

62. W. McKane, *Proverbs: A New Approach* (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1970), 33-47.

63. J. Barr, 'באדץ-μόλις: Prov. XI. 31, I Pet. IV. 18', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20 (1975) 149-164.

translation technique of the LXX of Proverbs, discussing whether in 11.31, where the simple בארץ is rendered μόλις, the Greek translator might have read בצר. He finally renounces his conjecture, concluding that 'the rendering was observant of the form and logic of the Hebrew sentence, and the sentiment which it produced was one deeply satisfying to Hellenistic Jewish feeling'[64].

The contribution of John E. Goldingay[65] might be interesting because it deals with the structures proposed for the chapters 8 and 2. Finally he states: 'Clearly achieving a balanced paragraph structure is not a paramount interest of LXX any more than of MT; nevertheless it is a feature of the developed form of MT in chapter ii of LXX in chapter viii'[66].

A very limited acceptance has been given to the paper of Jacob Weingreen[67] whose aim is to show that the interpretations of the Greek translation, above all the moralising ones, are an example of Rabbinic-type commentary. He thus tries to assess the significance of this conclusion 'as an element in the possible reconstruction of the cultural-religious life of Alexandrian Jewry, of which so little is known'[68]. Another phenomenon of Septuagint exegesis in Proverbs 'has its parallel in Rabbinic treatment of biblical texts. It takes the form of adding notes which are, in fact, quotations either from Proverbs itself or from other books of the Hebrew Bible'[69]. Weingreen thinks that such 'editorial notes, representing the official interpretation of the passages concerned [...] were already established in this text before the process of translating the Hebrew into Greek had been inaugurated'[70]. That would imply 'some measure of independence

---

64. Barr, 'μόλις', 164.

65. J.E. Goldingay, 'Proverbs V and IX', *RB* 84 (1977) 80-93.

66. Goldingay, 'Proverbs', 90.

67. J. Weingreen, 'Rabbinic-Type Commentary in the LXX Version of Proverbs', in A. Shinan, *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), vol. 1, 407-415.

68. Weingreen, 'Rabbinic-Type Commentary, 407.

69. Weingreen, 'Rabbinic-Type Commentary, 411.

70. Weingreen, 'Rabbinic-Type Commentary, 413.

in the authoritative exposition of the Bible'[71]. The author's conclusions are that 'this version may be described as a Targum'[72].

Entering the eighties, we deal again with a very conjectural critical approach. Jean Carmignac[73] presents a paper on 22.8-9 which in the LXX shows two distichs more than in the MT. Regarding 22.8A, whereas Baumgartner[74] and Mezzacasa[75] had argued that it was a double translation, Jäger observed that both 22.8b and 22.8Ab finished with the same words, so that the Hebrew could have lost the distich through homeoteleuton. The author agrees with the latter and proposes a retroversion. But he seems not to take into account the fondness of the translator for antithetical parallelism: actually 22.8Aa represents an antithesis of 22.8a, and probally ματαιότητα (22.8Ab) stands as a double translation for אָוֶן (in 22.8a), rendered the first time, more freely but in the right position, with κακά (22.8a). Even more conjectural is the proposal for the second additional distich (22.9A).

A year later we encounter a contribution by Emanuel Tov[76] treating the influence exerted by the Pentateuch on the later translations of the biblical books. Referring to Proverbs, the translation of 24.28 'is based on the exegesis of חנם [Prov. 24.28] as שקר [Exod. 20.16] mainly on the basis of the ninth commandment in Greek'[77]. Other minor influences are detected in 30.26 where χοιρογρύλλιος translates שָׁפָן as in Deut. 14.7, in 23.3 where ἐδέσματα renders מַטְעַמִּים as in Gen. 27.4, and in 29.1 where σκληροτράχηλος expresses קְשֵׁה־עֹרֶף as in Exod. 33.3; Deut. 9.6[78].

Caterina Moro's[79] article is mainly devoted to the text of Proverbs in the citations of

---

71. Weingreen, 'Rabbinic-Type Commentary, 414.

72. Weingreen, 'Rabbinic-Type Commentary, 413.

73. J. Carmignac, 'Critique textuelle de Proverbes 22, 8-9', *Folia Orientalia* 21 (1980), 33-41.

74. Cf. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 199.

75. Cf. Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 168-169.

76. E. Tov, 'The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books', in P. Casetti, O. Keel and A. Schenker (eds.), *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy* (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1981), 577-592.

77. Tov, 'Impact', 590.

78. And Exod. 33.5; 34.9; Deut. 9.13. Cf. Tov, 'Impact', 584-586.

79. C. Moro, 'Il testo greco di "Proverbi" in Clemente Alessandrino. Analisi testuale e confronto con la

Clement of Alexandria, and to their relation with the Sahidic; therefore it will be treated also in the section devoted to the Coptic translation. However some general observations can be dealt with here. Firstly the author links the redactional differences between the Hebrew and the Greek with the late acceptance of the book in the Jewish canon. The author refers to the famous passage in the treatise *Avot de-Rabbi Nathan* in which the book of Proverbs is listed among those which needed to be interpreted by the men of the Great Synagogue in order to be accepted. The LXX version of Proverbs is therefore the only witness we have to a more ancient text[80]. The author also points out that the text-critical use of the Greek version is strictly connected with its translation technique: 'l'autore di *Proverbi* greco aveva un'idea dell'aderenza al testo diversa dai traduttori del Pentateuco e aveva l'ambizione di creare un testo letterario. Molte rese in *Proverbi* sono accurate ma non "puntuali", e così la stessa ricostruzione del testo che ne era alla base non può essere "puntuale".'[81] Moro also pays attention to Lagarde's proposal of the *Revisor*[82], and points out that the insertion of the double translations happen to modify the original text: 'l'integrazione di queste doppie traduzioni nel testo portò sicuramente a rielaborazioni, alterazioni ed armonizzazioni, talvolta individuabili per merito di forme testuali più antiche, ma il più delle volte solo ipotizzabili'.[83] However, the writer fails to prove cogently her point with the three examples she offers: in 17.18 the Peshitta of Proverbs cannot be the only textual evidence for a different Greek text since this version, even when there is no Hebrew *Vorlage*, shows quite a free approach to the Greek[84]. The doublets found in 31.29a-b and 2.19b-c would need a more detailed discussion, but it is possible to argue that they stem from the original translator. After having analysed the equivalences proper to the καίγε recension, Moro concludes that the *Revisor* does not belong to this group:

---

versione copto-saidica', *Annali di studi religiosi* 2 (2001), 391-437.

80. Cf. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 392.

81. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 393.

82. Cf. above.

83. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 394.

84. Cf. e.g. the long additions in chapter 9, and more in general Joosten, 'Doublet', 70, 72.

La revisione che ha prodotto le doppie non sembra legata al gruppo καὶγε [sic]: da una semplice analisi delle corrispondenze emerge che il linguaggio καὶγε è assente in *Proverbi* se non in alcuni asterischi dei manoscritti esaplari [...]. Il lessico di tipo καὶγε irrompe nella tradizione greca dei *Proverbi* solo con Aquila, Simmaco e Teodozione, ed è da respingere pertanto la teoria di C.T. Fritsch che tutto il materiale "doppio" della versione greca di *Proverbi* (con e senza asterisco) sia dovuto all'intervento di Origene e derivi dai Tre traduttori[85].

Although I agree with this last statement, I find it methodologically insufficient that the author bases her judgement only on the exclusive lexicon[86] proposed for the καίγε recension, and that she fails to discuss more generally the translation technique observed in the doublets. This issue will be fully dealt with in the next chapter. Finally the author briefly discusses the repartition of the manuscripts and the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions. Firstly, Moro rightly observes that the division proposed by Cook[87] is merely based on the one proposed by Ziegler for Ecclesiastes[88]. Consequently she adopts the classifications which emerge from the studies of Johannes Schildenberger[89] and Günther Zuntz[90], although in the following sections it will be shown that these also are far from being conclusive. When dealing with the Syro-Hexaplar, Moro rightly points out that it does not translate the 5th column of the Hexapla, but the edition prepared in Caesarea by Pamphilus and Eusebius by using Origen's 5th column. The author also suggests that ms. 542 might be a direct descendent from this edition. Unfortunately she does not offer any further comment to support her statement. Finally

---

85. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 395.

86. The author explicitly refers to καίγε for וְגַם, ἀπάνωθεν for מֵעַל, νῖκος for נֵצַח, βᾶρις for אַרְמוֹן.

87. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 27.

88. Cf. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 396 fn. 30.

89. Cf. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 397 fn. 32, and J. Schildenberger, *Die altlateinischen texte des Proverbien-Buches* (Beuron: Erzabtei Beuron, 1941), vol. I, 23-54.

90. Cf. G. Zuntz, 'Der Antinoe Papyrus der Proverbia und das Prophetologion', *ZAW* 68 (1956), 124-184.

she agrees with Guillaume Bady that the ms. Patmos 161, which preserves alone the full text of the *Commentary to the Book of Proverbs* of John Chrysostom, preserves a Lucianic text, altogether with the manuscripts already mentioned by Schildenberger[91].

Gerhard Tauberschmidt in 2004 published with minor revisions his dissertation presented at the University of Aberdeen in 2001. In his study the author intends to show

> that the translator of LXX Proverbs frequently rendered Hebrew parallelisms in a form that is more closely parallel than the MT, that is, the colons of couplets correspond more closely to each other semantically and/or grammatically. The argument is based on the hypothesis that the Hebrew source of LXX Proverbs is similar to the MT in the cases discussed. It is true that there are recognizable differences between the MT and the source or *Vorlage* of the LXX that cannot be explained on the basis of applied translation techniques etc., but this area goes beyond the scope of this study. The translator's fondness for producing closely corresponding lines needs to be considered when using LXX Proverbs as a source of variant readings. The thesis will assist in evaluating the Greek translation of Proverbs, thus avoiding the misuse of LXX Proverbs for the sake of "better" parallelisms[92].

With this study for the first time the text-critical concern for the Hebrew text is linked to the translation technique. Besides the characteristics already addressed by Johann Cook[93], Tauberschmidt's research shows the existence in the Greek translation of more symmetric parallels, and the attempt at creating more cohesive textual units.

---

91. The author mentions mss. 106 149 260, 68 161 248, Compl, and 'il materiale delle *Catenae Patrum* non condiviso dal testo esaplare' (cf. '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 398).

92. G. Tauberschmidt, *Secondary Parallelism: A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), xi.

93. Concerning the numerous contributions by Cook on the subject, cf. below section 3 devoted to his research.

However, when dealing with some of the doublets[94] the author demonstrates his unfamiliarity with the Greek textual tradition and its commentators. This leads him to inaccurate conclusions on the origin of the doublets[95].

Michael V. Fox[96] has recently devoted a paper to the text-critical value of the LXX in which he reacts to the opinion expressed recently by J. Cook and G. Tauberschmidt for whom virtually all the changes in the translation depend on the translation technique and not on a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the MT. Although he acknowledges that the Greek translation of Proverbs 'often diverges from the literal sense of the MT, sometimes radically [...]. Still, the freedoms the translator takes are not anarchic, and when he has the MT or something like it, he almost always tries to address its essential meaning as he understands it'[97]. Regarding the alleged free character of the translation the author quotes Anneli Aejmelaeus's remark: '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'[98]. Moreover, according to Fox 'In numerous verses [...] the translation is mimetic (a term I prefer to the ambiguous "literal"), meaning that it maps the lower-level components of the Hebrew – at least its consonantal text – closely onto the Greek, with only a few touches of flexibility for the sake of Greek style (such as a

---

94. Cf. Tauberschmidt, *Parallelism*, 144 fn. 97 (Prov. 2.21), and 49 (Prov. 18.22, cf. Lagarde [*Proverbien*, 59] who clearly shows that the second distich is based on a different vocalisation of the Hebrew).

95. Cf. also the critical review of Tauberschmidt's book published by Michael V. Fox, in *Review of Biblical Literature* 11 (2004), http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4192_4111.pdf. The author extends my criticism to other passages: 'Many of the variants that Tauberschmidt passes over in silence are proposed and discussed in A. Baumgartner's valuable study, *Etude* [sic] *critique sur l'état du texte du Livre des Proverbes* (Leipzig: Drugulin, 1890), which cites earlier text-critical work. Tauberschmidt mentions this book but virtually ignores it.' (n. 1) He concludes that 'Scribal practices and errors should be weighed simultaneously with translation "technique" and stylistic, exegetical, and ideological tendencies. No factor has inherent priority, but considered in combination they can help confirm or discount variants.'

96. Fox, Michael V., 'LXX-Proverbs as a Text-Critical Resource', *Textus* 22 (2005), 95-128.

97. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs', 95-96.

98. A. Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of Septuagint Translators* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), 64.

preference for the postpositive δέ for *waw*).'[99] Therefore, the author attempts to compare the MT and the LXX of some passages with the aim 'not of correcting the MT, but with the reasoning involved in recovering the Hebrew of the LXX *Vorlage*'[100]. The passages under discussion are classified according to a number of factors which may indicate Hebrew variants (particularly interesting: '1. A component that does not serve the translator's goal'[101]; '2. An awkwardness in the LXX'[102]; '4. External support'[103]). Although Fox admits that 'Hexaplaric doublets [...] should be excluded from the assessment, insofar as they can be identified.'[104], in a number of passages he deals with doublets which he considers to have a different origin: under case 1 the author deals also with 13.11a which shows a doublet (מהבל / מבהל) that is unlikely to be a revision since the alleged revisional insertion (μετὰ ἀνομίας) 'is nicely matched with μετʼ εὐσεβείας'[105] in the stich 11b. The variant מבהל is confirmed by σ´ ε´ (ὑπερσπουδαζομένη) and the Vulgate (*festinata*). Under case 6 another doublet of two verses is addressed: 12.11A-12.12[106], and in case 8 the doublet found in 18.22 is also discussed. Finally in the appendix a few doublets found in Ben Sira's Hebrew text are indicated in order to remind 'that LXX-MT differences in Proverbs should not automatically be ascribed to "translation technique". A translator could introduce them, but so could a copyist. However, it seems unlikely that a translator would undertake to shift material around [...] at the same time as he was trying to figure out the Hebrew and transpose it into good Greek'[107]. Fox concludes that

---

99. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs', 97-98.

100. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs', 99.

101. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs', 100.

102. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs', 102.

103. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs', 106.

104. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs', 96.

105. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs', 101.

106. Verse 12.11A, not mentioned by Fritsch, is under obeli, however the reconstruction of its *Vorlage* seems quite intricate.

107. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs', 121-122.

wisdom literature is especially malleable and even invites manipulation – in the form of additions, rephrasings, variations, glossings, reorderings, and more. Wisdom Literature does not present itself as the words of God, but rather as the teachings of sages, and the scribes who followed could view themselves as part of the creative wisdom tradition. This process is evidenced in MT-Proverbs as well, in the numerous duplicates and near-duplicates that are preserved and that testify to the mechanics of wisdom creativity. Nothing fundamentally different happens when one line of the textual tradition emerges as the *Vorlage* of LXX-Prov[108].

The author thinks that the translation is made by 'an Alexandrian Jew'[109].

In the course of the last decade Fox also published a comprehensive commentary on the Hebrew Proverbs. With the publication, in 2009, of the second volume of his work, Fox's study is the most complete commentary appeared in the last decades. It mainly deals with the MT, but two ample sections of textual notes (360-423; 977-1068) represent the major text-critical commentary since the time of Mezzacasa. The notes deal also with the LXX, Peshitta, Vulgate and, although rarely, with Targum.[110]

### 1.1.3. The Antinoopolis Papyrus 8/210

The papyrological discoveries[111] have not added relevant new data for the text-critical appraisal of the Greek Proverbs, with the significant exception of the

---

108. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs', 121.

109. Fox, 'LXX-Proverbs', 96.

110. Fox, Michael V., *Proverbs*, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 2000; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

111. For a complete descriptions of all the findings I refer to the recent new edition of the catalogue of the Greek manuscripts of the Old Testament published by Alfred Rahlfs, and Detlef Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments. Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

Antinoopolis Papyrus 8/210, whose peculiar readings have raised a certain interest among scholars.

In the winter of 1913-1914, during his excavations in Sheikh Abada – the Roman Antinoopolis founded in 130 by the emperor Hadrian – John Johnson uncovered a number of papyri of which some were published as late as 1950. Among these, some fragments of a papyrus codex were found which displayed the Greek text of the book of Proverbs, Wisdom of Solomon, and Sirach. In Rahlfs's *Verzeichnis*[112], the papyrus has been given the number 928. Due to the poor condition of the fragments, the text has been edited thrice[113], and more recently R. Geoffrey Jenkins asserted that he had prepared his 'own re-edition of numerous disputed scraps of the papyrus, and an edition of some newly identified fragments'[114]. Unfortunately the author does not cite his new edition, and I have not been able to locate it, if it was ever published. Since the situation appeared so intricate I have visited on three different occasions the Sackler Library, Oxford, where the papyrus is kept, and studied the numerous issues involved[115].

The text exhibited by the fragments from Proverbs was immediately considered significant by Roberts[116]. He noticed a particular agreement with V[117] which, at least for Proverbs, constitutes our best Greek witness to the Hexaplaric text. Roberts dated the

---

112. Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 284-287.

113. After C.H. Roberts, *The Antinoopolis Papyri*, vol. 1 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1950), 2-19, also Zuntz, 'Prophetologion', 124-184. Several new fragments of the papyrus were later published by John W.B. Barns (John W.B. Barns, and Henrik Zilliacus, *The Antinoopolis Papyri*, vol. 3 [London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1967], 177-180) who provided also a new edition for f. VI.

114. R.G. Jenkins, 'The Text of P Antinoopolis 8/210', in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the IOSCS* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987), 65-77.

115. Cf. my paper 'The Treatment of Personal Names in the Book of Proverbs from the Septuagint to the Masoretic Text', in Timothy M. Law (ed.), *Proceedings of ESAJS 2010*, (Leuven: Peteers, *forthcoming*), in which I focussed particularly on the title uniquely preserved in Prov. 10.1. I repeat here some of the general considerations I already expressed there.

116. Cf. Roberts, *Antinoopolis Papyri*, 3: 'the first substantial contribution that the papyri have made to this book'.

117. In a few instances (6.9 ποτε; 6.21 καρδια; 6.29 ατιμωρητος; 8.9 νοουσιν; 20.19), mostly Hexaplaric, V agrees with 928 and a few other witnesses. However, 928 agrees with BSA against V in some of its peculiar readings (9.9 δέχεσθαι 928 BSA] δεξασθαι V | 10.3 δικαίαν 928 BAS^(ca)] δικαιου V; δικαιων S*).

papyrus in the second half of the 3rd century[118]. Daniela Colomo[119] would prefer instead a later dating, up to the beginning of the 4th century, since she detects in the hand some archaising features. This is an important indication on the relation between 928 and the Hexaplaric text. Actually, due to its early dating, both Roberts and Günther Zuntz[120], who reedited the papyrus a few years later, argued for its pre-Origenic origin[121]. To support this view they interpreted a number of readings unique to 928 as independent corrections toward the Hebrew[122].

John W. Wevers[123] has convincingly argued against this contention. As for me, I will just stress that these variant readings are either trivial (5.22; 6.16; 7.5), or already

---

118. Roberts (*Antinoopolis Papyri*, 2) puts the papyrus in the 'Third century', and specifies 'it belongs to the same family as the hand of the Chester Beatty Pauline Epistles and may well have been written a little later in the same century'. Since, as rightly pointed out by Zuntz ('Prophetologion', 127), the Chester Beatty Pauline Epistles ($P^{46}$) have been dated by some to the late 2nd century, he asked Roberts whether he could be more precise and even consider a dating in the 4th century. Roberts answered that 'In looking at the plate again, I would still like to keep to what I said. I should regard a date not earlier than 250 and not later than 300 as the most likely. It has not got the 4th century characteristics – though, as you know, palaeography is no subject for dogmatism.' The papyrus is more generally put in the 3rd century by Eric G. Turner (*The Typology of the Early Codex* [(Philadelphia), 1977], 179), and by Fraenkel (Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 284).

119. I would like to thank here Dr. Colomo, Curator of the Oxyrhynchus Collection in the Sackler Library, for her help, and the views she kindly shared with me during my study of the papyrus.

120. Zuntz, 'Prophetologion', 124-184. The author argued that the papyrus is strictly related to the *Prophetologion* (cf. 165), a Byzantine liturgical book, compiled in the 8th century, attested by some 160 manuscripts since the 9th century (cf. 125). Important agreements would be found also in the manuscripts 336 and 443ˢ (cf. 165), and to a minor extension in V and 252 (cf. 166). Zuntz had began to deal with the *Prophetologion* for its edition within the project *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae* (1939-1981) with Carsten Høeg.

121. Cf. Roberts, *Antinoopolis Papyri*, 3: 'It may be probably regarded as a pre-Origenic text of the Septuagint, considerably influenced by other translations and perhaps the M.T., and very probably owning a common ancestor with N-V'; Zuntz, 'Prophetologion', 181; see also P. Katz, review of C.H. Roberts, *The Antinoopolis Papyri*, vol. 1 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1950), in *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 80 (1955), 738.

122. Roberts (*Antinoopolis Papyri*, 15-16) proposed 5.22 (ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν] transp. 928) and 7.5 (σε τηρήσῃ] transp. 928). Zuntz ('Prophetologion', 164-165) added to these readings also 5.23 (ἀπαιδεύτων] απαιδευσιᾱ 928) | 6.16 ὅτι] > 928 | 10.1 υἱὸς σοφὸς] praem. π[αρα]βολαι [σ]αλ[ομω]ντος 928 | 10.17 ὁδοὺς δικαίας ζωῆς φυλάσσει] οδος ζωης φυ[λασσει 928).

123. J.W. Wevers ('Septuaginta Forschungen seit 1954', *Theologische Rundschau* n.F. 33 [1968], 59-60), after an analysis of the 9 important variant readings shown by the papyrus, concludes: 'Anzeichen für vororigenistische LXX-Revision sind vorhanden, wie Barthélemy gezeigt hat, aber dieser Text ist kein klarer Beweis dafür.' Cf. also below the Hexaplaric features observed by Jenkins ('Antinoopolis', 73).

attested in some Hexaplaric witness: the readings found in 10.1 and 10.17 represent indeed the text of the Syrohexapla[124], whereas ἀπαιδευσίαν (5.23) agrees with σ´[125], whose translation was hardly known before Origen. Furthermore, the fragments show two additional peculiar agreements with the Hexaplaric text: (1) Prov 20.9A (= MT 20.20) is preceded by verse 20.19 (instead of 20.9), a feature witnessed only by V 336 Arm. Verse 20.19, according to the Syrohexapla[126], is under asterisks and derives from θ´; (2) to fill the gap[127] which the 7th folio presents between the verso (20.4) and the recto (θ´ 20.19), the papyrus must have contained 20.10-18 in their numerical order which is a feature again witnessed only by V 336 Arm. Verses 14-18, according to the Syrohexapla, are also under asterisks and derive from θ´.

If one considers that no independent correction toward the Hebrew is found – since all the readings mentioned above agree with some Hexaplaric witness – it seems difficult to believe that this codex is fully independent of the Hexapla. We are likely to be dealing here with a text critical work based on it, partially independent[128] of the 5th column.

More recently two possible agreements with the *Vetus Latina* and the Coptic have been suggested. Jenkins[129], after the identification of a new small fragment, proposes

---

124. The reading in 10.17 is also found in a scholium registered by Nobilius, and in 161[mg].

125. Moreover the word in the papyrus shows a curved stroke above the δ (απαιδευσιᾱ) which 'may point to a marginal scholion' (Roberts, *Antinoopolis Papyri*, 15) that, unfortunately, is no more extant. One wonders if the majority reading ἀπαιδεύτων was there. Another unique reading of 928 (10.2 ἀνομούς] ανομων) raises some interest since according to Field's retroversion σ´ has παρανόμων (Syh: .ܘ ܀ ܪ̈ܫܝܥܐ ܕܪ̈ܫܝܥܐܘ): if it is not just a banal mistake, the reading of 928 could be influenced by σ´.

126. Prov 20.14-22 is under asterisks also in two Armenian manuscripts, cf. Claude E. Cox, *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986), 155-156.

127. According to Roberts (*Antinoopolis Papyri*, 2) 'There were about 30 lines to a page', thus between the verso and the recto of a fragment about 28 stichs are expected. This is exactly the number of stichs embraced by Prov 20.5-18 in the Hexaplaric text (= V 336). The original translation of Proverbs was lacking verses 20.14-19, and put verses 20.10-13 after verses 20.20-22. Thus, the order of the verses in the LXX is as follows: 20.9; 20.20-22; 20.10-13; 20.23.

128. Apart from the reading in 10.3 (δικαίαν 928 BAS[ca]] δικαιου V; δικαιων S*) in which 928 departs from a Hexaplaric reading of V, one needs to remember the reading in verse 6.23 (εντο]λη αγαθη νομος δ[ε) which matches the Sahidic, Achmimic and Bodmer VI, and agrees with a citation of Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* I 29 181,3 [L. Früchtel and O. Stählin]).

129. Jenkins, 'Antinoopolis', 71-72, 75 fn. 25. Jenkins had already introduced his study in a previous

this reconstruction for verse 8.31γ (an additional stich found also in Sahidic, Achmimic and Bodmer VI): ο[ι] δε θη[σαυροι], which agrees with *thesauri autem eius faciunt homines gaudibundos*, a Latin reading found uniquely in the Valvanera codex (Revilla 1920 [= Lat⁹⁴]). Thus the author criticises Roberts's conclusions that the papyrus 'has no special affiliation with the Sahidic (S) or the Bohairic (Bo¹ and Bo²) versions'[130]: both the papyrus and the Coptic not only share the extra line of 8.31, but also the reconstruction of the papyrus according to the distinctive Coptic stichometry 'resolves numerous difficulties'[131]. This textual type could be then vindicated as upper-Egyptian and 'Origen may have used this text as the basis for one of his attempts to reform the Septuagint'[132]. However, the papyrus shows 'many features in respect of which its text deviates from both the majority Septuagint and the Coptic. These features give the distinct impression of being Hexaplaric'[133]. As it has been shown, the certain data coming from the papyrus are scanty. The defect of Jenkins's paper is to let the reader constantly understand that the textual evidences are many more than the few he mentions. This is not actually the case.

Jean-Marie Auwers[134] also deals with the *Vetus Latina* and the Coptic. The author turns our attention to a quite literal citation of Prov. 8.22-25[135] in Tertullian's *Adversus Hermogenem* (18,3 [E. Kroymann]), which preserves an additional line after 25β: *prior autem abysso genita sum*.[136] A similar text form is witnessed by Origen's homily *In*

---

note: R. G. Jenkins, 'A note on the Text of Rahlfs 928', *BIOSCS* 19 (1986), 5-6.

130. Roberts, *Antinoopolis Papyri*, 3.

131. Jenkins, 'Antinoopolis', 72. The author explicitly mentions the situation found at 7.19.

132. Jenkins, 'Antinoopolis', 73.

133. Jenkins, 'Antinoopolis', 73. The author refers to three of the Hexaplaric characteristics I already mentioned above.

134. J.-M. Auwers, 'Tertullien et les Proverbes. Une approche philologique à partir de Prov. 8, 22-31', in *Mémorial Dom Jean Gribomont (1920-1986)* (Rome: Institutum patristicum Augustinianum, 1988), 75-83. The main purpose of the paper is to evaluate Tertullian's citations of the book of Proverbs. Since Prov. 8.22-30 is cited also in *Adversus Praxean* 6,1-2, the author presents 8.22-31 as one citation. This makes the comparison easier. However, verses 27-31 are cited by Tertullian a few lines before verses 22-25, and the two citations are separated by a short commentary. This may account for the lack of v. 26, which, however, is missing in *Adversus Praxean* also.

135. However, line 24β is missing.

136. The same reading is found also in *Adversus Hermogenem* 32,2.

*Isaiam* (IV 1)[137], and the Sahidic[138], Achmimic and papyrus Bodmer VI. The three Coptic versions exhibit this line as the second half of stich 24α[139]. This is made particularly clear by the presence of ⲇⲉ (= *autem*) in the three of them. The LXX instead reads: καὶ πρὸ τοῦ τὰς ἀβύσσους ποιῆσαι. The author notes that the Antinoopolis papyrus, after a lacuna of about 8 letters reads: ]δε της αβ[. He rightly observes that 'La restitution proposé par Roberts est invraisemblable: πηγ]ας της αβ[υσσου'[140]. In his opinion the lacuna can be filled in a better way: 'Nous croyons pouvoir proposer: προτερα] δε της αβ[υσσου εγεννηθην].'[141] These conclusions need some further remarks. Firstly, the reading δε is not completely sure, and the traces are compatible also with the reading αε[142]. Secondly, Auwers's retrotranslation suits Tertullian's citation, but the Coptic versions witness instead ἐγεννήθην [?] δὲ πρὸ τῆς ἀβύσσου: ϩⲁⲑⲏ is consistently, in this passage, the equivalent for πρό, especially in Bodmer VI. Finally, the equivalent for *genita sum*, ⲁϥⲧⲡⲟⲓ, is also used in verse 25 to render the present γεννᾷ (*generavit* in Tertullian's citation)[143]. To sum up, a retrotranslation from the Latin may fit the traces left in 928 but the stich is witnessed in Tertullian after verse 25; a retrotranslation from the Coptic, although the line is found there in the right position, does not match the papyrus since it implies a πρό between δε and της[144]. A final remark needs to be made concerning Auwer's assertion that the variant reading 'est une traduction littérale de l'hébreu'[145]. The MT, actually, has no equivalent for δε,

---

137. The homily is preserved only in a Latin translation by Jerome (Baehrens, 258): 'Audi Sapientiam in Proverbiis praedicantem: "Ante omnes abyssos nata sum".'

138. The author does not read Coptic and depends on Kasser's French translation of the papyrus Bodmer VI. Thus he had not been able to notice the agreement with the Sahidic and Achmimic.

139. In the stychometry of Bodmer VI this is line 24β.

140. Auwers, 'Tertullian', 82.

141. Auwers, 'Tertullian', 82.

142. I would however rull out the reading αc proposed by Roberts: some traces of the central stroke of ε are clearly visible.

143. However, Jerome's translation *nata sum* suggests the Greek variant reading ἐγενήθην and confirms Auwers's conjecture. It also confirms, along with the Coptic, the reading πρό (= *ante*).

144. Even if we preserves the order of the Latin as more original (πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἀβύσσου), πρό is to short to fill alone the lacuna.

145. Auwers, 'Tertullian', 81.

whereas the equivalent for *abysso* is in a plural form. The variant reading is 'more literal' only when using *genita sum* for חוֹלָלְתִּי. The LXX instead is more literal when showing the plural ἀβύσσους. Also, the use of καί, although without equivalent in the MT, is more consistent with the vocabulary employed by the later revisers. If one adds that the position of the variant reading, in Tertullian, after verse 25 is more natural[146], one wonders if his citation is not preserving the original LXX. The stich would have been later moved, according to the MT, in verse 24, where we find it in the Coptic versions, and finally adjusted syntactically to the context. The repetition of ποιῆσαι is rather odd, and might not depend on the original translator.

---

146. This is recognised by Auwers also who, however, considers this position secondary: 'Dans le modèle grec de Tertullien, elle aura été rejetée après le v. 25, sans doute afin de ne pas interrompre la série des propositions temporelles à l'infinitif.' ('Tertullien', 81)

## 1.2. The Cultural Ambience of the Translation

Between the two World Wars, the interest in the text critical value of the LXX translation of the book of Proverbs decreased, and scholars began to be attracted by the investigation of the cultural environment in which the Greek version originated.

In 1936 Georg Bertram[1] published a paper in which for the first time attention is given to the translational shifts in order to cast some light on the cultural ambience – here defined tout court as "hellenistische Judentum" – of the translation. Although on occasion the author accepts a different *Vorlage* for the Greek Proverbs, he stresses that the Greek sometimes 'macht [...] aus einer profaner eine religiöse Aussage'[2]. He discerns also an apparently opposite tendency when 'in der Septuaginta mehrfach radikale theologische Aussagen der Masora verwischt oder aufgehoben werden zugunsten einer ethisierenden Durchschnittsreligiosität'[3]. Frequently the paper shows an ideological approach, for instance when it detects the substitution of the "alttestamentlichen Gnadenreligion", with the "jüdische Leistungsreligion"[4], or when it argues that in the whole LXX human piety 'ist nicht nüchtern ethisch, sondern mystisch, ekstatisch-gnostisch eingestellt'[5]. Referring to Proverbs, this applies, above all to 9.1-6. While commenting on this passage, the author follows Hans Lewy's suggestions[6], and

---

1. G. Bertram, 'Die religiöse Umdeutung altorientalischer Lebensweisheit in der griechischen Übersetzung des Alten Testaments', *ZAW* 54 (1936), 153-167.

2. Bertram, 'Die religiose Umdeutung', 160.

3. Bertram, 'Die religiose Umdeutung', 160-161.

4. Cf. Bertram, 'Die religiose Umdeutung', 161, while commenting Prov. 16.7 (MT = 15.28A LXX).

5. Bertram, 'Die religiose Umdeutung', 162.

6. Cf. H. Lewy, *Sobria Ebrietas. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der antiken Mystik* (Gießen: A. Töpelmann, 1929), 14-17. In the long footnote n. 3, which extends on pages 15 to 17, the author offers a short study of Prov. 9.1-6. He accepts the reading of the codex Vaticanus in v. 6a (cf. below footnote 8), and introduces an interesting comparison with Wis. 5.15. Lewy refuses Lagarde's contention of Christian intrusions in the translation: 'für die vorliegende Stelle sprechen schon die Philonzitate dagegen' (16). He also complains that this important document has been so far overlooked. After noting the relevant additions of the words κήρυγμα and κρατήρ, he suggests that the oldest propaganda speech of the Jewish *Sophia* intended for the Greek audience might be in competition with the Greek mysteries. He shows parallel texts which indicate that the contents of the κρατήρ might by the *Sophia* itself, and that the libation has a sacramental value. He concludes that: 'Der Übersetzer der Proverbia [...] überträgt [...] die Motive aus dem griechischen Mysterienkult auf die Schilderung des jüdischen Gastmahls der

writes: 'Die Septuaginta knüpft dabei an die Bilder vom Essen der Opferspeisen in Masora an, läßt aber das Bild von dem mystischen Trunk in den Vordergrund treten.'[7] Noteworthy, as we shall see, is also Bertram's comprehension of 9.6, based on the stich preserved in the Vatican codex[8]: he takes this as one of numerous examples in which he detects an eschatological shift. However, these eschatological readings are often not convincing, and seem more dependent on the author's assumption according to which the belief in the hereafter 'wird für den Juden im hellenistischen Zeitalter immer mehr ein Postulat der frommen Vernunft und damit gleichzeitig ein Auslegungsprinzip der Heiligen Schrift'[9].

Twenty years later a major contribution was given by Gillis Gerleman[10]. After having given a short review of the investigations of six predecessors (Vogel, Jäger, Schleussner, de Lagarde, Heidenheim and Baumgartner), the author argues that 'What is lacking is a clear exposition of the translator's nature and aims. [...] Only if this task can be accomplished will it become possible to form an opinion of the value of this translation in criticising MT'[11]. First of all, from a formal point of view, it is clear that 'The aesthetic value produced in the Hebrew Proverbs by means of various stylistic devices, above all assonance, has been reproduced and reinforced by the Greek translator'[12]. 'His way of working reveals a considerable familiarity with Greek

---

Weisheit [...]. Diese griechische Übersetzung stellt damit die erste Etappe auf dem Wege der Angleichung der jüdischen Sophialehre an hellenische Vorstellungen dar' (17).

7. Bertram, 'Die religiose Umdeutung', 163.

8. Stich 9,6a: ἵνα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα βασιλεύσητε. Actually, the reading is preserved by BS*A, but rejected by Rahlfs because it would have derived from Wis. 6.21. Cf. Bertram, 'Die religiose Umdeutung', 164.

9. Bertram, 'Die religiose Umdeutung', 167.

10. G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint. III. Proverbs*, Lunds Universitets Årsskrift 52, no. 3 (Lunds: Gleerup, 1956), which fully integrates the previous essay: G. Gerleman, 'The Septugint Proverbs as a Hellenistic Document', *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 8 (1950), 15-27. G. Gerleman, 'Religion och moral i Septuagintas Proverbia-översättning', *Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift* 26 (1950), 222-232, addresses the religious and moral shift in the translation.

11. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 5.

12. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 14.

tradition'[13]. Particularly, referring to the existence of a versification, as argued by Thackeray, Gerleman writes: 'the most convincing proofs given by Thackeray are the hexameter endings, i.e. the *versus paroemiaci*'[14]. Another important characteristic pointed out by the author is 'that the synonymous parallelisms of the Hebrew text have, to a large extent, had their places taken by antitheses'[15]. So that, 'It is obvious that divergences of this type between MT and LXX Prov. do not come from a Hebrew original used by the translator and deviating from MT'[16]. Metaphors of the original are moderated or even weeded out[17]. 'Numerous passages in the LXX Prov. sound very much like echoes from various Greek authors'[18]. Gerleman then offers us a number of passages referring to Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Aeschylus, Euripides. Among these, it is noteworthy that the translator 'makes a clear distinction between φρόνησις and σοφία, in a manner which displays familiarity with the philosophical usage'[19]. In a later chapter the author deals with the religion and ethics of the translator. 'He has chosen to underline the religious character by slight changes of the wording in order to make the proverbs more explicitly religious and moralizing. [...] he has found the Hebrew proverbs too secular'[20]. Nonetheless, in spite of what had been argued by Baumgartner[21], 'the religionizing interpretation of Proverbs carried out by midrashic commentators has very little in common with that found in the LXX Prov. In particular it is remarkable that there is no trace whatever in the LXX Prov. of an identification of Wisdom and Torah'[22]. Among the tendencies found in the Hebrew Proverbs which the translator develops the humanisation of the religious view is the most important. 'If it is

---

13. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 15.
14. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 15.
15. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 18.
16. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 25.
17. Cf. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 26.
18. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 28.
19. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 52, n.3.
20. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 38.
21. Cf. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 253.
22. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 42.

true that the piety of the Sages already represents a broadening and humanization of the Prophetic religion, then it might be said that the LXX Prov. has advanced far in the same direction'[23]. But that is not a result, as Bertram claimed, of Jewish legalism[24]. According to Gerleman, 'Unlike the translator of the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the prophetical books the Proverb [sic] translator has failed to take the word תורה as a technical term'[25]. Actually, his favourite word is not ἄνομος or παράνομος, but κακός which translates here, in addition to its normal equivalent רע, ten other Hebrew words[26]. Gerleman criticises even more strongly Bertram's conclusions: his 'attempt to find mystical, ecstatic-gnostic features in the LXX Proverbs is quite erroneously founded, op. cit. p. 162 f. Neither in the passages quoted 8,22 ff. and 9,1 ff. or elsewhere in the description of Wisdom, ch. 1–9, am I able to discern the slightest traces of a mystical or ecstatic-gnostic attitude'[27]. Turning then to Kaminka's contribution, Gerleman discusses every verse cited by the former to support his view, finally arguing that, even if the matter would deserve a special investigation, it is likely that the Targum is depending on the LXX and the Peshitta[28]. Finally the author indicates 'a passage in the LXX Prov. the difficult wording of which may become clearer when seen in the light of the Stoic view of universe'[29]: 8.30, ἁρμόζουσα. 'Here the part played by Wisdom in the creation of the world has been defined in an interesting manner: Wisdom accommodates, creates harmony. This idea occurs frequently in Stoic philosophy.'[30] The author infers that,

The reminiscences of Hellenistic philosophy found in this version certainly give

---

23. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 43.
24. Cf. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 43.
25. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 45.
26. Cf. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 44-45.
27. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 43.
28. Cf. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 46-51.
29. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 57.
30. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 57.

us no right to characterize the translator as a Stoic. [...] The Greek translation of Proverbs comes from a time when OT piety and Greek philosophy were first coming into opposition. [...] The benevolent attitude to Hellenistic culture which is transparent in the LXX Prov. has left its traces first and foremost in the stylistic form of the translation. At the same time, however, it is undeniable that the Hellenistic ideas, especially of a Stoic stamp, have found their way into the Greek interpretation of Proverbs[31].

The last chapter deals with the dating of the translation. After having discussed and rejected the proposal of Thackeray[32], Gerleman shows the affinities with the Wisdom of Solomon and the LXX translation of Job, arguing that the date of the translation 'must be based upon its close relationship to Wisdom and the LXX Job'[33]. As we shall see, these opinions were to be widely discussed in the following decades.

In 1984 Anna Passoni Dell'Acqua[34] published a notable commentary which systematically compares the Hebrew and the Greek texts of Prov. 8. As we shall see in more detail[35], it can be relevant to mention her interpretation of συμπαρήμην αὐτῷ (v. 27) which translates שָׁם אָנִי: 'Questo verbo sembra sottolineare una maggiore partecipazione della Sapienza alla creazione che non la frase "io ero là" del testo ebraico'[36]. The observation that in v. 25b Wisdom is said to be "generated" (γεννᾷ με) while the universe (cf. vv. 24, 26, 28) is just "created" (ποιέω) also seems to be important: 'Per la Sapienza affermare di essere stata generata da Dio è una garanzia ben maggiore che il proclamare di esserne stata creata. Nella generazione c'è un elemento in più a favore del carattere intermedio del suo essere. L'umanità e, a maggior ragione, il

---

31. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 57.

32. Cf. Thackeray, 'Poetry', 58-59.

33. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 60.

34. A. Passoni Dell'Acqua, 'La sapienza e in genere l'elemento intermedio tra Dio e il creato nelle versioni greche dell'Antico Testamento. Analisi delle divergenze tra testo ebraico e versioni greche dell'Antico Testamento: Proverbi 8', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 98 (1984), 97-147.

35. Cf. section 1.3 devoted to the work of Cook, below.

36. Passoni Dell'Acqua, 'l'elemento intermedio', 132.

mondo, sono stati solo creati.'[37] Her remark that the perfect חוֹלָלְתִּי has been translated with the present (γεννᾷ με) is also interesting. The author is not in agreement with Gerleman's understanding of ἁρμόζουσα as referring to Stoic philosophy: she considers far more likely that the translator's choice was influenced by the sound of the corresponding word in the parent text (אָמוֹן in the MT, which would have been vocalised אָמָן by the translator).

In 1985 Karl-Gustav Sandelin[38] devoted a book to the characterisation of Wisdom as a nourisher. In his 4th chapter the author deals with the Greek version of Prov. 9.1-6 on account of its major deviations from the MT. He focuses especially on the additions of the words κρατήρ and κήρυγμα, as Lewy[39] had done, but he thinks that 'it is extremely difficult to show that the Greek translator deliberately used the words κρατήρ and κήρυγμα in order to guide the thoughts of his readers to the mysteries'[40]. Sandelin prefers to move the problem to the level of the reader: 'I think it possible that the Greek text might have been read, by somebody who possessed the required frame of reference, as a parallel to some Hellenistic mystery religion'[41]. Among those readers he is able to mention the author of the Wisdom of Solomon and Philo of Alexandria. As for the former, Sandelin's textual evidence is too narrow to be compelling. Interestingly enough, the author cites a number of passages where the Wisdom of Solomon verbally depends on the Greek Proverbs. However, when he deals with the hemistich refused by Rahlfs because it is allegedly dependent on Wis. 6.21[42], this last remark is not sufficient to induce him to accept the verse as authentic.

Only two years later, in the second part of a paper devoted to the Greek Job, John G. Gammie[43] deals with 'Gerleman's contention that the LXX of Job and Proverbs had a

---

37. Passoni Dell'Acqua, 'l'elemento intermedio', 144.

38. Karl-Gustav Sandelin, *Wisdom as Nourisher* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1986), 73-81.

39. Cf. Lewy, *Sobria Ebrietas*, 15, n.3, and footnote 6 above. The author does not seem to know Bertram's article.

40. Sandelin, *Nourisher*, 76.

41. Sandelin, *Nourisher*, 76.

42. Cf. footnote 8 above.

43. J.G. Gammie, 'The Septuagint of Job: Its Poetic Style and Relationship to the Septuagint of

common translator'[44]. Against the some 26 expressions proposed by the former[45], Gammie illustrates a similar number of translational attitudes where the two versions are proved to run in a very different way. Therefore, although 'Some common background between Greek Job and Greek Proverbs may be granted [, this] does not necessitate the conclusion that the translator was one and the same person nor even from one and the same group'[46]. Furthermore, 'Correspondences between Greek Proverbs and Sirach are intriguing and suggest a possible origin of the former in Palestine'[47]. To my knowledge, this was the first time such an assertion was proposed, and, although the contention was not advanced with a completely developed argumentation, it was destined to receive ample discussion. Finally Gammie argues that 'In positing a provenance for the Greek Proverbs among a circle sympathetic toward Stoicism [...] Gerleman falls short'[48]: the translator's position concerning wealth seems to be far from the Stoic one. 'It is clear, then, that however much Stoic influence may have left its mark on Greek Proverbs, this influence was not always one of positive acceptance'[49].

In 1990 Michael B. Dick[50] published a relevant contribution for the comprehension of the Greek Proverbs. The aim of the paper is to examine the ethics of the translation and therefore it focuses 'on the tendencies of the Greek text both (a) towards an increased and more explicit moralizing and (b) towards de-emphasizing the theology of an afterlife'[51]. The translation

---

Proverbs', *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987), 14-31.

44. Gammie, 'Septuagint of Job', 15.

45. Cf. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 59-60.

46. Gammie, 'Septuagint of Job', 28.

47. Gammie, 'Septuagint of Job', 30.

48. Gammie, 'Septuagint of Job', 29.

49. Gammie, 'Septuagint of Job', 30.

50. M.B. Dick, 'The Ethics of the Old Greek Book of Proverbs', *The Studia Philonica Annual* 2 (1990), 20-50.

51. Dick, 'Ethics', 20.

is surprisingly innocent of Hellenistic Greek ethical language. [...] Most of the moral evolution [...] within this translation are consonant with developments witnessed even within the Masoretic text. [...] this translation might best be understood perhaps not as a product of Hellenistic Alexandria but rather of a more conservative Greek-speaking Jewish school perhaps resident in Palestine; it was probably translated by a group not yet caught up in the speculation about Law and Wisdom represented by its contemporary Ben Sira, nor yet imbued with the apocalypticism and speculation about the after life that peaked with the martyrs of the Maccabean revolt[52].

Although our Greek text does not appear to have been known to the translator of Ben Sira (132 B.C.E.), who cites Proverbs but not according to the LXX text, the Greek Book of Proverbs was probably translated not later than the second century B.C.E. No single argument can establish the date of Greek Proverbs, however several factors combine to suggest this second century date (*terminus a quo*). Because LXX Proverbs both consciously plays down a theology of the afterlife and yet still has a universalistic outlook, the book could probably be dated to the beginning of the second century B.C.E. In any case, Greek Proverbs is first cited (5 times) in the works of Philo of Alexandria (c. 20 B.C.E.–45 C.E.) which establishes its *terminus ad quem*[53].

Dick too acknowledges that 'Frequently the LXX converts Hebrew synonymous parallelism to antithetic parallelism, and so displays sensitivity to Greek style, that supposedly preferred antithesis and found the customary synonymity of Semitic poetry tedious'[54]. Nevertheless, the author also argues that

---

52. Dick, 'Ethics', 20.
53. Dick, 'Ethics', 21.
54. Dick, 'Ethics', 22.

These changes, however, may not be solely due to a Greek poetic dislike for synonymous parallelism, for the ethics of the time whether Hebrew or Greek (e.g. Stoicism) tend towards a moral dualism that stresses good and evil as antipodal. [...] For example, of the ninety-five times that κακός is used in Greek Proverbs, eighteen cases seem to use this root *de novo* with no correspondence in the MT. In most instances it is impossible to determine whether this moralizing inclination stems from the Hebrew *Vorlage* and represents the same dynamic evidenced in the MT itself or whether it is the contribution of the Greek translator[55].

Then the author discusses the essays of Bertram, who, in his opinion stresses the genesis of the ethics of the LXX of Proverbs within Judaism, and of Gerleman, who, on the contrary, proposes that the book is a product of Hellenistic Stoicism. Dick contends that the translator is aware of the philosophical distinction between σοφία and φρόνησις[56]. More in general, technical philosophical vocabulary is lacking[57]. In conclusion,

Even when mention of God has not been added to the text, generally the natural retribution has been highlighted in the LXX [...]. Greek Proverbs conspicuously avoids much of the lexicon of Greek ethics [...]. *Pace* Bertram, the Greek text does not stress a transcendent eschatology. [...] Unlike many other Hellenistic Jewish works, whether written in Palestine or Alexandria, LXX Proverbs has no Torah-based ethics. The Law of Moses does not play a clear role in this book[58].

'A translation in Jerusalem before the Maccabean revolt could explain many of its

---

55. Dick, 'Ethics', 22-23.
56. Cf. Dick, 'Ethics', 46, and Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 52.
57. Cf. Dick, 'Ethics', 49.
58. Dick, 'Ethics', 49.

peculiarities, especially its avoidance of the lexicon and theologumena most typical of the diaspora'[59].

This study of Dick, which discusses both Bertram and Gerleman, excels for its acquaintance with numerous open questions, and for it proposes a deep analysis and some new solutions of the problems posed by the translation of Proverbs. It also leads us chronologically to the 'period of Johann Cook'. In the last two decades he has, more than any one else, applied himself to the interpretation of this book, producing among many articles, a monograph[60] and a full English version[61] of it. Cook's contribution will be dealt with in the next section.

---

59. Dick, 'Ethics', 50.

60. J. Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

61. 'Proverbs', introduction and translation by J. Cook, in A. Pietersma and B.J. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 621-647.

## 1.3. The Contribution of Johann Cook

Although Cook had already devoted, mainly starting from 1991[1], no less than 18 articles to the Greek version of Proverbs, one can easily locate the most comprehensive account of his earlier research in the monograph published in 1997: *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs*. It will be then necessary here to take the book as a definitive synthesis of this first period of Cook's research and as a useful starting point to elucidate his understanding of the Septuagint of Proverbs.

### 1.3.1. The introduction

As the title makes us aware, the study deals with the question whether the Greek Proverbs share a Hellenistic *Weltanschaung*. It should be clear from the history of the research depicted above that Cook is here trying to approach a matter widely discussed since the contributions of Bertram and Gerleman appeared. As Cook himself describes it: 'it became clear that some scholars would argue for influence by Hellenism on all levels, or in the words of Gerleman: the *stylistic form* and the *world of ideas*. Others (Cook, Gammie, Dick and Giese) are more cautious and also critical for the claims that especially Stoic perspectives found their way into the Greek text of Proverbs'[2]. Therefore,

> the aim of the present monograph is to determine to what extent the Septuagint version of Proverbs has been influenced by Hellenism. Expressed in terms of the

---

1. A first article devoted to the Septuagint of Proverbs appeared in 1987: J. Cook, 'Hellenistic Influence in the Book of Proverbs (Septuagint)?', *BIOSCS* 20 (1987), 30-42.

2. Cook, *Proverbs*, 12.

research problem: should this version of Proverbs be seen primarily as a Hellenistic document or did the author basically adhere to his Jewish background in his translating activity? [...] The hypothesis to be tested is that Hellenism did not influence the Septuagint version of Proverbs fundamentally.[3]

The author had already devoted three articles to this precise question[4], thus showing his specific interest in the subject. As Cook himself tells us in the preface: 'It began in an ordinary class situation when I was preparing a course in textual criticism for second year students. The Septuagint version of Proverbs Chapter 2 was the prescribed passage and in preparing the lectures I became aware of the remarkable differences between the different versions.'[5] Therefore the three mentioned essays are mainly devoted to the relevant plus found in Prov. 2.17 which mentions the κακὴ βουλή that Cook interprets as 'foreign wisdom'[6]. This understanding eventually led the author to acknowledge the Jewish character of the translation.

Cook claims to be aware of the complex nature of the main concepts he uses, namely Hellenism and Judaism.

This hypothesis – he writes – is naturally a problematic one, for it is not immediately clear what should be understood by Hellenism. The Septuagint was after all translated into Greek for a Jewish community which no longer could communicate in their mother tongue. The language is consequently already an

---

3. Cook, *Proverbs*, 38-39.

4. Cf. Cook, 'Hellenistic Influence in the Book of Proverbs (Septuagint)?', 30-42; J. Cook, 'Hellenistic Influence in the Septuagint Book of Proverbs', in C.E. Cox, *VII Congress of the IOSCS* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991), 341-353; J. Cook, 'The Septuagint Proverbs as a Jewish-Hellenistic Document', in L. Greenspoon, and O. Munnich, *VIII Congress of the IOSCS* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995), 349-365.

5. Cook, *Proverbs*, xv.

6. Cook, *Proverbs*, 138; and Cook, 'Jewish-Hellenistic Document', 350-352. A slightly different position was held in Cook, 'Hellenistic Influence in the Septuagint Book of Proverbs', 344-345.

integral part of what is called Hellenism. [...] The implication of this intricate phenomenon is that the meeting between Hellenism and Judaism can only be described in a complex way.[7]

In addition, the author fully accepts Gerleman's stylistic evaluations: 'In Chapter 2 Gerleman presents an exhaustive discussion of the literary style of the Greek translator. This chapter represents the best work in the book and Gerleman unequivocally demonstrates that this translator had an excellent training in the Greek language'.[8] In a subsequent passage he states more clearly

that the translator of Proverbs must have had an excellent education, a point that various scholars, *inter alia* [sic] Gerleman, have also made. This translator was well acquainted with Greek literature and made use of various categories of literary and stylistic devices in order to explicate his parent text. His knowledge of both Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic is also of a remarkably high standard.[9]

The allusion to the relation of the Greek translation with the parent text leads us to the delicate, very relevant, question about the reason for the impressive number of deviant renderings in the Septuagint of this book. According to Cook, this issue is strictly related to the problem of the cultural world of the translator: 'If indeed it can be determined that the translator was responsible for a large number of these deviations, it will be helpful to determine the "theology" of this translation.'[10] Thus,

---

7. Cook, *Proverbs*, 39.
8. Cook, *Proverbs*, 6.
9. Cook, *Proverbs*, 35.
10. Cook, *Proverbs*, 2.

It should [...] be evident that the study of the way the translator of Proverbs approached his parent text is of critical importance to the analysis undertaken here. If indeed he did render the parent text freely, as is generally accepted, then this could assist us in determining the origin of the large number of pluses in this book. For this could naturally lend support to a view that would ascribe deviations from the MT to the translator[11].

Although Cook is right in arguing that 'Practically all the scholars [...] take as point of departure the given fact that this translator approached his parent text creatively'[12], in my opinion he underestimates the authoritative position of Tov when he claims that the latter 'holds a middle position in this regard, arguing for both exegetical as well as recensional differences between MT and LXX Proverbs'[13]. In the words of Tov – who expressed his opinion twice, the first time in 1990[14] and the second in 1999[15] in a revised edition of his former article –

It seems that the translation was made from a Hebrew copy of Proverbs which differed recensionally from that of MT. These differences consisted of major and minor differences in sequence as well as differences in pluses and minuses. If the interpretation of these differences is correct, we have gained further insights into the history of the growth of the book of Proverbs. At a relatively late time the different editorial stages of the growth of the book were still reflected in the

---

11. Cook, *Proverbs*, 31.

12. Cook, *Proverbs*, 11.

13. Cook, *Proverbs*, 11.

14. Cf. E. Tov, 'Recensional Differences Between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs', in H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins, and T.H. Tobin, *Of Scribes and Scrolls* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1990), 43-56, which Cook knows and cites.

15. Cf. E. Tov, 'Recensional Differences Between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs', in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 419-431, which could be aware of the monograph of Cook, published two years before.

texts. When Proverbs was translated into Greek, presumably in the second century BCE, a scroll was used that contained an editorial stage of the book differing from that now contained in MT. Such an understanding parallels views developed previously regarding other biblical books. This view does not imply that the editorial changes were made as late as the time of the Greek translation, but that at that time, in a geographically remote center of Judaism, such early scrolls were still available[16].

One is particularly struck by Tov's assumption that the translation was accomplished 'in a geographically remote center of Judaism', thus taking a position quite different from the one which, as we have seen above, the majority of the recent scholars hold. In conclusion, Tov does not seem to hold a 'middle position' as suggested by Cook.

The philological problems of the Hebrew text are only a part of the question[17]. Cook devotes an ample section of the introduction to the textual situation of the Greek version, first of all to the fact that a major critical edition is still lacking. In such a situation many questions still remain open and between them the riddle of the double translations. According to Cook, 'There is consensus that LXX Proverbs contains a fair number of double translations. However, some uncertainty remains concerning this issue'[18]. The author is in particular referring to the fluidity and uncertainty of the terminology in use among scholars about this subject. He had already dealt with this issue in an earlier article[19], especially trying to distinguish between the expression 'double translation' and the term 'doublet' which are currently used interchangeably by

---

16. Tov, 'Recensional Differences' (1999), 431.

17. Unfortunately among the Dead Sea Scrolls just a few fragments have been found of the book of Proverbs. Cf. Eugene Ulrich, *et al.* (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4: Psalms to Chronicles*, vol. 11 (*Discoveries in the Judean Desert* 16; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 181-186, pl. XXII-XXIII (= 4Q102, 4Q103).

18. Cook, *Proverbs*, 13.

19. J. Cook, 'The Hexaplaric Text, Double Translations and Other Textual Phenomena in the Septuagint (Proverbs)', *JNSL* 22/2 (1996), 129-140.

scholars. Cook refers to some distinctions advanced by Shemaryahu Talmon[20] who

suggests the following questions in this regard. Is a particular double translation peculiar to the translator and is it ultimately derived from a Greek or a non-Hebrew tradition? Or did it perhaps originate in an ancient Hebrew tradition subsequently taken over by the translators? He also distinguishes various categories of double translations: a) double translations which according to him are usually the work of copyists who combined alternative renderings of a single Hebrew word or a single expression found in different mss of the version in question; b) conflate translations of synonymous readings. The translator had recourse to a doublet to preserve two alternative Hebrew traditions which he found in different mss of the original, because he would not presume to prefer one to other; c) translations of double readings which had already been incorporated as such in the Hebrew ms used by the translator and whose conflated character escaped his notice, or he did not presume to correct them.[21]

By moving from these observations the author proposes to

distinguish between doublets and double translations. The latter should be used solely with reference to a translator who endeavours to elucidate a problematic Hebrew/Aramaic reading that appears in his *Vorlage*. He therefore sees the need to explicate and uses more than one word or phrase in order to do so. The doublet, on the other hand, is the result of the transmission history of the translation, either because of inner Greek corruptions or changes by a later

---

20. Cf. S. Talmon, 'Double Readings in the Massoretic Text', *Textus* 1 (1960), 144-184.

21. Cook, *Proverbs*, 14.

revisor.'[22]


The question of the revision leads Cook to the problems related with the Hexaplaric recension. In Septuagint Proverbs, as we have said while reporting the position of Fritsch, the presence in the text edited by Rahlfs of some Hexaplaric fragments is still a disputed question. As Cook states, 'In addition to the fact that the OG has not yet been determined, the pluses and glosses in many instances seem to be similar to the rest of the text. Many of these additions in comparison to the MT therefore also exhibit the same creative approach to lexical items, syntax etc.'[23]. On the other hand, the author acknowledges that 'There is a direct relationship between what has come to be known as double translations [...] and the hexaplaric text.'[24] Finally Cook presents a description of the manuscripts available for the Greek text of the Proverbs and proposes also a partition of the manuscript families mainly based on the categories which the late researcher of the Septuaginta-Unternehmen, Joseph Ziegler, had formulated in respect of Ecclesiastes. We shall see that this partition does not apply to Proverbs and has been already criticised by Caterina Moro[25]. There is no doubt that in some cases this wrong assumption impeded Cook's attempt to recover the original text.

In the last part of the introduction Cook discusses from a wider point of view the relation existing between parent text and translation. He is of the opinion that 'There is a legitimate and timely contemporary development in Septuagint studies, and for that matter in exegesis in general, to accept that the LXX was indeed the first exegetical commentary on the Hebrew Bible and that it should not be seen as relevant only, or even primarily, for textual criticism.'[26] In consequence of this Cook thinks that 'It is

---

22. Cook, *Proverbs*, 16.
23. Cook, *Proverbs*, 17.
24. Cook, *Proverbs*, 20.
25. Cf. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 396 fn. 30.
26. Cook, *Proverbs*, 2.

therefore a holistic approach towards the Greek text, in the first place making sense of this text as an independent entity.'[27] We can regard this last consideration as the formulation of the author's research method.

## 1.3.2. The analysis of selected chapters from Proverbs

In chapter two, the main part of his work, Cook deals with the study of the individual sections of the Greek Proverbs which in his opinion are the most helpful to answer the principal question about the character of the translation: chapter 1, chapter 2, chapter 6, chapter 8, chapter 9, and the displacement of chapter 31. The author had already treated, in his previous published articles, the major problems opened by these sections of the book; here, anyway, he offers a complete commentary of these passages which enables him to achieve more definitive conclusions.

Cook considers the commentary to chapter 1[28] particularly relevant to show his methodological approach. In addition to this, the author tries to demonstrate the theological implications of two deviating renderings, namely in verses 7 and 32. In relation to the former Cook says: 'The translator clearly has a religious intention in these seven verses, which culminates in his application of Ps 110 (LXX) in verse 7. [...] Finally, the application of the phrases from the Psalms acts as scriptural proof of where true wisdom can be found.'[29] Then referring to verse 32, Cook notes that

---

27. Cook, *Proverbs*, 41.

28. Cook had already devoted attention to this chapter in J. Cook, 'Were the Persons Responsible for the Septuagint Translators and/or Scribes and/or Editors?', *JNSL* 21/2 (1995), 45-58; J. Cook, 'Aspects of the Translation Technique Followed by the Translator of LXX Proverbs', *JNSL* 22/1 (1996), 143-153; Cook, 'Hexaplaric Text', 129-140; J. Cook, 'Contrasting as a Translation Technique in the LXX of Proverbs', in C.A. Evans, and S. Talmon, *The Quest for Context and Meaning* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 403-414; J. Cook, 'The Law in the Septuagint Proverbs', *JNSL* 23/1 (1997), 211-223.

29. Cook, *Proverbs*, 64.

The translator linked verse 32 and the previous verses. The κακοί of verse 28 onwards, which in the final analysis go back to and also include the "fools" (οἱ δὲ ἄφρονες) of verse 22, are made the subjects of those who wronged the innocent. The result of these deliberate changes is that instead of the innocent being killed as the MT has it, these "ungodly ones" have to pay this penalty. This issue is naturally of importance for it acts as proof that the translator made even syntactic changes on the basis of his "theological" perspectives.[30]

Drawing the conclusions to the first chapter, the writer states, among other things, that 'there is no predictable pattern in the application of particles [...] in line with the free approach referred above'[31]; that the translator 'employs explicative renderings in order to translate with the utmost clarity for his readers. Consequently a number of adjectives have been added'[32]; and that there are a number of singulars for plurals and *vice versa*[33]. Some different consonantal readings have also been found[34]. Finally, from a theological point of view, Cook concludes:

Moralising dualisms abound in this chapter. On the one hand, there are the ἄκακοι (verses 4 and 22); the παιδοὶ νέοι (verse 4); the σοφοί (verse 6); the ἄνδρα δίκαιον (verse 11) and the νηπίοι (verse 32). On the other hand, the translator refers to the ἀσεβεῖς (verses 7 and 22), the ἄνδρες ἀσεβεῖς (verse

---

30. Cook, *Proverbs*, 104.

31. Cook, *Proverbs*, 102.

32. Cook, *Proverbs*, 103.

33. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 105; namely verses 6; 8; 9; 19; 20; 23; 25; 28; 29; 30; 31.

34. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 108: 'The translator read חמות instead of הֹמִיּוֹת in the first stich in verse 21. The word δυναστῶν in verse 21 is probably an interpretation of the Hebrew lexeme שַׂר, instead of שַׁעַר. It is possible that the translator read שְׁאֵלֹת for שְׁלֹות in verse 32.'

10); the ἀνδρῶν παρανόμων (verse 18); the ἄφρονες (verse 22) and the κακοί (verse 28).

Chapter One is thus seen by the translator as an introduction to the whole of the book of Proverbs (the collection he had in front of him). It functions especially as an introduction to Chapter 2 where the wisdom teacher is directly instructing the son in the ways of wisdom. Chapter 1 is an introduction to these teachings and consequently the dualism between the good and the bad, which is already implicit in the Hebrew text, is depicted much more explicitly in the Greek translation.[35]

We have already mentioned the relevance which Prov. 2[36], particularly verse 17, has had in Cook's comprehension of the translation. After a careful and complete comparison of the Hebrew and Greek versions of the chapter, Cook infers the following conclusions:

The question that needs to be answered is whether the phenomenon of variation – be it stylistic variation or of a grammatical order – has its roots in a Hellenistically orientated approach, or whether it indeed attests to the Jewishness of the translator. I will address this issue in the light of accumulated textual evidence. However, in the two chapters analysed thus far, it has become clear that the translator indeed employs all facets of the language in order to serve his

---

35. Cook, *Proverbs*, 110.

36. Cook had already payed attention to this chapter in many contributions: J. Cook, 'The Dating of the Septuagint Proverbs', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 69 (1993), 383-399; J. Cook, 'The Septuagint as Contextual Bible Translation – Alexandria or Jerusalem as Context for Proverbs?', *JNSL* 19 (1993), 25-39; J. Cook, 'Are the Syriac and Greek Versions of the אשה זרה (Prov 1 to 9) Identical? (On the Relationship between the Peshitta and the Septuagint)', *Textus* 17 (1994), 117-132; J. Cook, יִשָּׁה זָרָה [sic] (Proverbs 1 – 9 Septuagint): A Metaphor for Foreign Wisdom?', *ZAW* 106 (1994), 458-476; Cook, 'Jewish-Hellenistic Document', 349-365; Cook, 'Aspects of the Translation Technique', 143-153; Cook, 'Contrasting as a Translation Technique', 403-414; Cook, 'Law', 211-223.

religious perspective on his parent text. [...] However, when the broader picture is taken into account it becomes clear, especially in the nuanced addition to verse 17 compared with MT, that the suggestive Greek concepts κακὴ βουλὴ and καλὴ βουλὴ are actually the bearers of a religious view concerning the dualism that can guide man in the form of either good or bad counsel.[37]

Thus Cook concludes that

The Jewish translator used the concepts of the "good and evil" counsels in order to warn the readers against "foreign wisdom". These interpretations and the fact that the law plays a greater role in this translation unit, are an indication that the translator who was responsible for these chapters was indeed a Jewish and not a Hellenistically inclined scribe, at least as far as the "world of ideas" is concerned.[38]

As for Prov. 1 the writer locates a number of features of the translation technique such as singulars for plurals and *vice versa*[39], minuses[40], maybe different consonantal readings[41]. The author proposes as well to consider "'Hexaplaric'' text'[42] some stichs in verses 2; 3 (?); 19 (?); 21. An interesting observation on the double translation found at verse 18 clearly shows a religious implication:

There are [...] more indications that the person responsible for these chapters had certain "theological" issues in mind in his rendering of his basic text. The

37. Cook, *Proverbs*, 150.
38. Cook, *Proverbs*, 153.
39. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 150; namely verses 1; 8 (justices); 9; 13; 14; 20.
40. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 151; namely in verses 14 and 22.
41. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 152; namely in verses 2 and 7.
42. Cook, *Proverbs*, 152.

phrases used to describe אֶל־רְפָאִים, namely καὶ παρὰ τῷ ᾅδῃ and μετὰ τῶν γηγενῶν τοὺς ἄξονας αὐτῆς, clearly contain varied information concerning the netherworld and will be studied in conjunction with other passages, such as the crucial Chapter 9.[43]

Lastly, another concise observation of Cook regarding the consistency and freedom of the translator is worth mentioning: 'The conclusion drawn on the basis of the results of Prov Chapter 1, namely that this translator had a creative, free approach towards his Hebrew text (*diversity*) and at the same time a remarkably consistent treatment of certain lexemes (*unity*), is underscored by the evidence of the current chapter.'[44]

The sixth chapter of Proverbs[45] shows the first ample plus, namely the addition concerning the bee in Prov. 6.8, where 7 stichs are found. By treating this verse[46], Cook happens to comment on a previous essay of Ronald L. Giese who in the two years 1992-1993 devoted no less than four papers[47] to the Greek Proverbs, especially dealing with the question of wealth. The latter was convinced that 'the addition in the LXX [...] introduces a different lesson about labor, one that [...] deals with the relationship of strength and wisdom'[48]. Giese's conclusion is that 'The Septuagint has taken [... the] two paths to prosperity and contrasted them to a greater extent than the Hebrew tradition,

---

43. Cook, *Proverbs*, 153.

44. Cook, *Proverbs*, 152.

45. Cook had already dealt with this chapter in a number of papers: Cook, 'Dating', 383-399; Cook, 'Alexandria or Jerusalem', 25-39; Cook, 'Syriac and Greek Versions', 117-132; Cook, 'Metaphor for Foreign Wisdom?', 458-476; Cook, 'Jewish-Hellenistic Document', 349-365; Cook, 'Aspects of the Translation Technique', 143-153; Cook, 'Law', 211-223.

46. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 165-168.

47. Cf. R.L. Giese, 'Qualifying Wealth in the Septuagint of Proverbs', *JBL* 111 (1992), 409-425; R.L. Giese, 'Strength through Wisdom and the Bee in LXX-Prov 6,8a-c', *Biblica* 73 (1992), 404-411; R.L. Giese, 'Compassion for the Lowly in Septuagint Proverbs', *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 11 (1993), 109-117; R.L. Giese, 'Dualism in the LXX of Prov 2:17: A Case Study in the LXX as Revisionary Translation', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 36, no. 3 (1993), 289-295.

48. Giese, 'Wisdom and the Bee', 405.

making more explicit the thought that the weak or poor wise person will actually supplant the rich yet ungodly.'[49] Cook too acknowledges this contrast, and by referring it to the main purpose of the monograph, states: 'It is important to note that the translator interprets this dualism in a religious way, for he brings wisdom into play, which is an attribute that is indispensable for the righteous.'[50] Moreover Cook agrees with Gerleman[51], about the presence of an allusion to Aristotle: 'It is also remarkable that the one of the *hapax legomena* in this chapter, ἐργάτις, appears in Aristotle in connection with the bees (HA 627ᵃ 12). [...] there can be little doubt that the translator of Proverbs had access to Aristotle'[52]. This, of course, might challenge Cook's claim about the Jewish character of the translator, and actually was an argument which supported Gerleman's persuasions. The position of Cook is as follows: 'the translator [...] made use of Greek thought (Aristotle?) in order to make the intention clear of the text he had available. He thus does not draw Aristotle's philosophical view from this Greek motif, but utilises it in order to explicate a religious issue in the Semitic text he is translating.'[53]

Later on, when dealing with verse 23, the writer argues that the genitive construction ἐντολὴ νόμου is referring to the Mosaic law; in his opinion this fact has relevant religious consequences: 'This interpretation must have implications for the perspective this translator had on the Jewish religion and more specifically Mosaic law. From the whole of the analysis it would seem to me that the person responsible for the chapters I have thus far analysed rendered his subject matter with a close eye on pertinent Jewish

---

49. Giese, 'Wisdom and the Bee', 411.

50. Cook, *Proverbs*, 168.

51. Cf. G. Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint. III. Proverbs*, Lunds Universitets Årsskrift 52, no. 3 (Lunds: Gleerup, 1956), 31.

52. Cook, *Proverbs*, 166.

53. Cook, *Proverbs*, 168.

religious perspectives and that the law also plays an integral part in his thinking.'[54]

Then, the discussion of verse 25 leads the author to formulate some interesting remarks on the relation existing between the Septuagint and Peshitta of Proverbs: 'In verse 25 the Peshitta has the double translation that appears in the Septuagint,'[55] thus

> Like the Septuagint the Peshitta has three stichs instead of the two in the MT. However, the Peshitta [...] has smaller differences in nuances compared to the LXX. In the second stich, for example, the Peshitta reads "her eyes", which is the intention of MT, whereas the LXX has "your eyes". I think it probable that the Peshitta is dependent on the LXX.[56]

In the main conclusions to the commentary on Prov. 6 Cook again observes the inconsistency in rendering the Hebrew particles[57], the use of singulars for plurals and *vice versa*[58], and possible examples of '"Hexaplaric" text'[59]. On the other hand, when focussing on the minuses, the writer states: 'The Greek version of Proverbs is definitely an expansive text. Consequently, there are by far fewer minuses than pluses in comparison with MT.'[60]

Finally, referring to his main issue, namely the cultural identity of the translator,

---

54. Cook, *Proverbs*, 184.

55. Cook, *Proverbs*, 199. Cook already treated the relationship between the Septuagint and Peshitta of Proverbs in Cook, 'Syriac and Greek Versions', 117-132, esp. 126. Here for the first time Cook expressed the conviction that 'the Targum is [...] dependent on the Peshitta' (131), cf. also Cook, *Proverbs*, 28: 'I deliberately omit the Targum of Proverbs as it has been based upon the Peshitta.' The writer in both occasions quotes the unpublished doctoral dissertation of P.E. Steyn, *External influences in the Peshitta version of Proverbs* (PhD. thesis, University of Stellenbosch, 1992).

56. Cook, *Proverbs*, 187.

57. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 196-197.

58. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 198; namely in verses 1; 3 and 10 (hands); 17 (eyes); 26 (men); 31 (possessions); 35 (bribe).

59. Cook, *Proverbs*, 199; namely verses 7 and 25.

60. Cook, *Proverbs*, 199.

Cook expresses the following statements:

> The issue he addresses is that wisdom is better than brute strength, just like the bee and the ant, for that matter, are small but active and industrious. The important point to make in this regard, is that this issue is treated "theologically/religiously". The translator states that wisdom is of crucial importance for the poor but righteous, for if he should be wise – wiser than the industrious insects – as well as diligent, then poverty will not be a threat to him.
>
> In my opinion this "theological" theme is approached from a Jewish perspective and should therefore not be brought into relationship with the Greek "pagan" literature from which it originates. The highly competent Jewish translator thus made use of known Hellenistic traditions in order to explicate a specific religious issue in the Hebrew Bible.
>
> [...] In verse 23 the deliberate combination of lexemes acts as an indication of the law of Moses that will guard the inexperienced son against this foreign wisdom. In verse 25 she is depicted in terminology that creates a direct relationship with the previous verse. The law is therefore more prominent than Gerleman for one thought possible.[61]

The eighth chapter of Proverbs[62] is treated by Cook in a slightly different way. In a short introduction the writer deals with the structure of the text on a 22-line pattern,

---

61. Cook, *Proverbs*, 199-200.

62. Cook had already studied the present chapter mainly in J. Cook, 'Aspects of the Relationship Between the Septuagint Versions of Proverbs and Job', in B.A. Taylor, *IX Congress of the IOSCS* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 309-328; and in the following essays: Cook, 'Alexandria or Jerusalem', 25-39; Cook, 'Aspects of the Translation Technique', 143-153; Cook, 'Hexaplaric Text', 129-140.

which leads him to the disputable conclusion that some pluses in the Septuagint are not original. In the words of Cook:

> Verse 10b and 13c are the only passages where I could detect evidence of possible hexaplaric influence. It is remarkable that a chapter with a rather large number of differences in comparison with MT has only two pluses that can with some certainty be ascribed to the influence of the hexaplaric additions. This is, as I indicated above, the result of the remarkable stylistic approach of this specific translator. [...] However, I indicated that this chapter (and by implication Proverbs as a whole as well) was not transmitted as carefully as is the case with many of the other Septuagint books. Many of the minuses or pluses, or the transpositions for that matter, are the result of apparently careless transmission of texts. This is a characteristic of Proverbs that will have to be studied more extensively and its relevance determined for understanding the double translations in this book.[63]

However, in my opinion, it may be faulty to draw textual conclusions mainly on the basis of alleged formal arguments.

Afterwards Cook discusses only the third section of the chapter, namely verses from 22 to 31, both in the Hebrew original and in the Greek translation. Lastly the author draws a comparison between Prov. 8 and Ben Sira. His conclusion is that 'There clearly is a relation between these writings on various levels. On a lexical level the same verbal form is used in the description of the creation of wisdom. The problem, however, is that the translator of Ben Sira could have used the verb independently of the LXX Proverbs.'[64] Be this as it may, what is important in Cook's opinion is that 'In the final

---

63. Cook, *Proverbs*, 245.
64. Cook, *Proverbs*, 244.

analysis [...] these two writings agree on one crucial issue: Wisdom is seen by both as part of the creation. This is a different perspective from that of the author of the Wisdom of Solomon.'[65] Cook is also able to locate a prominent difference as far as the relation of wisdom and law is concerned: 'I shall return to the question of the role of the Torah in LXX Proverbs. However, it is clear that the same degree of identification between law and wisdom has not taken place in the Septuagint version, at least not in the chapter under discussion, as is the case in Sir 24.'[66]

As for the previous chapters, in the main conclusions Cook makes some observations on the translation technique. Again, even if 'the translator clearly did not apply the particles as creatively as was done in Chapter 1 [...], a fair amount of diversity is observed in this regard'[67]. Some confusion of consonants/lexemes is also observed[68]. Again singulars for plurals and *vice versa* are found[69] as well as minuses[70]. Lastly, concerning the transmission of the text, Cook contends that 'Haplography took place between verses 32 and 33' and that 'Verse 34b in Rahlf's edition was transposed from verse 29.'[71]

The final remarks of Cook concerning the cultural identity of the translator are as follows:

> The translator of this chapter was evidently at pains to stress the fact that God was solely responsible for the creation and that wisdom had no independent role to play in this regard. This tendency was indicated especially in the

---

65. Cook, *Proverbs*, 238.

66. Cook, *Proverbs*, 237.

67. Cook, *Proverbs*, 241.

68. Cook, *Proverbs*, 241: 'In verse 29 he probably read בחזקו for בחוקו.'

69. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 243; namely in verses 1; 4 (people); 8 (justices); 11; 13 and 20 (ways); 22 (paths); 31 (people); 32 (my son); 36 (souls).

70. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 243; namely in verses 2; 3; 30; 32; 36.

71. Cook, *Proverbs*, 245.

famous creation passage, verses 22-36. In no fewer than four passages (verses 23, 24, 25 and 31), he has intentionally changed the person or aspect of the verb in order to avoid possible misunderstanding in this regard. The translation of verse 22 is instructive for the Greek rendition places wisdom in the correct perspective, at least as far as the translator is concerned. She has a privileged position next to God. She also has an important role to play, therefore she was *created* by God *for the sake of* his works. This privileged position is not as evident in the Hebrew text (MT), at least as far as the translator was concerned, and therefore deliberately adapted the Greek in order to avoid any misunderstanding as to the omnipotency of God. It also became true that the privileged position of wisdom is stressed by the translator in order to underline the superior position she actually took in the Judaism of the day *vis-a-vis* [sic] other cultural systems.

These conclusions corroborate the view that the Greek translator was a conservative, Jewish-schooled scribe, who was anti non-Jewish, especially Hellenistic, interpretations of the creation.[72]

Approaching the ninth chapter of Proverbs[73] Cook firstly draws our attention to the presence of a considerable number of pluses: 'This chapter also contains by far the largest number of pluses of any of the first nine chapters in the LXX Proverbs. All in all there are 17 extra stichs and several individual pluses in comparison to MT. It is naturally of crucial importance to determine what the origin of these pluses is.'[74] Cook's

---

72. Cook, *Proverbs*, 245-246.

73. Cook had already discussed this chapter in a number of papers: Cook, 'Dating', 383-399; Cook, 'Alexandria or Jerusalem', 25-39; Cook, 'Syriac and Greek Versions', 117-132; Cook, 'Metaphor for Foreign Wisdom?', 458-476; Cook, 'Jewish-Hellenistic Document', 349-365; Cook, 'Aspects of the Translation Technique', 143-153; Cook, 'Law', 211-223.

74. Cook, *Proverbs*, 247.

main conclusions about the intentions of the translator are as follows:

> In the present chapter he intentionally warns the reader of the inherent "dangers" of foreign wisdom. He has done this by intentionally adding a number of stichs and by reinterpreting yet others, as I demonstrated above. In my view these conspicuous interpretations are the results of the historical milieu in which the translator actually operated. I think he completed his translation at a time when Judaism was increasingly coming under pressure from Hellenism and this translator felt obligated to resist these pressures and to actively warn his Jewish readers against the inherent dangers of this attractive religious system.
>
> The nuanced relationship between law and wisdom which I discussed in the context of verses 10 and 11 is also important in this regard. As I stated verse 10a is significant for the translator stresses the fact that the law also has to do with the intellect.[75]

In this context, it can be relevant to note with the author that the Peshitta is found to be the only other version which shares with the Septuagint the pluses of verses 12 and 18. 'This chapter reveals the largest number of correspondences between LXX and Peshitta in the book of Proverbs. The pluses in verses 12 and 18 are found only in these two versions. However, I indicated that the Peshitta translator in some instances interpreted uniquely and apparently made use of the Septuagint.'[76] Starting precisely from these pluses, Cook is able to detect thematic relationships with Ben Sira:

> I have indicated that there is a definite relationship between these two Jewish-

---

75. Cook, *Proverbs*, 291-292.
76. Cook, *Proverbs*, 291.

Hellenistic sources. This is observed more on a thematical level than in respect of specific lexical items. The essence of this relation seems to be found in the unique cultural milieu in which the persons who were responsible for these writings executed their work.[77]

Moreover Cook observes that 'There are a larger number of pluses and practically no minuses in this chapter'[78], and tends to consider verse 6b of hexaplaric origin[79].

Thus Cook is able to trace a portrait of the translator:

> To me the profile of the Septuagint text of this *whole* chapter, and not just of the first six verses, is not oriented towards Hellenism in its broader context, but on the contrary, is evidence of the Jewishness of the translator. As I have demonstrated, this applies to the other chapters which I have analysed thus far too. This translator was in fact more "conservative" than the author(s) of the *Vorlage* of the MT. He therefore attempts to avoid the possible misunderstanding of his underlying Hebrew text, not by referring to Hellenistically inclined perspectives, but, on the contrary, by on the one hand applying ancient Jewish traditions such as the tale of Sodom, and on the other hand, by linking up in a negative manner with ancient Greek traditions, such as the traversing of the river Styx. Of decisive importance to me in this regard is the fact that the reference to a "foreign river" has been placed precisely in the context of Hades (שְׁאוֹל).[80]

The moment therefore has come to introduce the contribution of Michael V. Fox[81]

---

77. Cook, *Proverbs*, 291.

78. Cook, *Proverbs*, 291.

79. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 291.

80. Cook, *Proverbs*, 292.

81. M.V. Fox, 'The Strange Woman in Septuagint Proverbs', *JNSL* 22/2 (1996), 31-44.

which deals mainly with the interpretation given in the Septuagint Proverbs to the strange woman (אִשָּׁה זָרָה). 'The LXX translates most of the Strange Woman passages quite literally, neither muting the sexuality nor obscuring the woman's humanness. At the same time, the LXX introduces additional ways of interpreting these texts.'[82] First of all, in the thorough and intentional reworking of the passage 2.16-17, אִשָּׁה זָרָה is somewhat substituted by κακὴ βουλή, "good counsel". Fox criticises here the position held by Cook[83] who was arguing 'that "good counsel" and "evil counsel" correspond to the rabbinic concepts of "the good inclination" and "the evil inclination" (יצר הטוב, יצר הרע) and that the latter in turn alludes to the foreign wisdom. But [...] the evil inclination is [...] nowhere thought to be foreign ideas or conducive to them'[84]. In addition Fox notes that Ben Sira, who translates יצר with διαβούλιον, uses the biblical meaning (i.e. the human deliberative faculty, by referring to Gen. 6.5), and not the rabbinical one. In the writer's opinion instead, for the translator of Proverbs אִשָּׁה זָרָה may symbolise a number of evils, and actually, the decoding as a translation technique is applied elsewhere, for instance in Prov. 1.27; 3.8.

The author continues his study focusing on Prov. 5.1-23. 'The Strange Woman in Chapter 5 does not lose her literal, non-symbolic quality. [...] The LXX remains close to the spirit of the MT throughout this chapter. At two points, however, in vv. 5 and 19, we can glimpse an additional level of interpretation'[85]. Thus in Prov. 5.5, according to the writer, the woman is also 'a symbol of folly. This symbolic reading is reinforced later on in the description of one's own wife (ἡ ἰδία), who – without losing her literal meaning – is a metaphor, albeit elusive, for wisdom in 5.19'[86]. Actually in the author's view 'the phrase "let her lead you" suggests that the translator has another entity in mind. ἡγεῖσθαι, especially with the genitive, connotes rule and control as well as

---

82. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 32.

83. Cf. Cook, 'Metaphor for Foreign Wisdom?', 464-465.

84. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 33.

85. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 34.

86. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 35.

guidance'[87]. Particularly Fox points out that 'The notion of the woman leading the man was inspired by the implicit vocalization of ירוך as יִרוּךְ "teach/guide you" (thus too in Syriac) in place of MT's יְרַוֻּךְ "slake your (sexual) thirst". Thus the LXX hints at the allegoric identification of the two women in this passage as folly and wisdom (i.e., Torah), without overriding the literal level'[88].

In 6.20-35 and 7.1-27 Fox is not able to find out any metaphorical meaning[89]. The author then moves to chapter 9 and states: 'Proverbs 9, with its two major additions in the LXX, is the site of the major reinterpretation of the Strange Woman. The MT of this chapter is already an expanded text, for vv. 7-10 and 12 are obvious additions to the speeches of Wisdom (9:1-6+11) and Folly (9:13-18).'[90] Fox proposes that 'three strata of development are discernible in these additions: (1) the earlier, leaner text, maintained in the MT, (2) the addition with a Hebrew source, 12a-12b, and (3) further augmentation in Greek (12c [?] and 18a-18d)'[91]. In the author's view '12a-12b reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage*. This is shown by the awkward use of the Greek future in 12a (imitating *yiqtol* forms), ἄξονας, which reflects מעגלי in 12b, and the awkward syntax of that line, best explained as an Aramaizing construal of a Hebrew error'[92]. On the contrary, 9.12C could lack a Hebrew *Vorlage* because it seems to be influenced by Jer. 2.6b, more likely in its Greek version. This impression is strengthened by the presence of two Septuagintal hapax legomena (διψώδης and ἀκαρπία) and by the fact that διατάσσω has no suitable equivalent here. Thus, in Fox's opinion, 'A Hebrew scribe inserted 9:12a-12b as a hermeneutic guide to the chapter and this was expanded, possibly in Greek, by 12c.'[93]

---

87. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 35.

88. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 35-36.

89. Cf. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 36. It is interesting though to point out that line 6.25c is a doublet rather closer to MT than 25b.

90. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 37.

91. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 37.

92. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 38.

93. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 38. In a later paper ('LXX-Proverbs as a Text-Critical Resource', *Textus* 22 [2005], 111-112) Fox also offers a full reconstruction of these two stichs.

Proceeding to the second addition, the author is first of all strongly critical of the position held by Cook[94] who, as it has been seen, was proposing, in the words of Fox, 'that this verse alludes to the river Styx. But the river mentioned here can be traversed safely, whereas all, foolish and wise, cross the Styx to death'[95]. Fox continues his reasoning: 'Although v. 18b has informed us how we may safely "pass through" strange water, 18c insists that we *keep away* from it and avoid imbibing it. This is not a contradiction but a *modus vivendi* for life in the diaspora.'[96] Finally verse 9.18D sounds as a stereotypical motivation inspired to 9.11. As a whole, the sense of this second addition, in the author's opinion 'is not reinforced elsewhere in LXX-Proverbs, the addition is probably the work of a later inner-Greek glossator than of the translator'[97].

The writer closes with a comparison of the two additions:

> Foreignness is the principle issue in both additions, but the attitude toward it differs. Addition 1 assumes it is possible simply to stay home and avoid the foreign realm, whereas in Addition 2, traversing an alien area seems to be an inescapable, or at least accepted fate [...]. Both additions assume, independently, that 9:13-18 refers to foreignness. The source of this assumption is twofold: the foolish woman [the אֵשֶׁת כְּסִילוּת of 9.13] is equated with the Strange Woman [אִשָּׁה זָרָה] described in chaps. 2, 5, and 7, and her "strangeness" is understood to be ethnic foreignness. The latter idea was not derived from the Greek translation.[98]

In Fox's opinion, actually, the meaning of ἀλλότρια in verse 5.20 is specified by τῆς

---

94. Cf. Cook, 'Metaphor for Foreign Wisdom?', 474.

95. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 41. While referring to the same verse Fox happens to do a philological evaluation about 9.18Bb which is lacking in BS*: 'The omission is accidental, since the other verses of the addition are couplets. Syriac confirms διαβήσῃ and the existence of line b.'

96. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 41.

97. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 41.

98. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 42.

μὴ ἰδίας in the tenor of a woman not your own. Therefore, the writer argues: 'The authors of both additions seem to be basing themselves upon an existing allegorization of the Strange Woman.'[99]

Unfortunately Cook is not found to answer either in his monograph or in later papers the stimulating issues raised by Fox.

The last section of the second chapter of Cook's monograph is shorter than the previous ones. It has been devoted to the differences in the order of the last chapters in the Septuagint when compared with the MT, and particularly to chapter 31. The first noticeable observation of the writer is that a different verse order is found in Prov. 15; 16; 17; 20 and 31, so that the major phenomenon observable in the last chapters would not be fully isolated[100]. Cook notes that the figure of the king is the topic of both 25.1-8 and 31.1-9. According to the writer, therefore, the translator 'simply observed that these passages belong together thematically and consequently rearranged these sections'[101]. Another important remark of Cook is that every mention of other kings is removed in Prov. 30 and 31. This, in his opinion, could be 'another indication of the conservative "theological" position of this translator. Only the proverbs of Solomon apparently are acceptable proverbs to him for Israel'[102]. Later on, Cook notices that the last verse of chapter 29 (v. 27), which handles with the ἀνὴρ ἄδικος, forms at the present state a good contrast with the following verse, namely 31.10, which treats instead of the γυνὴ ἀνδρεία. According to the writer then 'it can be argued that the translator of Proverbs, after completing these chapters, realised that these two verses actually related better to each other than the beginning of Prov 30 does with the end of Prov 29. He then decided

---

99. Fox, 'Strange Woman', 42.

100. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 294.

101. Cook, *Proverbs*, 307.

102. Cook, *Proverbs*, 307.

to adapt the order of these chapters'[103].

### 1.3.3. Conclusions

After the close inspection of this relevant amount of material, Cook feels ready to address some conclusions, first of all that the translator 'has a clearly defined approach towards his parent text which [...] has to be described as a free rendering of his parent text'[104]. In Cook's opinion this conspicuous amount of free translations has a final and deep reason which 'can be defined as the drive to make the intention of his parent text, *as he understood it*, evident to his readers'[105]. This intent to clarify his parent text is actually a distinctive orientation throughout the work. In the words of Cook the translator 'should be seen as an extremely competent translator, perhaps another one of the best. [He] was well versed in the Greek language. He evidently had an excellent education'[106].

Nonetheless in Cook's opinion the translator had a conservative theological view: 'I discussed many pointers that provide evidence of the fundamentally *Jewish* approach of this translator to his subject matter. The large number of dualisms attest to this. Another is his "conservative" approach towards the subject matter he translates. His view on the proverbs as all originating with Solomon is another example.'[107] This attitude, in Cook's view, is paradoxically confirmed even by the way he uses the non-Jewish material[108]. Thus the writer is led to be critical of Gerleman's opinion which argued for the presence

---

103. Cook, *Proverbs*, 313.
104. Cook, *Proverbs*, 316.
105. Cook, *Proverbs*, 316.
106. Cook, *Proverbs*, 317.
107. Cook, *Proverbs*, 318.
108. Cf. Cook, *Proverbs*, 318-319.

of Stoic perspectives in the translation. According to Cook 'This translator, being a conservative Jewish thinker, nowhere used extra-biblical (pagan) sources positively', and his "philosophical" character was '*fundamentally Jewish* in his approach to his subject matter'[109]. Thus the final main conclusion of the author is as follows:

> In terms of the problem I formulated in the title of this monograph, I therefore conclude that the book of Proverbs in its Septuagint version (those chapters which I researched) should not be seen as a Hellenistic document as suggested by Gerleman, nor even as Hellenistic-Jewish document as some would have it. The "weltanschauliche" position of the translator, as evidenced in the pages of his translation, is too conspicuously Jewish; therefore I interpret this translation unit as *Jewish-Hellenistic* writing.[110]

Cook deals then with secondary questions which have come to light through the analysis. He first discusses the issue moved by Gammie whether the text was rendered by several translators. In the author's opinion the simultaneous presence, throughout the book, of a basic common approach as well as of slight differences could be better explained by assuming 'that Proverbs is actually the result of team work, but then in the sense of a *school of translators* who worked within the same historical context and had the same theoretical training. This would account [...] perhaps also for the number of doublets and "hexaplaric" additions which I located'[111].

A second issue examined by Cook is the way in which is actually possible to define the work of the translator. Is he a mere translator rather than a scribe or an editor? In the writer's opinion the task of the translator can

---

109. Cook, *Proverbs*, 320.
110. Cook, *Proverbs*, 320.
111. Cook, *Proverbs*, 322.

be likened to some extent to the editorial reworking done by the deuteronomistic school. Talmon has also indicated that we should not distinguish too strictly between scribes and authors: "the authors and the copyists, *mutatis mutandis*, employed the same or similar literary tenets and techniques". Ulrich also made the point "that the compositional creativity of these late creative scribes is of the same nature as the compositional creativity of the early tradents". I would apply these perspectives also to the translators, at least to the translator of the Greek Proverbs[112].

A further issue examined by Cook is provenance of the translation which, especially on account of the conservative approach of the translator, could be better located in Jerusalem than in Alexandria[113].

Cook passes then to deal with the relationship occurring in the book between wisdom and law. Against Dick[114], who argued that the law of Moses does not hold any significant position in the Greek Proverbs, he states that it 'was indeed prominent in the thinking of the translator'[115]. Particularly convincing is the observation that the Hebrew תּוֹרָה is translated with the singular νόμος only when referring to the law of God. The author discusses also the possibility of an identification of law and wisdom in the translation:

> A related issue pertains to the question whether law and wisdom are identified by the translator of Proverbs. That there is a relationship between these two is clear from the whole of my analysis. As I have already stated, Seeligmann is of

---

112. Cook, *Proverbs*, 326.
113. Cook, *Proverbs*, 326-327.
114. Cf. Dick, 'Ethics, 49.
115. Cook, *Proverbs*, 328.

the opinion that in Prov 10 these two entities are actually identified, a view that is shared by Dick. The passage in Prov 31:5 seems to underscore the conclusion that there is a close relationship between law and wisdom. However, it is not possible on the strength of the current analysis to formulate a final opinion in this regard. What is clear to me is that there is a difference between the way these entities are related in Ben Sira and LXX Proverbs. There is a closer relationship between them in Ben Sira than in LXX Proverbs.[116]

Cook goes further in the comparison with contemporary literature so that he recognises some relations with the Hellenisers depicted in 1 Macc. 1.11-15:

There are remarkable parallels between the description of these apostates and some of the depictions I discussed in connection with LXX Proverbs. In Proverbs 1:18 the following phrase has no equivalent in MT: ἡ δὲ καταστροφὴ ἀνδρῶν παρανόμων κακή (*and the overthrow of transgressors is evil*). I suggested in my discussion of this passage that this could be a reference to some contextual situation. The rendering of verse 17 in Prov 2 is also conspicuous in this regard, where "foreign wisdom" is described as ἡ ἀπολείπουσα διδασκαλίαν νεότητος καὶ διαθήκην θείαν ἐπιλελησμένη. There seems to be some connection between these different groupings.[117]

---

116. Cook, *Proverbs*, 331.

117. Cook, *Proverbs*, 332. About verse 2.17 it should be noted though that, even if the first line has no Hebrew original, and the second one shows the Aramaising translation of אלוף with διδασκαλίαν, the third stich is translated rather literally: the reference to God's covenant is therefore already present in the original. Consequently, *against* Cook's opinion about bad inclination (cf. p. 148, and the discussion of Fox above), one should rather interpret the likely translational κακὴ βουλή (2.17a) as a reference to Hellenisers' advice (cf. also Cook's interpretation [*Proverbs*, 138]).

In addition Cook identifies in the translator's propensity for contrasts a typical feature of apocalyptic dualism. Nonetheless he would not class the Greek Proverbs as apocalyptic literature:

It would seem to me that LXX Proverbs as well as Maccabees differ from these "apocalyptic texts" as does Ben Sira. [...] So, even though it seems appropriate to conclude that these three writings should not be seen as apocalyptic documents proper, all seem to be influenced strongly by the "apocalyptic" contexts in which they functioned. It may therefore be possible that there is some historical connection between the different groups referred to in these writings.[118]

Cook's final remarks are devoted to philological issues. Against de Lagarde[119], who believed he could recognise numerous proofs of Christian interpolations, he states that 'The translator of Proverbs was a conservative Jew and nothing in the subsequent transmission history of this text indicates the influence of later Christian interpolators.'[120] Moreover, addressing the text-critical value of the translation, the writer declares that

the Septuagint version of Proverbs should be treated with the utmost caution when utilised for text-critical purposes. By far the greatest number of differences compared to MT are the result of the translator's creative approach. To me at least it would seem that the Hebrew parent text from which this Greek version

---

118. Cook, *Proverbs*, 333.
119. Cf. Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 9.
120. Cook, *Proverbs*, 333.

was constructed did not differ extensively from the Massoretic text[121].

## 1.3.4. A critical evaluation of Cook's work

The time has now come to outline a critical appraisal of the book of Cook. The monograph has been harshly criticised by Claude Cox:

> Reviewing this book has been a distressing experience for me: I know its author and count him as a friend, and I recognize the amount of work that is represented in this book. But there are some books which should never appear in print. This is one of them. [...] This book before me cannot be commended, but that is not the fault of a reviewer who can only assess what comes into his or her mailbox. Rather, the responsibility for the many problems of this book is shared by the author and by the publisher, in this case Brill, who together have advanced to us a book so badly written that I can think of no other book remotely like it.[122]

Actually Cox multiplies in his review the examples of mistranslation either from the Hebrew or the Greek. To those he adds examples of bad or even wrong English. So that he may conclude: 'All in all the book represents one long, sustained, debilitating assault on the English language.'[123] But the most important critique advanced by Cox is probably that the book completely omits to define the concepts which it is based on: Hellenism and Judaism; thus it totally fails in its aim.

---

121. Cook, *Proverbs*, 334.

122. C. Cox, review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), by J. Cook, in *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 3 (1998), on the web.

123. Cox, review of Cook, *Proverbs*.

The evaluation expressed by Raymond C. Van Leeuwen[124], even if it uses different words, is not more enthusiastic. He firstly lists some trivial mistakes, either misprints or wrong English expressions; then he deals with methodological errors such as (1) the non correspondence of the printed Hebrew text with the offered English translation, (2) the abuse of the lexical approach and especially the too simplistic opposition between free and literal translation, and finally (3) the lack of 'a substantive or clear statement of what he means by Judaism and Hellenism, or of the large literature on the topic'[125]. Anyway, the reviewer is still able to derive from the book the overall conception which seems to underlie the work: 'In Cook's treatment of LXX Proverbs, generally but not consistently, Jewish seems to correspond to theological-religious and Hellenistic to philosophical'[126]. To sum up, for Van Leeuwen also Cook fails to prove his thesis.

The judgement expressed by James K. Aitken[127] appears to be more balanced; nonetheless it points out the same problems already mentioned, first of all the meaning of Hellenism and Judaism. In the words of Aitken: 'This extreme position of creating a duality between Judaism and Hellenism does not allow for the complexity and subtlety of the two traditions, and, although it is still prominent in many studies of Second Temple literature, is open to question.'[128] Aitken tends to acknowledge that the foreign river described in Prov. 9.18, immediately after the mention of Hades, could be understood by a Greek reader as the Styx. He is more doubtful about identifying in Aristotle the source of the plus of the bee in Prov. 6.8. He states: 'It is still debated whether writers had access to Aristotle at all in the Hellenistic period [...] and the simile

---

124. Cf. R.C. Van Leeuwen, review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), by J. Cook, in *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 90 (2000), 505-509.

125. Van Leeuwen, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 508.

126. Van Leeuwen, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 508.

127. Cf. J.K. Aitken, review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), by J. Cook, in *VT* 51 (2001), 274-276.

128. Aitken, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 274-275.

of the bee seems to have been widespread in ancient Greek literature'[129]. Finally Aitken as well observes that the book is full of mistakes, inconsistencies, and that its linguistic background is too poor. In his words: 'The presentation of the material in this book is spoilt by an extremely high frequency of errors, some even rendering passages unintelligible without reconstruction [...]. The linguistic comments are often too simple, and the conclusions often do not follow from the material that is meant to support them'[130].

A more favourable assessment is expressed by Natalio Fernández Marcos[131]. According to the Spanish writer 'the book is well developed and argued within the limits imposed. [...] The conclusions are prudent and balanced and, in general, I agree with most of his points of view'[132]; moreover 'the monograph is an important contribution to Septuagint studies and, in particular, it will be indispensable for any future approach to the Greek Proverbs'[133]. The reviewer is not a native English speaker and accordingly is probably less sensible to the wrong English usage. Anyway he notes many Greek and Latin misprints and grammatical errors[134]. Being a philologist, the reviewer puts the attention especially, as I have already noticed above (p. 50), on the weak basis of the grouping of the Greek manuscripts proposed by Cook, and stresses that he overlooks the agreement of the Lucianic manuscript 106 and 260 already recognised in 1941 by Johannes Schildenberger[135]. The refined specialist of the Antiochian tradition also notes that 'the Old Latin, a very important witness for this

---

129. Aitken, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 276.

130. Aitken, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 276.

131. N. Fernández Marcos, review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), by J. Cook, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 30 (1999), 95-98.

132. Fernández Marcos, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 96.

133. Fernández Marcos, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 97-98.

134. Cf. Fernández Marcos, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 97.

135. Cf. Fernández Marcos, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 97. We shall see that also this relation can be questioned on a wider basis of manuscripts.

book due to its peculiar text, has not been [...] used' thoroughly[136]. Finally Fernández Marcos, referring as well to the concepts of Judaism and Hellenism, weakens the main conclusions of the author: 'Perhaps, I would attenuate Cook's emphasis on the conservative Jewish character of the translator, that is, his "intention" or his "theological" bias. At least, his knowledge of the classics is surprising and some reminiscences of Plato and Homer are very probable'[137]. The reviewer also stresses, in agreement with Cook's warnings, that 'only five chapters are thoroughly studied'[138] out of 31, and therefore the results cannot be applied to the whole book. It sounds a kind way to say that he disagrees with the claimed Jewish character of the translation.

The review of Gian Luigi Prato[139] is particularly interesting because it deals with some particular assertions of the monograph. First of all, he notes, as I have also done above (p. 59), the philological inconsistency of reconstructing the 8th chapter according to a structural principle (the acrostic) that is actually absent even from the MT[140]. Regarding the claimed dualism of the translator the reviewer underlines that Cook is not able to prove any connection with apocalyptic circles[141]. Then he notes that sometimes the observations which Cook makes on the different order of the last chapters might also work in Hebrew[142], so that the translator would have been able to find it already in his *Vorlage*. More detailed is the discussion about the role of Wisdom in Prov. 8.22-31 which, as we have seen, Cook connects with Ben Sira. Prato brilliantly observes that the prologue of the Greek Ben Sira informs us that the translation was accomplished in

---

136. Fernández Marcos, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 95.
137. Fernández Marcos, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 96.
138. Fernández Marcos, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 96.
139. G.L. Prato, review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), by J. Cook, in *Adamantius* 7 (2001), 330-335.
140. Cf. Prato, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 331.
141. Cf. Prato, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 332.
142. Cf. Prato, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 332.

Egypt in the second part of the second century, thus: 'Se il Ben Sira greco è "conservatore" e attaccato alla tradizione giudaica (così appunto lo vede Cook), perché allora postulare un ambiente gerosolimitano per il traduttore di Prv LXX, come se il conservatorismo fosse una prerogativa esclusiva di Gerusalemme?'[143]. However the reviewer thinks that the Greek Ben Sira shows a conception of the Mosaic law which is suitable for the Greek world. One might then understand the accent on the theme of the law which is found in the Greek Proverbs in such a similar enlightened way open to Hellenism[144]. Prato accepts some results of Cook's investigation, especially the understanding of the work of the translator as an editor[145]. Finally the reviewer remarks on some of the numerous misprints in Hebrew and Greek[146].

After presenting these five reviews I would like to synthesise my personal views on the work of Cook. First of all, I will list the points in which Cook can be followed at least to some extent.

1. We have seen that the first main conclusion which Cook addresses is that the translation is basically a free rendering of the Hebrew text. This may be true at least when comparing this approach to the one of the presumably later καίγε group. Nonetheless, I would stress with Cook that the first concern of the translator is to render the Hebrew Proverbs plain to his Greek audience: chiefly, this is a faithful translation *ad sensum*. I would probably disagree with Cook about the extent to which this happens. In my opinion the allusions to the Greek classical authors, the use of rare words, of plural for singular and vice versa, of the antitheses, or, as Thackeray showed, of several hexametric endings, all denote a cultivated translator who firmly wants to offer a literary work according to the parameters of the classical tradition. In addition, I would

---

143. Prato, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 333-334.
144. Cf. Prato, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 334.
145. Cf. Prato, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 334.
146. Cf. Prato, review of Cook, *Proverbs*, 335.

underline that here and there the translation departs from the original Hebrew and creates new meanings. That might not be exactly what we expect from an excellent translator; it is rather a reassessment of the message of the book in a different geographical, chronological, cultural, probably even socio-economic environment.

2. I also appreciate the comparison which Cook draws between the translator of the Greek Proverbs and on the one hand the deuteronomistic editors or, on the other, the Jewish scribes. I would not maintain, however, that the translator is producing an editorial reworking similar to the one accomplished by the deuteronomistic school. Cook fails indeed to prove that the translator is the author of the transpositions of the final chapters. As we have seen, most of the changes may work also within the Hebrew *Vorlage*; in addition Cook does not try to explain the reasons of most of the changes. As a general working rule, I do not think we may follow, without any other evidence, the subsequent *a priori* argumentation: because the Greek translator is using a free approach towards the Hebrew original, he is ipso facto responsible for any variations. Thus, we can consider Cook's attempt just as a proposal. I would prefer then to retain the comparison with the scribes. As we shall see, the behaviour of the scribes, as we know it from the Qumran documents[147], seems to be quite close to the interpretation technique used by the translator.

3. As I have already indicated above (p. 70), Cook seems to be right in arguing that the Hebrew תּוֹרָה is translated with the singular νόμος only if the law of God is referred to. Cook is perhaps exaggerating the consequences of this by interpreting it as a sign of the translator's theological conservatism: in my opinion the only certain outcome is that he wanted to give νόμος in its singular form a specific theological meaning, so that the translation might be theologically plainer. Cook is likely to be right, though, in avoiding, for the Greek Proverbs, an identification between the law and wisdom, and

---

147. See also the views, cited by Cook, of S. Talmon in 'Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts', *Textus* 4 (1964), 95-132.

marking in this way a distance from Ben Sira.

4. Another point upon which we may agree with Cook is the keenness of the translator for creating antithetical parallelism. That is commonly acknowledged by scholars and has been recently proved by the monograph of Tauberschmidt[148]. It is not necessary, though, to connect them to an alleged dualistic *Weltanschaung* of the translator as Cook does. Synonymous parallelism, a typical feature of Hebrew poetry, sounds tedious indeed when transposed into Greek poetics. It is more than natural, then, that such a cultivated translator often prefers to shift to an antithetic parallelism. It may be true that this procedure also reaches the final result of augmenting quantitatively the ethical antitheses, but that is by no means against the overall intention of the original text.

I may take this last observation to begin the list of the arguments on which I would not totally agree with Cook.

1. I have already suggested that the hypothesis of an apocalyptic influence on the translation stands unsubstantiated; if also the ethical dualism is not confirmed, not very much is left to support the locating in Palestine of the translation at the time of the Maccabees. Everything can still be questioned, and actually, as we shall see, David-Marc d'Hamonville, in his recent French translation of the text[149], produces a number of philological arguments which allow him to settle the work in Egypt. In addition, it seems to me that also the mentioned (pp. 76-77) counter-argument of Prato is valid: if the alleged more conservative Greek Ben Sira was written in Alexandria, even more the same might be true for the Greek Proverbs.

2. We have also seen that Cook agrees with the proposal advanced by Gammie, so that he tends to believe that the translation is actually the fruit of a group of several

---

148. Cf. Tauberschmidt, *Parallelism*. The work is related in section 1.1 above.

149. D.-M. d'Hamonville, *La bible d'Alexandrie*. *Les Proverbes* (Paris: Les éditions du cerf, 2000), 24-25.

translators of the same school. In his opinion that may be supported by the presence of the numerous doublets. In my opinion this view is simply odd: if we are dealing with a team group, it is difficult to believe that among them there was no agreement about how to translate such a wide number of passages. The reason will be more probably found in the translation technique or in the transmission history of the text. More generally, I do not see any compelling reason to multiply the number of the translators: the free approach to the original text seems to be an adequate reason for the slight differences observable along the translation.

3. Above all we have seen that the attention of the reviewers focused upon the lack of definition of the basic terms of the book: Hellenism and Judaism. This is actually the worst weakness of the work. I think that Van Leeuwen is basically right when he shapes the undeclared meanings implied by Cook in a very dualistic way. I would then agree with Aitken and state that it is very difficult to settle the question in such dualistic terms: Hellenistic/Jewish; progressive/conservative; Alexandria/Jerusalem. Such a dualistic filter is not the appropriate intellectual instrument to understand the world of the translator. In this way, he shall be only a liberal Hellenistic philosopher or a conservative Jewish theologian. The recent debate has satisfactorily proved that the real world in the second century was far more complex[150].

Finally I would like to add some minor evaluations.

1. Contrary to what Aitken thinks, Cook is probably right in arguing that Prov. 6.8a-c is alluding to Aristotle's *Historia animalium* IX 40; the lexical proximity is quite convincing: the use of the terms ἐργάτις (and I would add ἐργασία which is used just here in Proverbs[151]) within a context which deals with bees seems to be typical of this

---

150. Cf. F. Millar, 'Empire, Community and Culture in the Roman Near East: Greeks, Syrians, Jews and Arabs', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 38 (1987), 143-164; J.J. Collins, and G.E. Sterling (eds.), *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001); C. Bakhos (ed.), *Ancient Judaism in its Hellenistic Context* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 53-153.

151. The allusion was already noted by Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 30-31.

work, at least by the second century BC. Moreover the treatise is among the most famous and widely read during the Hellenistic age[152]. Cook[153], with an astonishing trivialisation, excludes that the allusion to Aristotle may mean acceptance of his philosophical view. He therefore does not seem to be aware that this work of Aristotle is not, strictly speaking, a philosophical one: actually, in the intention of Aristotle, the *Historia animalium* is just a description[154], not even an attempt at explaining the related phenomena or at researching their causes. In my opinion thus, especially if we consider that the translation might have taken place within the Alexandrian upper class, the *Historia animalium* could stand among the encyclopedic reference works which were to be consulted when needed[155].

2. In my opinion, Fox is right in criticising the identification of the foreign river (Prov. 9.18b) with the Styx. Actually, the river related here has to be crossed during the lifetime. Furthermore, the complex diachronic reconstruction proposed by Fox for the whole chapter is, in my opinion, the only one able to account for the partially inconsequent state of the text.

3. When dealing with Prov. 8.22-25[156], Cook markedly downplays the portrait of Wisdom. His ultimate reason is to show the theologically conservative approach of the translator. Cook stresses that some passive forms of the Hebrew become active in the Greek, so as to make clearer that God is the subject. However, Cook leaves without any comment the translator's effort to clarify that Wisdom *is generated* before everything[157].

---

152. Cf. P. Louis, 'Introduction', in Aristote, *Histoire des animaux* (Paris: Les belles lettres, 1964), vol. 1, vii; lii. The 9th book is nowadays considered spurious and seems to derive from Theophrastus's *De animalium prudentia et moribus*, cf. A. Scott, 'Notes and Observations: Pseudo-Aristotle's *Historia Animalium* in Origen', *The Harvard Theological Review* 85 (1992), 235-239, esp. 236 fn. 8.

153. Cook, *Proverbs*, 168.

154. Cf. P. Louis, 'Introduction', xi-xii.

155. Cf., for a later period, A. Scott, 'Notes and Observations: Pseudo-Aristotle's *Historia Animalium* in Origen', *The Harvard Theological Review* 85 (1992), 235-239.

156. Cook, *Proverbs*, 218-226.

157. Cook, *Proverbs*, 225, devotes only these few words to the question: 'More than is the case in the MT these verses underline the fact that wisdom was created *before* the creation'. See also, with a more

It would be beyond the scope of this presentation to discuss every point in detail. Here I shall just say that in 8.25 the Greek translates the perfect חוֹלָלְתִּי with the present γεννᾷ. This translation, in my opinion, is important for two reasons: (1) the choice of the verb seems to give the horizon in which also the previous κτίζω (v. 22) and θεμελιόω (v. 23) have to be understood, i.e. a *generation* that sounds to be different from the *making* (ποιέω, δράω) used for the earth (v. 24), the abysses (v. 24), and the mountains (v. 25); actually, the verb κτίζω does not mean only *create*: here the sense *establish* might be more appropriate; (2) the present for the past, which sounds quite odd, seems to seek a way to express the act of generating ἐν ἀρχῇ (v. 23), i.e. before everything was made. Such a use seems to have a close parallel in the present found in Exod. 3.14, where God reveals his name to Moses in a quite Hellenic way (ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν). In conclusion, Cook should not rule out without any discussion some possible links to the Platonic speculations about the demiurge.

Finally, I would agree with the reviewers that Cook's argumentations are too often difficult to follow. I needed a very long practice to get accustomed to his style. After having read nearly every contribution published by Cook, I must confess that trivial errors are more common in his articles, so that, before reading the reviews, I had been surprised by the comparatively higher accuracy of the book.

After Cook's publications another relevant contribution appeared, namely the French translation of the book of Proverbs by David-Marc d'Hamonville. The next section will deal mainly with the portions of this work which are particularly relevant for the present study.

---

balanced position, Passoni Dell'Acqua, 'l'elemento intermedio', 97-147, esp. 144: 'Per la Sapienza affermare di essere stata generata da Dio è una garanzia ben maggiore che il proclamare di esserne stata creata. Nella generazione c'è un elemento in più a favore del carattere intermedio del suo essere. L'umanità e, a maggior ragione, il mondo, sono stati solo creati'.

<center>**1.4. The French Translation of David-Marc d'Hamonville**</center>

### 1.4.1. The organisation of the text in the Greek version of Proverbs

In a relevant part of the introduction to his French translation of the Greek Proverbs[1], D.-M. d'Hamonville devotes considerable attention to the organisation of the material in the Greek version of Proverbs. He recognises 5 sections: 3 collections of strophes and 2 of distichs. In his opinion this formal distinction, although already present in Hebrew, is working as an organising principle in the translation only. The writer attempts to find, in this way, an explanation of the different structure we find in the last part of the book. In fact the 1st section of strophes (S1, according to d'Hamonville's siglum) matches the 1st Hebrew booklet (1.1-9.18); the 1st section of distichs (D1) equates the 2nd Hebrew booklet (10.1-22.16), while the 2nd section of distichs (25.11-29.27, D2) is nearly equivalent to the 5th Hebrew booklet (25.1-29.27); finally the 3rd section of strophes (S3) closes the book as the 9th Hebrew booklet (31.10-31) does. Hence, the main distinction is concerning the 2nd section of strophes (S2) which overlaps the 5 remaining Hebrew booklets. As d'Hamonville shows, it is through this expedient that the translator succeed in ascribing to Solomon the authorship of the whole book. In fact this section puts together all the material which is not specifically attributed to Solomon in Hebrew (cf. 1.1; 10.1; 25.1), but the final poem; namely, the 2 booklets of the 'wise men' (3rd and 4th booklets), the booklet of Agur (6th), the anonymous collection of numerical proverbs (7th), and the booklet of king Lemuel (8th). Thus, in 22.17; 30.1; 24.23; 31.1 – the first verse of booklets 3, 6, 4, 8 respectively – a first person singular expression is incorporated. This reference links to the beginning of the book (1.1) where Solomon is ascribed the authorship. It has also to be noted that the reference to Solomon in 10.1 disappears, resulting in a more thorough harmonisation. Moreover all the personal names are dropped, and in 24.23 the role of the sages is strongly downplayed.

---

1. Cf. D.-M. d'Hamonville (ed.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie. Les Proverbes* (Paris: Les Édition du Cerf, 2000), 29-41.

Also interesting is the author's observation that both 24.23 and 25.1 begin with the expression גם אלה, and that immediately before the Greek version inserts the 4th Hebrew booklet and the 7th and 8th ones respectively. In other words, according to a first hypothesis of d'Hamonville, the translator may have tried to bring together all the additions, while working to withdraw their character as additions. The writer finds this behaviour contradictory. I shall come back to this for some further remarks.

D'Hamonville put forward a second hypothesis: the translator might have been ordering materials which were still independent. This proposal is based on the exegesis of verse 25.1 which is close to the hinge between the 2nd section of strophes and the 2nd section of distichs. This verse introduces in Hebrew the second Solomonic collection (5th booklet), but in Greek it is still followed from two big strophes (25.2-7b; 7c-10A). This induces the author to refer the verse to the previous section too. His view is reinforced by his comprehension of the two Septuagint hapax legomena ἀδιάκριτοι (*non triées*, not selected) and ἐκγράφειν (*copier à l'écart*, to copy out) which would reflect the condition of the text of the last parts of the book when the translator handled them, i.e. 'un ensemble d' "instructions, *paidéiai* [≠ TM *mishlêy*, 'sentences'], non triées et copiées à l'écart"'[2].

In my opinion, this situation forbid to link directly verse 25.1 with section D2, as d'Hamonville thinks. Actually, if the division in 5 sections proposed by the author is right, we should consider verse 25.1 as referring first of all to the last two following strophes (25.2-11).

It will be convenient to have a thorough discussion about this issue and therefore to present here both the Hebrew and Greek texts of verse 25.1.

גם אלה משלי שלמה אשר העתיקו אנשי חזקיה מלך יהודה

Αὗται αἱ παιδεῖαι Σαλωμῶντος αἱ ἀδιάκριτοι,

---

2. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 36.

ἃς ἐξεγράψαντο οἱ φίλοι Εζεκιου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ιουδαίας.

As we can see, every Hebrew word has a direct equivalent but גם, and every Greek word has a counterpart except for ἀδιάκριτοι. The word φίλοι may be a good rendering for אנשי, whereas ἐξεγράψαντο certainly represents an attempt at rendering העתיקו[3]. As noted by d'Hamonville, παιδεῖαι is instead a strong interpretation of משלי. What is intended in Hebrew has been widely explained by scholars[4]: a new section is beginning and *also* the following proverbs are ascribed to Solomon and were transcribed by the men of king Hezekiah. The Greek translator, by eliminating גם and adding ἀδιάκριτοι, understands that 'these are the *instructions*, the not selected ones, which were copied for themselves by the companions of king Hezekias'. Two problems arise then: 1) what are 'the instructions, the not selected ones'? The following two strophes? the previous section of strophes (S2)? the following distichs (D2)? 2) which were the selected ones? S1? D1? both?

In order to find an answer to these questions, first of all we should try to contextualise the word παιδεῖαι. The singular παιδεία is used by the translator around 25 times (9 in S1, 14 in D1, 2 in S2) nearly always (22 times) to render מוסר (which in its turn appears 30 times[5]). In other words the translator is quite consistent – at least by his standards – in this pattern. However the *plural* παιδεῖαι almost certainly[6] occurs uniquely in 25.1[7]. Finally, as it is for מוסר, also παιδεία does not occur anymore after

---

3. I discussed in full this equivalence and its implication in my, 'The Treatment of Personal Names in the Book of Proverbs from the Septuagint to the Masoretic Text', in Timothy M. Law (ed.), *Proceedings of ESAJS 2010*, (Leuven: Peteers, *forthcoming*).

4. Cf., for instance, Toy, *Proverbs*, 457, and Fox, *Proverbs*, 776-777.

5. The word מוסר is not translated by παιδεία in the following verses 5.23; 13.24; 23.13 (where the same root is used), and in verses 1.3; 7.22; 13.1. Verses 8.33; 23.23 are lacking in Greek.

6. According to d'Hamonville, in 3.11 the word (παιδείας) has to be considered plural even if in the classical language the verb ὀλιγωρέω usually takes the genitive. As d'Hamonville recalls, the verb is also hapax legomenon in the Septuagint. This make more likely, in my opinion, that we are dealing here with a classical reminiscence. In any case, the question is not really relevant because the meaning that παιδεία takes in this context is closer to 'discipline, correction'.

7. It is also necessary to mention that the reading παιδεῖαι is not totally certain because another relevant tradition – witnessed by the majuscule mss. A S<sup>c</sup> and some other minuscule ones, especially those belonging to the Hexaplaric galaxy – is reading παροιμίαι. This variant seems anyway to be secondary because of the later and weaker witnesses upon which it is based, and because it keeps the Greek closer to

25.1. Hence, it seems reasonable to stress the author's explicit intention to put aside the more generic word 'proverbs' (παροιμίαι, משלים), for a more specific 'instructions'. The choice of this word may be intended to allude to the number of παιδεῖαι which we actually encounter in the three previous sections. However, as will be illustrated, this does not mean per se that verse 25.1 is referring to the previous sections.

In order to show this, we should now turn our attention to the addition of the term ἀδιάκριτοι. As it often happens elsewhere, with this addition the author might have desired to make the text clearer. In other words, in the translator's intention, the term ἀδιάκριτοι would explain why these παιδεῖαι had been copied for themselves by the companions of king Hezekias: in his opinion they were *difficult to understand*[8].

If this is correct, it may lead us to find out the reason why גם has not been translated. In fact, in the MT the particle is itself sufficient to accredit the previous section to Solomon. Thus, from d'Hamonville's perspective, its elimination seems to be particularly awkward. However, from a different point of view, the elimination of גם seems to unveil the intention of minimising the redactional activity of the companions of king Hezekias, hence to strengthen the Solomonic authorship, or at least the antiquity of the collection[9]. Indeed in the MT the particle may be understood in the sense that *also* the previous section was transcribed by the companions of king Hezekiah. This is exactly the sense which the translator wants to exclude, as we would expect from a translator who is trying to ascribe the whole book to Solomon. Therefore, in my opinion, the translator intended to refer 25.1 just to the two following strophes (25.2-11), which, as mentioned, are closing section S2. I would then question

---

the Hebrew משלי.

8. Cf. my contribution 'Personal Names' (forthcoming) for a full discussion of the meaning of ἀδιάκριτοι. There I express the view that the Armenian interpretation (անքննիք *ank'nink'*, 'not examined, inscrutable', which is based on the meaning 'unintelligible' of the adjective ἀδιάκριτος) offers the better solution. The impenetrability of the sayings of the wise had been otherwise solemnly stated in the last verse (1.6) of the grand initial title where they are juxtaposed to the 'enigmata' and to the 'obscure speech'.

9. The elimination of גם might really be a clue of the entire process aiming to canonise the text by eliminating any suspicion of spurious origin, and hypothetically might have already happened even in Hebrew. The text, nonetheless, should have already reached a sufficient character of authority so that it was not possible to rule out the mention of the companions of king Ezechias. For this reason I would consider the second hypothesis of d'Hamonville fairly unlikely.

d'Hamonville's proposal to refer verse 25.1 to both S2 and D2. Moreover if d'Hamonville is right in thinking that the divisions of the text in ms. B respects the original structure of the translation, then we have to remark that, in the manuscript, verse 25.1 is separated from 31.9 but connected to 25.2-7b.[10]

The previous discussion may lead us to formulate some observations about the organisation of the Hebrew redaction of the book which the translator could have received. D'Hamonville does not discuss indeed a third possibility, which had been already suggested by Tov: 'It seems that the translation was made from a Hebrew copy of Proverbs which differed recensionally from that of MT. These differences consisted of major and minor differences in sequence as well as differences in pluses and minuses.'[11] Nonetheless, it is exactly the previously mentioned observation raised by the French scholar, according to whom the 4th, 7th and 8th Hebrew booklets were moved before the two verses (24.23; 25.1) which begin with the words גם אלה, that suggests the different order could exist already in Hebrew. If that makes particular sense in 24.23, where Agur could be entitled as being 'also' one of the sages[12], it nonetheless produces troubles when we observe that the saying of king Lemuel (31.1-9) are immediately followed by 25.1 which, at least according to the MT, ascribes to Solomon the authorship of the previous verses. We would then be forced to suppose that the Hebrew redaction underlying the Septuagint was already omitting the mention of king Lemuel. Jäger[13] first suggested that the Septuagint translation originated from a different partition of a not yet separate consonantal text[14] in a reading tradition where the name of

---

10. D'Hamonville is giving a last argument: 'l'usage que fait le traducteur du démonstratif *houtos* tout au long du livre est conforme à l'usage classique: il désigne ce qui précède' (309). It is difficult to follow this statement at least because the competing demonstrative pronoun (ὅδε, which in the classical literature is usually referred to what is following) is found just twice (4.17; 30.1, much less than in other Septuagint books), and in 4.17 is clearly connected with the aforementioned (4.14) ἀσεβεῖς and παράνομοι. The translator seems then to prefer the pronoun οὗτος to ὅδε, without keeping the classical usage.

11. Cf. Tov, 'Recensional Differences' (1990), 43-56. See also above.

12. Even if the elimination of the name of Agur was not necessary, I shall discuss below more in detail what appears to be the early history of the comprehension of verse 30.1.

13. Jäger, *Observationes*, 222. Cf. also the other commentators: Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 91; Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 242-243; Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 180.

14. However Jäger's suggestion has not been corroborated by the archeological findings: both the ancient biblical manuscripts in Qumran and ancient Hebrew inscriptions consistently show a division

king Lemuel had been forgotten. Let's have a closer look at Jäger's proposal on verse 31.1a.

MT:

<div dir="rtl">דִּבְרֵי לְמוּאֵל מֶלֶךְ מַשָּׂא</div>

LXX: Οἱ ἐμοὶ λόγοι εἴρηνται ὑπὸ θεοῦ, βασιλέως χρηματισμός

Jäger:

<div dir="rtl">דְּבָרַי לְמוּ אֶל מַשָּׂא מֶלֶךְ (or למלך משא)</div>

Jäger[15] suggested that the personal name לְמוּאֵל had been split in לְמוּ, a poetic variant for the preposition לְ attested a few times in Job (27:14; 29:21; 38:40; 40:4), and אֶל, and that the word מַשָּׂא had been connected to מֶלֶךְ[16].

As noted by d'Hamonville[17], the name of king Lemuel is left out also in verse 31.4.[18] Thus, d'Hamonville seems to be right when claiming that all the proper names are eliminated, and that this may be a result of the translator's approach to its parent text, namely the intention to ascribe to Solomon the entire collection.

In consequence of this, I would now like to focus on 30.1a where the name of Agur is mentioned in the MT. Again the Greek is avoiding all the proper names, but this, as pointed out by Jäger[19], could actually underlie a different parent text. First of all, let us have a look to the beginning of the verse.

---

among the words of the text.

15. Jäger, *Observationes*, p. 222. Cf. also Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 91; Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 242–243; Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 180.

16. He suggests to read either לְמֶלֶךְ מַשָּׂא מֶלֶךְ or מַשָּׂא מֶלֶךְ.

17. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 34.

18. In verse 31.4 in place of Lemuel one reads πάντα ποίει. Lagarde (*Proverbien*, 91) suggests that ποίει corresponds to an Aramaising infinitive hifil (מוֹאֵל ?) from יעל which in later Hebrew can mean 'to effect; to accomplish' (Jastrow, ad loc.). A rendering of יעל with ποιέω is actually found in Job 35.3. The addition of πάντα may point to emphasise the sense of accomplishment implied in the root יעל.

19. Jäger, *Observationes*, 215. Cf. also the other commentators: Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 90; Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 239; Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 177. Cf. also the apparatus of *BHS*, ad loc.

MT:

דברי אגור בן יקה המשא

LXX: Τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους, υἱέ, φοβήθητι καὶ δεξάμενος αὐτοὺς μετανόει·

Jäger:

דברי תגור בני קחם

This time, in order to explain the Greek translation we need to suppose a different consonantal text. We have to note also that no one has been able to give a convincing explanation to μετανόει[20]. Despite this uncertainty, the impression that something similar to the text proposed by Jäger has been read by the translator remains strong. However, it is not necessary to suppose that the consonantal text of this verse had already undergone some changes. As we have seen, it may be sufficient to understand that Agur son of Yakeh, was just one of the wise men we are told about in verse 24.23. It is nonetheless striking that none of the 4 proper names in this verse has been translated: according to Jäger[21] the MT וְאֻכָל has been read וָאֲכַל (an unusual[22] spelling from כלה attested only in Ezek. 43.8), while for the Greek rendering of לאיתיאל (τοῖς πιστεύουσιν θεῷ), de Lagarde[23] is just able to propose ל.....ֶ אל. Nonetheless while the Vulgate is offering a Midrashic[24] translation of the entire verse, both α´ and θ´, after having translated as a proper name לאיתיאל (only once), offer a verbal rendering of ואכל (α´ [καὶ τέλεσον] as the Septuagint is deriving the form from כלה but in the 2nd

---

20. I would just mention that according to Franz Wutz (*Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* [Stuttgart, 1933], p. 356) the translator read קַח (וְ)הַמֵּשׁ to be compared with ܣܡ——ܗ 'to meditate' (Payne Smith, ad loc.). However, the root is lacking in Jewish Aramaic, and the meaning does not really overlap the one of μετανοέω.

21. Cf. Jäger, *Observationes*, 216.

22. The form without the inversive waw would be a piel jussive.

23. Cf. Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 90

24. Cf. Jan de Waard (ed.), *Proverbs* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008), 55* who is showing the proximity of the Vulgate to the Midrash Tankhuma.

person[25]; θ´ [καὶ δυνήσομαι] is deriving it from יכל). More complicated is the interpretation of the witness of the Peshitta:

ܟܠܡܗ، ܕܐ ܓ ܒܪ ܝܩܐ. ܕܩܒܠ ܢܒܝܘܬܐ ܘܐܬܚܝܠ, ܘܐܡܪ. ܘܐܝܬܝ ܠܐܝܬܝܐܠ.[26]

Apparently the Syriac version is rephrasing the Hebrew: ܢܒܝܘܬܐ is translating המשא; ܘܐܬܚܝܠ, is interpreting ואכל as if coming from יכל; ܚܝܠܐ (strength) seems to be connected with גבר (strong man); ܐܡܪ is a verbal rendering of the noun נאם; and finally לאיתיאל is taken as a proper name and given only once in a different consonantal form: ܠܐܝܬܝܐܠ; ܕܩܒܠ seems to have merely the aim to connect in a whole sentence what in Hebrew was probably just a title. Thus we are facing a translation technique which is struggling to get a meaning from a difficult text. While not very far from the approach of the Greek translator, it seems to be more anxious to render every word of the parent text, although without respecting the original word order. The repetition of לאיתיאל will have been avoided either because it was lacking in the *Vorlage* or because, once the original meaning was lost, was considered tautological. This repetition is indeed the main reason why also the modern critics began to suspect the quality of the MT.

Hence, the Septuagint was followed by all[27] the ancient translators in interpreting ואכל as a verb; on the other hand it is the only version[28] (with the paraphrastic exception of the Vulgate) which reads לאיתיאל also as a verbal form. It is noteworthy that this view has been followed instead by many modern commentators[29]. Among the many proposals which have been advanced, the following is in my opinion the one

---

25. I would assume that α´ is reading the 2nd person jussive תֻכַל by exchanging an א for a ת exactly as the Septuagint was doing in the first part of the verse (אגור/תגור).

26. Words of Agur son of Yaqe, who received a prophecy and prevailed, and said to Etliel.

27. Only the later Targum, although it is clearly using the Peshitta, is in agreement with the MT both by repeating twice לאיתיאל, and by understanding ואכל as a proper name.

28. The Vulgate is translating לאיתיאל twice with two different relative sentences: *vir [הגבר] cum quo est deus et qui deo secus morante.*

29. See for example *BHS*, ad loc., or Toy, *Proverbs*, 519-520.

which, at the same time, is most meaningful, both in itself and in the context, and respectful of the tradition transmitted by the MT:

נְאֻם הַגֶּבֶר לְאִיתִי אֵל לְאִיתִי אֵל וָאֻכָל[30]

Announcement of the man: 'I became tired, God,

I became tired, God, and I may fade away.'

In conclusion, it seems that the comprehension of 30.1b underwent at least 3 stages of development: (1) The Septuagint (2nd century BC) is witnessing a phase when both לְאִיתִיאֵל and וָאֻכָל were understood as verbs; this phase persists at least until the 5th century AD when it is still witnessed by the Vulgate and the Midrash Tankhuma; (2) θ´, α´ and the Peshitta are witnessing a second phase (probably starting from the 1st century BC and up to the 2nd AD) when וָאֻכָל is still understood as a verb but לְאִיתִיאֵל is considered a proper name, hence rendered just once; (3) in a later period, difficult to date, but possibly after the 5th century AD, the Targum and the MT comprehend both words as proper names.

As for the genesis of the variant readings, apparently וָאֻכָל as a proper name has been strongly influenced by the more ancient comprehension of לְאִיתִיאֵל also as a proper name. The former entered the MT with the vocalisation (אֻכָל) already witnessed by θ´, Peshitta and Midrash Tankhuma. More difficult is to speculate why the verbal meaning of לְאִיתִיאֵל was abandoned. I just wonder if this happened to avoid a quite impious reading as the following:

לָא יָתִי אֵל לָא יָתִי אֵל וָאֻכָל

---

30. Although it is the reading supposed by the Septuagint, technically the cohortative of כלה is not attested in the MT. This might be the reason why, starting from θ´, the form would have been identified with the more usual one derived from יכל, in its defective spelling.

This sentence, for an Aramaic speaker, would have meant[31]:


God is not with me, God is not with me, and I will succeed.


Be that as it may, it seems to me safe to state that the elimination of the two proper names in 30.1b cannot be ascribed to the Greek translator and was instead a shared reading at his time. This may induce us to be prudent in asserting that all the proper names were eliminated by the Greek translator in order to ascribe to Solomon the authorship of the entire book, as d'Hamonville maintains. It is therefore difficult, in the absence of more compelling arguments, to know whether the absence of proper names is depending mainly on the intention of the translator or upon the textual tradition which he received.

In fact, in my opinion, the translator could have inherited the structure of the book from his parent text altogether with a specific textual tradition which was already about to attribute to Solomon the whole collection of booklets. Interestingly enough, d'Hamonville[32] observes that the canonisation of a book is connected with the canonisation of its author. In his opinion the free translation, especially the many additions, find a better explanation if the canonical character of the book has not yet been fully recognised. In fact, he notes, the judgement upon Solomon is still really ambiguous in Sir. 47.12-23. However the positive evaluation seems to overlap the negative one, starting from the 1st century AD. Hence, according to the author, the Greek Proverbs have to be taken as an important witness of this entire process because of the patent intention of giving Solomon the authorship of the whole collection[33]. In a recent monograph Stuart Weeks, while treating the internationalism of Ben Sira, is offering a new nuance to our picture by pointing out that in 47.19 Ben Sira 'changes the

---

31. The possibility of this comprehension (but leaving out לא) is clearly witnessed by the Midrash Tankhuma and the Vulgate.

32. Cf. *Proverbes*, 28.

33. This had been already recognised by Cook, 'How Much Hellenism in the Hebrew Proverbs?', K.-D. Schunck – M. Augustin (eds.), *"Lasset uns Brücken bauen…"* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1998), 291-301, who anyway was giving the fact a different interpretation.

traditional, biblical understanding of Solomon's downfall: the wives are no longer foreign, and the problem is a sort of sexual subjugation not apostasy'[34]. I may like to understand this as an early trace of the positive trend in evaluating Solomon's figure. The presumed Hebrew redaction underlying the Greek Proverbs would be thus already part of the historical process of canonisation of the figure and writings of Solomon and may date back to the early 2nd century BC at the latest.

D'Hamonville is able to recognise another organising element in the addresses to the son in the sections of strophes (S1 and S2).

> Dans l'état actuel du livret I TM, on compte dix-neuf "monition"; on en compte vingt dans la LXX; cependant celle qui sont propres à la LXX en 2,16 et 9,12 ont un rôle important pour l'effet de refrain, puisqu'elles correspondent aux deux seuls "trous" du TM, les chapitres 2 et 9, qui ne présentent aucune monition. Autre trait qui renforce ce rôle: l'uniformisation du singulier (19 fois sur le 20) alors que le TM compte quatre adresses au pluriel[35].

Yet in S2 we find three more addresses than in the MT and this fact raise their quantity to a proportion comparable with the one which we find in S1.

Sometimes it is the addition of a line (cf. 5.3a; 8.21A) which is connecting diverging elements, other times it is just the correction of an unsuitable shift to singular or plural. An acoustic link is provided between 3,20b and 3.21a (ἐρρύησαν / παραρρυῆς) as well as between 31.9b and 25.1a (διάκρινε / ἀδιάκριτοι).

Also in the sections of distichs it is possible to observe the iteration of the singular υἱός even when there is no correspondence in Hebrew (13.1, 15.20; 17.1). 'On peut remarquer aussi que le dix-neuf occurrences du mot *huiós* propres à la LXX sont toutes au singulier. Le pluriel *huioí* n'apparaît que dans trois versets (sur plus de 60

---

34. S. Weeks, *Instruction and Imagery in Proverbs 1–9* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 161-162.
35. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 37.

occurrences) [...]. Plus que le TM, la LXX a fait "du fils", "d'un fils" au singulier, l'interlocuteur privilégié de l'auteur des *Proverbes*'[36].

D'Hamonville seems also to be right when he locates a series of distichs (16.10-15) devoted to the figure of the king by stressing that 'Ces six distiques présentent une unité de thème, comme dans le TM, soulignée dans les Vaticanus (grand tiret et lettre en marge au v. 10, nouvelle lettre au v. 16). Le "roi" grec est toujours au singulier (TM pluriel v. 12-13), ce qui accroît l'unité du passage, et le thème de la "justice" y est particulièrement souligné encore'[37]. It is indeed the theme of justice which is unifying verse 16.11 also, where the king is not mentioned, to the previous and the following verses.

It is more difficult to follow the argumentation of the author when he tries to locate a second series (15,29-16.7), with theistic character, to be compared to the series with a Yahwistic character in the MT (16.1-9)[38]. To better understand the bewildering situation at the centre of the second Hebrew booklet, it is my hope that the following charts may be helpful.

| MT | 15.28 | 15.29 | 15.30 | 15.31 | 15.32 | 15.33 | 16.1 | 16.2 | 16.3 | 16.4 | 16.5 | 16.6 | 16.7 | 16.8 | 16.9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| LXX | 15.28 | 15.29 | 15.30 | – | 15.32 | 15.33 | – | 16.2 | – | 16.9 | 16.5 | 15.27A | 15.28A | 15.29A | 15.29B |

| LXX | 15.27A | 15.28 | 15.28A | 15.29 | 15.29A | 15.29B | 15.30 | 15.32 | 15.33 | 16.2 | 16.5 | 16.7 | 16.8 | 16.9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

36. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 40.

37. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 255.

38. A number of commentators have recognised this structure; for instance, according to Toy (*Proverbs*, 319) these 9 verses are devoted to the 'Divine control of life'.

| MT | 16.6 | 15.28 | 16.7 | 15.29 | 16.8 | 16.9 | 15.30 | 15.32 | 15.33 | 16.2 | 16.5 | – | – | 16.4 |
|----|------|-------|------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|---|---|------|

As one may easily observe – apart from the different organisation of the verses – whereas the Hebrew verses 15.31; 16.1; 3 are lacking in Greek, the Greek verses 16.7; 8 are lacking in Hebrew. Peshitta follows, with a certain freedom[39], the MT order, although, in places, it happens to be interestingly close to the Greek: for instance in 15.28 the rendering ܒܡܣܝܒܪܢܘܬܐ mirrors the Greek πίστεις more than the Hebrew לענות. We find another allusion to the Greek in 16.4 (= 16.9LXX) where ܢܬܬܩܢ is translating literally φυλάσσεται whereas we do not have any verb in the MT. Interestingly enough the Syrohexapla is rendering, even more literally, with the participle Ethpeel of the same verb ܡܬܢܛܪ (Peshitta had been using the passive participle peal). Finally the first line of verse 16.5 is mirroring the Septuagint more than the Hebrew: particularly ܛܡܐ has no correspondence in the MT while it is a good translation of ἀκάθαρτος, which will be emulated by the Syrohexapla, and which then requires the use of the preposition ܩܕܡ that, again without any parallel in Hebrew, reflects instead παρά[40]. Lastly in the second line, which is deeply reworked by the Peshitta, the form ܕܡܩܫܐ could reflect the Greek ἐμβαλών.

---

39. In 15.33 the rendering ܕܚܠܬܐ for חכמה seems to have an exegetical explanation perhaps connected with the translation of מוסר with ܡܟܟܐ (but 6h16 and most of the later manuscripts show here a more literal ܝܘܠܦܢܐ). In 16.1 as well מענה is translated exegetically by ܡܚܫܒܬܐ. The same phenomenon occurs again in 16.5 where the verb ינקה is rendered by ܢܬܚܫܒ so that the sentence needs to be completed by the addition of ܡܟܟܐ. It is finally interesting, in verse 16.6, the translation of יכפר with ܡܬܚܣܐ where it seems that the translator desires to avoid a cultic interpretation. In the same verse we face also the translation of the phrase חסד ואמת with the couple ܛܝܒܘܬܐ ܘܩܘܫܬܐ, which occurs also in 20.28 and in 3.3 (here we find also ܛܝܒܘ) but not in 14.22 where we find the more literal rendering ܚܣܕܐ ܘܩܘܫܬܐ. Some other departures form the MT have just the aim to clarify it. Thus in verse 15.33 the Hebrew ולפני כבוד ענוה is freely interpreted ܘܡܢ ܩܕܡ ܕܢܫܬܒܚ ܐܝܟ ܐܪܟܢ ܢܦܫܗ. The same seems to happen in 16.2 where בעיניו is inflated to ܚܒܝܒܝܢ ܩܕܡ ܥܝܢܘܗܝ. In four other instances we may suppose a different consonantal text (in 16.2 תכן is read תקן, and, according to Baumgartner [cf. Proverbes, 152] רוחות is read ארחות) or a different vocalisation (16.4 לְמַעֲנֵהוּ for לַמַּעֲנֵהוּ; 16.7 יְשַׁלֵם for יַשְׁלִם [cf. ibid., 153]). Finally in verse 15.30 we deal probably with a faulty manuscript tradition where the current text ܠܐ. ܠܐܘ could derive from ܠܐܠܐ. ܠܐܠܐ. The mistake between ܠ and ܠ is easy in Estrangelo script and ܠܐܠܐ is actually the rendering of שמועה in the only other occurrence in Proverbs (25.25).

40. The Syrohexapla translates here ܠܘܬ.

Let us return to the main question: the suggestion advanced by d'Hamonville is hardly acceptable. First of all the Vatican manuscript is putting in the margin a small capital at verse 16.2, and, as indicated above, again at verse 16.10. Since verse 16.1 is lacking in Greek, 16.2 is in fact the first one of the verses which correspond to the Yahwistic series in the MT, whereas in 16.10 the series devoted to the king begins. The small capitals of the Vatican manuscript, therefore, might not be casual[41]. Moreover, d'Hamonville is forced to leave out, quite artificially in my opinion, first of all verses 16.8, 9, where κύριος is used, which constitutes the natural close of this series before the one devoted to the king begins; secondly verses 15.27A, 28A (MT 16.6, 7), which in Greek are displaced from what appears to be the Yahwistic section in the MT, are also left out. By observing the thematical order witnessed by the MT in verses 16.1-9 one is inclined to think that the order found in Greek is the fruit of a displacement operated by the translator, who would be keen instead to stress the theme of πίστεις which relates 15.27A and 15.28: interestingly enough here πίστεις has no *Vorlage* in the MT (לענות), but already Vogel[42] noted that the translator could have read לאמנות[43], an issue that one would be inclined to take more seriously after considering that both the Peshitta and the Targum have read בהימנותא / ܒܗܝܡܢܘܬܐ, although they may be influenced, as noted above, in this reading by the Septuagint. Nevertheless, the Greek translator proves his ability to recognise and translate satisfactorily the root ענה in 6[44] out of the 7 remaining cases where it occurs in the Hebrew Proverbs.

More striking is the connection established between 15.28 and 15.28A which is clearly based on the term δικαίων whose *Vorlage* is in verse 28 צדיק, but in verse 28A is simply requested by the use of the adjective δεκταί to translate the infinitival construction ברצות (cf. 16.7^MT דרכי). This interesting phenomenon occurs again

---

41. Yet, it is not methodical nor consistent to consider original the structure offered by the Vatican manuscript only when it suits one's views.

42. Schultens and Vogel, *commentarius*, ad loc. The confusion among gutturals is well known. Less explicable is how the מ could have arisen.

43. The plural of אמונא, אמונות is attested in the MT only in Prov. 28.20.

44. Cf. 1.28; 21.13; 25.18; 26.4; 26.5; 29.19. Verse 18.23 is lacking in Greek.

between 15.29 and 15.29B where again the term δίκαιος is found twice in Greek while in Hebrew we read צדיקים in verse 29 but דרכו in verse 16.9. Also the term καρδία (15.28, 29B) could have played an organising role.

Therefore, the first impression is that the reorganisation happened in Greek under a specific translator's interest concerning πίστις and δικαιοσύνη. This impression is confirmed when we investigate the reason why verse 16.4[MT] has been moved after verse 16.8 in the Septuagint. Verse 16.9 is a fairly faithful rendering of 16.4[MT] but the term δικαιοσύνη is a free interpretation of the prepositional expression למענהו. Now we may just note that both 16.7 and 16.8, the 2 verses which are lacking a *Vorlage* in the MT, are focussing on the theme of justice: actually we find the expression τὰ δικαία in 16.7 and the same wording of verse 9, μετὰ δικαιοσύνη, in 16.8. Therefore, in this case too, the most likely explanation is that the change of order happened in Greek again because of the translator's interest in the theme of δικαιοσύνη. It may be interesting to note, instead, that he was not interested in stressing the formal resemblance that he created between 16.2 and 16.9[45] which would have been quite near because of the lack of verse 16.3, nor, and this seems to be more important, the figure of the ἀσεβής on the ἡμέρα κακή which he had shaped in verse 2 as well, where in Hebrew we read a completely different statement about the Lord's ability to weigh the spirits. To sum up, it seems that the translator is trying to enlarge the connections among the verses, as it had previously happened in Hebrew with verse 15.32-33 where the linking theme appears to be the מוסר.

However, d'Hamonville's proposal that the Yahwistic series could be the result of a late recensional effort to put the mention of יהוה in the centre of the second booklet (which also happens to be the centre of the entire book) requires further investigation. D'Hamonville's main argument is that in 10.1-15.27 (corresponding to the first part of the 2nd Hebrew booklet) and in 25.11-29.27 (the second section of distichs, D2) θεός does not occur at all, while in 15.27A-22.16 (the second part of the 2nd Hebrew

---

45. Both verses have the words πάντα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ, whereas in Hebrew they just begin with the same world כל.

booklet) we find it 16 times, even if, here as well, we never encounter אלהים in the MT.

I have studied the chart proposed by d'Hamonville[46] and, since I have found some inaccuracy and mistakes, I have checked it all and I propose here, in an amended form, the figures as they actually stand in the Septuagint edition of Rahlfs and in the MT.

| | S1 1.1-9.18 | D1a 10.1-15.27 | D1b 15.27A-22.16 | S2 22.17-25.10[47] | D2 25.11-29.27 | S3 31.10-31 | Tot. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| יהוה-κύριος | 13 | 18 | 21 | 4[48] | 6[49] | 1[50] | **63** |
| יהוה-θεός | 6[51] | – | 13 | 1[52] | – | – | **20** |
| יהוה-0 | – | – | 3[53] | 1[54] | – | – | **4** |
| אלהים-κύριος | 1[55] | – | – | – | – | – | **1** |
| אלהים-θεός | 1[56] | – | – | 2[57] | – | – | **3** |
| אלהים-θεῖος | 1[58] | – | – | – | – | – | **1** |

---

46. Cf. *Proverbes*, 46.
47. This section, according to the Greek, contains also 30.1-31.9.
48. 22.19; 22.23; 23.17; 24.18.
49. 25.22; 28.5; 28.25; 29.13; 29.25; 29.26.
50. 31.30.
51. 1.7; 3.5; 3.7; 3.19; 3.33; 5.21.
52. 24.21.
53. 16.1; 16.3; 21.30.
54. 30.9.
55. 3.4.
56. 2.5.
57. 25.2; 30.9.
58. 2.17.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| אלוה-θεός | – | – | – | 1[59] | – | – | **1** |
| אדני-κύριος | – | – | – | – | 1[60] | – | **1** |
| 0-κύριος | 4[61] | 1[62] | 4[63] | 3[64] | 2[65] | – | **14** |
| 0- θεός | 2[66] | – | 3[67] | 5[68] | – | – | **10** |
| **Tot.** יהוה | 19 | 18 | 37 | 6 | 6 | 1 | **87** |
| **Tot.** אלהים | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | **5** |
| **Tot.** κύριος | 18 | 19 | 25 | 7 | 9 | 1 | **79** |
| **Tot.** θεός | 9 | 0 | 16 | 9 | 0 | 0 | **34** |

---

59. 30.5.

60. 27.18: here κύριος is not referring to the Lord.

61. 3.18; 3.34; 7.1A; 8.26.

62. 10.6.

63. 16.8; 17.11; 21.27; 22.11.

64. 23.11; 24.7; 24.12.

65. 27.20A; 29.23.

66. 1.7; 4.27A.

67. 16.7; 21.8; 22.8A.

68. 30.1 (but cf. the above discussion); 30.3; 31.1 (cf. again the above discussion); 31.2; 31.8.

What is striking at a first inspection is the inconsistency of the translator: as d'Hamonville correctly states[69], while in the sections D1a and D2 (where יהוה is found 24 times in toto) the translation θεός is not occurring at all, in the section D1b (יהוה appears 37 times here) the translation θεός is found 16 times. It is also interesting to note that in S2 κύριος is used 7 times up to 24.18, and then θεός is used 9 times starting from 24.21 even if in Hebrew אלהים is used just twice (30.9; 25.2). In S1 finally, in about one third of the times that יהוה occurs, it is translated with θεός.

I think thus that it is difficult to speculate, as d'Hamonville does[70], about the *Vorlage* of the Greek translator in the central part of the book. What is clear to me is that whereas in Hebrew we have in all 87 times יהוה and only 5 times אלהים, in Greek we find 79 times κύριος and 34 times θεός; in all יהוה is translated by θεός 20 times[71]. In consideration of this general result, it seems to me safe to argue that the translator is inclined to reduce the use of the divine name κύριος in favour of the universally comprehensible θεός[72]. This tendency appears to be confirmed when we consider that verse 1.7, which represents, even more in Greek[73], the main verse of the introduction, translates יהוה with θεός. For this reason, I would not consider the reduction of the use of κύριος as a religious concern in order to avoid the abuse of the divine name.

## 1.4.2. The omissions and the additions

---

69. Cf. *Proverbes*, 46.

70. 'L'enquête sur les noms divins fait donc apparaître un travail rédactionnel sur le texte hébreu postérieur à l'intervention du traducteur LXX, qui pourrait être contemporain de la réunion des différents livrets en un seul ouvrage' (47).

71. Perhaps 21 times: in 6.16 ms. B has θεός but Rahlfs has preferred the reading of both A and S, which can be just a later correction.

72. It seems that the use of κύριος as a divine name was not yet common in Greek, cf. G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, (Stuttgart: Verlag von W. Kohlhammer, 1967), vol. 3 1045-1050.

73. Cf. my paper 'Concerning the Origin of the Addition Found in Prov^LXX 1:7', in Melvin Peters (ed.), *Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress 2010* (Society of Biblical Literature, *forthcoming*), in which I show that verse 1.7 is doubled by adding a citation from Ps. 111.10 which is also mentioning the fear of YHWH. The Greek is using twice θεός.

D'Hamonville connects this question with the more comprehensive problem concerning the omissions in the Greek version. In his view, possibly no omission is dependant on the translator but on his *Vorlage*. In the author's opinion thus, the reorganisation of verses 15.27A-16.9, the omissions and the additions in this segment, are depending on a Hebrew *Vorlage* which was to some extent different from the MT. The presence of θεός in Greek where we find יהוה in the MT would be an indication of this. I have just shown how weak this assumption seems to me. Apart from this, however, d'Hamonville makes a good point by observing that the two major omissions (18.23-19.2; 20.14-19) happen to be again in the second part of the second Hebrew booklet. According to the author:

> Le deux "séquences" manquantes en IIB (TM 18,23-19,2 et 20,14-19) ne peuvent pas s'expliquer par une volonté délibérée du traducteur, car plusieurs de ces sentences illustrent des thèmes manifestement valorisés dans la LXX, le respect dû au pauvre (18,23 et 25), l'amitié (18,24), le "prix" de la connaissance (20,15), le rôle du conseil (20,18). Tout au contraire, la transposition de trois versets contigus à la deuxième série entre le versets 9 et 10 du même chapitre (20,20-22 TM = LXX 20,9ABC) nous oriente vers l'hypothèse d'un accident du manuscrit-source à cet endroit du texte[74].

D'Hamonville goes further and states that 'Aucune omission délibérée ne ressort non plus de l'analyse des autres versets manquants dans ce livret IIB'[75] namely 21.5; 18b; 22.6. Unfortunately he is not able to produce any argument at all to support this statement. For instance one would like to read a more thorough discussion about verse 21.5 where the MT is speaking in a negative way about poverty: a subject that the translator might have been inclined to overlook. Still concerning omissions, I would

---

74. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 45.
75. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 45.

content myself to recall d'Hamonville's interesting observation:

> Ce qui est manifeste est l'opposition entre ce que nous avons appelé le "premier receuil" (Pr 1,1-22,16), qui compte quarante-deux stiques propres au TM, e le "second receuil" (22,17-31,31) qui n'en compte que deux (23,23). Cette différence semble bien traduire l'état des manuscrits hébreux qu'a utilisés le traducteur, plus lacuneux, peut-être plus anciens, pour le "premier" receuil, plus récents au contraire pour le "second", en tout cas plus comparables à ceux qui ont servi de base au TM[76].

Regarding this statement I would not follow the main persuasion of the author that the translator was still working with separate Hebrew booklets[77]. I do not think that such a hypothetical opinion is really necessary: in particular I do not see why the translator would have used exactly the same nine Hebrew booklets if his *Vorlage* were still so much unstable. One would have expected, for instance, to be faced with different or additional collections. But that is not the case. What we have is a different location for some of the same nine booklets, and some minuses in the second part of the 2nd Hebrew booklet. It is more likely, thus, to question whether the second Hebrew booklet, and possibly the first one, had entered the collection in a form which is partly different from the one which the MT is showing us. In any case, it does not seem to me safe to speak about 'more ancient' and 'more recent' manuscipts. In order to explain this, I will just present an issue to which I turned my attention. In section 1.1, while mentioning the

---

76. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 44-45.

77. While expressing his opinion about the Yahwistic character of the final redaction of the MT, d'Hamonville expresses more clearly this idea: 'L'enquête sur le noms divins fait donc apparaître un travail rédactionnel sur le texte hébreu postérieur à l'intervention du traducteur LXX, qui pourrait être contemporain de la réunion des différents livrets en un seul ouvrage' (47). I have shown why I do not think that he is right about the Yahwistic character of the final redaction of the MT, thus I am of the opinion that d'Hamonville is overestimating the relevance of his interesting findings. It is possible that the translator is dealing with a redaction which is partly different from the one we received through the MT. But I do not think that the translator is contemporaneous of the collection of the nine booklets in a sole work.

article of H.P. Rüger[78] about the doublet occurring in 31.30b-c, I have proposed to admit that here we are dealing with a double translation. In fact, in Sir. 16.4 the Hebrew ms. A and the first line of B read:

מאחד >ערירי< ירא ייי תשב עיר[79]

This is reflected by the Peshitta:

ܡܢ ܚܕ ܓܒܪ ܕܕܚܠ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܬܬܒܬܒܠ ܡܕܝܢܬܐ

In the following line, ms. B retain as well a doublet which seems to read: מאחד [נ]בון ת[ש]ב עיר], that is reflected by the Greek: ἀπὸ γὰρ ἑνὸς συνετοῦ συνοικισθήσεται πόλις. The Greek συνετός corresponds to the Hebrew נבון also in Sir. 9.15 where the Peshitta has instead: ܡܢ ܕܕܚܠ ܠܐܠܗܐ. Thus the Hebrew ms. B of Ben Sira shows alongside one another two different texts one which presents ירא ייי while the other quite probably reads נבון. Now, what is interesting to stress is that the Greek Proverbs prove that already by the time of the translation the scribes were considering the participal nifal נָבוֹן (*the intelligent one*) as a synonym[80] for the adjectival expression יְרֵא ייי (*the one who fears the Lord*). In this case, the translator of Proverbs would have just decided to render, by using two sentences, the full meaning of the Hebrew text together with his exegetical tradition. In verse 31.30b he interpreted יראת יהוה (or נבונה, in case he found it as variant reading, exactly as we see in ms. B of Ben Sira) as an adjective referred to אשה, in 31.30c as an object of תתהלל. In other words, it is not necessary here, to suppose a textual variant reading. The double translation could just depend from an exegetical tradition which also the later Hebrew

---

78. Cf. Rüger, 'Prv. 31,30', 96-99, and section 1.1 above.
79. 'From one who fears the Lord the city will be inhabited.'
80. It seems that this kind of identity is at work in the scribal activity: intelligent is the one who fears the Lord; who fears the Lord this one is intelligent.

manuscripts of Ben Sira and the Peshitta make known to us[81].

Whether the translator was aware of both the scribal reading נבונה and the MT reading יראת יהוה or not, the latter, as it is shown by the textual tradition of Sir. 9.15, 16.4, had to be taken, at the very beginning, as an adjectival expression meaning *the one who fears the Lord*. Possibly יראת יהוה was a theophoric interpretation of נבונה. If that is the case, the *wise woman* would have become *the woman who fears the Lord*. What is thus striking, is that, already by the time of the Greek translator, יראת יהוה was interpreted as a noun: *the fear of the Lord*. So, even if our translator did not take it as an apposition to the subject, the interpretation suggested by the vocalisation of the MT[82] (*the woman, the fear of the Lord*) was already possible by his time. One may argue that this interpretation entered the text altogether with the 9th booklet which was assumed at the very moment as a praise to Lady Widsom[83]. In other words, it seems

---

81. But the *Vorlage* of the Greek could have shown here, as it is in Sir. 16.4 according to the Hebrew ms. B, already a doublet. It might look like this:

שקר החן והבל היפי
אשה נבונה היא תתהלל
אשה יראת יהוה היא תתהלל

If such is the case, the translator would have condensed the repetition into what is now Prov. 31.30b-c, by interpreting יראת as a noun which is object of the verb תתהלל. I am not very inclined to take this position in consideration of the fact that the ms. B of Ben Sira was copied very late, probably into the 12th century (cf. Pancratius C. Beentjes [ed.], *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew* [Leiden: Brill, 1997], 5). We do not have enough evidence that such a textual approach was already in use by the time of the Greek translator of Proverbs.

82. The more common translation is: 'The woman who fears the Lord'; accordingly יְרְאַת is taken as the feminine form of the adjective יָרֵא. However this would be the only time in the whole Hebrew scripture that such a feminine form occurs. Moreover this spelling is anomalous (cf. P. Joüon, and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* [Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2006], 287 [§97Bd]; a different opinion in A.E. Cowley (trans.), *Gesenius's Hebrew Grammar as edited and enlarged by E. Kautsch* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957], 279 [§95h]), while the regular adjectival form would have been יְרֵאַת. Thus the MT considers certainly יראת יהוה apposition of אשה. However, one may not rule out completely the adjectival interpretation: as shown by Al Wolters ('Ṣôpiyyâ (Prov 31:27) as Hymnic Participle and Play on *Sophia*', *JBL* 104 (1985), 582-584), this could be – as it is certainly for verse 31.11b, and probably for verse 31.27a – another case of ambiguity in this acrostic. The term was understood as a noun also by the Greek translator, even though as the object of the verb תתהלל (*May she praise the fear of the Lord*). As pointed out by Thomas P. McCreesh, 'Wisdom as Wife: Proverbs 31:10-31' *RB* 92 (1985), 28-29, fn. 11, 'The LXX [...] does not give any direct support to a sapiential interpretation of the woman, but it does witness to a substantival understanding of *yirat*'.

83. Wolters ('Ṣôpiyyâ Sophia', 577-587), is quite convincing when arguing that צופיה, in Prov. 31.27, is a rare spelling of the feminine participal which was chosen because it was also the Hebrew transcription of σοφία. This could corroborate the hypothesis that the acrostic was composed by the final redactor with the precise intention to serve as the close of the book.

likely that a very early scribe, when the canonical process was anything but closed[84], was thinking that wisdom is the fear of the Lord; a statement that we find in 9.10 (a verse which stays almost at the end of the first booklet and that has been probably reworked by the translator[85]), and similarly in 1.7$^{MT}$, the most important introductory verse. Moreover in 1.7$^{LXX}$, which is citing from Ps. 111.10, probably directly from the Hebrew[86], we find literally that *the beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord*. On this basis, we may suspect that the *Vorlage* of the translator had a strong inclusion, even stronger than the MT, between 1.7, 9.10 and 31.30. The *Vorlage* of the Greek could have already included (at least for 1.7 and in 31.30) the additions that we read in the translation. If the situation in verses 1.7; 9.10, and above all in verse 31.30 is the one which I have tried to draw, one may easily understand how hazardous it could be to speak about "more ancient" and "more recent" manuscripts. Actually, in verse 31.30 the reading συνετή (נבונה), which could be earlier, is found together with the reading φόβον δὲ κυρίου (יראת יהוה) which could be later. And this was happening in the first part of the 2nd century BC.

Regarding the omission in verse 1.16, d'Hamonville is probably right: the verse is lacking (among other witnesses) in mss. BS*C, and one cannot easily explain why it would have fallen out in Greek: it is not a matter of homeoarcton or homeoteleuton[87], while in the MT it may well be derived from Isa. 59.7[88]. Later in Greek it could have been inserted from a reviser who might have set up a new translation from his contemporary Hebrew text. D'Hamonville also notes that verses 4.5a; 4.7; 23.23, which

---

84. It seems to me that the substitution of נבונה with יראת יהוה is possibly later than the insertion of the 9th booklet in the collection, otherwise we would not find any trace of it in the translation, but it is definitely very old: actually the remaining ancient translations, which are all closer to the completion of the Hebrew canon, do not show any trace of this process.

85. In Greek we find the addition: τὸ γὰρ γνῶναι νόμον διανοίας ἐστὶν ἀγαθῆς.

86. Cf. my 'Addition Found in Prov$^{LXX}$ 1:7' (forthcoming).

87. Nor do I find convincing the arguments put forward by Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 33.

88. A.B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1968), vol. 6, 12-13, offers interesting arguments for the authenticity of the verse. Accordingly he thinks that we are dealing here with a citation from the book of Isaiah. Anyway this seems to me a literary argument, not a critical one: the citation might have been inserted any later. And if we deal with a citation, why נקי would have been left out?

are all lacking in Greek, have a common theme (the purchase of wisdom) as verses 16.16; 17.16 (less convincingly he cites also 18.15; 19.8). Moreover 'À cela s'ajoutent les ruptures que produisent les versets 4,5a et 4,7 TM dans le cours du texte [...]; de son côté, le verset 23,23 est thématiquement très extérieur au contexte immédiat'[89]. For these reasons the author proposes to consider these verses later additions in the MT and states that one can no longer rule out the hypothesis of glosses in the MT for the three remaining omissions: 7.25b; 8.29ab; 33. 'En conclusion, – he writes – comme le laissait deviner l'intégrité de toute la dernière partie du livre, les "omissions" de la LXX ne s'apparentent pas à un processus d'ordre rédactionnel imputable au traducteur'[90]. However, Jan de Waard, in his recent edition of the Hebrew Proverbs, is quite convincing when, while commenting on the rendering νοσσιαὶ σοφίας in verse 16.16 for קנה חכמה, states: 'The change in 16:16 and the omissions in 4:5, 7 and 23:23 seem all to be conditioned by a theological *a priori*, namely, that חָכְמָה is a קִנְיָן, "a possession," of God and that it therefore never can be a possession of men'.[91] Thus, de Waard is thinking, against d'Hamonville's persuasion, that the Greek translator can, for theological purposes, omit to translate some parts of his *Vorlage*.

After the omissions, d'Hamonville tries to handle the question of the many additions which we find in the Greek version. In a simple list containing all the additions, he suggests the origin of each of them by using 4 categories: additions which stem directly from the author, others which derive from a reviser, later glosses and scribal errors. The author thus thinks to be able to detect 9 lines originated through revision. He is aware that this is a very small amount in comparison with the many proposals put forward by the former scholars. The main reason for this, according to d'Hamonville, is that the translator is inclined to set up doublets and the main evidence of this is that we find doublets also where we do not have a Hebrew original in the MT. The main example of this is probably verse 9.18D which is clearly a doublet of verse 9.11. It is also for this

89. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 47.
90. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 48.
91. De Waard, *Proverbs*, 46*.

reason, as we have seen above while discussing his contribution, that Fox[92] was arguing instead that the second addition in chapter 9 is a secondary gloss which is not stemming from the translator.

After showing some examples (1.7; 1.21) in which the additions play an organising role, d'Hamonville states:

> Un nombre non négligeable d'additions jouent ainsi un rôle structurant, introductif, conclusif, créateur d'une symétrie, au sein d'une simple strophe ou d'une section entière. La majorité de ces additions est située dans la section S1 [...]. À ce groupe on peut associer d'autres additions, "fonctionnelles" en ce qu'elles tendent à expliciter un verset hébreu particulièrement dense, soit en le développant un peu (13,12b; 17,17c), soit en le dissociant et en recréant un distique à partir de chaque moitié du verset (3,15bc; 11,16bc)[93].

According to the author in these additions one may find some frequent themes: 'Les thèmes qui apparaissent le plus souvent dans les additions sont, par ordre d'importance, celui de la sagesse (16 fois), notamment sous l'angle du désir et de la recherche (7), le thème de la voie, bonne ou mauvaise (16), la miséricorde (5), douceur et colère (5) [...]'[94]. The writer is also stressing that these themes are normally consonant with those uncovered by the translational process.

On the other hand, d'Hamonville[95] points out a couple of additions, namely 9.10A[96], and 13.15b[97], which seem to be dissonant with the views of the translator who is usually not really sensible to the theme of the Law[98]. Interestingly enough, the same wording is

---

92. Cf. section 1.3 above. See also: Fox, 'Strange Woman', 41.
93. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 52.
94. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 53.
95. Cf. *Proverbes*, 54.
96. τὸ γὰρ γνῶναι νόμον διανοίας ἐστὶν ἀγαθῆς.
97. τὸ δὲ γνῶναι νόμον διανοίας ἐστὶν ἀγαθῆς.
98. This is not Cook's view, cf. Cook, 'Law', 211-223.

found again in 24.28[99] according to the Sahidic version. Moreover the reiteration of δέ in verses 9.10A-11, and of γάρ in 13.15b-c sounds strange and is unusual in the sections of distichs. In my opinion, one would have to consider whether this two extra lines aim to link the addition of 1.7 (where we read σύνεσις ἀγαθή which translates שֵׂכֶל טוֹב in Ps. 111.10b), 13.15 (again we find σύνεσις ἀγαθή which translates שֵׂכֶל טוֹב, but also the synonymous addition: διάνοια ἀγαθή), and 9.10 (where we find διάνοια ἀγαθή but also the word σύνεσις as in 1.7b and 13.15a and the line ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου which cites almost literally 1.7a). I am not really sure, therefore, that the translator is not at work here again.

Finally, while referring to the 4 major additions, d'Hamonville asks:

> Qu'en est-il des quatre "grandes" additions? À vrai dire, elles ne sont justement pas "grandes" lorsqu'on retire le matériau commun. Le caractère rédactionnel de chaque premier verset est ainsi très net en 6,8A; 9,18A; 24,22A: à chaque fois, ce verset fait transition avec ce qui précède; 9,18D, le verset final de la section S1, est aussi un doublet littéral de 9,11, comme 24,22E résonne avec 30,17. La note "grecque" est patente pour les trois additions de S1, mais l'art avec lequel elles sont insérées et le contenu assez mince de ce qui ne relève pas par ailleurs des *Proverbes* nous poussent à y reconnaître la plume du traducteur[100].

Regarding the two additions in chapter 9, the writer is thinking, as Cook did, that 'l'insistance sur le fleuve à traverser fait songer au Styx', furthermore that 'la mise en garde "ne t'attarde pas en ce lieu, ne porte pas vers elle ton regard" peut évoquer le mythe d'Orphée et Eurydice'[101]. When discussing the addition of the bee (6.8A-C), d'Hamonville as well mentions the Aristotelian *Historia animalium*. Lastly, concerning the addition in verse 24.22, the author is convinced that one cannot find a precise

---

99. ⲡⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲡⲁ ⲟⲩⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ.
100. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 55.
101. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 55-56.

literary dependance, although the Wisdom of Ahiqar may offer some thematic parallels.

### 1.4.3. The dating and location of the translation, and the question of the authorship

The study of d'Hamonville's views raised my interest on the organisation of the text, and on the omissions and additions in comparison with the MT. All these questions are intrinsically related to the research on the doublets which I am undertaking. Thus, it seemed reasonable to devote so much space to these topics.

Moreover, it is from these elements, as well as from the literary character of the translation and the shift in the meaning, that d'Hamonville infers his opinions concerning the dating and location of the translation, and the authorship.

First, d'Hamonville agrees with the results of Martin Hengel who proposed 170 BC, especially because of the philosophical conceptions of the book, similar to those of Aristobule and of the epistle of Aristeas: 'Notre propre recherche nous amène à souscrire pleinement à cette dernière analyse et nous voyons dans le débuts du règne de Ptolémée VI Philomêtor (181-145) le contexte historique le mieux accordé à cette traduction des *Proverbes* LXX'[102]. Thus the writer calls into question the positions held by Gammie and especially Cook[103], and states that 'Au stade actuel, les arguments exposés dans les articles que nous avons pu lire ne nous ont pas paru suffisamment décisifs pour que soit remise en cause la thèse communément admise.'[104]. Even though d'Hamonville was not on time to have access to Cook's monograph, some of his suggestions prove to be really interesting. Some geographical and climatic details represent captivating hints, such as the disappearance of the bears from Prov. 17.12 and 28.15 (there are no traces of this animal under the 30th parallel). Moreover, there is a stress on political and juridical subjects while agricultural and meteorological ones are

---

102. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 23-24.
103. Cf. section 1.3 above.
104. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 24.

sometimes treated imprecisely. Therefore the author may conclude: 'l'insistance du traducteur sur certains thèmes, certaines inflexions de sens, nous invitent à situer cet écrit dans un milieu socialement élevé, proche des cercles royaux et de la politique en général'[105].

It is inside this Jewish milieu that, following M. Hengel[106], d'Hamonville suggests locating the translator and the Jewish philosopher Aristobule. The latter was actually both a literate person and a thinker. Moreover, the fragment of his work that we read in Eusebius's *Praeparatio Evangelica* XIII 12.1-16, according to d'Hamonville, show us that 'Les inflexions de sens et de forme que nous avons relevées dans le poème grec de la Création (Pr 8,21A s.) par rapport à son modèle hébreu sont en accord avec les développements d'Aristobule'[107]. The author also notes some lexical proximity, namely the word λαμπτῆρ (four times in the Proverbs, but nowhere else in the Septuagint), and the neologism βιότης (Prov. 5.23) which one may relate to the unusual βιοτή which the philosopher uses in XIII 12.9.

D'Hamonville finds another common trait between Aristobule and the translator of Proverbs, namely their approach to Greek thought: 'Le traducteur de *Proverbes* fait de Salomon, comme Aristobule le fait de Moïse, l'auteur véritable de pensées admises par les Grecs. Dans le deux cas, une réelle connaissance de la culture grecque est requise et le primat du judaïsme est affirmé'[108].

The writer is also inclined to accept the tradition referred by 2 Macc. 1.10 where Aristobule is mentioned as the διδάσκαλος τοῦ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ βασιλέως. This tradition would be confirmed by the information referred to by Clement of Alexandria[109] and Eusebius[110] that the philosopher dedicated to king Ptolemy a number of books in which he explained the Law of Moses. Moreover, according to an Easter canon of

---

105. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 25.
106. Cf. *Giudaismo ed ellenismo* (trans. Sergio Monaco; Brescia: Paideia, 2001), 332-348, esp. 334.
107. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 135.
108. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 136.
109. Cf. *Stromata* I 150.1 (Stählin).
110. Cf. *Praeparatio Evangelica* VII 13; VIII 9.38; IX 6.6-8 (Mras).

bishop Anatole reported again by Eusebius[111], Aristobule is said to be one of the Seventy translators. D'Hamonville concludes:

> Les données chronologiques d'Anatole sont inconciliables avec l'ensemble des autres données bibliques et patristiques, qui invitent à situer l'activité d'Aristobule sous le règne de Ptolémée VI Philomêtor (181-145), mais rien n'oblige à disqualifier complètement cette tradition qui fait d'Aristobule non seulement un exégète mais aussi un "traducteur" des Écritures[112].

D'Hamonville summarises his conclusive hypothesis in this way:

> vers 175 avant notre ère, Aristobule, effectivement précepteur du jeune Philomêtor, traduit ou fait traduire pour son élève le livre des *Proverbes*. [...] De son royal destinataire, le texte grec des *Proverbes* donne parfois quelque indice: par exemple dans son traitement particulier de la figure du roi, fils de roi, et du personnage de la "mère"; la mère de ce "Philo-*mêtor*" a en effet exercé une régence de 181 à 176, et une expression comme *thesmoí mētrós sou*, "les lois [civiles, administratives!] de ta mère", originale et insolite à première vue, devient lumineuse s'il s'agit bien de ce roi (voir 1,8; 6,20)![113]

These detailed observations proposed by d'Hamonville are particularly valuable since, as I have shown in the section 1.2 devoted to the cultural ambience of the translation, a generic agreement has been reached on locating the version in the cultural world of the 2nd century BC, but very few literary or historical arguments have been given. I may recall here the few structured attempts at dating the translation before d'Hamonville.

---

111. Cf. *Historia Ecclesiastica* VII 32.6 (Schwartz).
112. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 138.
113. D'Hamonville, *Proverbes*, 138.

First Thackeray proposed for the translation a dating not older than 100 BC because of some orthographical particulars[114]. The author observed that in the 17 occurences of οὐδείς in Proverbs the word is never found with the spelling οὐθείς, which is 'practically the only form in use throughout the Greek-speaking world during iii/B.C. and the first half of ii/B.C.'[115]. Hence, 'the δ forms attested throughout by BℵA doubtless go back to the original translator. *This suggests a date* not earlier than 132 B.C., *probably not earlier than* 100 B.C., *as the date when Proverbs was translated*'[116]. However, the author himself indicates an exception in μηθετέρῳ (Prov. 24.21 according to mss. BS).

Later on, in a short note Priscilla D.M. Turner[117] added another observation concerning the dating. She informs us that the verb στηρίζω followed by the accusative of a part of the body is not idiomatic. This construction occurs twice in Proverbs (16.30; 27.20A), in Amos (9.4), and in Jeremiah (24.6). Whereas in 16.30 the verb does not supply a literal translation and verse 27.20A is even an addition, in the two Prophets it furnishes quite an exact rendering of the parent text. This seems to indicate that Proverbs is depending either on Amos or on Jeremiah, and, of course, implies a late dating of the translation. The author herself remarks that strangely enough this 'tendency is the opposite of the Hellenizing commonly detected in the Proverbs version'[118].

Moro also deals with the date of the translation, and incidentally observes that Thackeray's[119] late dating is challanged by Aristobule's allusion to Proverbs found also in Clement of Alexandria[120]. Unfortunately, the author does not offer any further

---

114. Cf. Thackeray, 'Poetry', 58-59. This dating had been already suggested in H.St.J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: University Press, 1909), 13-16, 58-62. In the present work, Thackeray also classifies the translation of Proverbs among the 'Paraphrases and free renderings' (13) altogether with 1 Esdras, Daniel LXX, Esther and Job all of them from the *Kethubim*.

115. Thackeray, *Grammar*, 58.

116. Thackeray, *Grammar*, 61.

117. P.D.M. Turner, 'Two Septuagintalisms with στηρίζειν', *VT* 28 (1978), 481-482.

118. Turner, 'στηρίζειν', 482.

119. Cf. Thackeray, 'Poetry', 58-59, and Thackeray, *Grammar*, 13-16, 58-62.

120. Cf. *Stromata* VI 138.4 (Stählin), and Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 392, fn. 6.

remark, but I have also observed this phenomenon, and I may add that Aristobule's allusion[121] to Prov. 8.22-27, shows a peculiar agreement with our Greek version for its use of the adverb πρό, which is repeated numerous times in the LXX, whereas the MT prefers the *variatio* in order to express the time phrases.

On a wider perspective, James Aitken[122] recently published a contribution which addresses the theme of kingship, and sets itself tentatively in the picture drawn by d'Hamoville. The study is mainly terminological and according to the author 'It may well be that Proverbs, on these criteria, is the most poetic of all the LXX books.'[123] Aitken adds to the above mentioned observation on the word θεσμοί, his own remarks on the use of χρηματισμός in 31.1 in connection with the king's mother. In his opinion here the term cannot mean 'oracle', but has 'to denote a "decree," "petition," or any form of legal "document" or "report"'[124]. Aitken also notes that in 1.21 an additional line similar to 8.3 is added: 'It is striking [...] how the translator emphasizes the political role of the female figure of Wisdom, an image that could recall the role of Ptolemaic queens, of whom we might be reminded in the allusion to Philometor's mother.'[125] Less convincing is the author's interpretation of 30.31 which would be critical of the royalty because it would compare 'kings to pompous goats and fornicating cocks'[126]. This understanding does not seem to fit the context of verses 29-30 where it is clearly stated that the cock, goat and king are compared, together with the lion's cub, because of their beautiful walking.

It is my hope that the study of the double translations will offer new material to understand the historical ambience of the translator, and to further discuss some of the stimulating views which I described in this first chapter.

---

121. Eusebius of Caesarea, *Praeparatio Evangelica* XIII 12.11 (Mras).

122. J. Aitken, 'Poet and Critic: Royal Ideology and the Greek Translator of Proverbs', in J. Aitken, et al. (eds.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 190-204.

123. Aitken, 'Poet and Critic', 195.

124. Aitken, 'Poet and Critic', 196.

125. Aitken, 'Poet and Critic', 197.

126. Aitken, 'Poet and Critic', 202.

## 2.0.1. Fritsch's paper and its reception

When I began my study of the LXX translation of the book of Proverbs, my attention was drawn towards a study of Fritsch[1] who devoted a paper in 1953 to the transmission of the Hexaplaric signs in the Syro-Hexaplar of Proverbs. Fritsch connected this question to the many doublets found in the LXX of Proverbs, and concluded that 'SH did not "scrupulously" retain all of the Origenian signs from the fifth column of the Hexapla'[2] (pace Swete[3]). He also concluded that in 24 (out of 25) doublets which correctly preserves the obeli 'The rendering [...] under the obelus is that of OG, whereas the unmarked member is always closer to the Hebrew, and therefore Hexaplaric.'[4]

The paper was not only challenging in itself, but its conclusions also received a large acceptance. This has been confirmed by my bibliographical study. Fritsch's article is accorded wide attention in Sidney Jellicoe's rightly famous introduction to the LXX[5], and was reissued in the well-known collection edited by Jellicoe in 1974[6].

In the history of the studies on the LXX of Proverbs a few items have passed by the decades as such unchallenged: in 1990 Dick[7] bases on it his warning that ms. B 'must be used with caution since it contains *many* Hexaplaric readings'[8] (my italic). Still in 2004 Fox in criticising Tauberschmidt's approach to the text states that '*many* stichoi in

---

1. Fritsch, 'Hexaplaric Signs, 169-181.
2. Fritsch, 'Hexaplaric Signs', 171.
3. Swete, *Introduction*, 112: 'the Origenic signs were scrupulously retained'.
4. Fritsch, 'Hexaplaric Signs', 178.
5. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 138-139.
6. S. Jellicoe (ed.), *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (New York: Ktav Publ. House, 1974), 356-368.
7. Dick, 'Ethics, 20-50.
8. Dick, 'Ethics', 20.

LXX Proverbs are Hexaplaric'[9] (my italic). If, when Fritsch published his article, only very little was known about the pre-Hexaplaric recensions, it is astonishing that his conclusions may still be repeated today without a careful reexamination.

Other scholars have been more cautious: de Waard[10] only recalls the doublets as identified by Fritsch without being more specific. Cook instead quotes Fritsch only when dealing with specific passages[11]. Although he may disagree at points with Fritsch, he never discusses the latter's thesis as a whole. The same can be said about Tauberschmidt[12] who, according to his approach, ascribes the origin of the doublets to the translation technique and, occasionally, rejects Fritsch's thesis.

Fritsch's theory is cited also by Richard J. Clifford[13] who, however, combines it with Lagarde's theory, so that the Hexaplaric origins of the doublets is tacitly nuanced, and the not 'scrupulous' retention of the Hexaplaric signs is virtually invalidated. Nonetheless, here also no attempt is made at a critique of Fritsch's thesis as a whole.

Moro[14] is, to my knowledge, the only one who advanced a critical assessment to Fritsch's theory. After having analysed the equivalences proper to the καίγε recension, Moro concludes that the *Revisor*[15] does not belong to this group:

> La revisione che ha prodotto le doppie non sembra legata al gruppo καὶγε [sic]: da una semplice analisi delle corrispondenze emerge che il linguaggio καὶγε è

---

9. Fox, review of Tauberschmidt. Cf. also Fox, 'Text-Critical Resource', 96, and Fox, *Proverbs*, passim.

10. J. de Waard, 'Some Unusual Translation Techniques Employed by the Greek Translator(s) of Proverbs', in S. Sipilä, and R. Sollamo (eds.), *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 185-193. Fritsch is cited at p. 190.

11. Cf. especially Cook, *Proverbs*, passim, and also Cook, 'Translators and/or Scribes', 45-58; Cook, 'Hexaplaric Text', 129-140; Cook, 'Proverbs and Job', 309-328.

12. Tauberschmidt, *Secondary Parallelism*, esp. 49, and 144 fn. 97.

13. Clifford, 'Observations on the Text and Versions of Proverbs', in M.L. Barré (ed.), *Wisdom, You Are My Sister* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1997), 47-61, esp. 53. Cf. also Clifford, *Proverbs: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), esp. 28-29.

14. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente, 391-437.

15. The author ascribes the double translations to the *Revisor* proposed by Lagarde, cf. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 393.

assente in *Proverbi* se non in alcuni asterischi dei manoscritti esaplari [...]. Il lessico di tipo καὶγε irrompe nella tradizione greca dei *Proverbi* solo con Aquila, Simmaco e Teodozione, ed è da respingere pertanto la teoria di C.T. Fritsch che tutto il materiale "doppio" della versione greca di *Proverbi* (con e senza asterisco) sia dovuto all'intervento di Origene e derivi dai Tre traduttori[16].

Although this last statement may be correct, it is methodologically insufficient since the author bases her judgement only on the exclusive lexicon[17] proposed for the καίγε recension, and, more in general, that she fails to discuss the translation technique observed in the doublets.

A last consideration needs to be made: as I mentioned, Lagarde's theory is still accepted by Clifford and Moro. Emanuel Tov also, in a workshop in Oxford where I presented the problems involved in Prov. 2.21 and 3.15, proved himself to consent to Lagarde's axioms. Therefore some attention would need to be given to this issue. I believe this will allow us to draw an up-to-date portrait of Lagarde's *Revisor*.

## 2.0.2. A proposal to evaluate Fritsch's theory

Fritsch[18] drew attention to 76 doublets of which 10 involve a whole verse, and 17 a whole stich. The last 49 comprehend only a phrase or a word. In my view, the 27 doublets involving at least one stich have to be preferred in the analysis because they offer more lexical and – due to the peculiar parallelism of Proverbs – syntactical[19] material.

---

16. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 395.
17. The author explicitly refers to καίγε for וְגַם, ἀπάνωθεν for מֵעַל, νῖκος for נֶצַח, βᾶρις for אַרְמוֹן.
18. Fritsch, 'Hexaplaric Signs', 170.
19. Often one line shows a complete clause.

Fritsch also objects that only in 25 instances the Hexaplaric signs are correct. Although he may be occasionally wrong in his evaluation (cf. e.g. 1.7 below), it would be methodologically correct to analyse first those passages where the ancient text-critical material seems to be well preserved.

By following these two guidelines, the research may exert both an internal (literary), and external (text-critical) control on the doublets.

The doublets which respond to these criteria are 16. However 1.7 has to be excluded because it is not a doublet[20]. Of the remaining 15 doublets 6 consist of two lines (2.21; 3.15; 14.22; 15.6, 18; 18.22[21]). In the other 9 cases the doublet involves only one stich (2.2b-c, 19b-c; 4.10b-c; 6.25b-c; 9.10b-c; 14.35b-15.1a; 16.17e-f, 26a-b; 31.29b-c).

Among the verses which present two additional lines, 3.15 is particularly interesting because it seems to witness a variant reading shown also by the *qere/ketiv* apparatus in the MT. Verses 14.22 (ידעו \ יתעי); 15.6 (עקר \ עכר) will also deserve a careful study since they seem to present original double translations based on ancient Hebrew variant readings. In addition, among the Greek variant readings further doublets appear to be concealed. On the other hand 2.21 presents a translation technique compatible with θ´, and one wonders whether this odd insertion really stems from the Hexaplaric apparatus, or the καίγε recension.

Therefore, these four cases will be investigated in detail in order to deduce which general patterns may occur when dealing with doublets in the book of Proverbs. After establishing a text critical apparatus, a lexical analysis will compare every item with the MT, the patterns occurring in the other LXX books[22], and, when appropriate, with the equivalences found in α´, σ´ and θ´. This would allow us to evaluate Fritsch's proposal

---

20. Cf. my paper 'Concerning the Origin of the Addition Found in Prov[LXX] 1:7', in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress 2010* (Society of Biblical Literature, *forthcoming*), where I showed that Prov. 1.7 is not a doublet, and that, moreover, the obeli cover also a part of the third line. In this verse the Hexaplaric signs are indeed 'scrupulously' preserved.

21. Here the whole rewriting covers four lines, but only one line has a doublet, whereas the fourth one has no counterpart in Hebrew.

22. A particular attention is given to the Pentateuch for the influence it may have exerted on the book of Proverbs. Cf. Tov, 'Impact', 590.

of a Hexaplaric origin for the doublets. The text critical apparatus will also be discussed, in order to make certain what the original text was. Through this procedure it will also become possible to establish the Hexaplaric text.

The collation of the manuscripts is made against Rahlfs's text as revised by Robert Hanhart[23]. The Greek manuscripts are quoted according to the sigla listed in Rahlfs's *Verzeichnis*[24]. In the apparatuses the variant readings are usually written without breathings, accents and iota subscript as is usual for the Göttingen editions. The abbreviations are those commonly admitted by the Göttingen *editio maior*. For the collation I also used the editions of Holmes and Parsons, Swete, and Rahlfs. In addition, I had access to the incomparable tools made available to me by the *Septuaginta Unternehmen* during my sojourns in Göttingen. Beside the fundamental majuscule mss. B S A, particular attention has been given to mss. V 106 130 336 728 which alone preserve the order of the chapters according to the MT. This is a variant reading on the macroscopic level which makes one suspect that these manuscripts may be good witnesses to the Hexaplaric text.

As for the Antiochian recension, the subfamilies 106-130 and 336-728, separately, exhibit sometimes peculiar readings which might underlie this textual type. Regarding this debated subject, Guillaume Bady[25] claimes, concerning the still unpublished *Commentary on the Proverbs* attributed to John Chrysostom, that 'le texte biblique que commente l'auteur est de type lucianique: le Patmiacus gr. 161 en est même sans doute le meilleur témoin pour les Proverbes'[26]. He explains[27], in his unfortunately still unpublished doctoral thesis on the same topic, that the Patmiacus codex shows 600 variant readings. Although from a methodological point of view a critical position may

---

23. A. Rahlfs, and R. Hanhart, *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

24. Cf. Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*.

25. Cf. Bady, 'La méthode exégétique du Commentaire inédit sur les Proverbes attribué à Jean Chrysostome', *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001), 319-327.

26. Bady, 'méthode exégétique', 320.

27. Cf. Bady, *Le commentaire inédit sur les proverbes attribué à Jean Chrysostome. Introduction, édition critique et traduction* (Doctoral Thesis, Université de Lyon 2: 2003), 44-46.

be taken, the indication that the closest biblical manuscript to the Patmiacus is V (150 common variants), immediately followed by 336 (123 common variants), the Syro-Hexaplar version (106 common variants) and 728 (104 common variants) is important. This leads me to a prudent scepticism about the survival, for the book of Proverbs, of an Antiochian recension, although it is clear, both from Johannes Schildenberger's[28] and Bady's[29] studies, that a cluster of manuscripts shows a randomizing agreement around the text exhibited by the Antiochian Fathers, namely John Chrysostom and Theodoretus of Cyrus. Be this as it may, we deal here, as always for the Antiochian recension when it was proved to exist, with a recension accomplished beside the Hexapla[30], or at least reworking the Hexaplaric recension.

## 2.0.3. The ancient translations

Peculiar problems involve the use of the ancient translations. The *Veteres Latinae* (II-IV cent.), the Coptic (Sahidic, Achmimic, papyrus Bodmer VI, III-V cent.), Armenian (V cent.), Ethiopic (V-VII cent.), and Syro-Hexaplar (AD 617) versions, are quoted in their likely chronological order.

As for most of the Old Testament books, the Old Latin of the book of Proverbs is merely preserved in a fragmentary state, and displays disparate recensions. This lamentable textual condition and the lack of a critical edition do not allow a full appraisal of the philological status of this version. In other words, it is sometimes difficult to evaluate whether some peculiar readings represent a literal translation of

---

28. Cf. Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 35-40, 126-131.
29. Cf. Bady, *commentaire inédit*, 37-75.
30. Cf. N. Fernández Marcos, 'Some Reflections on the Antiochian Text of the Septuagint', in D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J.W. Wevers (eds.), *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 219-229, and idem, 'The Textual Context of the Hexapla: Lucianic Texts and Vetus Latina', in A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 408-420.

their Greek model[31], or merely a stylistic choice of the translator. Schildenberger, in his main monograph devoted to the *Vetus Afra*, shows that the translation is rather literal although not slavish[32], and that the recensions move toward more word-for-word renderings[33]. The Old Latin text of Proverbs has not been given continuous attention. Only Schildenberger has studied in deep the subject by devoting to the *Veteres Latinae* his doctoral dissertation[34], which was later reworked and published as the aforementioned monograph. As in general in the *Veteres Latinae*, the *Vetus Afra*, witnessed mainly by Cyprian of Carthage, represents the oldest available text type which later underwent substantial corrections and revisions. In the book of Proverbs the *Vetus Afra*[35] is also shown by the Viennese/Ambrosian palimpsest (Lat[165])[36] and by the glosses to a Vulgate incunable (Lat[94]) preserved at El Escorial, and to a Vulgate manuscript (Lat[95]) preserved in Madrid. This translation goes back to the Christian Africa of the 2nd half of the 2nd century[37]. Therefore, it is particularly relevant since it antedates the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions. Schildenberger[38] was able to detect a wide number of Lucianic readings which, as Rahlfs had done before him for the Psalter,

---

31. Cf. also Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 91: 'Und im Fall der Ursprünglichkeit bleibt öfters noch die Frage, ob der Übersetzer nicht doch eine verloren gegangene griechische Vorlage wiedergegeben hat.'

32. Cf. Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 10: 'Doch zeigen auch die wenigen Ausnahmen, wie treu im Großen und Ganzen die griechische Wortstellung beibehalten ist.'

33. Cf. Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 13: 'Daß die freieren Wiedergaben im allgemeinen die älteren sind und die späteren Texte sich enger ans Griechische angeschlossen haben, ist auch schon anderweitig beobachtet worden.'

34. Johannes Schildenberger, *Die altlateinischen Proverbien. Ein Beitrag zu ihrer Textgeschichte* (Doctoral thesis, Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome: 1934). I could not have access to this work.

35. Cf. Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 66: 'Die textliche Zusammengehörigkeit der Valvanera-Randlesungen mit Vind hat schon P. Alberto Vaccari erkannt. Durch die 130 Verse oder Versteile, die diese Glossen enthalten, bekommen wir einen Überblick über die ganze Prov-Buch in seiner alten afrikanischen Textgestalt.'

36. For the description of this and the following witnesses cf. R. Gryson, *Altlateinische Handschriften. Manuscrits vieux latins*, vol. 1 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1999), 150-152, 251: in order to distinguish the number of a Latin manuscript from the number of a Greek one, the siglum Lat is used, followed by the number of the Latin codex (e.g. Lat[94]).

37. Cf. Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 112: 'Es bleibt also bei der wahrscheinlichen Annahme, daß die alte Übersetzung der Prov, wie die von Sap und Sir, aus dem christlichen Afrika der 2. Hälfte des 2. Jhs stammt'.

38. Cf. Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 129-130.

he interpreted as pre-Lucianic: 'Wir sind also berechtigt, auch in den *L*-Lesungen der handschriftlichen Zeugen der altafrikanischen Textform ursprüngliches Gut und damit Wiedergaben vorlukianischer Lesungen zu sehen.'[39] A few agreements with the Peshitta or other Syrian materials, induce Schildenberger to conclude that the *Vorlage* of the *Vetus Afra* must have come from Syria, and that the readings which the latter shares with the Sahidic do not imply an Egyptian influence, but must have once existed in Syria as well[40]. The existence of some of these readings in Clement of Alexandria witnesses, according to Schildenberger, the strong missionary influence that the church of Antioch had in the early Christian era both towards Egypt and Africa[41]. I am indebted to the digital card-index made available by the Vetus-Latina-Institut in Beuron for the collection of the fragments[42]. The patristic witnesses are quoted according to the Beuron abbreviation system[43].

The Coptic translations are entirely or partially preserved in four different dialects: Sahidic[44], Achmimic[45], the mixed Sahidic-Achmimic dialect witnessed by the papyrus

---

39. Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 130. In an old paper 'Pr 19,17: ἀνταποδώσει ο ἀνταποδωθήσεται?', *Adamantius* 10 (2004), 53-56, the present author found an original reading shared by a few dispersed witnesses: mss. B 637, Antiochian materials (i.e. the *Constitutiones apostolorum*), one Armenian manuscript, and one Old Latin quotation. It is interesting to note that the agreement between Antiochian materials and the Old Latin may represent the original text.

40. Cf. Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 142-143. Cf. in particular p. 143: 'Es ist daher für die von Sah. und Vet. Lat. allein bezeugten Lesungen anzunehmen, daß auch sie einmal in einem griech. Text Syriens gestanden haben, der uns aber, wie vieles andere, verloren gegangen ist.'

41. Cf. Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 143: 'So spüren wir also hier wohl etwas von dem Einfluß, der von Antiochien als der ersten christlichen Heidenmissionszentrale ausgegangen ist. Es ist doch beachtenswert, daß die griech. Übersetzung selbst in ihrem Ursprungsland Ägypten diesen Einfluß erfahren hat'.

42. Regarding the critical editions of the manuscript fragments and of the glosses cf. Gryson, *Altlateinische Handschriften*, 150-152, 251-253.

43. Cf. R. Gryson, *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l'antiquité et du haut moyen âge* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2007).

44. Edited by George P.G Sobhy in 1927, and again by William H. Worrell in 1931. A more recently discovered fragment was published by Sebastián Bartina in 1970.

45. Edited by Alexander Böhlig in 1958.

Bodmer VI[46], and Bohairic[47]. The former three versions are related from the textual point of view[48], since the Achmimic and the Bodmer VI were translated on a Sahidic *Vorlage* very close to the one we possess, whereas the Bohairic shows a text closer to the standard LXX[49]. For this reason, and also for its late attestation[50] the Bohairic has not been collated. Unlike the Old Latin, the Coptic has been given some consideration by scholars. Already Mezzacasa[51] devoted some attention to the additions found in the Sahidic, and was able to identify a few lines which could be traced back to a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. A few years after the publication of the Sahidic and Bohairic critical editions, and the discovery of the Achmimic, Alexander Böhlig studied the differences among these versions[52]. Also Gerleman, in an additional note to his major study of the Greek Proverbs, deals with the Sahidic translation. In his opinion 'On the whole Sah. may be said to render the Greek text rather faithfully. [...] There are, however, instances to show that the Sahidic translator has sometimes made deliberate changes of the

---

46. Edited by Rudolphe Kasser in 1960. The text breaks at Prov. 21.4. In a recent paper, after the discovery of a linguistically cognate ostracon, Kasser ('Protodialectes coptes', 80) proposes to identify this dialect as 'proto-thébain'. However, I preferred, for the moment, to indicate this version with the abbreviation BodVI.

47. Edited by Oswald H.E. Burmester and Eugène Dévaud in 1930.

48. A. Böhlig ('Zum Proverbientext des Clemens Alexandrinus', *Byzantinische Forschungen* 3 [1968], 73. 75) considers the Achmimic and the Bodmer VI 'Interlinearversionen'. Cf. also Kasser, *Bodmer VI*, XXIX. According to Jenkins ('Antinoopolis', 70) 'Not only do we have for Proverbs as for other books of the Old Testament a well-attested Sahidic version, but we also possess in two relatively early papyri witnesses to an earlier Sahidic text which has been "translated" into Achmimic and a mixed Sahidic-Achmimic.' However Jenkins fails to prove the existence of the "earlier Sahidic text". More recently Kasser ('Protodialectes coptes à systèmes alphabétiques de type vieux-copte', in M. Immerzeel, and J. van der Vliet (eds.), *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New Millennium* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 80 fn. 8) affirms: 'Manifestement, le texte saïdique du livre des Proverbes forme, avec son texte akhmimique et son texte proto-thébain (P. Bodmer VI), une seule et même version égyptienne, polydialectale.'

49. Cf. Böhlig, 'Clemens', 73-79.

50. The base manuscript used for the critical edition by Burmester and Devaud is dated to the 14th century by Walter E. Crum, *Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the Collection of the John Rylands Library* (Manchester: University Press, 1909), n. 417. The translation might have been executed in the 12th or 13th century, cf. Kosack, *Proverbia*, XIII.

51. Cf. Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 84-88.

52. Cf. Böhlig, *Untersuchungen über die koptischen Proverbientexte* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1936). One of the author's main conclusions is that the Achmimic depend on a Sahidic *Vorlage*.

wording in order to secure a better meaning.'[53] Later on, two papers were devoted to the relationship between the text preserved by Clement of Alexandria and the Coptic translations. Böhlig[54], while treating the text type cited by Clement of Alexandria, argued that 'Clemens hat ebenso wie sein großer Nachfolger Origenes eine Fülle von textkritischem Material vor sich gehabt'[55]. Clement also represents an interesting witness to the earlier Coptic translations: in the given examples, while the Bohairic usually support the Septuagint, Clement often agrees with Sahidic, Achmimic and Bodmer VI[56]. This may sometime coincide with an alignment with the MT. More recently, Moro[57], stimulated by Böhlig's observations, undertook a full comparison between the text of Clement and the Sahidic. In her opinion

> the comparison between the Sahidic version and the text quoted by Clement can help us to detect actual textual variants from contextual adaptations or intentional changes by the Christian author. The results of this comparison show a common stock of readings more near to the translation techniques of the translator than the standard text, but also point to a first revision toward the Hebrew[58].

Finally Jenkins[59] devoted some attention to the affinities between the Antinoopolis papyrus (Rahlfs 928) and the earlier Coptic versions. The author criticises Roberts's conclusions that the papyrus 'has no special affiliation with the Sahidic [...] or the Bohairic (Bo[1] and Bo[2]) versions'[60]. Actually, as we have seen[61], both the papyrus and

---

53. Gerleman, *Proverbs*, 61.
54. Böhlig, 'Clemens', 73-79.
55. Böhlig, 'Clemens', 73.
56. Cf. Böhlig, 'Clemens', 79.
57. Cf. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 391-437.
58. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 391.
59. Jenkins, 'Antinoopolis', 65-77.
60. Roberts, *Antinoopolis Papyri*, 3.
61. Cf. subsection 1.1.3. above, p. 31.

the Coptic share the extra line of 8.31. Furthermore, the reconstruction of the papyrus according to the distinctive Coptic stichometry 'resolves numerous difficulties'[62]. The papyrus also exhibits in 10.14 the reading ἀτιμίαν which is attested also by the Sahidic and Achmimic[63]. This textual type could be then vindicated as upper-Egyptian and 'Origen may have used this text as the basis for one of his attempts to reform the Septuagint'[64]. However, as Jenkins admits, the papyrus shows a text which deviates in many features from both the majority Septuagint and the Coptic. In some of these cases it alone agrees with the Syro-Hexapla[65]. On the whole, Jenkins's contentions are not based on enough material to be compelling. This situation depends also on the lamentable material state of the papyrus which allows only limited observations.

As far as the Armenian translation is concerned, we still have to rely on the revered diplomatic edition prepared by the mechitarist monk Hovhann Zohrabian, published in Venice in 1805. The text is a faithful reproduction of the ms. Venice 1508, copied in 1319. Unfortunately, despite its early date, at least for the Armenian tradition, its textual type depends on the Cilician recension which largely modified the original translation. In the apparatus Zohrabian set the variant readings of 7 more manuscripts, which were available to him in Venice, and the 17th-century edition published by Oskan[66]. I am indebted to Claude E. Cox for making a copy of the mss. Jerusalem 1925 and Matenadaran 1500 available to me. These, according to Cox, have proved to preserve a very good type of text wherever they have been studied[67]. Thus, I have constantly checked Zohrabian's edition and I have given in the appendix an independent critical apparatus for the Armenian in case I needed to justify the choice I had made in the main

---

62. Jenkins, 'Antinoopolis', 72. However, the author offers only the example found in Prov. 7.19.

63. However in the papyrus the reading (καὶ ἀτιμίαν) is an addition to the standard LXX αἴσθησιν, whereas in the Sahidic and Achmimic the reading (Sah ϲⲱϣ, Ach ϣⲱⲥ) is found *instead of* αἴσθησιν. Also, according to Barns (*Antinoopolis*, 179-180) καὶ ἀτιμίαν is not a marginal variant reading as Jenkins ('Antinoopolis', 72) assumes.

64. Jenkins, 'Antinoopolis', 73.

65. Cf. Jenkins, 'Antinoopolis', 73.

66. Cf. Cox, 'Introduction', in H. Zohrapian (ed.), *Astuatsashunch' Matean hin ew nor Ktakarants': A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1805 Venetian Edition* (New York: Caravan Books, 1984), x-xix.

67. Cf. Cox, *Job*, 32-33.

apparatus. A variant reading found in Zohrabian's apparatus is indicated Arm[mss] if it is attested in more than one manuscript[68], while it is referred to as Arm[ms] if only one manuscript shows the reading. If the variant is found in the two additional manuscripts I checked, the abbreviations are respectively Arm[J1925] and Arm[M1500]. Finally, after a suggestion from Robert W. Thomson I have also taken into account the variant readings attested in the lemmata of the commentary of Hamam which show an eccentric type of text[69]. Despite the Armenian tradition records that the book of Proverbs was the first one to be translated immediately after the invention of the alphabet[70], the Armenian Proverbs have not received attention until now. Only Cox, in his important contribution on the Hexaplaric materials in the Armenian tradition, dealt also with Proverbs, but stated that 'The work of Origen in Prov is poorly preserved by Arm. No signs are preserved in the text itself. MSS 102 121 224 have signs in the mg at 11:22; 12:26; 18:23-19:2; 20:14-22'[71]. A contact of the Armenian Proverbs with the Hexaplaric recension had been already noticed by Anton Baumstark[72].

Apart from local editions, the Ethiopic text of the book of Proverbs has been published only once in the complete Bible in Geʻez issued by the Franciscan Francesco da Bassano[73]. Although da Bassano used a number of different sources, the edition had no main scientific purpose, and does not show any variant reading. In 1978 the diplomatic edition of the ms. Add. 1570 (Cambridge University Library, dated 1588/9) was prepared by Hugh A.W. Pilkington for his doctoral thesis at the University of Oxford. Unfortunately the thesis is protected and cannot be cited without the permission of the author[74]. As Pilkington himself states in the introduction, the Cambridge

---

68. This is indicated with ոմանք in Zohrabian's apparatus.
69. Cf. Thomson, *Hamam*, 15-18.
70. Mainly Koriwn (Abełean, 8), echoed by Movsēs Xorenacʻi (Abełean–Harutʻiwnean, III 53).
71. Cox, *Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986), 155.
72. Baumstark, 'Armenischer und Afrikanisch-lateinischer Proverbientext', *Biblica* 35 (1954), 354-356.
73. Da Bassano, ብሉይ፡ ኪዳን። [*Bəluy Kidān*] (Asmara: Bamāḫtama frānčaskānā, 1925), vol. 3, 227-268.
74. The matter is further complicated by the fact that Pilkington was killed on the 16th October 1986 by a car accident while jogging in Toronto. At the moment I am trying to get in touch with his inheritors in order to receive the permission to use his dissertation.

manuscript was chosen because it was the earliest known one dated. Unfortunately, as the author recognises, the investigation proved that the best manuscripts are the earlier Lake Ṭānā, Ṭānāsee 54 (Ts54, 15th), and Paris, d'Abbadie 55 (Abb55, 15th/16th), which belong to the same textual type, and which 'exhibit the oldest form of the Ethiopic text known to us'[75]. Therefore, the base text I used was the edition published by da Bassano, which has been constantly compared with the two aforementioned manuscripts. When necessary, as for the Armenian, I have given in the appendix an independent critical apparatus in case I needed to justify the choice I had made in the main apparatus. I am indebted to Ted Erho for sharing with me his personal list of ancient Ethiopic manuscripts, from which it follows that 8 more manuscripts, not available to Pilkington, date to the 15th/16th century. It is quite likely that new relevant findings on the early history of the Ethiopic translation would be revealed by a critical study of these manuscripts. It is hoped that the time has eventually come for a full critical edition of the book of Proverbs in Ethiopic.

The Syro-Hexaplar version is certainly less problematic: as far as the book of Proverbs is concerned, it is attested in one early manuscript (8th cent.), the famous Ambrosian code C 313 inf., which is on the whole correct, and rightly famous for its adherence to the Greek model. Generally speaking the translation allows one to recognise the Greek *Vorlage*, as much as this is possible to the Syriac language. When the Syriac is not precise enough the Greek variant reading is also put in the margin.

From the text critical study of the doublets occasional differences emerge among the Syro-Hexaplar, and the other Hexaplaric witnesses, of which ms. V is the main representative. Such heterogeneity had been already noticed by Jenkins:

> The differences between Syh on the one hand and all other Hexaplaric witnesses on the other turn out to be quite profound, and so consistently represented that

---

75. Pilkington, *A Critical Edition of the Book of Proverbs in Ethiopic* (Doctoral Thesis, University of Oxford: 1978), 42.

they can scarcely have arisen accidentally. In our view, Syh and Venetus represent independent Hexaplaric traditions, presumably from independent though related Hexaplaric sources. Whether we ought to assign these traditions to Hexapla, Tetrapla, or to the Hexaplaric recension of Eusebius and Pamphilus need not occupy us here.[76]

I will add to Jenkins's guess some observations which I happened to make while studying the different order of verses and chapters in the book of Proverbs. This book must have been the cause of peculiar troubles for Origen, and Pamphilus and Eusebius because of the many verses and chapters which are in a different position in comparison to the Hebrew.

As is well-known, the Ambrosian Syro-Hexaplar codex represents the second half of the Syriac translation of the Hexaplaric text accomplished by Paul of Tella in 617 in the surrounds of Alexandria. As a number of colophons[77] in the manuscript itself indicate, it precisely translates the edition prepared by Pamphilus and Eusebius of Caesarea. In the book of Proverbs, the order of chapters 24-31 agrees with the LXX. The fact that ms. V and its allies (106 130 336 728) preserve instead the order of the Hebrew may originate with Origen's Hexapla. In fact, in the Syro-Hexaplar and, according to an introductory note[78], in its parental edition prepared by Pamphilus and Eusebius the misplaced verses

---

76. Jenkins, 'Antinoopolis', 69. However, the author does not offer any specific example to elucidate his observation.

77. For Proverbs such a statement is to be found in the subscription at f. 66ra. The ms. Patmos 270, f. 230v preserves in Greek only the original subscription of Proverbs by Pamphilus and Eusebius themselves: Μετελήφθησαν ἀφ᾽ ὧν εὕρομεν ἐξαπλῶν (sic) καὶ πάλιν αὐταχειρι (sic) Πάμφιλος καὶ Εὐσέβιος διορθώσαντο. Cf. Paul Géhin (ed.), *Évagre le Pontique: Scholies aux Proverbes* (Paris: Cerf, 1987), 58, and fn. 2. Cf. also L.F. Constantin von Tischendorf (ed.), *Notitia editionis codici bibliorum Sinaitici [...]. Item Origenis scholia in Proverbia Salomonis* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1860), 122, and Moro, 'Proverbi in Clemente', 397-398. G. Mercati ('Sul significato di alcune sottoscrizioni della siroesaplare specialmente', in *Nuove note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica* [Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1941], 43-48), when discussing Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, offers this important statement: 'Nell'uno e nell'altro caso resta confermato che i tre libri vi erano derivati da un codice unico esaplo (non dico solo esaplare), curato da Pamfilo ed Eusebio e sottoscritto da Pamfilo; codice che nei Proverbi aveva scolî di Origene' (46).

78. The text is transmitted by the ms. Patmos 270, f. 185v: Τὰ δὲ ἠστερισμένα ἐν ταὐτῷ καὶ

are marked by both an obelus and an asterisk. However, this procedure does not itself allow the reader to know where these verses are to be found in the other versions. For this reason, as far as we know from the Syro-Hexaplar, the editors added marginal notes and cross-references which stated with precision the position of these verses ἐν τῷ ἑβραϊκῷ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς. Moreover, the particular case of chapter 24-31 was treated in detail in a second introductory note[79].

If we pass to consider the work of Origen, it is difficult to maintain that in the Hexapla itself the different order between the Greek and the Hebrew text of Proverbs had been preserved. This particular difficulty offered by the book of Proverbs would have caused the impossibility to compare the LXX text of the last 8 chapters with the other 5 columns. It has also to be noted that Origen himself is never found to mention the use of obelus and asterisk together[80]. From this observations it may follow that ms. V is regarded as a copy of the 5th column of the Hexapla, while the Syro-Hexaplar represents the edition prepared by Pamphilus and Eusebius. The latter was presumably

---

ὠβελισμένα ῥητὰ φέρονται μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ο΄, φέρονται δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἑβραϊκῷ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἑρμενευταῖς· τὴν θέσιν δὲ μόνην παραλλάσσουσιν οἱ λοιποὶ καὶ τὸ ἑβραϊκὸν παρὰ τοὺς ο΄. Ὅθεν ὠβέλισται ἐν ταὐτῷ καὶ ἠστέρισται, ὡς παρὰ πᾶσι μὲν φερόμενα, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς δὲ τόποις. Cf. Géhin, *Scholies aux Proverbes*, 56, and Tischendorf, *Notitia*, 76.

79. Cf. the ms. Patmos 270, f. 185v-186r, edited by Géhin, *Scholies aux Proverbes*, 56, and Tischendorf, *Notitia*, 76.

80. Cf. especially the *Commentarius in Matthaeum* XV 14, 85-114 (Klostermann) where Origen offers the most complete explanation about obeli and asterisks which has come to us. As Swete (*Introduction*, 71) makes us aware obelus and asterisk had been already used by Aristarchus for misplaced verses, thus Origen could have just imitated the Alexandrian philologist. However, there is no positive evidence for this, and one has to consider the possibility that the combination of obelus and asterisk depends on the editorial activity of Pamphilus and Eusebius. They might have devised this expedient in order to restore the LXX order of verses and chapters, and, in the meanwhile, to make the reader aware about the different order to be found in the Hebrew and παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς. If the authors were introducing here a non-Origenian practice, it could be explained why they felt the need to reiterate the significance of this last combination: Τὰ δὲ ἠστερισμένα ἐν ταὐτῷ καὶ ὠβελισμένα ῥητὰ φέρονται μὲν παρὰ τοῖς ο΄, φέρονται δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἑβραϊκῷ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἑρμενευταῖς· τὴν θέσιν δὲ μόνην παραλλάσσουσιν οἱ λοιποὶ καὶ τὸ ἑβραϊκὸν παρὰ τοὺς ο΄. Ὅθεν ὠβέλισται ἐν ταὐτῷ καὶ ἠστέρισται, ὡς παρὰ πᾶσι μὲν φερόμενα, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς δὲ τόποις. On the contrary, the explanation for obelus and asterisk is not reiterated, cf. ms. Patmos 270, f. 185v, and the literature cited at the fn. 77 above. From a different point of view, if the combination of obelus and asterisk had been already used by Origen these signs might have meant that the relevant verses had been moved from their original LXX position.

intended for inner Christian use[81], and in consequence of this it preserved the LXX order of verses and chapters. The originally different provenance of the Syro-Hexaplar and of codex V may well explain the differences which we observe. However, ms. V, admittedly, has suffered some non-Hexaplaric contamination. Thus, some of the disagreements with the Syro-Hexaplar may not pertain to the Hexaplaric recension.

A further observation can be added if we consider the situation in chapter 20. In the original LXX text verses 14-19 are lacking, while verses 20-22 are positioned between v. 9 and 10. In the Syro-Hexaplar verses 20-22 keep their position before v. 10, and are marked in the margin by both obeli and asterisks. A marginal note[82] with a cross-reference informs the reader that these verses are present also in the Hebrew and the other translators. Immediately before v. 23, a similar marginal note[83], marked by a double cross-reference, lets the reader understand that the verses marked with obeli and asterisks are positioned here in the Hebrew and the other translators. Verses 14-19 instead are supplied from θ´, inserted after v. 13, and marked with asterisks. The order of the Hebrew is witnessed in this chapter only by mss. V and 336 – once again – by the Antinoopolis papyrus 928[84], and by the Armenian version which follows instead the normal LXX for chapters 24-31. All the other witnesses differ from the Hebrew, and are closer to the LXX. The peculiar case of the Armenian, which shares the order of chapter 20 with ms. V (and the 5th column?) and the order of chapters 24-31 with the Syro-Hexaplar, is at best explained by the aforementioned cross-references and marginal notes: the Armenian translators (or the scribe who copied their *Vorlage*), evidently depended, directly or indirectly, on the edition of Pamphilus and Eusebius[85], and

---

81. As it may be inferred also by Constantin's request of 50 bibles for the churches of the capital from the library of Caesarea. Cf. Eusebius of Caesarea's *De vita Constantini*, 34-37 (*PG* 20, 1182-1186): πεντήκοντα σωμάτια [...] τῶν θείων δηλαδὴ Γραφῶν, ὧν μάλιστα τήν τ᾿ ἐπισκευὴν καὶ τὴν χρῆσιν τῷ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας λόγῳ ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι γινώσκεις.

82. ܐܝܟ ܥܒܪܝܐ ܘܗܢܘܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ: 'As the Hebrew and those which remain'.

83. ܐܝܟ ܥܒܪܝܐ ܘܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܪܟܐ: 'As the Hebrew and these which remain'.

84. The papyrus is completely missing for chapters 24-31, and does not allow us to know which order it attested there.

85. As aforementioned in the fn. 81 above, the edition of Pamphilus and Eusebius reached Constantinople already by the time of Constantine. It is there, according to Zohrabian, that the Armenian translators

decided to follow the LXX order for the relevant changes in chapters 24-31, but preferred to place in their "correct" position verses 20.20-22 altogether with the additions under asterisk from θ´. They probably judged that the misplacement of these few verses would have occurred by a scribal accident, while the major changes in chapters 24-31 might have been an intentional feature of the LXX. The example of the Armenian translation seems to suggest that some witnesses may exhibit the Hebrew order of verses even without depending on the Hexapla. Hence the direct dependence of ms. V and its allies on the Hexapla, although quite likely, needs further evidence to be proved. Consequently, one cannot be sure, at the present stage, which was the order of chapters 24-31 in the 5th column of the Hexapla.

As for most of the Peshitta translations[86], for the book of Proverbs as well the LXX has been used by the original Syriac translators[87] or by some revisers[88]. Therefore, it may happen that the Peshitta of Proverbs witnesses a reading found in the LXX and not in the MT. This is in fact the case in a number of additions which the Peshitta shares with the LXX[89]. In this way, the testimony of the Peshitta of Proverbs can be sometimes significant for our knowledge of the Septuagint text. However, the Peshitta often renders the LXX less literally than the Hebrew[90]. Jan Joosten has devoted a paper to the

---

would have found this text type when they visited the city after the council of Ephesus in 431. Cf. Cox, 'Introduction', xi, and Koriwn (Abełian, 19).

86. Cf. Weitzman, 'Peshitta, Septuagint and Targum', in R. Lavenant (ed.), *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1994), 51-84, esp. 55-60. Weitzman's conclusions are as follows: 'polygenesis and common tradition do not suffice to explain the parallels between P and LXX. Some literary dependence of P on LXX must be posited, though not in all books and never systematically' (83).

87. Joosten, 'Doublet Translations in Peshitta Proverbs', in P.B. Dirksen, and A. van der Kooij (eds.), *The Peshitta as a Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 64: 'Influence of the Greek version is quite pervasive in Peshitta Proverbs, more so – if I may give my opinion on this matter – than in any of the other canonical books of the OT.'

88. Cf. e.g. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 266: 'l'oeuvre du traducteur syriaque reproduisait, à peu de chose près, le texte dont les Massorètes nous ont transmis une dernière recension; et c'est plus tard, à une époque où se produisit un retour à la vieille version grecque, que l'on a tenté une revision nouvelle de la traduction syriaque officielle, d'après l'antique texte alexandrin'.

89. E.g. the additions found in Prov. 9.12, 18; 14.22; 18.22. Cf. also Weitzman, 'The Interpretative Character of the Syriac Old Testament', in *From Judaism to Christianity: Studies in the Hebrew and Syriac Bibles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 63.

90. Otherwise Joosten ('Doublet', 70): 'the translational attitude evinced by the Hebrew-based and the

double translations in the Peshitta of Proverbs. He has found 7 doublets which cover a line or a complete verse. Interestingly enough, while 5 of them translate both the Hebrew and the Greek alongside one another, two of them (14.22; 18.22) are related to the doublet already found in the LXX. More generally, according to Joosten,

> The author of Peshitta Proverbs was working on the Hebrew and the Greek simultaneously. Where he understood the Hebrew, he translated it (though sometimes quite freely); where the Hebrew was difficult, he followed the Greek. In many places, however, both Hebrew and Greek contained elements that looked interesting to him. When such was the case, he did not always choose one at the expense of the other: at times, he combined elements from both his sources into a "versional patchwork" [...]. At other times he opted to translate both versions integrally – which procedure resulted in the doublet translations[91].

Joosten also offers some general remarks about the authorship and the date of the Peshitta of Proverbs. 'Extensive dependence on the LXX [...] constitutes an index of the relative lateness of Peshitta Proverbs compared to the Peshitta of the other books of the OT, where influence of the LXX is much less in evidence'[92]. Moreover 'Whereas the Syriac versions of the NT do not give indication of having used Peshitta Proverbs, the author of Peshitta Proverbs apparently did know the Syriac NT. We may perhaps conclude, therefore, that Peshitta Proverbs is later than the oldest Syriac translation of the NT.'[93] 'This would also seem to imply that the author of Peshitta Proverbs was a Christian.'[94]

---

Greek-based renderings is remarkably similar. [...] both types of rendering are rather free and loose'.

91. Joosten, 'Doublet', 70.

92. Joosten, 'Doublet', 65.

93. Joosten, 'Doublet', 66.

94. Joosten, 'Doublet', 66 fn. 18. The author continues: 'A Christian origin and a late date for Peshitta Proverbs would fit in with the theory of Weitzman that the community that produced the OT Peshitta moved from Judaism to Christianity during the process of translating the OT.' Another possible Christian feature of the Peshitta of Proverbs is that it occasionally 'introduces positive statements on poverty absent

A few words need to be said also about the Targum of the book of Proverbs. General agreement has been reached about the dependence of this Targum on the Peshitta. For details I refer to the recent bibliographic survey published by John F. Healey[95]. Here I would only recall that this fact had been already documented more than two centuries ago by Johann A. Dathe[96], and proved in great detail by Hermann Pinkuss[97]. In the latter's opinion the Peshitta used the Septuagint, and the Targum depended on the Peshitta[98]. The most serious attempt to challenge this position has been produced by Armand Kaminka[99], who, although conceding that the Targum 'eine sehr grosse Anzahl *syrischer* Worte und Formen enthält'[100], dated the Targum to the 3rd or the beginning of the 2nd century BC, and consequently argued that the Septuagint used it, indicating as proofs some aramaising renderings of the Greek[101]. Michael P. Weitzman has more recently made an attempt to date the Jewish borrowing of the Peshitta. He points out that Hai Gaon (939-1028) is related to two illuminating incidents.

> First, we have a responsum from Hai to an enquiry whether the Targums to the Writings shared the origin (and status) of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. [...] This is the earliest reference to the extant Targums of the Writings [...]. Second, [...] Hai despatched a reluctant colleague to consult the Nestorian Catholicos on

---

from the Hebrew and the Greek. [...] as is well-known, a positive view on poverty typifies much early Syriac Christian literature' (68).

95. Cf. Healey, *The Targum of Proverbs* (The Aramaic Bible 15; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991), 1-5.

96. Cf. Dathe, 'De ratione consensus versionis Chaldaicae et Syriacae Proverbiorum Salomonis (Lipsiae, 1764)', in E.F.C. Rosenmüller (ed.), *Opuscula ad crisin et interpretationem Veteris Testamenti spectantia* (Leipzig: Karl Franz Köhler, 1796), 125: 'Nempe Iudaei utebantur versionibus Syriacis, quas legere atque intelligere ob summam utriusque linguae consensionem poterant. Sed mutabant eas passim, partim ad suae dialecti proprietatem, partim ad lectionem textus Hebraei inter eos receptam.'

97. Cf. Pinkuss, 'Die syrische Übersetzung der Proverbien textkritisch und in ihrem Verhältnisse zu dem masoretischen Text, den LXX und dem Targum untersucht', *ZAW* 14 (1894), 65-141, 161-222.

98. Cf. Pinkuss, 'syrische Übersetzung', 67-69.

99. Cf. Kaminka, 'Septuaginta und Targum zu Proverbia', *Hebrew Union College Annual* 8-9 (1931–32), 169-191.

100. Kaminka, 'Septuaginta und Targum', 171.

101. Cf. Kaminka, 'Septuaginta und Targum', 174.

an obscure phrase in the Writings [...]. It is in that atmosphere that the borrowing of P on Proverbs as a Jewish targum can be envisaged[102].


After the Church divisions of the first half of the 5th century the community which remained in communion with the Constantinople see, known as Melkite, proceeded to a new translation from the Greek to the Palestinian Aramaic dialect written in Syriac script. This translation was later abandoned after Arabic replaced Aramaic as the everyday language of the Near East. Consequently only a number of pericopes from a lectionary[103] and from the famous *Codex Climaci rescriptus*[104] survive for the Old Testament. Among these Prov. 1.1-22; 9.1-11 is attested. In the book of Proverbs the translation show some occasional agreements with the Hexaplaric text[105].

The Arabic version of the book of Proverbs printed in Walton's Polyglot has been translated from the LXX. This text has not received much scholarly attention. If it shares its origin with the book of the Prophets of the Polyglot it may be the work of the priest El 'Alam, it should date to the 9th-10th century Alexandria, and it would have a *Vorlage* which closely resemble ms. A. It would represent the early translation for the Arabic-speaking Melkites[106]. Although Joseph Ziegler left a collation of this version[107], I have not consistently checked this translation.

A few readings of the translations have been put between brackets. In these instances the witness is very clear under one respect but still incomplete. E.g. in Prov. 15.6 (οἴϰοις) the Armenian shows clearly the plural as the original text (տունք, *townkʿ*),

---

102. Weitzman, 'Peshitta, Septuagint', 81.

103. Cf. Agnes Smith Lewis (ed.), *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary: Containing Lessons from the Pentateuch, Job, Proverbs, Prophets, Acts, and Epistles* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1897), L, and pericopes number 26, 61, 64, 67.

104. Cf. A. Smith Lewis (ed.), *Codex Climaci Rescriptus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 26-27.

105. Cf. particularly the addition ܕܚܠܬ ܡܪܝܐ at Prov. 1.7c (θεόν] + φόβος ϰυρίου V 252 360 637 766 Arm^M1500 Syp Syh).

106. Cf. Vaccari, 'Le versioni arabe dei Profeti', *Biblica* 2 (1921), 401-423, and Jellicoe, *Septuagint*, 267-268.

107. I was able to consult Ziegler's notes at the Septuaginta Unternehmen in Göttingen.

but it changes the construction for stylistic reasons so as to witness the nominative instead of the dative.

## 2.1. Prov. 2.21

**MT**

כִּי־יְשָׁרִים יִשְׁכְּנוּ־אָרֶץ וּתְמִימִים יִוָּתְרוּ בָהּ׃

**LXX**

χρηστοὶ ἔσονται οἰκήτορες γῆς,

ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ,

ὅτι εὐθεῖς κατασκηνώσουσι γῆν,

καὶ ὅσιοι ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ·

χρηστοὶ – αὐτῇ 1° Aeth (ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς ClemRom; χρηστοὶ δὲ ἔσονται – ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς ClemAlex) EphrSyr] sub ÷ Syh; > B 157 Lat[165] | χρηστοὶ – γῆς AU[perf] | ἄκακοι – αὐτῇ 1°] > 106-130 | ἄκακοι δὲ] και οσιοι S* | ὅτι – αὐτῇ Aeth[mss]] > 125 390 543 ClemRom ClemAlex EphrSyr (Chrys) Aeth | καὶ – αὐτῇ > S*

### 2.1.1. Introduction

The repetition which we observe in Prov. 2.21 is so redundant that Lagarde[1] and Baumgartner[2] devoted just a few lines to it and argued that the second distich comes

---

1. Cf. *Proverbien*, 12.
2. Cf. *Proverbes*, 42.

from a reviser, basically because it is closer to the MT[3]. Just a few years later Mezzacasa[4] pointed out that the second distich represents a Hexaplaric insertion, a view which was later held also by Fritsch[5].

## 2.1.2. Lexical Analysis

Since Mezzacasa's and Fritsch's suggestion has never been proved, I will analyse the translational vocabulary in order to investigate if the distichs show any features compatible with what is known about the first translator and each of the Three. Although a short fragment ascribed to σ´ is preserved, and the first distich is not only under obeli, but clearly shows quite a freer translation technique, I will nonetheless accomplish, for the sake of completeness, a full analysis of the preserved material.

χρηστοί: the term is quite frequent in Psalms and Jeremiah, but rare in other books; usually it renders טוֹב. In the book of Proverbs it is found only here and it translates יָשָׁר. This pattern occurs just here in the whole LXX. In θ´ it is found in Dan 2.32 for the Aramaic homologous טָב. In αλ´ it is found also in Ps. 134,3 for טוֹב[6].

οἰκήτορες: it occurs only here in the LXX. The verb יִשְׁכְּנוּ has been rendered periphrastically by using copula and noun.

ἄκακοι: it occurs 14 times in the LXX, 8 of which appear in Proverbs. In 5 of these occurrences (1.4,22; 8.5; 14.15; 21.11) it translates פֶּתִי, in 13.6 תֹּם, and here it renders תָּמִים; in 15.10 there is no clear Hebrew equivalence[7]. תָּמִים in turn is found 5 times in

---

the MT of Proverbs: in 11.5,20 it is rendered with ἄμωμος, in 28.18 with δικαίως, while in 1.12; 28.10 it has no clear Hebrew equivalence. In the Hexapla ἄκακος occurs only twice s. nom.: in Prov. 10.17 a free translation[8] of a problematic verse is given, for which *BHS*[9] suggests a different vocalisation. In Prov. 10.29 it renders תֹּם.

ὑπολειφθήσονται: the verb is frequent in the LXX, but in Proverbs it occurs only here, twice, and in 11.26 where it has no evident Hebrew equivalent. Here it translates the niphal of יָתַר as already in Gen. 30.36; 32.25; 44.20. In θ´ it occurs in Jer. 27.18,19; Ezek. 6.8 to translate יָתַר, and in Jer. 39.9; Ez 6.12; 9.8 to translate שָׁאַר. In α´ it occurs in 1Kgdms 9.24; 3Kgdms 22.47; Isa. 11.11; 24.6; Jer. 41.10 always to translate שָׁאַר. In σ´ it occurs in 1Kgdms 9.24 to translate שָׁאַר[10], and in 1Kgdms 25.34 to translate יָתַר. Moreover, the verb occurs s. nom. in Lev. 27.18 to translate יָתַר, and in Josh. 23.12 to translate שָׁאַר. Therefore, in the Hexaplaric versions, for α´ the equivalent is always שָׁאַר, while θ´σ´ happen to use both שָׁאַר and יָתַר.

εὐθεῖς: it occurs 7 times in Proverbs. In 4 instances (2.21; 20.11; 28.10; 29.10) it translates יָשָׁר, whereas in 2.13 it translates יֹשֶׁר stemming from the same root. In 2.16,19 it has no Hebrew equivalent. Except for this passage and 29.10 it is connected to the theme of the way (ὁδός, τρίβος). The corresponding Hebrew word, יָשָׁר, is typical in Proverbs and Psalms where it is found some 25 times each. In Proverbs θ´ uses εὐθύς alone in 11.3; 11.11; 20.11; and with α´σ´ in 11.6; 12.6; 15.8; 15.19 as a rendering of יָשָׁר; α´ uses the word also in 23.16 to translate מֵישָׁרים; σ´ presents εὐθύς for יָשָׁר only in 14.9: in 4.11 it translates the noun of the same root יֹשֶׁר; in 23.16 it renders מֵישָׁרים; in 3.6 the phrase εὐθεῖς ποιήσῃ translates יְיַשֵּׁר, and in 4.25 the phrase εἰς τὸ εὐθύ renders לְנֹכַח[11].

---

commentators, cf. also recently E. Tov, and F. Polak, *The Revised CATTS Hebrew/Greek Parallel Text* (Jerusalem: 2009), ad loc., on the application *Accordance* 8.4.4.

8. ὁδὸς ζωῆς φυλάσσει ἀκάκους.

9. Ad loc.

10. In the problematic passage of Jer. 15.11, according to the critical apparatus of *BHS* (ad loc.), σ´ would have read the noun שְׁאֵרִיתְךָ and translated it freely with the verb ὑπελείφθης which he uses for rendering this root.

11. The last two passages exemplify well the tendency of σ´ to render precisely the Hebrew meaning in

κατασκηνώσουσι: the verb occurs only 3 times (1.33; 2.21; 8.12) in Proverbs always to translate שָׁכַן which in turn is found also in 7.11 (ἡσυχάζουσιν) and in 10.30 (οἰκήσουσιν). In θ´ it occurs in Job 18.15; 22.2 (with α´) to translate יִסְכָּן (he certainly read יִשְׁכֹּן[12]); than in 29.25; Ps. 67.7; 77.60; Isa. 32.16 (with α´σ´); 34.17 (with α´σ´); Jer. 33.16; 46.26; Ezek. 28.14 (where it renders הַסּוֹכֵךְ which has been presumably read הַשֹּׁכֵן[13]). In Aquila it occurs also in Ps. 67.19; Jer. 49.16 (with σ´). Here σ´ translates שָׁכַן with κατακληρονομήσουσι, but when he uses κατασκηνόω (Job 4.19; Ps.[14] 64.5; 67.17,19; Isa. 33.16; Jer. 7.12; 25.24; Ezek. 17.23) it is always to translate שָׁכַן. The verb occurs s. nom. in Lev. 16.16; Deut. 33.28 (Field [ad loc.] suggests to ascribe it to σ´); Job 18.15 (Field [ad loc.] suggests to ascribe it to α´). Thus, in all the Hexaplaric versions κατασκηνόω always translates שָׁכַן.

ὅσιοι: this word is common in the translation of Psalms, and occurs 9 times in Proverbs, 4 of which are without a clear Hebrew equivalent. In the remaining 5 cases it translates a different word on each occasion: here it renders תָּמִים, in 10.29 תֹּם from the same root, in 29.10, also from the same root, תָּם, in 20.11 זַךְ, and in 22.11 טְהוֹר. θ´ employs the word in Ps. 17.26 (with α´ε´); 88.20 (with α´σ´) to translate חָסִיד, but in Amos 5.10 (with o´ according to Jerome[15]) to translate תָּמִים. In α´ it occurs also in Ps. 31.6 for חָסִיד. In σ´ the word is found also in Deut. 33.8; Ps. 17.26; 31.6; 51.11 always to translate חָסִיד. In ε´ it occurs in Ps. 30.22 to translate חָסִיד. In αλ´ it is found in Ps. 4.4 to translate חָסִיד, and in Ps. 18.10 to render טְהוֹרָה. Thus in the Hexaplaric versions ὅσιος translates always חָסִיד but in θ´ Amos 5.10 (תָּמִים), and in αλ´ Ps. 18.10 (טְהוֹרָה).

---

a good Greek and by avoiding the word by word translation.

12. Although it is not possible to verify how θ´ translates סָכַן, its meaning ('be of use') cannot explain the use of κατασκηνόω.

13. Here again although it is not possible to verify how θ´ translates סָכַךְ, its meaning ('shut off') cannot explain the use of κατασκηνόω. It is more likely that θ´ reads השכן or השוכן.

14. Hatch and Redpath (*Concordance*) need to be rectified in σ´ Ps. 48.12: according to Field σ´ reads in this passage τὰς κατασκηνώσεις αὐτῶν, thus no form deriving from the verb is attested. Actually Hatch and Redpath record correctly this passage also at the lemma κατασκήνωσις.

15. Cf. *Commentarium in Amos prophetam* II 5.10 (Adriaen).

### 2.1.3. Text Critical Commentary


From the text critical point of view the agreement between the obeli of the Syh and the omission of the Armenian version (whose Hexaplaric character has been often noted[16]) is certainly superior to B which at least in another case[17] omits an obelized doublet. The witness of Lat[165] has to be clarified. Altogether it is regarded, by Schildenberger[18], as an Old African text which was adapted partially to the Lucianic recension[19]. In this specific passage Schildenberger[20] does not take into account the obeli of Syh and ends up considering Lat[165] as a fair support to the text of B which he assumes as original. The fact instead that the group 106-130, which we can for the moment suspect to represent the Lucianic text type[21], agrees in the omission of the

16. Cf. Jellicoe (*Septuagint*, 260), and Dorival (*Septante*, 331) who speaks about revisions 'à partir de la LXX hexaplaire'.

17. In Prov. 2.3c (erroneously under asterisk instead of obelus in Syh) B omits the original stich and keeps the stich stemming from θ′ (2.3b), cf. Jäger (*Observationes*, 21). Consequently B in Proverbs is not totally immune from the Hexaplaric recension. Moreover, it has to be remembered that according to Ziegler (*Isaias*, 38-40) B is, along with V, the best witness to the Hexaplaric recension for Isaiah.

18. According to Schildenberger (*Proverbien*, 129-130) the text of Lat[94.95.165] AN[scrip] has not been revised after the Hexaplaric recension. It is really likely that the Hexaplaric readings entered the text in the same way the Lucianic ones did: they would be pre-hexaplaric. These witnesses would represent an Old African text (the text type which is cited by Cyprian of Carthage) which would have been later adapted partially to the Lucianic recension. Therefore these witnesses are particularly important for the prehistory of the Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions. Also Gryson (*Altlateinische Handschriften*, 251) confirms that Lat[165] preserves 'une forme archaique du texte latin des Proverbes, proche de celui de Cyprien'.

19. Schildenberger (*Proverbien*, 35-45) identifies the Lucianic text by taking as a starting point the citations of John Chrysostom and Theodoret of Cyrus. According to the author, manuscripts 106 and 260, which share a particular agreement with these citations, can be regarded as representative of the Lucianic recension although they did not always preserve the original reading. Actually Chrys and 106 and/or 260 agree 23 times. Of those Chrys = 106 = 260 only 5 times; Chrys = 260 ≠ 106 14 times; Chrys = 106 ≠ 260 12 times. Thus the two manuscripts are not part of the same group, and the claim that Chrys represents the Lucianic text still need further research. After the discovery of the *Commentary on the Proverbs* attributed to John Chrysostom the question need to be investigated afresh. Cf. especially Bady ('commentaire inédit', 37-75).

20. Cf. *Proverbien*, 119-120.

21. The agreement between the two manuscripts was already acknowledge by Ziegler (*Sapientia*, 60-61; *Sirach*, 64-65; 'Ecclesiastes', 110) for Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach and Ecclesiastes respectively. In the former two books 106 130 (with 545 705) represent the Lucianic group.

second stich with Lat[165] could be explained exactly through the partial revision of the former on the Lucianic recension. Be this as it may, Augustine (*qui sunt boni, erunt habitatores terrae*[22]) alone witnesses the existence of a Latin version of the first stich[23]. The text shown by 106-130 seems to be a stylistic attempt at eliminating the most tedious and repetitive part of the doublet. If the reviser was working on a Hexaplaric text, it would be clear why the obelised text was eliminated. The text shown by S* (καὶ ὅσιοι replaces ἄκακοι δὲ, and the 4th line is missing) could be explained again as a reworking on the Hexaplaric text with the aim to eliminate the tedious repetition. In this codex though this result is achieved by removing the 4th stich and transferring its autonomous reading – perhaps under asterisks – to the nearly identical second line.

In conclusion, all the witnesses – included possibly B – concur to present the omission of the first distich (or just of the second line) as a recensional effect caused by the presence of the obeli.

Let's now consider the witnesses which omit the second distich. Manuscript 125 dates to the 14th century and presents the biblical text from Genesis to the sapiential books[24]. The codex 390 was written in 1075 and it presents catenae to Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticle. The manuscript 543 was copied in 1186, and presents the sapientials books. Ziegler[25] classified it in the mixed group. Thus the three manuscripts seem to belong to three different groups, and the loss would have originated independently. Since a loss due to homoioteleuton is found in 125 390 at Prov. 15.6, and in 125 only at Prov. 3.15, here also the same phenomenon would easily explain the absence of the second distich.

Concerning Clement of Rome and Clement of Alexandria, their text is almost

---

22. *De perfectione iustitiae hominis* XIV 32,18-20 (Urba-Zycha).

23. The Latin translation of Clement of Rome does not represent per se the Latin biblical tradition, but only the literal version of its Greek *Vorlage*.

24. The codex belongs in Ecclesiastes (cf. Ziegler, 'Ecclesiastes', 110) to the same group of 106-130. In the Wisdom of Solomon (cf. Ziegler, *Sapientia*, 49-50) it goes with 339-443-542. It could be a copy of the latter. Some of their readings are shared also by 155. The manuscript does not exhibit the text of Sirach.

25. Cf. 'Ecclesiastes', 110.

identical, and it is mutually confirmed despite its eccentricity: after sharing ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς
for ἐν αὐτῇ, they both lack not only the second distich of v. 21, but also the whole first
stich of v. 22; finally they close the citation with the same odd text: οἱ δὲ
παρανομοῦντες ἐξολοθρευθήσονται ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς, where παρανομοῦντες stands for
παράνομοι and ἐξολοθρευθήσονται for ἐξωσθήσονται. As Donald A. Hagner[26]
argues convincingly the verb in this last line could have been influenced by the almost
identical Ps. 36.38 (οἱ δὲ παράνομοι ἐξολεθρευθήσονται ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό). Clement of
Rome cites some verses from this Psalm immediately afterwards. Although Hagner[27],
regarding this and other similar cases, thinks that a combination of Old Testament
quotations is likely, in the total absence of evidence, he is reluctant[28] to hypothesise a
written collection. He prefers to explain these combined citations 'on the basis of
memory; the compilation of a string of quotations around a given word or subject is
probably due to Clement's own industry, using perhaps as a model the homiletical
tradition of the Hellenistic synagogue, or in some instances borrowing certain combined
quotations or series of quotations directly from sources of oral tradition'[29].

Therefore, if as in other passages we would have only the text of Clement of
Alexandria[30], we would consider it an aberrant text, but the citation in agreement with
the one from Clement of Rome leads one to think that the Alexandrian was quoting
faithfully the text he found in the *Epistle to the Corinthians* which he cites frequently in

---

26. Cf. *Clement of Rome*, 60. In any case Prov. 2.22 according to the manuscript tradition is more likely
to have been composed by the first translators: παράνομοι, in comparison with παρανομοῦντες, is a
less literal translation of the participal בּוֹגְדִים; on the other hand, the verb παρανομέω is never
employed by the Three (except for σ´ Ps. 25.5 where it translates the substantive adjective רָשָׁע, [in Isa.
52.5 α´σ´ παρανομοῦσιν 86, would render יְלֵל but it is probably a mistake; cf. Field ad loc., and
Ziegler, *Isaias*, ad loc.]). The verb ἐξολοθρεύω is really frequent in the LXX, but it never occurs in
Proverbs; also in the LXX it never renders נָסַח, seemingly because it does not have a satisfactory
meaning (but it is a good rendering of שָׁמַד in Ps. 36.38). The Three use this verb always for כָּרַת, apart
from σ´ 1Kgdms 15.8 where it translates הָרַם. In conclusion the citation cannot have a Hexaplaric origin,
and should not stem from the καίγε recension.

27. Cf. *Clement of Rome*, 64.

28. Cf. *Clement of Rome*, 102.

29. *Clement of Rome*, 103.

30. About the Proverbs text of Clement of Alexandria cf. Böhlig ('Clemens', 73-79), Zuntz
('Prophetologion', 180-182), and the extensive and learned study of Moro ('*Proverbi* in Clemente',
391-437).

the *Stromata*. This variant reading, thus, quite interesting at first sight, probably has to be regarded just as a combination of citations from memory.

Finally, to be considered is the double long citation which is found in the *Sermones parenetici ad monachos Aegypti*, a text of Egyptian origin ascribed falsely to Ephrem Syrus[31]. Since the same text occurs in two different passages, the suspicion of a fall due to homoioteleuton can be ruled out quite safely. In support of this it is worth noting that the two citations are not fully identical. Instead both show a small eccentric detail in an overall ordinary text. The first quotation reads, unique in the Greek tradition, ἐξ αὐτῆς for ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς; the second one witnesses with 254 542 754 ἐπορεύθησαν for ἐπορεύοντο. They both seem to present a banal outcome: in the first instance the preposition ἐξ (Prov. 2.22) is attracted by the preverbal particle of the main verb ἐξωσθήσονται; in the second one the imperfect ἐπορεύοντο is attracted to the aorist form (ἐπορεύθησαν) by the main verb, εὕροσαν, which is also in the aorist form. Therefore, in my opinion, the Pseudo-Ephrem may be considered an authentic witness of the original text.

The witness of the Ethiopic translation also needs to be discussed. The codex chosen by Pilkington[32] for the diplomatic edition and a number of its allies read only one of the two distichs. However, a number of manuscripts add a second distich, among which the two oldest manuscripts (the already mentioned Ts54 and Abb55) which, as I said, according to Pilkington[33] constitutes the closest group to the original Greek text. First of all one needs to understand which distich is translated by the text present in all the Ethiopic manuscripts. The task is not really easy because in the original Greek as well the two distichs are particularly close. Nonetheless, the first striking thing is that there is no translation of the causal ὅτι which everywhere else in the book of Proverbs is translated by እስመ (this is the word which we find in the addition). Moreover the word ኄራን ('good') represents a fair rendering of χρηστοί while εὐθεῖς is always translated

---

31. Cf. Hemmerdinger-Iliadou, 'Éphrem grec', 812.
32. Cf. *Proverbs in Ethiopic*, ad loc.
33. Cf. *Proverbs in Ethiopic*, 38-42.

by **ርቱዕ** (and it is actually this word which is employed in the addition). The adjective ἄκακος is rendered by **የዋህ** in all the occurences in the book of Proverbs, but it is employed for ὅσιοι only in 22.11, which in its turn it is quite consistently rendered by **ሳድቅ** (again, this is the word used in the addition). Finally, for the first two words (**ኤራን፡ ሰብእ፡**) a variant reads: **ኤራነ፡ ይከውኑ፡ እለ፡** which, as pointed out by Pilkington[34], seems to render more closely ἔσονται οἰκήτορες, and – I would suggest – could even represent the original reading, later made more idiomatic by a reviser. Indeed this variant reading is supported also by the above mentioned group A. Therefore the Greek distich witnessed in all the Ethiopic manuscripts is the first one. A second question needs to be answered: is the additional text present in group A and its allies original or recensional? As we said from the text critical point of view this text is supported by the best manuscripts. As already mentioned en passant the translation technique is fully consistent with the rest of the translation. I can now add that the verb used for κατασκηνώσουσι (**የጎድርዋ**) occurs also in 8,12 which is the only other passage where κατασκηνόω is found in the book of Proverbs. Therefore both on the text critical and translation technique basis I would consider the additional text as original. It would have been eliminated by part of the manuscript tradition because almost identical with the first part. In other words, within the Ethiopic tradition the same principle would have worked which we already observed in the mainstream Greek tradition.

To sum up, the whole manuscript tradition has been affected by a number of issues (homoioteleuton, omissions, word shifts) which have been generated, in all probability, by the extreme resemblance of the stichs b and d, and possibly also by the presence of the obeli.

## 2.1.4. Conclusions

---

34. Cf. *Proverbs in Ethiopic*, ad loc.

The analysis of the translational terminology is not really helpful to identify the author of the first distich: χρηστός and οἰκήτωρ are found just once each in Proverbs[35], and ὑπολείπομαι also occurs in the second distich. Only the term ἄκακος could suggest a late origin for this distich since it usually translates פֶּתִי and only here תָּמִים. If we turn to consider the second distich, εὐθύς and κατασκηνόω are terms certainly present in the lexicon of the first translator; since it is found 4 times without a Hebrew equivalent, ὅσιος is a term certainly suitable for the translator who in the other 5 occurrences employs it each time for a different Hebrew word. The second distich then seems to be more consistent with the translator's vocabulary. One could cast some doubts on εὐθύς which is usually connected with the theme of the road. However, the translation technique of the first distich is freer: χρηστός renders יָשָׁר less literally than εὐθύς; ἔσονται οἰκήτορες is also a less literal and loose rendering for יִשְׁכְּנוּ than κατασκηνώσουσι is; the particle δέ is the really common way in which the translator of Proverbs renders the Hebrew conjunction וְ, which will be more literally translated with καί by the καίγε recension onward. Lastly in the first line כִּי is not translated at all, while in the third stich it is literally rendered with ὅτι.

Concerning the Hexaplaric fragments, we already mentioned that σ´ is translating יִשְׁכְּנוּ with κατακληρονομήσουσι. This excludes his authorship of one of the two distichs. In this verse a translation s. nom. is also preserved in which כִּי־יְשָׁרִים[36] is translated οἱ δὲ εὐθεῖς. If the employment of εὐθεῖς, as we have seen, is compatible with each one of the Three, the use of δέ agrees only with the good Greek style of σ´[37],

---

35. This may be safely regarded as a typical feature of the original translator: Cook ('Aspects of the Translation Technique', 143-153; *Proverbs*, 318-319.335-342; 'Lexical Matters', 163-173) has shown widely that in Proverbs a number of words are found which occur just once in the whole book, or nowhere else in the whole LXX (as οἰκήτωρ).

36. Field (*Auctarium ad Origenis Hexapla*, 22) presents this reading as a translation of וּתְמִימִים, but at the same time as a different rendering in comparison with σ´ ὅτι εὐθεῖς. This is actually contradictory and the Hebrew reference needs to be corrected to כִּי־יְשָׁרִים.

37. Salvesen (*Symmachus*, 220-223) proves that σ´ avoids the equivalence between וְ and καί, and that he is inclined to maintain δέ if he finds it in the LXX. She also shows 10 examples where σ´ has δέ while the LXX is using καί.

to which therefore the fragment may belong. The version of σ´ should then sound like this:

οἱ δὲ εὐθεῖς κατακληρονομήσουσι

Regarding α´, the consistent translation of שָׁאַר with ὑπολείπω and of חָסִיד with ὅσιος, altogether with his typical tendency not to alter the equivalences between Hebrew and Greek words independently from the semantic context, rules out the attribution to him of one of the distichs.

Only in θ´ the use of ὑπολείπω for יָתַר and of ὅσιος for תָּמִים is witnessed. Moreover the rendering of כִּי with ὅτι and of וְ with καί are typical features of the material under asterisk attributed to θ´ in the book of Job[38].

To sum up, the translation technique of the second distich shows the authorship of θ´, and does not match the usual freedom of the first translator. Morevor the two distichs together do not meet the usual taste of the translator especially because of their similarity. Actually, it is exactly this last feature which probably caused most of the textual accidents we have come through. The Pseudo-Ephrem may prove the existence of an Egyptian text reading only the first distich. The doublet would then originate with the Hexaplaric recension, and the later manuscript traditions would have lost the asterisks and the attribution. Thus the Hexaplaric recension could have read as follows:

÷ χρηστοὶ ἔσονται οἰκήτορες γῆς,

÷ ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ, ✔

<θ´ ※> ὅτι εὐθεῖς κατασκηνώσουσι γῆν,

<θ´ ※> καὶ ὅσιοι ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ· <✔>

---

38. Cf. Peter J. Gentry (*Asterisked Materials*, 366-371): the conjunction וְ is translated 198 times by καί and just twice by δέ; the conjunction כִּי is translated 36 times by ὅτι and it *never* occurs without a Greek equivalent.

However, the asterisks are not transmitted and the two distichs are so similar that the insertion seems quite pedantic to stem from Origen. One should perhaps consider the possibility that the doublet had a pre-hexaplaric origin due to contamination with the καίγε recension: the latter could have actually looked like θ΄. This would better explain why all the Greek manuscript tradition has been affected, and only a remote Egyptian text, witnessed by the Pseudo-Ephrem, has escaped the intrusion. If that is the case, Origen would have just added the obeli to the less literal distich, and later witnesses, under the influence of the obeli, would have prefered to eliminate, completely (B Arm Lat[165]) or just partially (S*; 106-130), the tedious repetition. In other words, the second distich would have been considered original, and the first one, under obeli, would have been viewed as a scribal interpolation.

## Appendix: The Citations from the Church Fathers

Clemens Romanus, *Epistula I ad Corinthios* XIV 4,1-3 (Jaubert)
Γέγραπται γάρ· "Χρηστοὶ ἔσονται οἰκήτορες γῆς, ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς· οἱ δὲ παρανομοῦντες ἐξολεθρευθήσονται ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς."

Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata* II 19,102,3s. (Früchtel-Treu)
"χρηστοὶ δὲ ἔσονται οἰκήτορες γῆς, ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐπ᾽ αὐτῆς, οἱ δὲ παρανομοῦντες ἐξολοθρευθήσονται ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς."

[Ephraem Syrus], *Sermones paraenetici ad monachos Aegypti* XXV (Phrantzoles)
Διὸ λέγει· *οὐ γὰρ καταλαμβάνονται ὑπὸ ἐνιαυτῶν ζωῆς· εἰ γὰρ ἐπορεύοντο τρίβους ἀγαθάς, εὕροσαν ἂν τρίβους δικαιοσύνης λείας. Χρηστοὶ ἔσονται οἰκήτορες γῆς, ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ. Ὁδοὶ ἀσεβῶν ἐκ γῆς ὀλοῦνται, οἱ δὲ*

παράνομοι ἐξωσθήσονται ἐξ αὐτῆς. Υἱέ, ἐμῶν νομίμων μὴ ἐπιλανθάνου, τὰ δὲ ῥήματά μου τηρείτω σὴ καρδία. Ὅτι τῷ Θεῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

[Ephraem Syrus], *Sermones paraenetici ad monachos Aegypti*, XL (Phrantzoles)

Διὸ λέγει· οὐ γὰρ καταλαμβάνονται ὑπὸ ἐνιαυτῶν ζωῆς· εἰ γὰρ ἐπορεύθησαν τρίβους ἀγαθάς, εὕροσαν τρίβους δικαιοσύνης λείας. Χρηστοὶ ἔσονται οἰκήτορες γῆς, ἄκακοι δὲ ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ. Ὁδοὶ ἀσεβῶν ἐκ γῆς ὀλοῦνται, οἱ δὲ παράνομοι ἐξωσθήσονται ἀπ' αὐτῆς. Ἀνάγκη οὖν βαδίζειν ἐν τῇ εὐθείᾳ ὁδῷ, κατὰ τὸν λέγοντα·

Aurelius Augustinus Hipponensis, *De perfectione iustitiae hominis* XIV 32,18-20 (Urba-Zycha)

'et alibi scriptum est', inquit, '*bona bonis creata sunt ab initio*, et iterum: *qui sunt boni, erunt habitatores terrae*'.

**MT**

יְקָרָה הִיא מִפְּנִיִּים֒ וְכָל־חֲפָצֶ֗יךָ לֹ֣א יִֽשְׁווּ־בָֽהּ׃

**LXX**

τιμιωτέρα δέ ἐστιν λίθων πολυτελῶν,

οὐκ ἀντιτάξεται αὐτῇ οὐδὲν πονηρόν·

εὔγνωστός ἐστιν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐγγίζουσιν αὐτῇ,

πᾶν δὲ τίμιον οὐκ ἄξιον αὐτῆς ἐστιν.

οὐκ – αὐτῇ 2° Lat[165] Arm Aeth Chrys AU[Ad]] sub ÷ Syh; > Basil | ἀντιτάξεται BS* (-ξετε V) 248[mg] (-ταζεται 336) 728 Sa Ach BodVI Arm Syh Chrys] αντιτασσεται reliqui Lat[160 165] SacPar AU[Ad] | οὐδὲν – αὐτῇ] > 125 | ἐγγίζουσιν Lat[165] Arm Aeth Syh[mg] Chrys SacPar AU[Ad]] εφαπτομενοις V Syh[txt]; αγαπωσιν 637 336-728 | αὐτῇ 2° SacPar] αυτην 390 534 732 637 336-728 Chrys; + *et eis qui considerant eam diligenter* Lat[165] AU[Ad] | πᾶν – ἐστιν Lat[165] Arm Aeth Syh Basil Chrys AU[Ad]] > 329 333

### 2.2.1. Introduction

The first scholar who envisaged a double translation in this passage was Grabe[2] who at the margin of the third stich wrote: 'Alia interpretatio'. This proposal was refused by

---

1. *Qere*: מִפְּנִינִים.
2. Cf. *Septuaginta*, ad loc.

Jäger[3], but eventually refined by Lagarde[4] was accepted by all the subsequent commentators[5]. Lagarde suggested that a revisor was the author of stichs a and d, and that the first translator was responsible for stichs b and c. Referring in particular to the stich c, he would have read נִקְרָה הִיא לְפָנֶיהָ (sic). A different reconstruction of the stich c was put forward by Delitzsch[6]: נוֹדְעָה לְכָל־הַקְּרֵבִם לָהּ who tried instead to express the Greek more precisely. Later commentators could not move beyond these basic proposals[7]. It needs only to be mentioned that Fritsch[8] observed that stichs b and c are under obeli, therefore stichs 'a and d, which are closer to the Hebrew, are accordingly Hexaplaric'.

### 2.2.2. Lexical Analysis

It is difficult to question the authenticity of stichs a and d as they are found verbatim in Prov. 31.10b and 8.11b respectively. In particular, the MT of 31.10b[9] is quite different from the MT of 3.15a. Since the LXX version of 3.15a is relatively literal, 31.10b must have been translated with reference to 3.15a. This observation makes unlikely Lagarde's hypothesis according to which 31.10b, which exhibits a free translation technique and is therefore likely to be the work of the first translator, would cite 3.15, which would have been instead inserted by a later revisor. Moreover the use

---

3. *Observationes*, 30: '... neque aliam interpretationem exhiberi, ut Grabius in margine edixit, mihi persuadeo, neque tamen, unde cum multis aliis profectus sit, reperire potui'.

4. Cf. *Proverbien*, 14.

5. Cf. Delitzsch (*Spruchbuch*, 542-543), Baumgartner (*Proverbes*, 46-47), Toy (*Proverbs*, 72), Müller-Kautzsch (*Proverbs*, 72), Mezzacasa (*Proverbi*, 120), Fritsch ('Hexaplaric Signs', 172). Cf. also Schleusner (*Opuscula critica*, 270).

6. Cf. *Spruchbuch*, 543.

7. Cf. the passages signalled in the previous footnote.

8. Cf. 'Hexaplaric Signs', 172.

9. The MT reads: וְרָחֹק מִפְּנִינִים מִכְרָהּ; the LXX translates: τιμωτέρα δέ ἐστιν λίθων πολυτελῶν ἡ τοιαύτη. The suffix pronoun הּ takes the position of the subject ἡ τοιαύτη; the subject מֶכֶר is rendered with the adjective τίμιος, and the adverb רָחֹק is interpreted as a comparative.

of δέ in the stich d to translate וְ which is even left without equivalent in stich a, makes problematic an attribution to θ´ and α´. However, for the sake of completeness, I will also examine the relevant words found in stichs a and d, namely τίμιος, πολυτελής and ἄξιος, in the Three.

τίμιος: it occurs 9 times in Proverbs. In the present passage, in the stich a, and in 6.26; 12.27; 24.4 it translates יָקָר; here again, in the stich d, and in the identical 8.11b it renders חֵפֶץ, whereas in 31.10b it corresponds to מֶכֶר[10]. In 8.19 the phrase λίθον τίμιον is a free rendering for פָּז. The same equivalence is found in Ps. 18.11 (where one reads the same wording ὑπὲρ χρυσίον καὶ λίθον τίμιον), and in Ps. 20.4 (but not in Ps. 118.127!). Finally in Prov. 20.6 it has no equivalence in the MT. In the Three τίμιος always[11] translates יָקָר except for Cant. 5.11 where σ´ perhaps[12] uses it for פָּז.

λίθων πολυτελῶν: this phrase occurs two more times (8.11; 31.10) in the book of Proverbs always to translate פְּנִינִים, which its turn is found a fourth time in Prov.[MT] 20.15. This verse belongs to a section (20.14-22) which was not present in the first translation, and in the Hexaplaric recension was supplied from θ´ which used ἐσωτάτων, a word unknown to the LXX. פְּנִינִים occurs also in Job 28.18 which again is lacking in the original translation and is supplied from θ´ (ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσώτατα[13]). In this verse α´ reads παρὰ τὰ περίβλεπτα. Lastly פְּנִינִים occurs also in Lam. 4.7 where it is simply translated with λίθος. σ´ renders this occurrence with the phrase ὑπὲρ τὰ περίβλεπτα, whereas in Prov. 8.11 he uses τῶν ἐσωτάτων. The word πολυτελής is never found in the Three.

ἀντιτάξεται: this verb, whose basic meaning is 'to set oneself against' (LSJ, ad loc.), occurs twice in Proverbs where it represents here perhaps שָׁוָה ('to be equal' [*HALOT*,

---

10. According to Hatch and Redpath (*Concordance*, ad loc.) it would translate רָחֹק which can be only the equivalent of the comparative τιμωτέρα. Cf. previous footnote.

11. The word is found 8 times in the Hexaplaric versions: Job 28.16; Ps. 35.8; 71.14; 138,17; Prov. 1.13; 20.15; Ezek. 27.22; 28.13.

12. Cf. Field (*Hexaplorum*, ad loc.) and Ceulemans (*Canticles*, ad loc.). This reading is based only on Theodoret (*PG* 81, 157d), while the readings connected to the root χρυσ- are based on a larger evidence found in 161 248 Syh and Ambrose.

13. This translation is probably imitated by Jerome (Vulgate, ad loc.): *de occultis*.

ad loc.]), and in 3.34 the hifil of לִיץ ('to deride' [BDB, ad loc.]). Both renderings are interpretational and have to be regarded as peculiar to the first translator.

πονηρόν: it occurs 7 times in Proverbs; in 4 cases (8.13; 11.15; 20.8; 24.20) it translates the adjective רַע. In 22.3 it renders the noun from the same root רָעָה, whereas in 7.5 is a moralising rendering of נָכְרִי ('foreign, alien' [BDB, ad loc.]). In the present passage it does not seem to have an equivalent in the MT. However, Grabe[14] (followed by nearly all the commentators[15], but not by Rahlfs) suggested to emend the term, against the whole manuscript tradition, with ποθητόν ('longed for, regretted' [LSJ, ad loc.][16]) which would correspond to חֵפֶץ (in the meaning of 'desire, longing' [BDB, ad loc.]). Although this term is never found in the LXX, it is already used by Alciphron (Schepers 1905, 3.39.2) in the 4th cent. BC[17]; thus it could be available to the first translator. If such a confusion ever happened, since it affected the whole manuscript tradition, it must have occurred in majuscule where a ΠΟΘΗ†ΟΝ, in which only the vertical stroke of the τ was legible, might have been corrected with the more common ΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ. On the whole this conjecture is palaeographically unlikely[18]. Furthermore, it has to be noted that the translation of שָׁוָה ('to be equal') with ἀντιτάσσομαι is interpretational, and it stresses in adversative sense the Hebrew.

---

14. *Prolegomena* (*Septuaginta*, f. Γ'): '*Proverb*. cap. III. v. 15 ποθητόν, non πονηρόν, legere, et v. 32 negativum οὐ excludere Hebraeus textus suadet'.

15. Cf. Jäger (*Observationes*, 29-30), Lagarde (*Proverbien*, 14), Delitzsch (*Spruchbuch*, 542-543), Baumgartner (*Proverbes*, 46-47), Toy (*Proverbs*, 72), Müller-Kautzsch (*Proverbs*, 72), Mezzacasa (*Proverbi*, 120).

16. According to Pierre Chantraine (*Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, 922), the meaning of the root ποθε- is 'désirer celui ou ce dont on se sent privé'.

17. Cook ('Aspects of the translation technique', 1996, 143-153; *The Septuagint of Proverbs*, 1997, 318-319. 335-342; 'Lexical Matters', 2000, 163-173) has abundantly shown that the first translator uses terms which are found just once in Proverbs or even in the whole LXX.

18. Wevers (*Leviticus*, 306-307) explains with an exchange in majuscule the reading τὸν ἀρτακον for τὸν ἀττάκην (Lev. 11.22). However it is the only case found in the whole Göttingen edition, and it is not palaeographically justifiable: actually the word ἀττάκην is extremely rare, and Wevers's apparatus exemplifies the difficulties the scribes experienced to understand it. This reading can be better explained by a scribal misunderstanding. Indeed ms. 528, which shows this reading, is a careless copy, and does not have a model in majuscule. Palaeographically acceptable is instead the other exchange between τ and ρ signalled by Ziegler (*Ezechiel*, 72) in Ezek. 9.8 where ms. 544 reads πιπρω for πίπτω. In majuscule is indeed normal the ligature between the horizontal strokes of the π and τ (πτ > πρ). I am indebted to Chiara Faraggiana and Detlef Fraenkel for these observations.

Actually, the basic meaning of the verb is military 'set opposite to, range in battle against' (LSJ, ad loc.), and πονηϱόν would fit this sense far better than ποθητόν. Jäger[19] was the first one who noted the incompatibility between ἀντιτάσσομαι and ποθητόν, and adduced the use of ἀντιπαϱετάττετο in Epicurus[20], and its translation by Cicero (*compensabatur*)[21]. Consequently, he proposed the following translation: 'non compensatur cum sapientia, quicquid habet terrarum orbis pretiosum ac splendidum'[22]. Unfortunately Epicurus's citation is not relevant in many respects: firstly the verb derives from παϱατάσσω, which can actually mean 'set side by side, compare' (LSJ, ad loc.), but is found usually in a military context; second, the prefix ἀντι- adds a contrasting nuance to the verb (cf. LSJ, ad loc.); finally Cicero's translation is literary but not literal, and one could interpret it instead as: 'The joy in the soul was facing all these [afflictions] because of the memory of the philosophy we have got'. A discussion of LSJ's entry is also needed. The *Greek-English Lexicon* at the very end of the lemma ἀντιτάσσω is citing our passage, and giving the gloss 'set against, compare'. First of all, the dictionary states that we have here a passive form. This *might* be the case only if we took for granted the variant reading ἀντιτάσσεται which, however, both Swete and Rahlfs relegated to the apparatus. As we shall see in more detail, it is difficult to downplay the combined witness offered by BS* to the future form ἀντιτάξεται. Moreover, since the three other stichs are in the present tense (ἐστιν is repeated thrice), the future assumes here the status of a *lectio difficilior*. Therefore, the verb in the second

---

19. Cf. *Observationes*, 29.

20. Cited by Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philosophorum* 10.22 (Long): 'Τὴν μακαϱίαν ἄγοντες καὶ ἅμα τελευταίαν ἡμέϱαν τοῦ βίου ἐγϱάφομεν ὑμῖν ταυτί. στϱαγγουϱικά τε παϱηκολούθει καὶ δυσεντεϱικὰ πάθη ὑπεϱβολὴν οὐκ ἀπολείποντα τοῦ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς μεγέθους. ἀντιπαϱετάττετο δὲ πᾶσι τούτοις τὸ κατὰ ψυχὴν χαῖϱον ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν γεγονότων ἡμῖν διαλογισμῶν μνήμῃ. σὺ δ' ἀξίως τῆς ἐκ μειϱακίου παϱαστάσεως πϱὸς ἐμὲ καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ἐπιμελοῦ τῶν παίδων Μητϱοδώϱου.'

21. *De finibus bonorum et malorum* 2.30.96 (Schiche): Audi, ne longe abeam moriens quid dicat Epicurus, ut intellegas facta eius cum dictis discrepare: 'Epicurus Hermarcho salutem. Cum ageremus', inquit, 'vitae beatum et eundem supremum diem, scribebamus haec. tanti autem aderant vesicae et torminum morbi, ut nihil ad eorum magnitudinem posset accedere'. Miserum hominem! Si dolor summum malum est, dici aliter non potest. sed audiamus ipsum: '*Compensabatur*', inquit, 'tamen cum his omnibus animi laetitia, quam capiebam memoria rationum inventorumque nostrorum. sed tu, ut dignum est tua erga me et philosophiam voluntate ab adolescentulo suscepta, fac ut Metrodori tueare liberos'.

22. *Observationes*, 29.

stich must be considered a middle, and οὐδὲν πονηρόν (or ποθητόν) has to be taken as the subject of a reflexive action. Since it is difficult that anything evil (or desired) may compare itself with something, the second gloss 'compare' seems to be inaccurate. Also, even in the passive sense, one would not understand why something evil should be compared with wisdom. Thus I think that the second gloss 'compare' can be acceptable only if the authors of the lexicon were reading: οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται αὐτῇ οὐδὲν ποθητόν ('nothing desired has been compared with her'). On the other hand the first gloss 'set against' makes sense with the following reading: οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται αὐτῇ οὐδὲν πονηρόν ('nothing evil is set against her'). However a middle form would fit far better the context so to understand: 'nothing evil sets itself against her', that is to say, by using a common meaning of the middle form, 'nothing evil is resisting her', which is exactly what the ancient translations understood[23]. I think it important also that in 8.11b חֵפֶץ, as stated above, is rendered rather literally with τίμιον, and that also in 31.13 – the last passage where the term occurs in Proverbs – εὔχρηστον is a good rendering for the phrase בְּחֵפֶץ. Therefore, in stich b, through the interpretational translation ἀντιτάξεται, the first translator would have produced a moralising contrast instead of translating a term (חֵפֶץ) which nonetheless he is evidently able to recognise elsewhere. Both the creation or accentuation of antithetical distichs[24], and the moralising emphasis[25] are typical translation techniques of the first translator. Thus, also from this point of view, Grabe's conjecture seems to be unlikely. Finally it has to be mentioned that Schleusner[26] suggested the conjecture πανῆρες. This word is derived from πᾶς and ἀρέσκω, and it is attested only in Hesychius's *Lexicon*[27]; its basic meaning would be

---

23. Lat[165] *contrasistit*; Lat[160] *resistit*; Arm Հակառակ կայցէ; Aeth ይትቃወም; Syh ܢܩܘܡ ܠܩܘܒܠܗ.

24. Tauberschmidt (*Secondary Parallelism*, 43-61) offers many examples of both types. Cf. also Gerleman (*Proverbs*, 18-22), and Cook (*Proverbs*, 313-314; and 'Contrasting as a Translation Technique', 403-414).

25. Cf. Giese ('Qualifying Wealth', 411), Cook ('Apocalyptic Terminology', 255-260), and particularly Dick ('Ethics', 20-50), especially at p. 26, where a number of instances are mentioned in which the concept of folly is rendered in a moralistic sense.

26. Cf. *Opuscula critica*, 270.

27. π 346: πανῆρες· πᾶσιν ἀρέσκον. ποικίλον. παμμήχανον (Schmidt).

'agreeable to all' (LSJ, ad loc.), or more likely 'obsequious to all'. Neither meaning fits our context, nor do the two other more problematic glosses given by Hesychius (ποικίλον, παμμήχανον). Schleusner seems to suggest a meaning as 'totally agreeable'. This makes us fall prey to the problems already faced when discussing ποθητόν: the conjecture is palaeographically unlikely (ⲡⲁⲚⲎⲢⲉⲤ > ⲡⲟⲚⲎⲢⲟⲚ), and does not match the meaning of ἀντιτάσσομαι. It is true, as Schleusner suggests, that it may be the infelicitous correction of an ignorant scribe. But since no glosses given by Hesychius really fit this context, I think it very unlikely that such a rare word could have been the original reading in our passage.

εὔγνωστος: 'well known; easy to discern' (LSJ, ad loc.), does not occur in the LXX except for Proverbs where it is found thrice. In 5.6 it is a free rendering of the verb יָדַע, in 26.26 it is an addition, and here, as we shall see more in detail, it might correspond to יָקָר, especially in the meaning 'easy to discern'.

ἐγγίζουσιν: it occurs just 4 times in Proverbs: in 5.8 it translates קָרַב, in 10.14 it is a free rendering of קָרוֹב, from the same root, in 19.7, a problematic verse in the MT[28] also, it has no equivalence, whereas here, by reworking Lagarde's suggestion, it could be an attempt at rendering the *ketiv* פְּנִיִּים as a qal participle deriving from פָּנָה; the preservation of the radical י is actually attested in a few cases[29]. The basic meaning of the verb פָּנָה 'to turn', would have been interpreted as 'to approach'.

ἄξιον: it occurs in Proverbs only twice, here and in the identical 8.11b. Along with the copula (ἐστιν), it is a rather free rendering of שָׁוָה ('to be even'). In the Three the word is found only in σ΄, twice (1Kgdm 26.16; 2Kgdm 12.5, the latter perhaps with α΄), to translate the phrase בֶּן־מָוֶת.

## 2.2.3. Text Critical Commentary

---

28. Cf. for instance Baumgartner (*Proverbes*, 174-176).
29. Cf. Joüon and Muraoka (*Grammar*, 189 [§79c]).

First of all, the omission of stichs b and c in Basil agrees with the obeli in the Syro-Hexapla[30]. But it does not say anything about the supposed insertion of stichs a and d. In ms. 125 the fall of the passage between the two αὐτῇ is due to homoioteleuton, and therefore is not relevant[31]. Only mss. 329 333 which lack the stich d corroborate the commentators' views. However we are dealing here with just a partial witness – since it does not affect the stich a also – and quite an isolated one. Actually, the two mss. both contain Procopius of Gaza's *Catena in Proverbs*, are kept in the same Athos monastery, and were copied within less than two centuries[32]. It is thus really likely that they are cognate.

In any case, in the whole tradition the omission of both the stich a and d is not found. Consequently Fritsch's hypothesis of an hexaplaric addition is not supported; instead, the stich a which is more literal, thus more debatable, is critically more unquestionable.

The future ἀντιτάξομαι (a more literal rendering of the Hebrew yiqtol) is witnessed by BS*, V Syh Arm, 248$^{mg}$ 336 728[33] Chrysostom, and by the Coptic versions, against the remaining Greek and Latin witnesses. It represents certainly the Hexaplaric reading, but it is difficult to state if here BS* represent the original text or a recension toward the Hebrew.

Mss. V 336 728 and 637 (the latter belongs to the Hexaplaric group in Ecclesiastes and to the Lucianic group in Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach[34]) are witnessing the variations which affect the participle ἐγγίζουσιν amidst the Hexaplaric tradition. By following the agreement between V and Syh we can assume that ἐφαπτομένοις had

---

30. In other words, Basil would have omitted stichs b and c because under obeli, or because he did not find them in his biblical text, which I consider far less likely. One has to remember also that stichs b and c do not fit the context, in which Basil is dealing with the special value of the wisdom. One wonders also why this citation is separated by the redactional insertion of καὶ τὸ from the previous one which corrisponds to the preceding verse 3.14.

31. Ms. 125 often shows this mistake: cf. the text critical commentary to 2.21 above, and to 15.6 below.

32. Cf. Rahlfs (*Verzeichnis*, 12).

33. Since this two mss. often agrees with the *Commentary to the Proverbs* of John Chrysostom, they could represent the Antiochian text, cf. Bady, *commentaire inédit*, 44-45.

34. Cf. Ziegler ('Ecclesiastes', 110; *Sapientia*, 57-60; *Sirach*, 64-69).

been inserted in the Hexaplaric text, and that ἐγγίζουσιν was a marginal reading. Therefore the Hexaplaric text should have run as follows:

τιμιωτέρα δέ ἐστιν λίθων πολυτελῶν,

÷ οὐκ ἀντιτάξεται αὐτῇ οὐδὲν πονηρόν·

÷ εὔγνωστός ἐστιν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐφαπτομένοις* αὐτῇ, ✓

πᾶν δὲ τίμιον οὐκ ἄξιον αὐτῆς ἐστιν.

* αλ´· ἐγγίζουσιν

The most interesting feature is the presence of a variant reading in the obelised text: in the absence of a Hebrew original, how did the variant originate, and why did Origen prefer ἐφαπτομένοις to ἐγγίζουσιν? The former ('to apply oneself to' with the dative of the thing [LSJ, ad loc.]) may be a better interpretation of the Hebrew *ketiv* בניה.

Even if Chrysostom here has ἐγγίζουσιν, we can still assume that the agreement of 336-728 and 637 on the reading ἀγαπῶσιν represents a Lucianic emendation to the Hexaplaric text. It may represent a banal variant which arose because of the two conflicting readings under obeli.

The accusative αὐτήν, witnessed by 390 534 732 and Chrysostom (336-728 637 read instead ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτήν) is just less appropriate than the dative (αὐτῇ) when the sentence lacks a second object.

The textual tradition of the stich c is further complicated by the reading *et eis qui considerant eam diligenter*, concordantly witnessed by Lat[165] and Augustin's *Contra Adimantum*. This interesting addition, peculiar to the Latin tradition, presupposes the existence of a different doublet in its Greek original. These kinds of doublets have to be ascribed to the Lucianic recension according to Fernández Marcos:

unlike Origen, for Lucian the Hebrew was not the ultimate criterium for the change. In all probability, Lucian did not use the Hebrew text but the Hexaplaric tradition, especially Symmachus, as a source for his corrections towards the Masoretic text. In any case, his aim was not an exact accommodation to the Hebrew at all. *The "Three" are also the source for a great deal of double readings typical of this recension. Due probably to respect towards tradition, Lucian did not erase the old readings but placed them side by side with the new ones, usually taken from the "Three" and reflecting a more accurate translation from the Hebrew*[35].

I am not sure if the doublet found in the Vetus Latina may fit the picture drawn by Fernández Marcos. Since the stich c is not found in the MT, this textual material cannot derive from the Three. One may wonder if *qui considerant eam diligenter* is an equivalence for ἀγαπῶσιν, although the rendering *qui diligunt* would be more suitable. The adverb *diligenter* is usually found for specifying *considero* (cf. *ThLL*, ad loc.) which in its turn, in the Latin biblical tradition, translates a number of roots among which we may cite κατανοέω, σκοπέω, ἐπισκέπτω, but neither ἀγαπάω, or ἐφάπτω (which is usually rendered by *tango* and cognate words). Therefore, if this Latin reading is not a gloss peculiar to the western tradition, it may well be the translation of a lost Greek original.

## 2.2.4. Conclusions

On the whole, there are no text critical evidences for maintaining that stichs a and d have been inserted by the Hexaplaric recension. I would just suggest that Origen, when facing this verse, thought as his modern successors that these stichs were rendering the

---

35. 'Antiochian Text', 225, my italics.

Hebrew literally enough, and put stichs b and c under obeli because he did not find any equivalence in the parent text. It may be stressed also that an insertion to correct the text is likely to be of the following types (in the following examples the capital letter means the inserted stich, and the minuscule the original line): AaBb, ABab, aAbB, abAB[36], and not as we have it here AbaB: one would need to explain why the original text would have been inverted, and why the insertion would have been split; otherwise, why would have the scribe responsible for the insertion decided to assemble a new text, when his assumed aim was to drive the Greek closer to his Hebrew?

Concerning the translation technique, I anticipated above my scepticism that it could stem from α´ and θ´. The rendering of פְּנִינִים with λίθων πολυτελῶν, of חֵפֶץ with τίμιον, and of the verb שָׁוָה with the phrase ἄξιον ... ἐστιν are all unattested in the Three, whereas, as I mentioned above, they are all found again in 8.11 and 31.10b.

In any case, even if stichs a and d are translated quite literally they are not rendered word-for-word. Indeed פְּנִינִים has its equivalent in the phrase λίθων πολυτελῶν, שָׁוָה in the phrase ἄξιον ... ἐστιν, whereas the phrase πᾶν δὲ τίμιον excludes the personal pronoun of the parent text, if there was one[37].

It seems to me that the most important fact about this verse is that we probably have a variant reading in Hebrew which stands as the main reason for the origin of the doublet. The Masoretic tradition is so monolithic that we barely find some variant readings in it. Here, however, we do have one which is likely to be the reason for the rise of the stich c, and for the variant reading ἐφαπτομένοις found in the Hexaplaric text. If that is really the case, it could substantiate the claim that even elsewhere, wherever the doublets are showing his translation technique, the first translator had access to an alternative reading which he did not want to eliminate. A second fascinating question arises: who is responsible for the variant reading which we find in

---

36. This is in fact the model which we observed in the previous section devoted to Prov. 2.21.
37. One Kennicot ms. has the reading חֲפָצִים, which is found also in 8.11.

the obelised section? As it will be observed in 15.6 also, he is producing a more literal version of the 'non-Masoretic' portion of the doublet.

A final remark on stich b is due. As I mentioned above, it has been proposed to regard it as a doublet of the second part of the parent text. In order to do this it has been repeated many times, after Grabe, to read ποθητόν instead of the attested πονηρόν. As I said I do not think that the verb ἀντιτάσσομαι can accommodate this emendation. Also, I am not so sure that ἀντιτάσσομαι may really represent an interpretation for שָׁוָה. Therefore I would prudently suggest to consider this stich as originating from the need to balance the addition of the line c by using a moralising theme so typical of this translator.

## Appendix 1. Other Textual Witnesses: Daughter Translations

Lat[160]

praeciosior enim est lapidibus preciosis. non resistit illi ullum malum.

Lat[165]

praetiosior est autem lapidibus optimis non contrasistit quiquam nequ.. nota est omnibus propinquantibu. sibi et eis qui considerant eam diligenter omne autem quod est praetiosum non est ea dignum

Arm

*Պատուականագոյն է նա քան զականս պատուականս.*

Եւ[38] ո՛չ իւնէ է չար որ Հակառակ կայցէ նմա:

Յայտնի է ամենեցուն որ մերձին ի նա.

Եւ ամենայն իւնէ որ պատուական է չարժէ զնա:

Նա] > M1500 | պատուականս] Սոփերա Hamam | չար] > Hamam² | կայցէ] կա Hamam¹; կացցէ Hamam² | ամենեցուն որ] ամենացուն որք Hamam | մերձին] մերձենան J1925 | ի] առ M1500 Zoh^mss

Aeth

ክብርት : ይእቲ : እምዕንቀኡ : ዘብዙኅ : ሤጡ ፤

ኢይትቃወማ : ምንትኒ : እኩይ ፤

ሥናይት : ሀገሪት :[39] ይእቲ : ለኩሎሙ : እለ : ይቀርብዋ ፤

ወኩሉ : ክብር : ኢመጠና ።

ሥናይት] ሥናይ : Abb55 | ኢመጠና] ኢኮነ : መጠና : Ts54; አኮ : መጠና : Abb55

Syh

---

38. The Armenian does not represent δὲ in the stich a, but adds this conjunction in the stich b. If that is not an independent stylistic improvement, it may render the δὲ found after ἀντιτάξεται in mss. 534 613.

39. This word means 'cives; familiaris, amicus' (Dillmann, ad loc.), and, together with the adjective ሥናይት : constitutes an Ethiopic peculiar rendering of εὔγνωστος.

40. In the Greek *Vorlage* there is no trace of the conjunction.

41. It may be interesting to note that the Syh translates the phrase ἄξιον ... ἐστιν with the same root we find in the Hebrew. The Pesh was using the synonymous root ܚܫܡ.

ܠܐ ܚܙܝܢܝ ‡

## Appendix 2. Other Textual Witnesses: Patristic Citations

Basilius Theologus, *Homilia in principium proverbiorum* (*PG* 31, 393)

*Καὶ ἡτοιμάσατο τὴν ἑαυτῆς τράπεζαν. Πάντα δι' ἐμφάσεως λέγει, διὰ τῶν σωματικῶν τὰ πνευματικὰ ἡμῖν παραδεικνύς. Τὴν γὰρ λογικὴν τροφὴν τῆς ψυχῆς τράπεζαν ὀνομάζει, πρὸς ἣν συγκαλεῖ μετὰ ὑψηλοῦ κηρύγματος, τουτέστι, μετὰ δογμάτων οὐδὲν ταπεινὸν οὐδὲ καταβεβλημένον ἐχόντων. Ὅς ἐστιν ἄφρων, ἐκκλινάτω πρός μέ. Ὡς γὰρ οἱ ἀσθενοῦντες χρήζουσιν ἰατρικῆς, οὕτω σοφίας οἱ ἄφρονες ἐπιδέονται. Καὶ τό· Κρεῖσσον γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐμπορεύεσθαι, ἢ χρυσίου καὶ ἀργυρίου θησαυρούς· καὶ τό· Τιμιωτέρα δέ ἐστι λίθων πολυτελῶν· πᾶν δὲ τίμιον οὐκ ἄξιον αὐτῆς ἐστι· καὶ τό· Υἱὲ, ἐὰν σοφὸς γένῃ σεαυτῷ, σοφὸς ἔσῃ καὶ τοῖς πλησίον σου· καὶ τό· Υἱῷ δὲ σοφῷ εὔοδοι ἔσονται πράξεις. Καὶ ὅλως ἔξεστί σοι γνῶναι τοῦ λόγου τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀναλεξαμένῳ κατὰ σχολὴν τὰ περὶ τῆς σοφίας εἰρημένα τῷ Σολομῶντι.*

Καὶ – τράπεζαν] Prov. 9.2c | Ὅς – μέ] Prov. 9.4a | Κρεῖσσον – θησαυρούς] Prov. 3.14 | Τιμιωτέρα – ἐστι 2°] Prov. 3.15a.d | Υἱὲ – πλησίον] Prov. 9.12a | δὲ – πράξεις] Prov. 13.13Ab

Aurelius Augustinus Hipponensis, *Contra Adimantum* XIX (Zycha 1891, 175-176)

et illud: *beatus uir, qui inuenit sapientiam, et inmortalis*[42]*, qui uidet prudentiam. melius est enim illam mercari quam auri et argenti thesauros; pretiosior est autem lapidibus optimis, non resistit illi ullum malum; bene nota est omnibus adpropinquantibus ei et*

---

42. In such a way all the Latin witnesses (cf. also Lat[160][165] PS-AU[spe]) translate the parent text θνητός.

*eis, qui considerant eam diligenter. omne autem pretiosum non est illi dignum.*

*beatus – dignum*] Prov. 3.13-15

**MT**

הֲלוֹא־יִתְעוּ חֹרְשֵׁי רָע וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת חֹרְשֵׁי טוֹב׃

**LXX**

πλανώμενοι τεκταίνουσι κακά,

ἔλεον δὲ καὶ ἀλήθειαν τεκταίνουσιν ἀγαθοί.

οὐκ ἐπίστανται ἔλεον καὶ πίστιν τέκτονες κακῶν,

ἐλεημοσύναι δὲ καὶ πίστεις παρὰ τέκτοσιν ἀγαθοῖς.

πλανώμενοι – ἀγαθοί] > Bodmer VI | πλανώμενοι] + αδικοι 253 106-130 46-631 103 109 125 139 147 157 252 261ᶜ 295 297 339 390 613 705 732 733 754 | ἔλεον – ἀγαθοί] *misericordes bonorum cogitatores sunt* Lat⁹⁴ Sa; + ⲚⲢⲉϥϫⲓϣⲟϫⲚⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲚϪⲓⲚϭⲟⲚⲤ̄ ⲥⲉⲠⲗⲁⲚⲁ ϨⲘⲠⲉⲨϣⲟϫⲚⲉ ⲉⲣⲉⲠⲚⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲘⲚ̄ⲦⲘⲉ Ⲛ̄ⲦⲉⲚ̄ⲢⲉϥⲢ̄ⲠⲉⲦⲚⲟⲨϥ Sa | ἀγαθοί] αγαθα 336 | οὐκ – ἀγαθοῖς] hab Pesh; sub ÷ Syh | πίστιν] κρισιν 106-130 SacPar; **ፍሕረት** (= ἐλεημοσύνην) Aeth | ἐλεημοσύναι Syh] ελεημοσυνη 336-728 613 Pesh Sa Ach Bodmer VI Lat⁹⁴ Arm Aeth | πίστεις Syh Arm] πιστις SA 253 106-130 336-728 103 311 613 Pesh Sa Ach Bodmer VI Aeth; πιστης V | ἀγαθοῖς] αγαθων 297 Lat⁹⁴ Arm

### 2.3.1. Introduction

Although the first scholar to have recognised a double translation in this verse was

Grabe[1], it was Wesseling[2] who first suggested that it arose from a reading יִדְעוּ in place of יִתְעוּ via confusion of the dentals. Jäger[3] completed this observation by adding that οὐκ derives from a reading לוֹא instead of הֲלוֹא and 'ἔλεον καὶ πίστιν non, ut Wesselingio placebat, e tertia versione insertum loco non suo, sed ab eodem interprete profectum videri, bis expressis verbis חסד ואמת, quod sine his e יִדְעוּ sensus nullus efficeretur'[4]. Lagarde[5] accepted Jäger's view, and proposed to envisage in the first two stichs a more recent translation, although one which is itself very old since it also differs from the MT. In his opinion the *Vorlage* of the first translator would have read as follows:

לֹא יָדְעוּ חֹרְשֵׁי רַע חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת. חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת חָרְשׁוּ טֹבִים

Baumgartner[6], Müller and Kautzsch[7], Mezzacasa[8], and recently Fox[9] have held similar views. As I shall show in the appendix to this chapter about the *Vorlage* of the LXX none of these reconstructions is totally convincing. Here I will only observe that חָרְשׁוּ is unlikely since it breaks the parallelism kept in the MT and in both the Greek distichs. Moreover it is not a literal rendering of the noun τέκτονες.

From a different perspective, Fritsch[10] noted that lines c and d are under obeli in the Syro-Hexaplar, which would suggest that stichs c and d are original, and that lines a and b are Hexaplaric, an idea supported by the use of the word πλανηθήσονται (the same

---

1. Grabe (*Septuaginta*, ad loc.) wrote in the margin to the 3rd stich: 'Duplex interpretatio'.
2. Cf. *Observationum*, 150-151.
3. Cf. *Observationes*, 107-108.
4. Jäger, *Observationes*, 107.
5. Cf. *Proverbien*, 47-48.
6. Cf. *Proverbes*, 139-140. Baumgartner merely quotes Lagarde's reconstruction.
7. Cf. *Proverbs*, 77: לא ידעו חרשי רע חסד ואמת  וחסד ואמת לחרשי טוב. The insertion of לְ before חרשי is probably meant to explain the presence of παρά in the translation.
8. Cf. *Proverbi*, 68, 148: [ה] לֹא יָדְעוּ חֹרְשֵׁי רָע וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת [וְיָדְעוּ] חֹרְשֵׁי טוֹב [וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת]. Mezzacasa's reconstruction tries to keep as close as possible to the MT, and conjectures an elliptical *Vorlage*.
9. *Proverbs*, 1003: *lw'* [or *hlw'*] *yd'w ḥršy r' ḥsd w'mt ḥršy ṭwb*.
10. 'Hexaplaric Signs', 174.

root of πλανώμενοι) for יִתְעוּ by both α´and θ´. More recently d'Hamonville[11] has observed that also ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθεια 'correspond aux équivalences presque systématiques des *Psaumes* et des "autres traducteurs"'. If we combine d'Hamonville's observation with Lagarde's suggestion, then we may infer that the first distich is an early doublet made up by a reviser close to the environment which produced Psalms or the καίγε recension. This would explain the lexical similarities observed by both Fritsch and d'Hamonville. In the following sections we shall verify this last hypothesis and Fritsch's alternative idea, that the asterisks dropped out in the course of manuscript transmission, and that lines a-b derives from the Hexaplaric versions. In addition, wider attention will be paid for the first time to the variant readings preserved only in Latin and Sahidic, which largely enhance the picture.

## 2.3.2. Lexical Analysis

Concerning the Hexaplaric versions, I have already mentioned that α´ (μήτι οὐ πλανηθήσονται) and θ´ (ἰδοὺ πλανηθήσονται) translations of הֲלוֹא־יִתְעוּ have come down to us. There is no reason to question these attributions: α´ translates הֲלוֹא (or הֲלֹא) with μήτι οὐ also in Judg. 4.14; Job 7.1; Amos 9.7 (twice, the first with σ´); Mic. 2.7 (alone according to ms. 86, with θ´ according to the Syro-Hexaplar); Zech. 3.2; Isa. 40.28; 51.9; Ezek. 13.7,12, whereas he renders תָּעָה with πλανάομαι also in Isa. 35.8 (with σ´θ´); 47.15 (with σ´θ´); Ezek. 44.10 (with θ´). θ´ translates הֲלוֹא (or הֲלֹא) with ἰδού for instance in Prov. 8.1 and in Dan. 2.31, and, in addition to the verses already mentioned in connection with α´, he elsewhere renders תָּעָה with πλανάομαι as, for example, in the line under asterisk in Prov. 7.25. We may, therefore, rule out α´ and θ´ for the authorship of lines a and b with confidence, and only the possibility of a provenance from σ´ needs to be examined.

---

11. *Proverbes*, 245.

For confirmation of d'Hamonville-Lagarde's proposal as a whole, we must review the translation technique of the Psalter, but I would immediately exclude the possibility that we are dealing here with the καίγε recension. As Lagarde already pointed out, this translation is quite far from the MT: הֲלוֹא is not rendered, the imperfect יִתְעוּ is translated with the participle πλανώμενοι, the nominal participle חֹרְשֵׁי is rendered with the present indicative τεκταίνουσι, the two conjunctions וְ are translated with δὲ καί[12], and the singulars רָע and טוֹב are rendered with the plurals κακά and ἀγαθοί.

Let us now examine the vocabulary employed in this verse.

πλανώμενοι: the verb is frequent in the LXX. In Proverbs it occurs 10 times: here and in 21.16 (where again the present participle mediopassive is found) it renders the qal of תָּעָה (as already in Gen. 21.14; 37.15; Exod. 23.4), whereas in 10.17 and in 12.26 it translates the hifil. The verb also occurs in 1.10 where it renders the piel of פָּתָה, in 16.10 where it translates מָעַל, in 28.10 where it renders the hifil of שָׁנָה, in 29.15 where it translates שָׁלַח, and in 9.12B and 13.9 which are both without correspondence in the MT. In Psalms πλανάω occurs 6 times (57.4; 94.10; 106.4; 106.40; 118.110; 118.176) always to translate תָּעָה. The 4 forms in the perfect qal are consistently translated with the passive aorist, whereas the only qal in a participial construction is rendered with the present (94.10), and the wayyiqtol hifil is translated with the active aorist (106.40). σ´ in Isa. 29.24 translates with πεπλανημένοι the participle qal of תָּעָה, in 35.8 renders the imperfect qal with πλανηθήσονται (with α´θ´), and in 47.15 translates the perfect qal (with α´θ´) with ἐπλανήθησαν. σ´ uses the active πλανάω to render the hifil from תָּעָה in Ps. 106.40; Isa. 19.13; Jer. 50.6 (with α´).

τεκταίνουσι: there are 13 occurrences of this verb in the LXX, 8 of them in Proverbs. In addition to this passage (twice), it is found in 3.29; 6.14,18; 12.20 to translate חָרַשׁ. In 26.24 it renders שִׁית, and in 11.27 it corresponds to שָׁחַר, but the

---

12. Concerning θ´, which is a member of the καίγε group, Gentry (*Asterisked Materials*, 366-371) points out that in the asterisked materials of the book of Job the conjunction וְ is translated 198 times by καί and only twice by δέ. Cf. also subsection 2.1.4. above, p. 145.

translator probably read חָרַשׁ[13] here as well. In Psalms the verb occurs only in 128.3 where the imperfect translates the perfect qal of חָרַשׁ which in its turn occurs only a second time, exactly in the same verse, as a participle, and it is translated with ἁμαρτωλός. In σ´ (with α´θ´), only once in Prov. 12.20, one finds τεκταινόντων, which renders the plural participle qal of חָרַשׁ (here the LXX translated with the participle singular mediopassive τεκταινομένου).

κακά: the term is obviously very frequent in the LXX. In Proverbs it occurs 91 times and in around 22 cases it renders, as here, רַע. In Psalms it occurs 33 times and it always translates רַע or רָעָה. In σ´ as well this correspondence is frequent, and is to be found, for instance, in Prov. 21.12 and in Ps. 35.5 (with α´θ´); 40.6; 53.7; 55.6 (with θ´); 96.10.

ἔλεον: this is very frequent, since the book of Genesis, elsewhere in the LXX to translate חֶסֶד, but is curiously rare in Proverbs, where it occurs in just two verses: twice here to render חֶסֶד (the second time only if one accepts the *Vorlage* suggested by the commentators), and in 3.16A, a verse without correspondence in the MT. In Psalms it occurs 124 times, and it always[14] translates חֶסֶד. In σ´ also it usually translates חֶסֶד, for instance in Prov. 3.3; Jon. 2.9, and passim in the Psalms, although also the translations χάρις (Ps. 24.6; 30.8; 39.11; 88.25) and ἐλεημοσύνη (Ps. 24.7) are found.

δὲ καί: this phrase is found in Proverbs 8 times, twice in this verse; it always occurs in the second member of a distich. In 6 occurrences (1.7d; 3.16Ab; 14.22b; 14.22d; 22.15b; 30.8b) it connects two nouns. It then occurs also in 6.3d and in 15.18b. In 5 cases it translates only one coordinate וְ, whereas in 14.22 two וְ are found in the MT. In 22.15 it renders the construct state, while verse 3.16A is an addition in comparison with the MT. In Psalms we find 4 times the phrase ἔτι δὲ καί; as noticed already by Barthélemy[15], it translates גַּם once (70.24), וְגַם once (8.8), and אַף twice (15.7,9).

---

13. For other similar examples cf. de Waard, 'Unusual Translation', 185-190.

14. Except 83.11; 108.21 (1st occurrence) where the translation is less literal.

15. *Devanciers*, 43.

Regarding σ´, one may notice that José R. Busto Saiz[16] records in the Psalms no occurrence of this phrase in order to translate וְ.

ἀλήθειαν: very frequent in the LXX, it occurs 8 times in Proverbs. Here and in 5 more cases (8.7; 11.18; 20.28; 22.21 [2nd occurrence of אֱמֶת]; 29.14) it translates אֱמֶת[17]. In 28.6 it renders תֹּם, and in 26.28 it translates the problematic דַּכָּיו[18]. In its turn אֱמֶת occurs 6 more times in the MT of Proverbs: in 12.19 it is translated with the adjective from the same root ἀληθινός, in 14.25 with the adjective πιστός, in 22.21 (1st occurrence) with the adjective from the same root ἀληθής, whereas the phrase חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת is rendered twice (3.3; 15.27A [= MT 16.6] – I leave aside for the moment 14.22c-d) ἐλεημοσύναι καὶ πίστεις, and once (in 20.28 already mentioned above) ἐλεημοσύνη καὶ ἀλήθεια. Finally 23.23 lacks in the LXX. In Psalms the word is found 59 times and in about 35 cases it translates אֱמֶת. In σ´ אֱמֶת is always rendered by ἀλήθεια.

ἀγαθοί: it is very frequent in the LXX. In Proverbs it usually translates, as here, טוֹב, but in Prov. 11.10 it translates the noun from the same root טוֹב, and in 24.26 it renders נָכֹחַ. It often occurs even without a precise equivalent. Likewise, in the Psalms it most commonly corresponds to טוֹב. The same is true for σ´, but it is interesting to note the free translation found in Prov. 21.17 where ἐνδεήσεται ἀγαθῶν renders אִישׁ מַחְסוֹר ('man of indigence').

ἐπίστανται: the verb is not particularly frequent in the LXX, and usually corresponds to יָדַע since the first occurrence in Gen. 47.5 (= MT 47.6). It is found in Proverbs 5 times: it translates יָדַע in 9.13; 29.7, but in 15.2 the phrase καλὰ ἐπίσταται renders freely תֵּיטִיב דָעַת. In 10.21 the verb corresponds to יִרְעוּ, certainly read ידעו[19]. As mentioned above, in the present verse also the commentators postulate a reading ידעו for the MT יִתְעוּ. The variant reading would have arisen due to an exchange of the

---

16. *Símaco*, 223–228.
17. This correspondence is found already in Gen. 24.27,48; 32.11; 47.29.
18. Literally 'its oppressed'. *BHS* (ad loc.) explains the reading found in the LXX (Peshitta, Targum, and Vulgate) by referring to the Aramaic word *dkj'*, '*purus*'.
19. Cf. already Wesseling, *Observationum*, 150.

dentals.

πίστιν: in the whole Pentateuch, the noun occurs only in Deut. 32.20, where, uniquely in the LXX, it renders אֵמֻן. It is not particularly frequent in the LXX, and it usually translates the cognate noun אֱמוּנָה, as in Prov. 12.17,22. In Proverbs it occurs 5 more times: in three cases (here in the 2nd occurrence and in 3.3; 15.27A [= MT 16.6]) the phrase in the plural form ἐλεημοσύναι (δὲ) καὶ πίστεις translates the phrase (וְ)חֶסֶד (וֶאֱמֶת). If Jäger's conjecture is right, the 1st occurrence also would be a translation of אֱמֶת, and a more literal one, since it keeps the singular form (πίστιν). Finally, the occurrence in 15.28 has no precise equivalent in the MT.

τέκτονες: the noun is not very frequent in the LXX. In Proverbs it occurs only here (twice), and it corresponds to the participle qal from חָרַשׁ. However, as we shall see better below, it is very likely that the first translator read the noun from the same root חָרָשֵׁי.

ἐλεημοσύναι: the noun is not particularly frequent in the LXX. In Proverbs it occurs 7 times (here, in verses 3.3; 15.27A; 20.28 mentioned above, and in 19.22; 21.21; 31.28) always to translate חֶסֶד. This same equivalence in the whole LXX is found only in Gen. 47.29.

### 2.3.3. Text Critical Commentary

The Greek textual tradition itself provides only limited insight into the recensional character of the first distich. The few interesting clues are all preserved in the versions. Of course, the obeli of the Syro-Hexaplar affirm what seems clear from the lexical analysis: the second distich stand further from the MT than the first one, and it is therefore more likely to be original. Commentators could only conjecture the later origin of the first distich, however, before textual support was lent to this hypothesis by the publication in 1960 of the papyrus *Bodmer* VI, which was dated by its editor at the

4th-5th century[20]. Corresponding to its textual type, its dialect combines Sahidic and Achmimic forms[21]. The value of the early date, however, is offset to some extent, by the inadequacies of the scribe who was responsible for it. Kasser remarks that the copyist 'transcrivait machinalement, semble-t-il, ce qu'il croyait voir, et n'en cherchait pas toujours la signification'[22]. We encounter numerous dittographies and haplographies[23], and often he 'avec une incroyable étourderie, donne à une foule de mots une orthographe qui en modifie le sens'[24]. Finally the copy finishes at 21.4a 'au sommet d'un page blanche'[25]. Despite all these inaccuracies, the publisher includes 14.22 among the few verses which attest a particular textual form 'et qui pourraît être autre chose qu'une négligence de scribe'[26]. Thus the absence of the first distich in the *Bodmer* papyrus should be considered carefully.

The problematic character of the first distich is indicated also by the aberrant text preserved by both the Sahidic and Lat[94]. The former, after translating quite literally line a[27], reads as follows:

ϩⲉⲛⲣⲉϥϫⲓϣⲟϫⲛⲉ ⲛⲙⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲏⲧ

which largely corresponds[28] to the text preserved by Lat[94]: *misericordes bonorum cogitatores sunt*. By following the Old Latin, which seems to preserve better the Greek word order, we might reconstruct the *Vorlage* as follows:

---

20. Cf. Kasser, *Bodmer*, XIII.
21. Cf. Kasser, *Bodmer*, XXVIII-XXIX.
22. Kasser, *Bodmer*, XV.
23. Cf. Kasser, *Bodmer*, XVI.
24. Kasser, *Bodmer*, XVII.
25. Kasser, *Bodmer*, XXIX.
26. Kasser, *Bodmer*, XXIX.
27. Unfortunately, line a is missing in Lat[94].
28. Another line preserved only by the Sahidic (Achmimic, and Bodmer VI) and Lat[94] is 8.31c which has been recently partially recognised in the Greek papyrus 928. Cf. Cuppi, 'Personal names', (forthcoming).

οἱ ἐλεήμονες βουλευόμενοι ἀγαθά

The verb βουλεύομαι can be considered a good choice for the retroversion since ⲭⲓϣⲟⲭⲛⲉ[29] is its usual Coptic equivalent, and because in Lat[166], the only Old Latin witness to 15.22, which is the only passage where βουλεύομαι occurs in Proverbs, one reads the verb *cogitare*, as here in Lat[94]. Actually, βουλεύω in the middle form, can mean 'determine with oneself, resolve, devise, meditate'. Concerning ἐλεήμων, ⲛⲁⲏⲧ is its equivalence in all the four occurrences (11.17; 19.11; 20.6; 28.22). The same happens for *misericors* in the two passages (19.11; 20.6) where the Old Latin is preserved.

This text, as we shall see more in detail in the appendix to this chapter, may indicate a different Hebrew *Vorlage*[30]. Moreover, the agreement between Lat[94] and the Sahidic on this translation of the second stich, strengthens the relevance and the reliability of a long addition attested only in the Sahidic version[31], which reads as follows:

ⲛⲣⲉϥⲭⲓϣⲟⲭⲛⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲭⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ̄ ⲥⲉⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ ϩⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩϣⲟⲭⲛⲉ

ⲉⲣⲉⲡⲛⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲟⲩϥ

This can be retroverted in Greek as follows:

οἱ δὲ βουλευόμενοι ἀδικίαν πλανῶνται ἐν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτῶν,

ἔλεος δὲ καὶ ἀλήθεια παρὰ τέκτοσιν ἀγαθοῖς.

---

29. Cf. Crum (*Coptic Dictionary*, ad loc.). The same root (ϣⲟⲭⲛⲉ) is employed in 15.22 which is the only occurrence where βουλεύομαι appears in Proverbs. The noun ϣⲟⲭⲛⲉ is also the equivalent for βουλή in all the 18 occurrences (apart from 9.10 where a different *Vorlage* can be envisaged).

30. Already Mezzacasa (*Proverbi*, 86-88) had envisaged a Hebrew original in some Sahidic doublets.

31. The Sahidic shows a number of additions in comparison to the Greek. In this verse the addition seems to be, at least in part, a further doublet.

I discussed above the terms connected to the root ϣⲟϫⲛⲉ. The verb πλανάω is the obvious original of the Greek loan word ⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ. As for ⲛ̄-ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ̄ it is a usual equivalent of ἀδικία[32], and it is employed also in three of the 5[33] passages where the latter is found in Proverbs (11.5; 15.29A; 28.16). Concerning ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲛ̄-ⲣⲉϥⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲟⲩϥ, whereas ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲛ̄- may well represent παρά[34], ⲣⲉϥⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲟⲩϥ means literally 'doer of good'[35] and may be the equivalent of τέκτοσιν ἀγαθοῖς, especially if one considers that the whole phrase is virtually identical to the one found at end of the last distich (ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲣⲉϥⲣ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲟⲩϥ) to translate παρὰ τέκτοσιν ἀγαθοῖς. What is quite striking here, is that this sentence seems once again to be based on a Hebrew original. We shall see in the appendix to this chapter what the *Vorlage* could have been.

Lastly, for the sake of clarity, it may be useful to write here in extenso the probable Greek *Vorlage* of the Sahidic:


πλανώμενοι τεκταίνουσι κακά,

οἱ ἐλεήμονες βουλευόμενοι ἀγαθά εἰσιν

οἱ δὲ βουλευόμενοι ἀδικίαν πλανῶνται ἐν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτῶν,

ἔλεος δὲ καὶ ἀλήθεια παρὰ τέκτοσιν ἀγαθοῖς.

οὐκ ἐπίστανται ἔλεον καὶ πίστιν τέκτονες κακῶν,

ἐλεημοσύνη δὲ καὶ πίστις παρὰ τέκτοσιν ἀγαθοῖς.


Let us now examine the other variant readings. The addition ἄδικοι seems to be explicative, and its later character is denounced by its presence only in a number of minuscule manuscripts, among which one recognises the group 106-130, ms. 253 (which in Ecclesiastes[36] belongs to the Hexaplaric group), and 613 which we have

---

32. Cf. Crum (*Coptic Dictionary*, ad loc.).

33. In 8.13 ⲛ̄ⲧⲕⲁⲕⲓⲁ shows a correction toward the Hebrew original רָע.

34. Cf. Crum (*Coptic Dictionary*, ad loc.).

35. Cf. Crum (*Coptic Dictionary*, ad loc.).

36. Cf. Ziegler, 'Ecclesiastes', 110

already seen in agreement with 106 and/or 260 and Chrysostom's text[37]. It is however striking that the cognate noun ἀδικίαν is probably witnessed by the Sahidic addition.

The variant ἀγαθά, the neuter instead of the masculine, witnessed by 336 alone (here without the support of its ally 728), should be considered a harmonisation to the antithetic neuter plural κακά, found in the first stich.

The variant κρίσιν, witnessed by the group 106-130 and the *Sacra parallela* for πίστιν, has no such simple an explanation, but it might be an attempt at *variatio*: πίστις is actually used also in the following verse. This possibility looks all the more likely if one considers that 106-130 often agree with Chrysostom's text[38], and may represent here the Antiochian recension. The Ethiopic attests ምሕረት which usually corresponds to ἐλεημοσύνην. Since the word occurs also in the 4th line the variant reading may have been caused by this second occurrence.

The variant ἐλεημοσύνη, in the singular, could be a *lectio facilior* or even a correction toward the Hebrew. It is witnessed by the group 336-728, and again by 613. All the versions also read the singular form, although this may well derive from linguistic variations in expression of the abstract sense[39].

The variant πίστις, in the singular, is witnessed first of all by the majuscules S and A, and then by nearly all the possibly Hexaplaric witnesses: the group 106-130, the group 336-728, by 253, and once again by 613. In addition, the Peshitta, Sahidic, Achmimic, *Bodmer* VI, and Ethiopic agree with these manuscripts. This reading may derive from the itacistic pronunciation, from the influence of the πίστιν in line c, or, more probably perhaps, from correction toward the Hebrew. The plural is certainly preferable for literary reasons, since it expresses the abstract meaning in idiomatic Greek. It also has the fundamental support of B. The Hexaplaric text, here represented by the Syro-Hexaplar and the Armenian, seems to have had the plural too, and this

---

37. Cf. Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 35-45.
38. Cf. Schildenberger, *Proverbien*, 35-45.
39. For instance the singular የይማኖት often corresponds to the plural πίστεις in Proverbs, cf. Dillmann (*Lexicon*, ad loc.).

might lead us to read also the itacistic spelling found in V (πίστης) also as a plural. However, if the singular witnessed by 106-130 253 336-728 613 in fact represents the 5th column of the Hexapla, then the Syro-Hexaplar and the Armenian would reflect the edition prepared by Pamphilus and Eusebius, and V's reading should in that case be interpreted as a singular.

Finally, the variant ἀγαθῶν, in place of the dative, is witnessed only by ms. 297, and although supported by Lat[94] and the Armenian, should be considered a *lectio facilior*[40], influenced by the genitive plural κακῶν at the end of the previous line.

### 2.3.4. Conclusions

Let us begin from the most certain elements. In the 4th stich the phrase ἐλεημοσύναι δὲ καὶ πίστεις is certainly original, both because the phrase, in this plural form, is found also in 3.3 and in 15.27A, in both cases to translate the singular חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת, and because the nexus δὲ καί is found 6 more times (setting aside the other occurrence in the first distich of this verse) always in the second member of a distich. We may observe also that, in three of these cases (1.7d; 3.16Ab; 30.8b) it is used to connect two abstract nouns, as here.

In the 3rd stich the Masoretic חֹרְשֵׁי רָע (participle: 'those who devise[41] evil') has been vocalised חָרָשֵׁי רָע (noun: 'artisans of evil') and literally rendered τέκτονες κακῶν. In Greek, the concrete noun τέκτονες has been used in a metaphorical way (evil is not really the usual product made up by 'artisans'), and the metaphor has been extended to the 4th stich where τέκτοσιν ἀγαθοῖς would naturally mean just 'good artisans' in itself, but in this context assumes clearly the sense of 'artificers of

---

40. Cf. also below the discussion in the conclusions.
41. It is quite difficult to convey in one English word all the meanings implied by חָרַשׁ ('to cut in, to devise, to plot').

goodness'. That meaning has been made explicit by ms. 297 (τέκτοσιν ἀγαθῶν), and by the Latin and Armenian versions. Since the peculiar use of τέκτονες definitely shows that the same translator was responsible for both the 3rd and the 4th lines[42], it follows that the second distich must have been authored by the first translator. His translation is not literal when using the plurals κακῶν, ἐλεημοσύναι, and πίστεις for the corresponding singulars in Hebrew. As is the case for the parallels already mentioned in 3.3 and 15.27A, there is no reason to look for a different *Vorlage*, and the translator is simply using idiomatic Greek. The situation might be different for ἀγαθοῖς, because this adjective, used in agreement with τέκτοσιν, gives a slightly awkward sense, as I have noted, and its use might be more understandable if the translator had felt obliged to use a plural by his *Vorlage*. As we shall see better below, the first distich too might have had a plural טוֹבִים in the *Vorlage*. Be that as it may, I would consider it virtually certain that the translator read ידעו for יתעו in his text. With such a reading the context requires that הֲלוֹא (*nonne?*) becomes לוֹא (*non*), and that וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת be interpreted as object of יָדְעוּ. It remains doubtful whether this last phenomenon is due to a dittography[43] or to ellipsis[44], although this second solution is more economic, therefore preferable. The translator may well have clarified the ellipsis by rephrasing through a *variatio* (ἐλεημοσύναι and πίστεις in the plural form, and ἐλεημοσύναι instead of ἔλεον) what he had more literally translated (ἔλεον καὶ πίστιν) in line c.

The lexical analysis has shown that the vocabulary of the 1st distich is more compatible with the first translator than with σ´: the latter is never found, at least in the Psalter[45], to use the phrase δὲ καί in order to translate וְ, whereas the first translator uses this nexus 7 more times. Moreover, even if it is virtually impossible to check whether

---

42. It has to be noted, in addition, that this use of παρά with the dative, without the verbal predicate, which implies 'to be, to be present, to be found' is unique in the whole translation of Proverbs.
43. Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 47.
44. Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 148.
45. Unfortunately there are no available concordances, for σ´ beside Psalms.

there are instances in which σ´ does not translate הֲלוֹא[46], we know for sure that he renders it twice in Amos 9.7: the first time (with α´) with μήτι οὐ, the second one with μὴ οὐχί. On the other hand, the original translator of Proverbs never translates the particle in the remaining four passages (8.1; 22.20; 24.12; 26.19) in which it is found in the MT. In addition, we have observed in the analysis of the verb πλανάω that σ´ renders participles with participles, imperfects with futures, and perfects with aorists. In this passage, instead, the imperfect יִתְעוּ is translated with the participle πλανώμενοι (in Isa. 35.8 σ´ translates it πλανηθήσονται), and, even though this may be less evidential, the participle חֹרְשֵׁי is rendered with the present τεκταίνουσι. Furthermore, as already observed for the second distich, also the plurals κακά and ἀγαθοί are themselves not literal renderings. Finally, it has now been shown that the first translator uses ἔλεος for חֶסֶד also in 14.22c (in addition, as already mentioned, to 3.16A). In conclusion, the clues against the authorship of σ´ are quite numerous and strong, and, on the whole, they prove it rather unlikely that σ´ was the author of this distich. Since we have already discounted α´ and θ´, Fritsch's proposal[47] cannot be maintained: no one of the Three can be regarded as the author of the distich. Origen was probably in the same position as modern commentators, and having observed merely that stichs a and b were closer to the Hebrew, and that stichs c and d therefore had no precise equivalent, he consequently marked them with obeli. The Hexaplaric text would have read as follows:

πλανώμενοι τεκταίνουσι κακά,

ἔλεον δὲ καὶ ἀλήθειαν τεκταίνουσιν ἀγαθοί.

÷ οὐκ ἐπίστανται ἔλεον καὶ πίστιν τέκτονες κακῶν,

÷ ἐλεημοσύναι δὲ καὶ πίστεις παρὰ τέκτοσιν ἀγαθοῖς. ∕

---

46. One would have to compare the 273 occurrences of the word with all the remaining material from σ´.

47. 'Hexaplaric Signs', 174: 'a and b, which are closer to the Hebrew, are accordingly Hexaplaric'.

The hypothesis of d'Hamonville-Lagarde[48] is also difficult to sustain. Of the 7 lexical items offered for comparison, three (κακά, ἀλήθειαν, ἀγαθοί) may be excluded since they represent in both Proverbs and Psalms more or less consistently the same Hebrew equivalents. Of the remaining 4, ἔλεον is the most impressive instance of an alignment between the first distich and the translation of Psalms, since in Psalms it occurs 124 times, always to translate חֶסֶד, whereas in Proverbs it appears only in two verses[49]. However, one has to take into account the usual consistency of the translation technique in Psalms as opposed to the usual inconsistency in Proverbs. In the final analysis, the original translator of Proverbs still employs ἔλεος for חֶסֶד in two occurrences, including the second distich of this verse: one can hardly deny, therefore, that the equivalence ἔλεος / חֶסֶד belongs to his dictionary. As for πλανώμενοι, Proverbs knows the equivalence but it does not use it consistently; Psalms is consistent as regards the lexical equivalence, but grammatical equivalence is important also, and it is not typical of the translator of Psalms to employ a participle to render an imperfect as is the case here. Regarding τεκταίνουσι, Psalms, as mentioned above, shows this equivalence only once, whereas the second occurrence of its Hebrew correspondent חָרַשׁ is rendered with ἁμαρτωλοί. Proverbs is, for once, rather more consistent using this equivalence 7 times out of 8. Concerning the nexus δὲ καί, it appears 7 more times in Proverbs, always to translate the conjunction וְ, whereas in Psalms it appears only four times, as ἔτι δὲ καί, and it is never used for the simple conjunction. It would be also relevant to note that the phrase חֶסֶד וֶאֶמֶת is consistently[50] translated ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθεια. Lastly, the particle הֲלֹא always has in the Psalter an equivalent (in 8 cases

---

48. The distich is not original but still ancient, and shows the same translational patterns of Psalms.

49. D'Hamonville (*Proverbes*, 177) casts some doubt on the authenticity of verse 3.16A because of the occurrence of the word ἔλεος. However, I have already shown that ἔλεος belongs to the original translation here in 14.22c. Moreover, the occurrence of the nexus δὲ καί in order to connect two nouns in the second stich of verse 3.16A renders quite likely its authenticity.

50. The simple phrase, without personal pronouns, occurs 5 times (25.10; 61.8; 85.11; 86.15; 89.15). Only in 86.15 it is governed by the adjective רַב and consequently translated with the adjectives πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινός.

out of 13 it is οὐχί[51]), while in Proverbs, as aforementioned, it never has an equivalent. In conclusion, the arguments to ascribe this distich to the same environment which produced Psalms are far from compelling, and, if this passage had been translated in that environment, it would probably have read as follows:

οὐχὶ πλανηθήσονται οἱ τεκταίνοντες κακά; ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθεια τεκταίνουσιν ἀγαθόν[52].

When it comes down to it, nothing here compels or attracts us to associate the first stich either with the Three or with any other suggested translation, while nothing, on the other hands, discourages or forbids a recognition here of the usual techniques employed by the first translator of Proverbs. The inaccuracies of *Bodmer* VI, such a very careless copy, mean that we can give weight to its omission of the distich as textual evidence only where there are grounds to distinguish that omission from the many others in the manuscript: with no such grounds in evidence, the reading cannot be considered relevant, and so we are left with no reason, translational or textual, to deny that the first stich was written by the original translator of Proverbs. Since his authorship of the second is not in question, the whole verse should be assigned to him.

If the first translator really is the author of both distichs, then what pushed him to translate the same Hebrew verse twice can only have been the existence of the variant reading ידעו alongside יתעו. The translator may have found it in another manuscript or in the margin. Since this variant implies also the reading לוֹא for הֲלוֹא, it seems to me reasonable to maintain that this text actually existed, in other words, that it is not merely the fruit of an interpretation technique which substituted the ד for the ת and then created a new text. It is also quite probable that the first translator had the variant

---

51. In the 6 occurrences (Ps. 14.4; 44.22; 53.5; 60.12; 108.12; 139.21) where, as here in Proverbs, הֲלוֹא is at the beginning of the sentence it is always translated οὐχί. An apparent exception is 85.7 where הֲלֹא has been read אֱלֹהַ and translated ὁ θεός.
52. Or possibly τὰ ἀγαθά, or χρηστότητα.

reading חָרְשׁוּ for חֹרְשֵׁי[53]. This very common graphical confusion between *yod* and *waw* represents the most plausible explanation for the renderings with τεκταίνουσι in the first distich. This change of the participle חֹרְשֵׁי with the 3rd plural indicative חָרְשׁוּ, would have caused the rendering of יִתְעוּ (itself an indicative) as a participle (πλανώμενοι), as required in idiomatic Greek[54].

It is interesting to observe that the translator, in order not to create an extremely repetitive text, made use of *variatio*, which may itself be indicative of common authorship here. He arranged the two translations of the second stich in a complementary way: in the first one (line b) וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת[55] is regarded as the object – so that טוֹב can be seen as the subject –, in the second one (line d) it is considered as the subject (of course, in both lines the plurals ἀγαθοί and ἀγαθοῖς are not compelled by the translation technique, and we may wonder whether the translator actually read the plural טוֹבִים in both passages – if so, then, it would be even more difficult to maintain with Lagarde that the first distich is closer to the MT). The translator had also to render thrice the phrase וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת, driving him to exhibit all his lexical tools, and, by including variation also between singulars and plurals, he succeeded in avoiding any repetitions apart from ἔλεον in the second and third line. Other variation is achieved by interpreting טוֹב (or more probably טוֹבִים) as the subject (ἀγαθοί) of its clause, distinct from κακά, which remains the object, and finally, as mentioned above, via the peculiar agreement of τέκτοσιν and ἀγαθοῖς and the insertion of παρά in the 4th stich, the translator managed to create a *variatio* also with τέκτονες κακῶν in the 3rd stich.

The principal value of this sophisticated, if not, perhaps, really attractive rewriting, is to credit the ἀγαθοί with all the four mentioned qualities: ἔλεος, ἀλήθεια,

---

53. This has been recently suggested also by Fox (*Proverbs*, 1003).

54. It has to be observed that the second distich proves here to be more literal in using the finite verb (ἐπίστανται), although it supposes the different *Vorlage* ידעו.

55. In Hebrew it is difficult to specify the grammatical function of וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת. According to the word order, the phrase hold the usual position of the subject, and חֹרְשֵׁי the usual position of the predicate nominal. On the other hand, if one considers the parallelism with the first member, חֹרְשֵׁי טוֹב may be regarded as the subject, and וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת as the predicate.

ἐλεημοσύνη, and πίστις.

## Appendix Concerning the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX

Despite Lagarde's statement that the first distich also departs from the MT, no commentator[56] has until now paid attention to the *Vorlage* witnessed by the first distich, but, we can establish that with some degree of probability, even if necessarily also with a certain amount of speculation. I have already mentioned that in the 2nd line the finite verb τεκταίνουσιν finds the most plausible explanation in a graphical exchange where the *yod* of חֹרְשֵׁי would have been transformed in a *waw*: חָרְשׁוּ. This very common scribal mistake – the characters are virtually indistinguishable in some hands – would in turn have generated the reading טוֹבִים, and consequently would have solved the aforementioned[57] grammatical difficulty concerning the logical function of וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת in the sentence: this phrase would have become the object of the verb חָרְשׁוּ, and טוֹבִים would have been its subject. In the same way in the first member, we should expect the parallelism to have been kept, and the verb τεκταίνουσι would suggest a *Vorlage* חָרְשׁוּ. As I said earlier, this change of the participle חֹרְשֵׁי with the 3rd plural indicative would explain the rendering of יִתְעוּ as a participle (πλανώμενοι), as required by idiomatic Greek. Finally, we have already seen that the translator in no occurrence renders הֲלוֹא.

Consequently the *Vorlage* of the first distich should have been as follows:

הֲלוֹא יִתְעוּ? חָרְשׁוּ רָע. וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת חָרְשׁוּ טוֹבִים:

---

56. With the partial exception of Fox, cf. fn. 53 above.
57. Cf. fn. 55 above.

*Nonne errabunt? fabricarunt malum. Misericordiam autem et veritatem fabricarunt boni.*

The guess that the translator read the plural טוֹבִים is made stronger by the presence of the plural ἀγαθοῖς in the second distich, which is in grammatical agreement with τέκτοσιν. The *Vorlage* of the 2nd distich should have been as follows:

<div dir="rtl">

לוֹא יָדְעוּ חָרָשֵׁי רָע. וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת חָרָשֵׁי טוֹבִים:

</div>

*Non sciunt artifices mali. Misericordia autem et veritas artifices bonorum.*

The LXX translator would have felt the need to specify the object of יָדְעוּ, and would have done it by repeating חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת. He would have also preferred, in order to create a *variatio*, to render טוֹבִים as if it were the adjective of חָרָשֵׁי, and compose the difficult phrase παρὰ τεκτόσιν ἀγαθοῖς which, as we have seen, was amended by ms. 297 and by the Latin and Armenian versions.

As it may be clearer now, the *Vorlage* supposed by the first Greek distich shows the variant readings חָרָשׁוּ (twice) and טוֹבִים. On the other hand, the *Vorlage* supposed by the second Greek distich present the variant readings יָדְעוּ and probably anew טוֹבִים. Against Lagarde's judgement, it is therefore debatable that the first distich is closer to the MT.

It has also to be stressed that no attention has ever been paid to the implications of the Old Latin and especially Sahidic texts. I have anticipated that the text preserved by Lat[94] and the Sahidic seems to stem from a Hebrew original. The retroversion into Greek which I have suggested run as follows:

οἱ ἐλεήμονες βουλευόμενοι ἀγαθά

This seems to suggest the following *Vorlage*:

חֲסִידִים חֹרְשֵׁי טוֹבִים

The disappearance of וֶאֱמֶת is quite striking, and we may well wonder if this is in some way connected with the appearance of the ending ־ים after חסד. However a graphic explanation is not fully convincing, and, as it will be suggested below, the origin of this reading is more probably to be ascribed to a theological intention. The translation of חֹרְשֵׁי with βουλευόμενοι (i.e. *cogitatores*, ϩⲉⲛ-ⲣⲉϥϫⲓϣⲟϫⲛⲉ) is more neutral and solves the asperity which the use of τεκταίνω rises[58]. Finally once again we find a plural in place of the singular טוֹב.

A few words need to be said also about the Sahidic addition. I have already suggested that this can be retroverted into Greek as follows:

οἱ δὲ βουλευόμενοι ἀδικίαν πλανῶνται ἐν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτῶν,

ἔλεος δὲ καὶ ἀλήθεια παρὰ τέκτοσιν ἀγαθοῖς.

As said above, this also seems to be underlaid with a Hebrew *Vorlage*. The participle βουλευόμενοι (i.e. ⲛ̄-ⲣⲉϥϫⲓϣⲟϫⲛⲉ), as I just noted, is a more neutral choice in comparison with τεκταίνω and creates an etymological allusion to the following βουλῇ. Its Hebrew equivalent is certainly חֹרְשֵׁי. The conjunction δὲ might have been employed only in order to connect this second distich with the first one. Therefore it could be not present in the *Vorlage*. The noun ἀδικίαν (i.e. ⲛ̄-ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ̄) must correspond to רָע as it happens in Prov. 8.13. The main verb πλανῶνται (i.e. ⲥⲉ-ⲡⲗⲁⲛⲁ)

_____

58. As noted above, both τεκταίνω and חָרַשׁ are more idiomatic to the concept of evil than the one of good.

is finally the literal translation, which we did not find in Greek, of יִתְעוּ. But the most interesting issue is the phrase ἐν τῇ βουλῇ αὐτῶν (i.e. ϩⲙ-ⲡⲉⲩ-ϭⲟϫⲛⲉ). In Proverbs βουλή usually corresponds to עֵצָה and other words from the same root. However, in 31.4, for instance, where we have another doublet, it corresponds to מלכים in the Aramaic sense of 'counsel'. In my view here רע has been read as the extremely rare[59], and again Aramaising, רֵעַ and put as the indirect object of יִתְעוּ. In other words, we have here a double translation in the double translation. Yet, once again הֲלוֹא is not translated. As for the second stich, we have a 4th different attempt to translate וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת, here rendered with ἔλεος and ἀλήθεια, in the singular and as a subject. Again we have the nexus δὲ καί, and again we have the plural ἀγαθοῖς which is a further hint for the presence of טוֹבִים in an early *Vorlage*. From these features, there can be little doubt that the original translator is responsible also for this third distich. The reasons for creating another translation are basically the possibility of reading רע as רֵעַ, and the vocalisation of חרשי as the participle חֹרְשֵׁי in the first stich. In the second line, once again, some *variatio* has been used: the phrase וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת has been considered as a subject, and ἀλήθεια has been preferred for אֱמֶת. Thus, this line constitutes as a medium between line b and line d of the Greek. Its *Vorlage* should have read as follows:


הֲלוֹא יִתְעוּ חֹרְשֵׁי רָע[60]. וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת חָרְשֵׁי טוֹבִים


On the whole, these two further doublets witnessed mainly by the Sahidic present three variant readings: חֲסִידִים in place of וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת; the different vocalisation רֵעַ alongside רָע; once again, twice, טוֹבִים for טוֹב. It is striking that in four occurrences we always read the plural: this makes even stronger the impression that at an early date the available *Vorlage* read the plural.

---

59. It is attested only in Ps. 139.2,17. The meaning seem to be 'thought' (cf. *HALOT* ad loc.). But cf. also Gesenius (*Lexicon manuale*, ad loc.) 'cogitatio, voluntas'.

60. *Varia lectio*: רֵעַ. I do not think that it is necessary to postulate a reading as such: יִתְעוּ בְּרָעֵהֶם.

The recognition that the doublets preserved in Sahidic may find a coherent explanation as variant readings originally existing in Hebrew, raises a number of questions which will be dealt with in the main conclusions. For the moment, I would just content myself with stressing that, at least as far as the Sahidic addition is concerned, it seems that we are dealing with the usual translation technique of the first translator. Was then this addition expunged? Was instead a marginal note, a different translation attempt in the authorial manuscript which was inserted in the text by a later scribe?

Lastly, a few observations concerning the original text are due. In my opinion טוֹב is earlier than טוֹבִים because of the parallelism with the singular רָע, which seems original[61], and also because טוֹבִים may have been caused at first by the change from חֹרְשֵׁי to חָרְשׁוּ. Actually חָרְשׁוּ should be regarded as later because of the inappropriate syntactical location after יִתְעוּ in the first stich. As for the readings הֲלוֹא יִתְעוּ and לוֹא יֵדְעוּ, the latter seems to be the *lectio facilior* because both the particle לֹא and the verb יָדַע are by far more common than הֲלוֹא and תָּעָה. As I suggested above, רֵעַ seems to be only a different reading option which the translator exploited by giving an indirect object to יִתְעוּ. Especially for the sake of parallelism, it does not seem possible that רע was originally put after יִתְעוּ. Likewise it does not seem likely that רע could have been used twice in the original text, especially because תָּעָה is not a transitive verb in the qal form, and the *Vorlage* would have required something like בְּרֵעֲהֶם.

It is rather more complicated to make a decision about the readings וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת and חֲסִידִים. On the one hand the former is much better attested, but, as already noted[62], it raises the difficulty that it holds the habitual position of the subject even if this is against the parallelism with the first member of the verse (where חֹרְשֵׁי is rather the subject). One also need to understand the abstract nouns וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת as if they metaphorically

---

61. There is no reason to assume from the renderings κακά (line a) and κακῶν (line c) that the *Vorlage* had a plural: we have already seen (ἐλεημοσύναι, πίστεις) that the translator is able to use the plural for abstract concepts, as it is correct in idiomatic Greek. This would be confirmed by ⲛ̄-ϫⲓⲛϭⲟⲛⲥ̄ (ἀδικίαν) in the Sahidic addition.

62. Cf. fn. 55 above.

refer to persons since only human beings can 'devise good'. On the other hand, the reading חֲסִידִים, even if envisaged only by Lat[94] and the Sahidic, solves all these difficulties, and gives perfect sense in the contest. The word חָסִיד is attested once in Prov. 2.8. Therefore the reading וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת appears as the *lectio difficilior* and the variant חֲסִידִים might have been introduced in order to solve the aforementioned difficulties. However, one wonders if וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת has to be regarded as a theological phrase which replaces the more obvious reading חֲסִידִים: this kind of phenomenon has to be observed in 31.30[63]. The replacement might have been conditioned, for instance, by an inner (or anti)-pharisaic polemic.

Therefore the original text seems to be close to the MT. However the vocalisation of חרשי as a participle creates the difficulty that one does not technically 'machinate good'. This can be solved if one reads with the LXX the noun חָרָשֵׁי which only means 'artificer' and can be apt to both good and evil. The reading חֲסִידִים also seems to solve some difficulties. Thus, even if the MT shows in these two instances two *lectiones difficiliores*, the original text may have read as follows:

הֲלוֹא יִתְעוּ חָרָשֵׁי רָע. וַחֲסִדִים חָרָשֵׁי טוֹב

*Nonne errabunt artifices mali? Misericordes autem artifices boni.*

---

63. Cf. section 1.1 above, where Rüger observes that אִשָּׁה נְבוּנָה has been substituted by the *lectio difficilior* אִשָּׁה יִרְאַת־יהוה.

## MT

בֵּית צַדִּיק חֹסֶן רָב וּבִתְבוּאַת רָשָׁע נֶעְכָּרֶת׃

In the second member of this verse, the MT presents an anacoluthon: the clause lacks a subject because the feminine participle niphal נֶעְכָּרֶת cannot be governed by the feminine noun וּבִ(תְבוּאַת). Hence, *BHS*[1] suggests to read with a few manuscripts, Peshitta, and Targum וּתְבוּאַת. Gesenius[2] proposed instead to regard נֶעְכָּרֶת as a neuter (*conturbatum*) so to interpret it as an abstract noun (*conturbatio*, *perturbatio*).

## LXX

ἐν πλεοναζούσῃ δικαιοσύνῃ ἰσχὺς πολλή,
οἱ δὲ ἀσεβεῖς ὁλόρριζοι ἐκ γῆς ὀλοῦνται.
οἴκοις δικαίων ἰσχὺς πολλή,
καρποὶ δὲ ἀσεβῶν ἀπολοῦνται.

ἐν – ὀλοῦνται] sub ÷ Syh | ἐν – πολλή 1°] hab Vulg^mss | οἱ – πολλή] > 125 390 631 | οἱ – ὀλοῦνται Lat[94] Arm Aeth Syh^mg] λογισμοι δε ασεβων εκριζωθησονται V 336-728 248^mg 613 637 Syh^txt Vulg^mss; + λογισμοι δε ασεβων εκριζωθησονται ⲙⲚⲚⲉⲨⲚⲞⲨⲚⲉ (= ὁλόρριζοι? cf. Syh Lat[94]) Sa Ach BodVI | ὀλοῦνται (Aeth)] απολουνται BS* 534; εκριζωθησονται Aeth^mss | οἴκοις – ἀπολοῦνται Aeth^edit] > S* 103 297 339 360 Aeth^mss

---

1. Ad loc.
2. Cf. *Lexicon manuale*, ad loc.

Ι οἴκοις Sa Ach BodVI (Arm) Syh] οικος 139 147 336-728 338 SacPar Ι ἀπολοῦνται Sa Ach BodVI Arm Syh] απολλυνται 46-631 (απωλυ- 109) 125 139 (-ολυ- 147) 157 732 733; ολουνται 252; ολλυνται 705

## 2.4.1. Introduction

Grabe was the first one who noticed that a double translation[3] occurs in this verse. After him, Jäger[4] proposed to explain πλεοναζούσῃ with the reading ברבות[5] – a word attested in 29.2,16 – instead of בֵּית. Lagarde was the first who noticed that among the variant readings a further doublet is attested for line b, and suggested that both ἐκριζωθήσονται and ὁλόρριζοι ὀλοῦνται may be connected to the root עקר[6]. He also ascribed the first distich to the original translator[7], and the second distich and the doublet for line b to two different revisers. Mezzacasa[8] completed this assertion by suggesting to identify lines c and d as Hexaplaric fragments, a judgement which was repeated by Fritsch who added the observation that lines a and b are under obelus[9].

## 2.4.2. Lexical Analysis

πλεοναζούσῃ: the verb is not frequent in the LXX, and in Proverbs it occurs only

---

3. Grabe (*Septuaginta*, ad loc.) wrote in the margin to the third stich: 'Alia interpretatio'.
4. Cf. *Observationes*, 111.
5. While accepting this explanation, Fox (*Proverbs*, 1006) has interestingly observed that 'In fact, *brbt* could more easily be a permutation of *bbyt* (*yod* to *reš*, with metathesis). Heb *bbyt* "in the house" is probably the correct reading'.
6. Cf. *Proverbien*, 49-50. Lagarde refers specifically to the Syriac form ܥܩܪ.
7. The same judgement was later repeated by Baumgartner (*Proverbes*, 144), Toy (*Proverbs*, 305), Müller and Kautzsch (*Proverbs*, 78), and d'Hamonville (*Proverbes*, 248).
8. Cf. *Proverbi*, 150.
9. Cf. 'Hexaplaric Signs', 175: 'In SH, a and b with obelus = OG. c and d, which are closer to Hebrew, are accordingly Hexaplaric.'

here, where a precise equivalent is lacking. As aforementioned, Jäger[10] suggested that בֵּית had been read בְּרְבוֹת ('in the augmenting'). The conjecture does not seem really probable not only on a palaeographical basis, but also because in 29.16 the similar phrase בְּרְבוֹת רְשָׁעִים has been translated in quite a different way by πολλῶν ὄντων ἀσεβῶν (whereas in Prov. 29.2 the nearly identical phrase בְּרְבוֹת צַדִּיקִים has been read differently[11]). In the four occurrences (4.10; 13.11; 28.8; 28.28) in which the verb רָבָה is rendered literally, it is always translated by πληθύνω. In the remaining instances (6.35; 9.11; 22.16; 25.27) it is consistently translated by using the adjective πολύς. More cautiously Mezzacasa proposed that 'forse la stessa parola del testo בית che altrove (8, 2; Eccli. 42, 12) è resa per ἀνὰ μέσον[12] poté essere tirata a questo senso affine'[13]. However, a further hypothesis seems more convenient: since, as will be seen in detail below, חֹסֶן ('stocks, *abundance*, treasure') has been read as חָסֹן ('strong') and therefore translated ἰσχύς, it is possible that the other vocalisation has been taken into account[14] and rendered by πλεοναζούσῃ[15].

δικαιοσύνη: very frequent in the LXX, the term occurs 35 times in Proverbs, where it translates a dozen times צְדָקָה, five times (1.3; 2.9; 8.8; 8.15; 25.5) the word from the same root צֶדֶק, and five times (beside the present passage, in 2.20; 11.21; 11.30; 20.7) the term from the same root צַדִּיק: this last equivalence is found only in Proverbs in the whole LXX. When compared with this freedom by the translator, Lagarde's conjecture[16]

---

10. Cf. *Observationes*, 111. He was followed by Lagarde (*Proverbien*, 49), who proposed the unattested בְּרְבֹת, Baumgartner (*Proverbes*, 144), and LEH (ad loc.).

11. According to Jäger (*Observationes*, 209), followed by Lagarde (*Proverbien*, 89), the translation ἐγκωμιαζομένων δικαίων suggests that בְּרְבוֹת has been read בְּבְרְכֹת.

12. More accurately in Sir. 42.12 the text reads ἐν μέσῳ.

13. *Proverbi*, 150.

14. A similar case has been noted, for instance, by de Waard ('Unusual Translation', 191) in Prov. 22.18 where the consonantal text יחדו has been rendered twice: the readings יַחְדָּו and יַחְדוּ seem to justify at best the translation εὐφρανοῦσίν... ἄμα. A similar case may have originated the doublet attested in Sahidic in Prov. 14.22, cf. section 2.3 above.

15. The rendering with the active participle suggests that חֹסֶן (a noun in the MT) has been read as the qal participle from חָסַן ('abounding') of which only the niphal imperfect is attested in Isa. 23.18, where it means 'to be stored up' (*HALOT*, ad loc.). Cf. Joüon and Muraoka (*Grammar*, 136-137 [§50d]) who mention a number of verbs of which only the participle is attested in the qal form.

16. Cf. *Proverbien*, 49, followed by Baumgartner (*Proverbes*, 144).

according to which the Greek read צֶדֶק instead of צַדִּיק does not seem necessary.

ἰσχύς: the adjective, frequent in the LXX, occurs 10 times in Proverbs. In three cases (14.26; 18.10; 31.26 [= MT 31.25]) it corresponds to עֹז, and in 30.25 to the adjective from the same root עָז. In 5.10 and 14.4 it translates כֹּחַ; in 8.14 it translates גְּבוּרָה; in the present passage (twice) and in 27.24 it corresponds to חֹסֶן. As for this correspondence, the first problem is that חֹסֶן, as aforementioned, means 'stocks, abundance, treasure'; the word is rare in the MT: it occurs only in these two passages in Proverbs, and in Isa. 33.6; Jer. 20.5; Ezek. 22.25. From the renderings, one argues that the translator of Proverbs in both cases read חָסֹן ('strong'). This word is even rarer (it occurs in the MT only in Isa. 1.31 and Amos 2.9) and must have been rendered as a noun because of the proximity with the adjective רָב[17]. The second problem is that in 27.24 חסן is also translated twice, by ἰσχύς and κράτος. The latter occurs only in this passage in the book of Proverbs, and cannot be compared with the Hexaplaric recension since, unfortunately, no translation from the Three is left for חָסֹן, nor we do have α´ and θ´ for חֹסֶן. However, we do know that σ´ translates חֹסֶן with πλοῦτος in Isa. 33.6 and with ὑπόστασις in Jer. 20.5 (where the LXX reads again ἰσχύς). Moreover, in Ezek. 22.25 an anonymous translation renders חֹסֶן with πλοῦτος. Also, it has to be recalled that the Three usually confirm the masoretic vocalisation; hence one would expect them to read in Prov. 27.24 חֹסֶן rather than חָסֹן. As Baumgartner states: 'חסן est rendu par deux mots, κράτος καὶ ἰσχύς; les exemples de traduction double d'un même mot sont, on l'a déjà remarqué, très fréquents dans le grec des Prov.'[18]. In consequence of this, I would not doubt that this double translation stems from the original translator. The rendering with κράτος may be influenced by the contemporary Aramaic: in Dan. 2.37; 4.27 the cognate Aramaic word חִסְנָא assumes the meaning 'might'[19]. The occurrence of ἰσχύς in line c also will be further discussed in the

---

17. Accordingly, the masoretic vocalisation (deverbal noun) offers a better sense than the adjectival vocalisation of the Greek translation.

18. *Proverbes*, 231.

19. Cf. *HALOT*, ad loc. Accordingly, θ´ renders the word with κράτους in Dan. 4.27 (but with ἰσχύν in 2.37). However, the early LXX translation prefers ἰσχυράν (2.37) and ἰσχύος (4.27), whereas κραταιάν

conclusions.

πολλή: the term is very frequent in the LXX, and it often translates, as in this passage, רָב. This equivalence is the most frequent one in the Hexaplaric versions also.

ἀσεβεῖς: the term is often employed in the LXX, especially in the book of Job. In Proverbs it is extremely frequent and it mostly translates, as in the present passage, רָשָׁע. This equivalence is also quite common in the Three.

ὁλόρριζοι: the term occurs only here and in Job 4.7. In both passages it lacks a precise Hebrew equivalent: in Job 4.7 it is clearly an explicative addition[20]. In the present verse, Lagarde[21] explains the phrase ὁλόρριζοι ὁλοῦνται with the root עָקַר[22] ('to root up') which replaces עָכַר via the exchange of the voiceless velar with its emphatic counterpart.

γῆς: the word is very frequent in the LXX, and occurs 24 times in Proverbs. In most of the cases it translates אֶרֶץ, but in two occurrences (12.11; 28.19) it corresponds to אֲדָמָה. In the present passage it seems to be without any correspondent in the MT. Lagarde conjectures that the original translator have read וּמִתֵּבֵל ('and from the world'), a corruption which would have originated from וּבְתְבָאֽ[23]. However, in Proverbs the phrase ἐκ γῆς ὁλοῦνται occurs also in 2.22 (in this context the ἀσεβεῖς again are found), where it translates literally מֵאֶרֶץ יִכָּרֵתוּ ('they will be cut off from the land'). This evidence, together with the fact that γῆ in Proverbs never translates תֵּבֵל, and with the highly conjectural degree of Lagarde's palaeographic proposal, suggests that ἐκ γῆς is merely an explication of ὁλόρριζοι ὁλοῦνται which probably aims to reiterate the phrase already used in 2.22[24].

---

(2.37) and κράτει (4.27) are employed for the root תקף.

20. The phrase וְאֵיפֹה יְשָׁרִים נִכְחָדוּ is translated with ἢ πότε ἀληθινοὶ ὁλόρριζοι ἀπώλοντο. Only ὁλόρριζοι lacks a precise equivalent: in this context it strengthen the value of ἀπώλοντο by making it closer to the Hebrew verb, which means 'to be effaced' (*HALOT*, ad loc.).

21. Cf. *Proverbien*, 49.

22. Baumgartner (*Proverbes*, 144) suggests the (unattested) vocalised form יְעָקְרוּ.

23. Cf. Lagarde (*Proverbien*, 49), followed by Müller and Kautzsch (*Proverbs*, 78). However, this spelling, lacking the second radical, is not attested. Baumgartner (*Proverbes*, 144) more prudently, but even less likely, suggests that the corruption depends instead on the masoretic reading בִּתְבוּאַת.

24. It has been already observed that the translator renders freely a line by making it identical to another

ὀλοῦνται: the verb occurs only 23 times in the LXX: four times in Job (4.11; 18.11; 20.10; 34.17, all stemming from the original translator), 8 times in Jeremiah[25], and 10 times in Proverbs of which four (9.18; 13.2; 16.2; 25.19) are without a precise equivalent in the MT. In four occurrences (1.32; 10.28; 11.7 [twice]) it translates אָבַד; finally in 2.22, as aforementioned, it translates כָּרַת. Accordingly, Jäger[26] supposes for the present passage that נֶעְכָּרֶת had been read נִכְרָת ('it was cut off, it was eliminated'). This proposal is based on the phonetic weakness of the voiced guttural ע, and may be valid as Lagarde's exchange of the velars (עָכַר > עָקַר). Possibly, once again, both solution have to be accepted, and we face here another double translation in which the masoretic נֶעְכָּרֶת has been read נִכְרָת and translated ὀλοῦνται as in 2.22, and in the meanwhile it has also been connected to the root עקר[27] and rendered ὀλόρριζοι, which builds a nice antithesis with καρποί in the 4th line. As aforesaid, ἐκ γῆς would be an explanation of ὀλόρριζοι which strengthen the connection with verse 2.22, while בִּתְבוּאַת is left untranslated in this first distich.

οἴκοις: the term is very frequent in the whole LXX, and translates nearly always (always in Proverbs) בַּיִת. Also in α´ in all the passages, in σ´ in the Psalter and in Proverbs (apart from 11.17 where it corresponds to שְׁאֵר), and in θ´ in Proverbs (11.29; 15.27; 21.9; 27.27) it always translates בַּיִת.

δικαίων: the adjective is frequent in the LXX, and very frequent in Proverbs where it often translates, as in the present passage, צַדִּיק. In α´ (in all the occurrences but Prov. 16.11 where it renders מִשְׁפָּט), in σ´ in the Psalter and in Proverbs, and in θ´ in Proverbs it always translates[28] צַדִּיק.

---

one in Prov. 31.10b, which has been made equal to 3.15a. Cook (*Proverbs*, 262) too has noted the same technique in the addition found in 9.10A (cf. 13.15).

25. The occurrence in Jer. 10.20, witnessed by all the manuscripts, under obelus, is moved by Ziegler (*Jeremias*, ad loc.) to the apparatus.

26. Cf. *Observationes*, 111. Jäger was reading ἀπολοῦνται instead of ὀλοῦνται. Thus he was only able to refer to Prov. 11.17; 15.27 where עָכַר is rendered by ἐξόλλυμι. This hypothesis is also mentioned by Lagarde (*Proverbien*, 49), Toy (*Proverbs*, 309), and Müller and Kautzsch (*Proverbs*, 78).

27. It has to be stressed, once again, that this root is rare in biblical Hebrew, and that the meaning 'root' is properly found in later Hebrew, Jewish Aramaic (עִיקָר *et similia*), and in Syriac (ܥܩܪܐ).

28. But with the substantive neuter δίκαιον the Three often translate (e.g. in Prov. 8.15) the noun צֶדֶק.

καρποί: the noun is not rare in the LXX, and occurs 15 times in Proverbs, where it mostly translates (as in the other LXX books) פְּרִי. However, in four instances (in the present passage and in 3.9; 10.16; 18.20) it renders תְּבוּאָה. Such a correspondence is found only in Lev. 25.3 and 2Esd. 19.36 (= MT Neh. 9.36). In α′ and σ′[29] καρπός always translates פְּרִי. In θ′ also it always renders פְּרִי except for Josh. 5.12, where it translates תְּבוּאָה, and Isa. 57.19, where it renders נִיב.

ἀπολοῦνται: the verb is quite frequent in the LXX, and it occurs 12 times in Proverbs. In three occurrences (19.9; 21.28; 29.3) it translates אָבַד. In 5 instances (5.23; 11.23[30]; 12.4; 15.1; 23.28[31]) it lacks a precise equivalent in the MT. In the remaining four cases it translates in 13.23 סָפָה, in 17.5 אֵיד[32], in 19.16 מוּת, and in the present passage the niphal from עָכַר. The verb עָכַר occurs only 14 times in the MT of which four in Proverbs. In 11.17 and 15.27 the original translator renders עָכַר with ἐξόλλυμι, whereas in 11.29 with the periphrasis ὁ μὴ συμπεριφερόμενος. The verb ἐξόλλυμι occurs another time, in 10.31, where it translates the niphal from כָּרַת which in its turn is found three more times in Proverbs, always in the niphal form, and it is rendered, as aforesaid, with ὄλλυμι in 2.22, and with negative periphrases in 23.18 and 24.14. In α′ ἀπόλλυμι always translates אָבַד, as it happens in σ′ (apart from 1 Kgdms 12.25, where it renders סָפָה, and in Ps. 36.20, where it translates כָּלָה), and in θ′ (except for Jer. 49.8 [= LXX 30.2; Field 29.9], where it corresponds to אֵיד). Moreover, in α′ and σ′ the only other occurrence in the MT of the niphal from עָכַר (Ps.$^{MT}$ 39.3) is translated by ἀνεταράχθη, a verb which does not occur in the LXX. Jerome, who seems to look at the Hexaplaric versions or at the same interpretative tradition,

---

29. Apart from Job 37.11 where the MT reads the problematic hapax legomenon רִי (preceded by בְּ) which σ′ interpreted likely as פְּרִי.

30. Baumgartner (*Proverbes*, 116), followed also by *BHS* (ad loc.) suggests that the translator read with a Hebrew manuscript אָבְדָה.

31. Lagarde (*Proverbien*, 75) proposes that the translator read תֹאבֵד for תֶּאֱרֹב. Cf. already Jäger, *Observationes*, 167.

32. Lagarde (*Proverbien*, 55), followed by Baumgartner (*Proverbes*, 160), Toy (*Proverbs*, 340), and also by *BHS* (ad loc.) conjectures a reading לְאֹבֵד for the MT לְאֵיד. However, θ′ as well in Jer. 49.8 translates the noun אֵיד with the verb ἀπόλλυμι.

translates Ps.[MT] 39.3 with *conturbatus est*. Since in the present passage Jerome reads *conturbatur* it is quite possible that he read, at least in α´, a middle-passive form from ἀναταράσσω. In the Three עָכַר is never rendered with ἀπόλλυμι, ἐξόλλυμι, nor ὄλλυμι. It is translated instead with ταράσσω by the Three in Josh. 7.25; 1 Kgdms 14.29; Prov. 11.29, by σ´ in Prov. 11.17; and it is without attribution (perhaps by σ´ according to Field [ad loc.]) in Prov. 15.27.

Before passing to the text-critical commentary, the two terms found in the Hexaplaric text of line b, λογισμοί and ἐκριζωθήσονται, also need to be discussed.

λογισμοί: the noun is not really common in the LXX, apart from the 4th book of the Maccabees. In Proverbs it occurs 5 times (6.18; 12.5; 15.22; 15.26; 19.21) always to translate מַחֲשָׁבָה, which in its turn occurs also in 16.3; 20.18; 21.5. All these verses where not rendered by the original translator. In α´ the term always translates מַחֲשָׁבָה apart from Eccl. 7.25 where it renders the noun from the same root חֶשְׁבּוֹן[33]. In σ´ it translates מַחֲשָׁבָה in Jer. 18.18; 49.20, חֶשְׁבּוֹן in Eccl. 7.25, 27, and דָּבָר in 2 Kgdms 14.13. In θ´ it always renders מַחֲשָׁבָה, except for Eccl. 7.27, where it translates חֶשְׁבּוֹן, and in Ezek. 5.7, where it renders הָמוֹן. Lagarde proposes that the original form וּבְתִבָא[34] was corrupted to וְחִשְׁבֹנוֹת *'ratiocinatio'*[35], which is not attested in the plural. The conjecture does not seem tenable both from the palaeographic and the phonetic point of view. Moreover, the word (חִשְׁבֹנוֹת) only occurs twice (Qoh. 7.29; 2 Chron. 26.15) in the MT (not in the book of Proverbs which prefers the more common term מַחֲשָׁבָה, from the same root), so that the reading cannot be explained by a process of trivialisation either.

ἐκριζωθήσονται: the verb occurs only 9 times in the LXX, and it is never found in the book of Proverbs. As rightly observed by Lagarde[36], ἐκριζωθήσονται (as well as ὁλόρριζοι) is probably based on a reading עָקַר ('to root up') of the root עָכַר. This

---

33. This Hebrew word occurs only in Qoh. 7.25, 27; 9.10.
34. Cf. Lagarde, *Proverbien*, 49. As aforesaid (cf. fn. 6 above) this spelling lacking the second radical is unattested.
35. Zorell, *Lexicon*, ad loc.
36. Cf. *Proverbien*, 49.

equivalence in found in the LXX only in Zeph. 2.4 (the only case where עָקַר occurs in the niphal form). In α´ ἐκριζόω is attested only in Gen. 49.6, where it translates עָקַר. In σ´ it occurs in Gen. 49.6 and in Eccl. 3.2 to render עָקַר, and in Job 31.8 and Ps. 51.7 to translate שָׁרַשׁ. In θ´ it is attested only in Dan. 7.8, where it translates the corresponding Aramaic root עֲקַר.

### 2.4.3. Text-critical commentary

The lines a-b are under obelus in the Syro-Hexaplar, and are witnessed by all the manuscripts. The omission of the stichs b-c in mss. 125 390 631 depends on a homeoteleuton (from πολλή 1° to πολλή 2°). We have already observed that 125 and 390 (together with 543) omits line c-d in Prov. 2.21, and, in that passage, the reason seemed to be the homeoteleuton. Another homeoteleuton has been noted in 3.15 in ms. 125. This further evidence strengthens the impression that there as well we were dealing with a mechanical phenomenon, and not with a witness to an ancient reading still lacking the Hexaplaric intrusion. As aforementioned while commenting 2.21, ms. 125 dates to the 14th century, and exhibits the biblical text from the book of Genesis to the sapiential books. Ms. 390 dates to 1075, and shows the catenae to Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticle. Hence, they should not be related, while it is quite likely that they fell independently in the same mistake. Ms. 631 (14th century) is, according to Bogaert[37], a copy of 46 (13th/14th century). Since 46 keeps lines b-c, it is proved that the omission in 631 depends on a homeoteleuton which originated independently of 125 and 390.

In stich b it is particularly interesting that the variant reading λογισμοὶ δὲ ἀσεβῶν ἐκριζωθήσονται is witnessed by the Hexaplaric ms. V, by the Syro-Hexaplar in the text, by the fragments of Jerome's Hexaplaric version which survived in some Vulgate

---

37. Cf. 'Ancien Testament', 8.

manuscripts[38], once again by the agreement of 336-728, by the margin of 248, and by 613 637. The three Coptic versions also exhibit this reading, but their independence from the Hexaplaric recension is shown by the addition ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩⲛⲉ 'with their root' which should correspond to ὁλόρριζοι[39] usually attested in the competing reading. The variant is highly interesting: for the second time[40] a Hexaplaric variant concerns the text under obeli, i.e. the part of text which Origen should have contented himself with marking with obeli as absent in the Hebrew. The later character of this reading should be evidenced by its being slightly closer to the MT. The noun רָשָׁע, governed by a construct state, is rendered with the genitive ἀσεβῶν (in contrast to the nominative ἀσεβεῖς), the verb נֶעְכָּרֶת is rendered only by one word (ἐκριζωθήσονται, in contrast to ὁλόρριζοι ὀλοῦνται), and no further addition is found (in contrast to ἐκ γῆς). We shall discuss in the conclusions the issues raised by this reading.

The reading ἀπολοῦνται (instead of ολοῦνται) witnessed by mss. B S* 534 should be a *lectio facilior*: whereas ὄλλυμι in the LXX is attested only in three poetical books (Job, Proverbs, and Jeremiah, as aforesaid), ἀπόλλυμι is by far more common. In S* the reading could depend simply on the same reason which caused the fall of the last two lines: when the scribe reached the last word of the stich b, he could have, for homeoteleuton, passed to the end of stich d, and copied ἀπολοῦνται while skipping all the words in between. In B instead, a similar reading (ὄλλυται] απολλυται 637 336-728; απολειται B) occurs in 10.28, partially shared with two manuscripts (336-728) in which stylistic corrections have been already detected[41].

The omission of the last two stichs is witnessed, as aforesaid, by S* and by 103 297 339 360. The probable homeoteleuton in S* has been already discussed. As for the four minuscule codices, mss. 297 360 contain catenae, ms. 103 dates to the 15th century, and exhibits only Prov. 1.1-19.21, whereas 339 dates to the 11th century, and displays Job

---

38. Cf. Vaccari, 'Recupero', 94-95.

39.. Cf. the renderings chosen by Syh[mg] (ܚܟܡ ܚܠ ܚܡܣܘܡܝܢ) and by Lat[94] (*cum totis radicibus*).

40. Such a kind of reading was found also in 3.15c (ἐγγίζουσιν Syh[mg]] ἐφαπτομένοις V Syh[txt]).

41. Cf. 3.15c (ἀγαπῶσιν, once again with 637), in section 2.2 above; and 14.22d (ἐλεημοσύνη, πίστις), in section 2.3 above.

and the 5 sapiential books. Hence, they should not be related. These manuscripts have copied line b until ὀλοῦνται and then verse 7. The hypothesis of a homeoteleuton stands as the most likely, but one has also to take into account the possibility (quite remote without the support of S* which actually reads ἀπολοῦνται instead of ὀλοῦνται witnessed by 103 297 339 360) that these manuscripts witness the later character of the second distich.

In this respect, it is rather complicated to interpret the Ethiopic witness. The text as it is published by Da Bassano shows both distichs[42]. However, no manuscript among those used by Pilkington[43] knows a translation of lines c and d. Regarding the first distich, its original text was probably a faithful rendering of the Greek[44]. However, such an important and early manuscript as Ts54 exhibits the reading ይትመልሑ, literally 'they will be plucked out, eradicated'[45], which may well correspond to ἐκριζωθήσονται. Da Bassano[46] shows a further reading, ይሢረዉ, literally 'they will be extirpated, rooted out'[47], which also may well render ἐκριζωθήσονται, and, as in Greek, keeps the etymological connexion with እምሥርቀዎሙ (ὀλόρριζοι). Although it is possible that these two latter readings emerged as an independent stylistic improvement[48] inside the Ethiopic tradition, one cannot rule out the possibility that at least the variant ይትመልሑ had been made available to the Ethiopic readers by the translators. This would give a satisfactory account of the presence of the reading in the early ms. Ts54. Last but not least, the absence of the second distich from all the manuscripts studied by Pilkington may be original. However, if the original reading, as it seems quite likely, was ይትሐጐሉ, the usual way to render the Greek ἀπολοῦνται[49], one cannot exclude an

---

42. The first one is the second half of verse 5, as it happens in the Vulgate and in those editions which depend on it, for instance, Zohrab's Armenian edition.

43. Cf. *Proverbs in Ethiopic*, ad loc.

44. Cf. the appendix on the Ethiopic text at the end of this section.

45. Cf. Leslau, *Concise Dictionary*, ad loc.

46. Together with four Pilkington's manuscripts.

47. Cf. Leslau, *Concise Dictionary*, ad loc.

48. It is largely more congruent for roots to be eradicated than to perish (ተሀጕለ).

49. Cf. Dillmann (*Lexicon*, ad loc.), and the additional stich witnessed by Da Bassano's edition.

early deletion due to homeoteleuton. It is perhaps relevant to recall that we do not know which manuscripts Da Bassano used, and that he might have found the reading in some of his sources. This supposition is supported by the fact that Da Bassano's text is a rather word for word translation of the LXX[50], and because so many early manuscripts have not been studied yet[51]. In this case, the presence of the word ይትሐጕሉ at the very end of verse 6 in Da Bassano's edition would prove that the original reading in the first distich was also ይትሐጕሉ, and that this reading would have caused the fall of the second distich for homeoteleuton in the manuscripts used by Pilkington.

The variant in the nominative singular οἶκος (for οἴκοις), witnessed also by 336-728, seems to be at best explained as a realignment to the MT. The nominative plural found in the Armenian seems instead to depend on a stylistic choice: the Greek clause is understood as a possessive dative, the dative (οἴκοις) is thus translated with the nominative (տունք, *townkʿ*), and the nominative (ἰσχὺς πολλή) is rendered by the instrumental (զաւրութեամբ բազմաւ, *zawrowtʿeamb bazmaw*). Hence, the Armenian creates an agreeable *variatio* with line b where ἰσχὺς πολλή is translated instead in the nominative (զաւրութիւն բազում, *zawrowtʿiwn bazowm*).

Finally, for the original future ἀπολοῦνται, a number of minuscule manuscripts (among which we find 125 and 631 again) attest the present ἀπόλλυνται which seems a *lectio facilior* originated by the ideological wish to transpose the ruin of the impious from the future to the present. Ms. 252 (10th century) exhibits the future from ὄλλυμαι, a form which would be preferable if it would not be so isolated and comparatively late, while ms. 705 attests the respective present ὄλλυνται.

---

50. The Hebrew, Vulgate and Peshitta are all more distant from the Ethiopic than the LXX (singular instead of plural, different lexicon, different construction). The lexicon of the second distich is fully consistent (ኃይል, ብዙኅ, ይትሐጕሉ) with the one of the first distich apart from ኃጥአንስ, for ἀσεβεῖς which is rendered with ወረሲዓንስ in the first distich. Finally it has to be noted that in the second distich there is no element to represent the particle δέ.

51. Cf. p. 126 above in the preface to the second part.

### 2.4.4. Conclusions

To summarise the data, the most striking fact is the particularly free translation of the first distich. The word בֵּית is not rendered, instead חֹסֶן is translated a first time as if it were vocalised חֹסֵן, a participle qal from the verb חָסַן with an adjectival value. As elsewhere, but only in the book of Proverbs, the adjective צַדִּיק is translated with the noun δικαιοσύνη. The morpheme חסן is translated a second time with the meaning ('strong') which it carries with the adjectival vocalisation (חָסֹן), but it is considered a noun (ἰσχύς). The syntagm בִּתְבוּאַת is not rendered, and רָשָׁע, which was governed by it at the singular, is translated with a nominative plural (οἱ ἀσεβεῖς). The verb נֶעְכָּרֶת is read נִכְרָת and translated ὀλοῦνται with a reference to Prov. 2.22 where ὀλοῦνται translates the verb כָּרַת. This solution does not fully satisfy the translator who connects נֶעְכָּרֶת also to the root עָקַר and translates it with the adjective ὀλόρριζοι. Finally, the mention of the 'root' and the reference to verse 2.22 cause the insertion of the explicative addition ἐκ γῆς. The adjectives instead of nouns, the plurals instead of singulars, the non-rendering of some words (בֵּית and בִּתְבוּאַת), and the two double translations (חסן, נֶעְכָּרֶת), all point to the free technique typical of the original translator. It is possible to offer a visual representation of the text which the translator rendered:

בְּצַדִּיק חֹסֶן חָסֹן רָב וְרָשָׁע בְּעִקָּר נִכְרָת

Finally, it has to be stressed that the double translation ὀλόρριζοι, in agreement with ἀσεβεῖς, creates an elegant link with καρποὶ δὲ ἀσεβῶν in the 4th distich. This is a first important hint in favour of the compositional unity of verse 15.6: the impious are to be fully eliminated from their root to their fruits.

In fact, in the second distich two indications have been already detected which points to the authorship of the original translator. The first one is the translation of עָכַר

with ἀπόλλυμι. As we have seen, the niphal of this verb is rendered by α´ and σ´, in the only remaining passage in which it is attested (Ps. 38.3) with ἀναταράσσομαι, and similarly by Jerome with *conturbatus est*. Hence, Jerome's translation in the present passage (*conturbatur*) may witness the same interpretational tradition. Moreover, in the remaining passages עָכַר is always translated by the Three with ταράσσω. Modern scholars confirm this meaning ('to disturb, to trouble', *and not* 'to destroy') for the root עָכַר. Therefore, against Mezzacasa[52] and Fritsch[53], it is unlikely that any of the Three is responsible for the translation of lines c-d. Is it then possible to ascribe them to the original translator? This is actually the only passage where עָכַר is translated by ἀπόλλυμι. However, it is also the only occurrence where it is found at the niphal. In the remaining three occurrences (11.17; 11.29; 15.27, always at the qal form) it is rendered twice (11.17; 15,27) with the verb from the same root ἐξόλλυμι, and in 11.29 with the periphrasis ὁ μὴ συμπεριφερόμενος. This evidence shows that the original translator does not seem to know the meaning of the root עָכַר, and that he tends to interpret it as כָּרַת, which in its turn is translated with ἐξόλλυμι in 10.31 and, as aforesaid, with ὄλλυμι in 2.22. It has to be added that [ἀσε]βῶν ἀπολοῦνται is a hexametric ending. Thackeray[54] has convincingly shown that the original translator is keen to create hexametric and iambic rhythms. If ἐξολοῦνται had been used in this passage, the hexametric effect would have disappeared. Finally, one cannot rule out the possibility that in line d also the difficulty presented by the MT had been solved by the translator or its *Vorlage* with the reading נִכְרָת, as in the first distich[55]. In such a case ἀπολοῦνται would represent even more a *variatio* in respect of ὀλοῦνται found in line b. A second observation must be adduced: the word חֹסֶן is once again (as also later in 27.24) vocalised חָסֹן ('strong') and translated as a noun. This seems to indicate dependance on the first distich, although it has to be recalled that Jerome as well reads here *fortitudo*[56],

---

52. Cf. *Proverbi*, 150.

53. Cf. 'Hexaplaric Signs', 175.

54. Cf. Thackeray, 'Poetry', 46-66.

55. Although in this case the masculine participle would not agree with תְּבוּאָה.

56. This may originate from the LXX since in Prov. 27.24 חֹסֶן is translated *potestatem* which partially

hence this could represent a widespread pre-masoretic reading. It is unfortunate that no fragment from the Three is left for this passage, since this prevents us from fully evaluating Jerome's choice.

In the third place, as already shown in the previous sections[57], the translation of the conjunction וְ with δέ, typical of the original translator, is also compatible only with σ´, since α´ and θ´ prefer to translate וְ with καί. Furthermore, the rare correspondence between תְּבוּאָה and καρπός occurs three more times (3.9; 10.16; 18.20) in Proverbs, whereas it lacks completely in α´ and σ´. However, it is found, only once (Josh. 5.12), in θ´.

These four hints already suggest identifying the translator of lines c-d with the original translator. If one adds that οἴκοις, δικαίων, καρποί, and ἀσεβῶν, all in the plural, correspond to a singular in the MT, we can be sure that we are dealing with the technique of the same translator who, in the previous chapters, has been often observed preferring to the singular of the Hebrew the plural (which in Greek indicate all the concrete realisations, or all the individual implications of the concept expressed by the root).

If this is correct, the reason why the original translator created a double translation seems to be the possibility of interpreting the difficult נֶעְכֶּרֶת with the help of both the roots עָקַר and כָּרַת. Especially the former must have looked interesting for the chance to connect it to the translation καρποί in the 4th line. Also the possible double vocalisation of חסן represented a push toward the creation of the double translation. It has to be stressed that the two chosen roots (עָקַר and כָּרַת) together point to an attempt of interpreting the difficult reading found in the MT. One would also recall that the difficulty was even greater if, as suggested, the translator did not know the meaning of the root עָכַר. It is finally very interesting to recall that the chosen expedients are based

---

agrees with the LXX (κράτος καὶ ἰσχύς, cf. the commentary above on ἰσχύς). On the other hand, Jerome shows himself to know the meaning of חֹסֶן in the remaining passages (Isa. 33.6, *divitiae*; Jer. 20.5, *substantiam*; Ezek. 22.25, *opes*), which should have being translated before Proverbs.
57. Cf. subsections 2.1.4. above, p. 145, and 2.3.2., p. 165.

on a phonetic approach: the exchange of the voiceless velar with its emphatic counterpart (עָקַר < עָקַר), and the fall of the voiced guttural (נכרת < נעכרת).

One can, once again, appreciate the translator's effort to use the *variatio*, and his competent literary result. The adjective צַדִּיק is rendered the first time by the singular of the abstract noun (δικαιοσύνη), and the second time by the plural of the concrete persons (δικαίων). The noun רָשָׁע is always translated as a plural, but once at the nominative and the article (οἱ ἀσεβεῖς), and once at the genitive and without the article (ἀσεβῶν). In the first distich בֵּית is not rendered, and, in its position, we find חסן with a second vocalisation (חֹסֶן). Similarly, תְּבוּאָה is not translated, but its space, so to say, is filled by the explicative addition ἐκ γῆς, derived from 2.22. Only the translation of חסן רב, is given twice identical. This repetition has been skilfully avoided by the Armenian translator who changed the structure of the sentence, and put ἰσχὺς πολλή in the instrumental case. A solution which, however, was not available in Greek.

It is now the time to address the Hexaplaric variant under obelus in line b: λογισμοὶ δὲ ἀσεβῶν ἐκριζωθήσονται. As aforesaid, a Hexaplaric variant under obeli surprises since, theoretically, it does not originate from the Hebrew. In other words, Origen put lines a-b under obeli because he did not find an equivalent in the Hebrew. Therefore, the variant reading he chose does not come from the Three, but must have been already attested in some LXX manuscripts. This is confirmed by the Syro-Hexaplar which in the margin exhibits the reading witnessed by most of the LXX manuscripts. It is quite likely that Origen chose this variant because, as it was shown above, it was closer to the Hebrew. However, it supposes the reading נֶעֱקֶרֶת[58] for נֶעְכָּרֶת and the interpretation of תְּבוּאָה ('product, harvest') with λογισμοί ('calculation, reasoning'): the product of the impious are their calculations[59]. The author of this line shares with the translator of Zephaniah and the Three the equivalence between עָקַר and ἐκριζόω. However, as the

---

58. This form is unattested in the MT, but, as aforesaid, the niphal from עָקַר occurs in Zeph. 2.4.

59. Unless one has to suppose a reading תְּבוּנוֹת, although λογισμός is never found to translate this word. Moreover, the exchange נ < א is not very likely from the palaeographical point of view, even if it may have been possible in the Palaeo-Hebrew script. Cf. Baumgartner, *Proverbes*, 279.

original translator of Proverbs he uses the plurals for the singulars (λογισμοί, ἀσεβῶν), prefers the use of δέ, and renders with the future (ἐκριζωθήσονται) a participle[60] (נֶעְקָרֶת)[61].

These agreements with the translation technique of the original translator are quite striking. On the other hand, λογισμός in all the five occurrences renders, in Proverbs, מַחֲשָׁבָה[62] which does not seem the likeliest *Vorlage* in the present passage. However, this consistency is rather unusual for the original translator, and the *Vorlage* here might have been different. In my view, there is no clear element to rule out his authorship for this additional line. On the contrary, it is possible that the original translator had added in the margin of his manuscript a third version of the second member of the MT. A similar hypothesis seemed also the likeliest one for the Sahidic additions to verse 14.22. I shall come back on these evidences in the main conclusions.

Be this as it may, as a result of this analysis we may infer that the Hexaplaric text read as follows:

÷ ἐν πλεοναζούσῃ δικαιοσύνῃ ἰσχὺς πολλή,

÷ λογισμοὶ δὲ ἀσεβῶν ἐκριζωθήσονται. ╱ *

οἴκοις δικαίων ἰσχὺς πολλή,

καρποὶ δὲ ἀσεβῶν ἀπολοῦνται.

* αλ´· οἱ δὲ ἀσεβεῖς ὁλόρριζοι ἐκ γῆς ὀλοῦνται.

Some final remarks on the text-critical issues raised by the MT. The Greek line d points to a *Vorlage* which lacks the highly problematic preposition בְּ before תְבוּאַת as

---

60. The future for the participle is already used in lines b (ὀλοῦνται) and d (ἀπολοῦνται).

61. This *Vorlage* is the most economic hypothesis. It preserves the consonantal text (apart from ק for כ, contrary to an imperfect form), and is more compatible with a translation in the future tense than a perfect. Cf. also the previous footnote.

62. This is the most usual equivalence in the whole LXX.

it happens in a few Hebrew manuscripts, Peshitta and Targum. The Hexaplaric variant to line b (λογισμοί ...) may be added to these witnesses. This fact strengthens the relevance of the reading by making it more ancient. Concerning ἐκριζωθήσονται, נֶעְקֶרֶת[63] represents almost certainly[63] its *Vorlage*, which may have looked as follows:

$$\text{וּתְבוּאַת רָשָׁע נֶעְקֶרֶת}$$

This may be rendered: 'and the product of the impious one is rooted up'.

The reading נֶעְקֶרֶת offers a far better sense in the context, providing, as it does, a coherent image of a harvest being uprooted. Furthermore, the variant is ancient, because it is witnessed by a text which exhibits a rather free translation technique, which I would trace back to the original translator, hence to the 2nd century BC. This reading has also the advantage not to be a trivialisation because עָקַר at the niphal is attested only once (Zeph. 2.4), in the imperfect tense. The niphal of עָכַר is very rare also, but its sense in the context is so poor, despite the aforementioned brilliant interpretation by Gesenius[64], which cannot compete with נֶעְקֶרֶת: in fact, it is not typical of a harvest to be troubled.

**Appendix: The Ethiopic Text**

ጎበ ፡ ትበዝኅ ፡ ጽድቅ ፡ ኃይል ፡ ብዙኅ ፤ ወረሲዓንስ ፡ እምሥራርዎሙ ፡ እምድር ፡ ይትሐጐሉ ።

ጎበ] ወእደ Bass ǀ ብዙኅ] ትበዝኅ Ts54 ǀ ወረሲዓንስ] ወረሲዐንስ mss ǀ እምድር] > Abb55 ǀ ይትሐጐሉ] ይትመልሑ Ts54 Add1570; ይሜረዉ Bass; + ውስተ ፡ አብያተ ፡ ጻድቃን ፡ ኃይል ፡ ብዙኅ ፤ ፍሬ ፡ ኃጥአንስ ፡ ይትሐጐሉ Bass

---

63. It is confirmed, as shown above, by the translations in Zeph. 2.4, and by the Three.

64. Cf. p. 185 above, at the beginning of this section.

## Conclusions

It is now time to assess the data which have emerged from the study of the four doublets, and to draw some conclusions.

As we have already noted, only the second distich in Prov. 2.21 showed some typical characteristics of the translation technique of θ´. However, since the addition seemed very pedantic, I have suggested to take into account the possibility that these two lines stem from the καίγε group of which θ´ is a member. Hence, in this instance also, Fritsch's thesis – according to which the second distich would be of Hexaplaric origin, and the Syro-Hexaplar would not have 'scrupulously' preserved the Origenian signs – appeared open to debate. In other words, if this doublet stems from θ´ through the Hexapla, it follows that the Syro-Hexaplar lost here the asterisks and the siglum of the translation from which the distich was intruded. However, on account of its early attestation (B S Lat[165]) it seems more convenient to postulate a contamination with the καίγε recension. Hence, on the frail basis of the two citations of the Pseudo-Ephrem and of the literary critique, Rahlfs's text *should not* be emended.

The remaining three verses showed instead, surprisingly, the technique of the original translator.

The most important passage is probably Prov. 3.15, where, if my analysis is correct, the double translation originated precisely because of the variant reading still preserved, more than a thousand years later, by the masoretic apparatus *qere/ketiv* (\ מִפְּנִינִים מִפְּנִיִּים). In other words, we have here clear textual evidence that the original translator found a variant reading in his *Vorlage*, and consequently decided to render twice the entire verse so as to give his readers a full account of the possible meanings of the original text.

In the remaining two cases also (14.22 [ידעו \ יתעי]; 15.6 [עקר \ עכר]) a consonantal variant reading has been detected which induced the original translator to render twice the Hebrew verse. While doing this, the translator used largely the technique of *variatio* so as to avoid repetitions in two renderings which, in their

*Vorlage*, only differed by one word. If he may accept some repetitions (14.22 ἔλεον, τεκταίνουσι; 15.6 ἰσχὺς πολλή), he usually changes the syntax, the tenses, omits or adds words, uses plurals for singulars. In 14.22 a refined link is built between the addition ὁλόρριζοι (dependent on the root עקר for the masoretic עכר) in the second stich, and the term καρποὶ in the fourth, which alone seems to prove that both distichs depend on the same translator.

On occasions, a different Hebrew reading involves a number of consequential changes in the consonantal text as in Prov. 14.22, where the reading ידעו for יתעו produces a different division of the verse, the fall of the aspirated (הלוא \ לוא), the exchange between yod and waw (חרשי \ הרשו).   Of course, different vocalisations may be involved also (חֹרְשֵׁי \ חָרָשֵׁי, רָע \ רֵעַ). In 15.22 the author plays with the vocalisations חָסֹן (adjective) and חֹסֵן (participle qal, the latter unattested in the MT), whereas the MT reads the noun חֹסֶן. It is important to stress that in both 14.22 and 15.6 a common phonetic phenomenon is involved, namely a shift in the same consonantal series: the voiced dental ד for the voiceless dental ת, and the emphatic velar ק for the non-emphatic כ. This may well have been a common interpretative technique used by scribes and/or translators since, en passant, we noticed a similar phenomenon in Job 37.11, where σ´ reads the difficult hapax legomenon בְּרִי as פְּרִי. However, if in 14.22 the reading ידעו is clearly a *lectio facilior* for a not *difficillimus* יתעו, in 15.6 the reading נעקרת is certainly better but not *facilior* than the difficult נעכרת. Thus, the situation faced by the translator of Proverbs might have been partially different from the one met by σ´ in Job 37.11.

This leads us to another important conclusion. The careful study of these double translations has offered a good number of variant readings, most of which are not recorded in the scientific apparatuses of *BHK*, *BHS*, *BHQ*. If many of them may appear just trivial – although still interesting for the history of the interpretation of the biblical text during the Second Temple period – a few of them have a good chance to represent a better reading. This was actually the case for the previously mentioned נֶעֱקֶרֶת (in 15.6 for the masoretic נֶעְכָּרֶת), witnessed by the Hexaplaric reading ἐκριζωθήσονται, and

for the vocalisation חָרָשֵׁי (in 14.22 for the masoretic חֹרְשֵׁי) witnessed by τέκτονες; possibly also for the variant וַחֲסָדִים (still in 14.22 for the masoretic וְחֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת) witnessed only by the agreement of the *Vetus Afra* and Sahidic.

This last observation leads us to express an assessment on the versions. The Pre-Nicene translations, namely the *Vetus Afra* and the Coptic (especially the Sahidic), proved sometimes[1] to preserve readings which are lost in the Greek tradition. These readings may occasionally represent a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. The fact is well known, and has been already documented for other books of the Old Testament[2]. After the destruction of the holy books which took place under emperor Diocletian's persecution the LXX textual patrimony was not fully preserved. Under Constantine and his successors the LXX text began to reach a stability and a uniformity partially witnessed by the later versions (Armenian, Ethiopic, Syro-Palestinian, Syro-Hexaplar), which seem to be more helpful in order to locate a Greek textual type than to uncover variants lacking in the Greek tradition.

When comparing these data with Fritsch's hypothesis a first conclusion can be drawn: a simple, uniform solution cannot be offered. One cannot assume from the presence of the obeli beside two lines of a doublet that the remaining two are lacking the asterisks, and depend on the Hexaplaric recension. As we have seen, even in the case where a translation technique consistent with θ´'s has been observed (2.21), the manuscript tradition seemed too homogeneous to postulate a Hexaplaric origin. Hence, the more generic hypothesis of an intrusion from the καίγε group has been advanced. Moreover, in three cases the study of the translation technique has shown clear consistencies with the original translator's approach. In these instances Fritsch's theory must be rejected.

---

1. As in the case I just mentioned in Prov. 14.22 (ἔλεον – ἀγαθοί] *misericordes bonorum cogitatores sunt* Lat[94] Sa), and in the additional stich found in Prov. 8.31, cf. subsection 1.1.3. above, p. 31.
2. Cf. e.g. Arie van der Kooij, 'On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms', *VT* 33 (1983), 67-74, esp. 72, and Fernández Marcos, 'Lucianic Texts', 419.

Lagarde's theory, especially as recently rephrased by Moro[3], has been also fully taken into account while commenting on Prov. 14.22: for this addition d'Hamonville had suggested the dependence on the ambience which translated the Psalter. The lexical analysis has shown beyond any doubt that the alleged insertion is fully consistent with the translation technique of the original translator, but not with the technique of the translator of the Psalter. In Prov. 3.15 also, I have shown how the *rielaborazione* and *armonizzazione*, to put it in Moro's words, if it took place, worked in a very surprising way: the inserted lines are the first and the fourth one, whereas the original lines are inverted[4]. Since other passages show repeatedly the same attitude toward the Hebrew text – in particular it is often debatable which are actually the lines that better represent the MT[5] – in my opinion, the burden of proof is on Lagarde's followers.

To sum up, I do not deny that the text of the book of Proverbs suffered some intrusion during its textual transmission. Prov. 2.21c-d appears to me a later doublet, as well as other lines, namely 2.2b; 2.3b; 8.10b[6]. Beyond the question of the doublets, I also found Fox's argumentation on the additions to chapter 9[7] convincing. However, in my opinion, every single case has to be proven on its own. Furthermore, not only is it that three out of the four doublets, which I have discussed in depth, do not seem to be insertions, but also that most of the additional lines signalled by Fritsch[8], at a first inspection, did not show the καίγε group technique, which is so clearly witnessed instead by the lines I just mentioned (2.2b; 2.3b; 8.10b). Some of the additional stichs (31.27a-b; 31.30b-c) openly show instead the typical technique of the original translator. In other words, I find it questionable to introduce further *Revisoren* between

---

3. Cf. '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 394: 'Il problema non è solo quantitativo, perché l'integrazione di queste doppie traduzioni nel testo portò sicuramente a rielaborazioni, alterazioni ed armonizzazioni, talvolta individuabili per merito di forme testuali più antiche, ma il più delle volte solo ipotizzabili.'
4. Cf. subsection 2.2.4. above, p. 158, where I proposed the scheme AbaB.
5. This happens, for instance, in 14.22, as I have shown.
6. These lines show a translation technique which is fully consistent with θ′. It is interesting to note that here the doublets were inserted *before* the original line (i.e. 2.2c; 2.3c; 8.10c), whereas in 2.21 the doublet has been inserted *after* the original distich (2.21a-b).
7. Cf. subsection 1.3.2. above, pp. 65-67.
8. Cf. 'Hexaplaric Signs', 170.

the original translator and the occasional insertions from the καίγε group: it is arduous to detect a third translation technique.

Sometimes other small double translations are found: a word which can be vocalised in two different ways may be rendered twice in the same line (14.22 רע in the Sahidic addition, 15.6 חסן in the first line). In some instances, a root is interpreted more according to its Aramaic meaning than to its Hebrew sense[9].

All these features help to trace a portrait of the original translator; just to gather some of the elements which I related in the first chapter, I can recall that he is a literate, and his Greek is among the best examples in the LXX. He aims to create hexametric endings and iambs. His vocabulary tends to a classical model; Homeric, Platonic, and Aristotelian allusions have been observed. His translation technique, *ad sensum* and not *ad verbum*, may be compared with the almost contemporary attempts met in the early Latin literature, as Livius Andronicus's translations and Plautus's adaptations. When confronted with the asperities and obscurities of the original text, he may act as a modern translator by adding the appropriate linguistic material requested by the Greek language. In this context the wide attention given to the polysemy of the Hebrew text by this translator seems to add an important element to the picture. My contention is that this man is not only a literate, but also a *philologist*. He is someone accustomed to the variant readings of the manuscripts, he is able to vocalise the text in different ways, to restructure the Hebrew sentences. Particularly, he is so much interested in the polysemy of the Hebrew original that he *renders it more than once*. This characteristic represents his peculiarity among the LXX translators. This philological interest for the biblical text, for its variant readings and its polysemy, suits at best a location in Alexandria, in a cultural circle which may have access to the Library and to the philologists who worked there.

---

9. This seams to be the case for רֵעַ in the Sahidic addition to 14.22, and for מלכים in 31.4. More cases have been listed by Mezzacasa, *Proverbi*, 47.

As for the theology of the translator, he is certainly interested in ethics; its moralising has been stressed by several scholars. Even the stylistic tool of the antithesis is often used to enhance the moral meaning of the text in comparison with the Hebrew. Since in 3.15 a moralising antithesis is created, while in 14.22 and 15.6 the moralising antitheses are doubled, we may observe that the double translations also are involved in this moralising process.

The translator seems to cultivate also some interest for the theology of creation and of σοφία. When dealing with Prov. 8.22-25, I noticed[10] his repetition of the adverb πρό in order to emphasise the pre-existence of the σοφία *before* the created world, together with the peculiar use of the present γεννᾷ which seems to echo the philosophical speculations about the divine atemporality. I also indicated a conceptual and linguistic parallel in the famous translation Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὤν found in Exod. 3.14. One has to conclude, in addition, that the verb κτίζω does not bear the meaning 'to create' in this context. This fact might be an indication of an early dating for the translation.

To sum up, it seems that we are dealing here with an intellectual Jewish believer who is trying to explain his morality, and his belief in a Greek philosophical dress: a first Jewish theologian.

It is important now to recall that the Jewish philosopher Aristobule, whom d'Hamonville tentatively indicated as the possible author of the translation, alludes to this passage of Proverbs, uses exactly the adverb πρό, and more in general shows the same theological conceptions found in this passage: the interest for the Greek concept of the atemporality of God, and the existence of the σοφία before the created world[11]. The addition of the simile of the bee is also an important link between Aristobule and the translation of Proverbs. In fact, Aristobule is not only referred by the church Fathers to belong to the Aristotelian school, he also cites, while discussing the nature of σοφία, Solomon's opinion immediately after the peripatetic philosophers. Since it is widely

---

10. Cf. subsection 1.3.4. above, pp. 81-82.
11. Cf. Hengel, *Giudaismo*, 341-342.

recognised that the simile of the bee is an allusion to Aristotle's *Historia animalium*, clearly the translator is alluding here to the biblical tradition which ascribed to Solomon an encyclopaedic knowledge about the realm of the animals[12]. In this passage also, Solomon is an earlier, hence better, philosopher than Aristotle. I shall also recall that, although we mostly ignore the history of the Aristotelian work until the 1st century BC, we are sure that the *Historia animalium* was available at the Library of Alexandria.

In conclusion, the philological attitude of the translator, the theological agreement with Aristobule and the similar comparison between Solomon and Aristotle, the allusion to Aristotle's *Historia animalium*, are, in my opinion additional arguments, if of different value, to locate the translation in Alexandria, in a Jewish environment which was in contact with the Library. However, in order to identify the translator with Aristobule, or with someone in his circle, we would need further evidence regarding the dating. The fact that the Greek translation of Ben Sira cites indeed Proverbs but not in its Greek text is quite striking and might delay the *terminus a quo* of the translation to after 132 BC. However, not much later than this date, since the translation technique is totally unaware of the καίγε group's technique which, on a palaeographical basis, began its work at the latest by the middle of the 1st century BC, and, as I tried to show, managed to insert some revised verses in the original text. Moro has also convincingly indicated the lexical revision of some passages where the translation φόβος θεοῦ / κυρίου substituted θεοσέβεια or εὐσέβεια[13].

A few text critical remarks are finally appropriate. The lack of the Göttingen edition certainly affects our knowledge of the LXX of Proverbs. Some studies on the manuscripts have been undertaken by Schildenberger[14], Zuntz[15], Bady[16] and Moro[17]. The latter three had also the opportunity to consult the collations in Göttingen. However, an

---

12. Cf. 1Kgs 5.12-13; cf. also the later development in Wis. 7.20: φύσεις ζῴων καὶ θυμοὺς θηρίων.
13. Cf. Moro, '*Proverbi* in Clemente', 400, 432-433.
14. Cf. *Proverbien*.
15. Cf. 'Prophetologion'.
16. Cf. *commentaire inédit*.
17. Cf. '*Proverbi* in Clemente'.

exhaustive study on the partition of the manuscripts is lacking. Since the codices tend to share the same textual type in the same group of books (Octateuch, other historical books, sapiential books, prophetical books), the divisions given by Ziegler for Wisdom, Sirach, and Ecclesiastes[18] may be of some help. As in Ecclesiastes, I found that the subgroups 106-130 and 336-728 usually agree with each other. They may agree also with ms. V and the Syro-Hexaplar, but often (and more frequently 336-728) they may show peculiar readings which realign the text with the Hebrew, or represent a stylistic improvement. This fact leaves open, in my opinion, the question whether an Antiochian recension is preserved in Proverbs, as Schildenberger and Bady suggested. Ms. 637 which in Ecclesiastes belongs to the Hexaplaric group, and in Wisdom belongs to the Antiochian group randomly agrees with the aforementioned manuscripts. The same happens to ms. 613. Ms. 253 instead, which elsewhere is clearly Hexaplaric, did not show a special agreement with these manuscripts.

In verse 2.21 the omission of lines a-b in ms. B indicated the influence of the Hexaplaric recension even on our best manuscript for the book of Proverbs. The removal of the doublet under obeli may be at best explained if we admit that the scribe responsible for ms. B, when confronted with the striking similarity of the distichs, decided to set out the lines under obeli, because he considered them spurious. In the same way B* excludes verse 2.3c (sub ※ pro ÷ in Syh), and verse 8.10c (> Syh). Interestingly enough, the remaining verse which exhibits θ´'s translation technique (2.2b, sub ÷ in Syh) is fully preserved by ms. B. These facts could indicate that the insertions were made before the Hexaplaric edition: Origen, or Pamphilus and Eusebius, would have marked line 2.2b, line 2.3c, and lines 2.21c-d with obeli, whereas he/they would have expunged line 8.10c. The scribe of B would have overlooked the similarities in lines 2.2b-c (which are actually less striking than those in 2.3b-c; 2.21; 8.10b-c), and accepted the Hexaplaric corrections to the remaining passages. This would conveniently explain the textual data of both the Syro-Hexaplar and B, and

---

18. Ziegler, 'Ecclesiastes', 109-110.

would confirm that the pedantic doublet in 2.21c-d does not depend on Origen's activity, but stems from an earlier insertion from the καίγε group's recensional work.

An interesting phenomenon was found in 3.15 and 15.6 where we met a Hexaplaric variant to the text under obeli. In both instances Syh[txt] agrees with V, and Syh[mg] agrees with the common LXX[19]. As we observed, these readings cannot stem from a recension toward the MT. I suggested that the variant reading in 15.6 shows a translation technique compatible with the original translator. The same phenomenon was noted for the Sahidic addition found in 14.22. The existence of these extra lines led me to suggest that the authorial manuscript could have had marginal readings which occasionally were preferred by later scribes, and substituted for the readings found in the text. It seems consistent that a translator who is able to collect Hebrew variant readings might also have offered alternative translations in the margin.

Still concerning the Hexaplaric apparatus, in Prov. 2.21 a phrase transmitted without the siglum has been ascribed to σ´.

Lastly, thanks to Bady's doctoral thesis, the unedited text of Chrysostom's commentary to the book of Proverbs has been also collated, but the comparison was too limited in order to offer any conclusive result on the Antiochian recension.

---

19. Cf. Jenkins ('Antinoopolis', 69-70) who insists instead on a passage where Syh[txt] has no Greek ally.

# Bibliography


## Editions and translations


*Biblia Sacra iuxta Latinam vulgatam versionem: Libri Salomonis id est Proverbia Ecclesiastes Canticum Canticorum*, vol. 11 (Rome: Editrice Vaticana, 1957).

*Bibliorum sacrorum Graecorum codex Vaticanus B* ([Rome]: Istituto poligrafico e zecca dello stato, [1999]).

Barns, John W.B. (ed.), *The Antinoopolis Papyri*, vol. 3 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1967), 177-180.

Böhlig, Alexander (ed.), *Der achmimische Proverbientext nach Ms. Berol. orient. oct. 987* (München: R. Lerche, 1958).

Burmester, Oswald H.E., and Dévaud, Eugène (eds.), *Les Proverbes de Salomon [...], Texte bohairique* (Wien: Successeurs de Adolf Holzhausen, 1930).

Ceriani, Antonio M. (ed.), *Codex Syro-hexaplaris Ambrosianus* (Milan: Biblioteca ambrosiana, 1874).

Ciasca, Agostino (ed.), *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta Copto-Sahidica musei Borgiani*, vol. 2 (Rome: Congregatio de propaganda fide, 1889), 152-194.

Cox, Claude E. (ed.), *The Armenian Translation of Deuteronomy* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981).

—*Armenian Job* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006).

Da Bassano, Francesco (ed.), ብሉይ፡ ኪዳን። [*Bəluy Kidān*], vol. 3 (Asmara: Bamāḫtama frānčaskānā, 1925), 227-268.

Di Lella, Alexander A. (ed.), *The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshiṭta Version: Proverbs*, vol. 2.5 (Leiden: Brill, 1979).

Díez Merino, Luis (ed.), *Targum de Proverbios. Edición príncipe del ms. Villa-Amil no. 5 de Alfonso de Zamora* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas,

Instituto Francisco Suárez, 1984).

Drusius, Ioannes (ed.), *Veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum vetus Testamentum fragmenta, collecta, versa et notis illustrata* (Arnheim: Janssonius, 1622).

Elliger, Karl, and Rudolph, Wilhelm (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997[5]).

Field, Frederick (ed.), *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1875).

Géhin, Paul (ed.), *Évagre le Pontique: Scholies aux Proverbes* (Paris: Cerf, 1987).

Grabe, John E. (ed.), *Septuginta interpretum tomus ultimus [IV], continens* Psalmorum, Jobi*, ac tres* Salomonis *libros, Cum Apocrypha ejusdem, nec non* Siracidae Sapientia*; Ex antiquissimo MS. Codice Alexandrino accurate descriptos* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1709).

Hamonville, David-Marc d' (ed.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie, Les Proverbes* (Paris: Cerf, 2000).

Hanhart, Robert (ed.), *Esdrae liber I* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991[2]).

—*Esdrae liber II* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).

—*Esther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983[2]).

—*Iudith* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).

—*Tobit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983).

—*Maccabaeorum liber II* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976[2]).

—*Maccabaeorum liber III* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980[2]).

Healey, John F. (ed.), *The Targum of Proverbs* (The Aramaic Bible 15; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991).

Holladay, Carl R. (ed.), *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: Aristobulus*, vol. 3 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995).

Holmes, Robert, and Parsons, James (eds.), *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus*, vol. 3 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1823).

Kappler, Werner (ed.), *Maccabaeorum liber I* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,

1990³).

Kasser, Rodolphe (ed.), *Papyrus Bodmer VI. Livre des Proverbes* (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1960).

—(trans.), *Papyrus Bodmer VI. Livre des Proverbes* (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1960).

Kittel, Rudolf (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937).

Kosack, Wolfgang (ed.), *Proverbia Salomonis, achmimisch, sahidisch, bohairisch und arabisch* (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1973).

Lagarde, Paul de (ed.), *Hagiographa Chaldaice* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1873).

Lehner, Albert (ed.), *Florilegia. Florilegium Frisingense (CLM 6433). Testimonia Divinae Scripturae <et patrum>* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1987).

Mai, Angelo, *Novae Patrum bibliothecae. Origenis, Didymi, Hippolyti, Apollinaris, Polychronii scholia in Proverbia, Esaiam, et Ezechielem cum Didymi uberioribus in Psalmos*, vol. 7.2 (Rome: Typis sacri consilii propagando christiano nomini, 1854).

Müller, August, and Kautzsch, Emil (eds.), *The Book of Proverbs: Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text with Notes* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901), 70-85.

Quast, Udo (ed.), *Ruth* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).

Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.), *Psalmi cum Odis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979³).

—*Septuaginta*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935).

Rahlfs, Alfred, and Hanhart, Robert (eds.), *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

Roberts, Colin H. (ed.), *The Antinoopolis Papyri*, vol. 1 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1950), 2-19.

Sabatier, Pierre (ed.), *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, 2 vols. (Reims: Reginald Florentain, 1743).

Schultens, Albert, and Vogel, Georg J.L. (eds.), *Versio integra Proverbiorum Salomonis, et in eadem commentarius* (Halle: J.J. Curt, 1769).

Smith Lewis, Agnes (ed.), *A Palestinian Syriac Lectionary: Containing Lessons from*

*the Pentateuch, Job, Proverbs, Prophets, Acts, and Epistles* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1897).

—*Codex Climaci Rescriptus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909).

Sobhy, George P.G. (ed.), *The Book of the Proverbs of Solomon in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (Cairo: University of Egypt, [1927]).

Swete, Henry B. (ed.), *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896$^2$).

—*The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, vol. 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1901$^3$).

*The Codex Alexandrinus [...] in reduced photographic facsimile*, vol. 4 (London: British Museum, 1957).

Tischendorf, L.F. Constantin von (ed.), *Notitia editionis codici bibliorum Sinaitici [...]. Item Origenis scholia in Proverbia Salomonis* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1860).

—*Bibliorum codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus*, 4 vols. (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1969).

Thomson, Robert W. (ed.), *Hamam: Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005).

Ulrich, Eugene, *et al.* (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4: Psalms to Chronicles*, vol. 11 (*Discoveries in the Judean Desert* 16; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 181-186, pl. XXII-XXIII.

Waard, Jan de (ed.), *Biblia Hebraica Quinta: Proverbs*, vol. 17 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008).

Weber, Robert (ed.), *Sancti Cypriani episcopi opera, Ad Quirinum* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1972), LI-LX, 1-179.

—*Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983).

Weihrich, Franz (ed.), *S. Aureli Augustini [...] liber qui appellatur Speculum et Liber de divinis scripturis sive Speculum quod fertur s. Augustini* (Wien: C. Gerold's Sohn, 1887).

Weinberg, Johanna (trans.), *Azariah De' Rossi: The Light of the Eyes* (New Haven: Yale

University Press, 2001).

Wevers, John W. (ed.), *Genesis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

—*Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).

—*Leviticus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

—*Numeri* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

—*Deuteronomium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).

Worrell, William H. (ed.), *The Proverbs of Solomon in Sahidic Coptic: According to the Chicago Manuscript* (Chicago: University Press, 1931).

Ziegler, Joseph (ed.), *Iob* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

— *Sapientia Salomonis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981$^2$).

—*Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981$^2$).

—*Duodecim Prophetae* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984$^3$).

—*Isaias* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983$^3$).

—*Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976$^2$).

—*Ezechiel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978$^2$).

Ziegler, Joseph, Munnich, Olivier, and Fraenkel, Detlef (eds.), *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999$^2$).

Zohrapian, Hovhann (ed.), *Astuatsashunch' matean Hin ew Nor Ktakarants': A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1805 Venetian Edition* (New York: Caravan Books, 1984).

**Reference Works**

Brock, Sebastian P., Fritsch, Charles T., and Jellicoe, Sidney, *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1973).

Brown, Francis, Driver, Samuel R., and Briggs, Charles A., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953[2]).

Calfa Nar Bey, Ambroise, *Dictionnaire Armenien-Français* (Lisbon: Fundação C. Gulbenkian, 1991[6]).

Coakley, James F., *Robinson's Paradigms and Exercices in Syriac Grammar* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Crum, Walter E., *A Coptic Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939).

Damme, Dirk van, *A Short Classical Armenian Grammar* (Fribourg: University Press, 1978[2]).

Dillmann, August, *Lexicon linguae Aethiopicae* (Leipzig: T.O. Weigel, 1865).

Dillmann, August, and Bezold, Carl, *Ethiopic Grammar* (trans. James A. Crichton; London: Williams & Norgate, 1907).

Dogniez, Cécile, *Bibliography of the Septuagint. Bibliographie de la Septante (1970–1993)* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

Dos Santos, Elmar C., *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath Concordance to the Septuagint* (Jerusalem: Dugith, s.d).

Gesenius, Wilhelm, *Lexicon manuale Hebraicum et Chaldaicum in Veteris Testamenti libros* (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1833).

Gryson, Roger, *Altlateinische Handschriften. Manuscrits vieux latins*, vol. 1 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1999).

—*Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l'antiquité et du haut moyen âge* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2007).

Hatch, Edwin, and Redpath, Henry A., *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other*

*Greek Versions of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1897).

—*A Concordance to the Septuagint: Supplements* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1906).

Jastrow, Marcus, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: Choreb, 1926).

Jensen, Hans, *Altarmenische Grammatik* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1959).

Joüon Paul, and Muraoka, Takamitsu, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2009²).

Köhler, Ludwig, and Baumgartner, Walter, *Supplementum ad lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros* (Leiden: Brill, 1958).

—*The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2001).

Layton, Bentley, *Coptic in 20 Lessons* (Leuven: Peeters, 2007).

Leslau, Wolf, *Concise Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989).

Liddell, Henry G., and Scott, Robert, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996⁹).

Lisowsky, Gerhard, *Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1958).

Lust, Johan, Eynikel, Erik, and Hauspie, Katrin, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003²).

Mayser, Edwin, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit. Laut- und Wortlehre* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1906).

Metzger, Bruce M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stüttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994²).

Miskgian, Hovhannes, *Manuale lexicon Armeno-Latinum* (Rome: Congregatio de propaganda fide, 1887).

Montanari, Franco, *Vocabolario della lingua greca* (Torino: Loescher, 1995).

Muraoka, Takamitsu, *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Index to I Esdras* (Atlanta: Scholars

Press, 1984).

—*Classical Syriac for Hebraists* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987).

—*Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint: Keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998).

—*A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Leuven: Peteers, 2002).

Nestle, Eberhard, *Syriac Grammar with Bibliography, Chrestomathy and Glossary* (Berlin: H. Reuther, 1889).

Orlandi, Tito, *Elementi di lingua e letteratura copta* (Milan: La Goliardica, 1970).

Payne Smith, Jessie, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903).

Pazzini, Massimo, *Grammatica siriaca* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1999).

—*Lessico concordanziale del Nuovo Testamento siriaco* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2004).

Rahlfs, Alfred, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1914).

Rahlfs, Alfred, and Fraenkel, Detlef, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).

Raineri, Osvaldo, *Introduzione alla lingua Ge'ez* (Rome: Orientalia Christiana, 2002).

Reider, Joseph, and Turner, Nigel, *An Index to Aquila* (Leiden: Brill, 1966).

Vattioni, Francesco, 'Studi sul libro dei Proverbi', *Augustinianum* 12 (1972), 121-168.

Zorell, Franz, *Lexicon Hebraicum Veteris Testamenti* (Rome, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1989).

## Studies

Agelli, Antonio, 'Commentarius in Proverbia Salomonis', in Luigi Novarini, *Variorum opusculorum tomus*, vol. 3 (Verona: Typis Rubeanis, 1649).

Aitken, James J., review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), by J. Cook, in *VT* 51 (2001), 274-276.

— 'Poet and Critic: Royal Ideology and the Greek Translator of Proverbs', in T. Rajak, *et al*. (eds.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), 190-204.

Aland, Kurt, *Il testo del Nuovo Testamento* (trans. Sebastiano Timpanaro; Genova: Marietti, 1987).

Auwers, Jean-Marie, 'Tertullien et les Proverbes. Une approche philologique à partir de *Prov*. 8, 22-31', in *Mémorial Dom Jean Gribomont (1920–1986)* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1988), 75-83.

Ayuso Marazuela, Teófilo, *La Vetus Latina Hispana*, vol. 1 (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Francisco Suárez, 1953), 483-484.

— 'Un autorizado testigo en el Salterio de la Vetus Latina Hispana: El Pseudo-Speculum', *Estudios eclesiásticos* 34 (1960), 689-704.

Bady, Guillaume, 'La méthode exégétique du Commentaire inédit sur les Proverbes attribué à Jean Chrysostome', *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001), 319-327.

— *Le commentaire inédit sur les proverbes attribué à Jean Chrysostome. Introduction, édition critique et traduction* (Doctoral Thesis, Université de Lyon 2: 2003).

Barr, James, 'באר״ק-μόλις: Prov. XI. 31, I Pet. IV. 18', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20 (1975), 149-164.

— 'The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations', *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 15 (1979), 279-325.

Barthélemy, Dominique, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (Leiden: Brill, 1963).

—*Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1978).

—*Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, vol. 1 (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1982).

—*Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, vol. 3 (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1992).

—*Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, vol. 4 (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2005).

Barucq, André, *Le livre des Proverbes* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1964).

Bauer, Johannes B., 'Drei Cruces', *BZ* 9 (1965), 84-91.

Baumgartner, Antoine J., *Étude critique sur l'état du texte du livre des Proverbes d'après les principales traductions ancienne* (Leipzig: Drugulin, 1890).

Baumstark, Anton, 'Armenischer und Afrikanisch-lateinischer Proverbientext', *Biblica* 35 (1954), 346-356.

Bertram, Georg, 'Die religiöse Umdeutung altorientalischer Lebensweisheit in der griechischen Übersetzung des Alten Testaments', *ZAW* 13 (1936), 153-167.

Bickell, Gustav, 'Kritische Bearbeitung der Proverbien', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 5 (1891), 79-102, 191-214, 271-299.

Bickerman, Elias J., 'Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint', in *Alexander Marx: Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950), 149-178.

Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice, 'Le texte de l'Ancien Testament', in *Bibliorum sacrorum Graecorum codex Vaticanus B. Prolegomena* ([Rome]: Istituto poligrafico e zecca dello stato, [1999]), 7-26.

Böhlig, Alexander, *Untersuchungen über die koptischen Proverbientexte* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1936).

—'Zum Proverbientext des Clemens Alexandrinus', *Byzantinische Forschungen* 3 (1968), 73-79.

Brock, Sebastian P., 'The Phenomenon of the Septuagint', *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 17 (1972), 11-36.

—'Towards a History of Syriac Translation Technique', in R. Lavenant (ed.), *Les contacts du monde syriaque avec les autres cultures* (Rome: Pontificio istituto orientale, 1983), 1-14.

Bruyne, Donatien de, 'Étude sur le *Liber de diuinis scripturis*', *Revue Bénédictine* 43 (1931), 124-141.

—'Étude sur le *Liber de divinis scripturis*', *Revue Bénédictine* 45 (1933), 119-141.

Busto Saiz, José R., *La traducción de Símaco en el libro de los Salmos* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Arias Montano, 1985).

—'The Biblical Text of "Malachias Monachus" to the Book of Wisdom', in N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Arias Montano, 1985), 257-269.

Caloz, Masséo, *Étude sur la LXX origénienne du psautier* (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1978).

Canart, Paul, 'Notice paléographique et codicologique', in *Bibliorum sacrorum Graecorum codex Vaticanus B. Prolegomena*, ([Rome]: Istituto poligrafico e zecca dello stato, [1999]), 1-6.

Carmignac, Jean, 'Critique textuelle de Proverbes 22, 8-9', *Folia Orientalia* 21 (1980), 33-41.

Ceulemans, Reinhart, *A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of the Book of Canticles, with Emphasis on their Reception in Greek Christian Exegesis* (Doctoral Thesis, Catholic University of Leuven: 2009).

Clifford, Richard J., 'Observations on the Text and Versions of Proverbs', in M.L. Barré (ed.), *Wisdom, You Are My Sister* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1997), 47-61.

—*Proverbs: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999).

Cody, Aelred, 'Notes on Proverbs 22,21 and 22,23b', *Biblica* 61 (1980), 418-426.

Collins, John J., *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983).

Cook, Johann, 'Hellenistic Influence in the Book of Proverbs (Septuagint)?', *BIOSCS* 20 (1987), 30-42.

—'Hellenistic Influence in the Septuagint Book of Proverbs', in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the IOSCS* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991), 341-353.

—'Reflections on the Role of Wisdom in Creation with Special Reference to the Intertestamental Period', *Acta Academica* 23/3 (1991), 47-66.

—'The Dating of the Septuagint Proverbs', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 69 (1993), 383-399.

—'The Septuagint as Contextual Bible Translation – Alexandria or Jerusalem as Context for Proverbs?', *JNSL* 19 (1993), 25-39.

—'A Comparison of Proverbs and Jeremiah in the Septuagint', *JNSL* 20/1 (1994), 49-58.

—'Are the Syriac and Greek Versions of the אשה זרה (Prov 1 to 9) Identical? (On the Relationship between the Peshitta and the Septuagint)', *Textus* 17 (1994), 117-132.

—'יִשָּׁה זָרָה [sic] (Proverbs 1 - 9 Septuagint): A Metaphor for Foreign Wisdom?', *ZAW* 106 (1994), 458-476.

—'The Septuagint Proverbs as a Jewish-Hellenistic Document', in L. Greenspoon, and O. Munnich (eds.), *VIII Congress of the IOSCS* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995), 349-365.

—'Were the Persons Responsible for the Septuagint Translators and/or Scribes and/or Editors?', *JNSL* 21/2 (1995), 45-58.

—'Aspects of the Translation Technique Followed by the Translator of LXX Proverbs', *JNSL* 22/1 (1996), 143-153.

—'Exodus 38 and Proverbs 31: A Case of Different Order of Verses and Chapters in the Septuagint', in M. Vervenne (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Exodus* (Leuven: Peeters,

1996), 537-549.

—'The Hexaplaric Text, Double Translations and Other Textual Phenomena in the Septuagint (Proverbs)', *JNSL* 22/2 (1996), 129-140.

—'Following the Septuagint Translators', *JNSL* 22/2 (1996), 181-190.

—'Aspects of the Relationship Between the Septuagint Versions of Proverbs and Job', in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the IOSCS* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 309-328.

—'Contrasting as a Translation Technique in the LXX of Proverbs', in C.A. Evans, and S. Talmon (eds.), *The Quest for Context and Meaning* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 403-414.

—'The Law in the Septuagint Proverbs', *JNSL* 23/1 (1997), 211-223.

—'The Septuagint between Judaism and Christianity', *Old Testament Essays* 10 (1997), 213-225.

—*The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

—'Greek Philosophy and the Septuagint', *JNSL* 24/1 (1998), 177-191.

—'How Much Hellenism in the Hebrew Proverbs?', in K.-D. Schunck, and M. Augustin (eds.), *"Lasset uns Brücken bauen…"* (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1998), 291-301.

—'Septuagint Proverbs-and Canonization', in A. Van der Kooij, and K. Van der Toorn (eds.), *Canonization and Decanonization* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 79-91.

—'Towards the Dating of the Tradition "The Torah as Surrounding Fence"', *JNSL* 24/2 (1998), 25-34.

—'Apocalyptic Terminology in the Septuagint of Proverbs', *JNSL* 25/1 (1999), 251-261.

—'Contextual Exegetical Interpretations in the Septuagint of Proverbs', *JNSL* 25/2 (1999), 139-152.

—'The Law of Moses in Septuagint Proverbs', *VT* 49 (1999), 448-461.

—'Textual Problems in the Septuagint Version of Proverbs', *JNSL* 26/1 (2000),

171-179.

—'Lexical Matters in LXX Proverbs', *JNSL* 26/2 (2000), 163-173.

—'Ideology and Translation Technique: Two Sides of the Same Coin?', in S. Sipilä, and R. Sollamo (eds.), *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 195-210.

—'Intertextual Relationships between the Septuagint of Psalms and Proverbs', in R.J.V. Hiebert, C.E. Cox, and P.J. Gentry (eds.), *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 218-228.

—'The Ideology of Septuagint Proverbs', in B.A. Taylor (eds.), *X Congress of the IOSCS* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 463-479.

—'Les Proverbs – La Bible d'Alexandrie: Review Article', *JNSL* 28/1 (2002), 103-115.

—'Towards a Computerised Exegetical Commentary on the Septuagint Version of Proverbs', in J. Cook (ed.) *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 413-425.

—'Unit Delimitation in the Book of Proverbs in the Light of the Septugint of Proverbs', in M.C.A. Korpel, and J.M. Oesch (eds.), *Studies in Scriptural Unit Division* (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2002), 46-65.

—'Exegesis in the Septuagint', *JSNL* 30/1 (2004), 1-19.

—'"Theological/Ideological" *Tendenz* in the Septuagint – LXX Proverbs: A Case Study', in F. García Martínez, and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezechiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 65-79.

—'The Translation of a Translation: Some Methodological Considerations on the Translation of the Septuagint', in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 29-40.

Cowe, S. Peter, 'The Two Armenian Versions of Chronicles, Their Origin and

Translation Technique', *Revue des études arméniennes* 22 (1990-1991), 53-96.

Cox, Claude E., 'Introduction', in H. Zohrapian (ed.), *Astuatsashunch' Matean hin ew nor Ktakarants': A Facsimile Reproduction of the 1805 Venetian Edition* (New York: Caravan Books, 1984), x-xx.

—'The Use of the Armenian Version for the Textual Criticism of the Septuagint', in N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Arias Montano, 1985), 25-36.

—*Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986).

—*Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion in Armenia* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996).

—review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), by J. Cook, in *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 3 (1998), online.

—'Traveling with Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion in Armenia', in A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 302-316.

Cuppi, Lorenzo, 'Pr 19,17: ἀνταποδώσει ο ἀνταποδωθήσεται?', *Adamantius* 10 (2004), 53-56.

—'Samples of Variant Readings in the Armenian Proverbs: A Comparison with the Hexaplaric Text and the Peshitta', *Newsletter of the International Association for Armenian Studies* 46 (online).

—'The Treatment of Personal Names in the Book of Proverbs from the Septuagint to the Masoretic Text', in T.M. Law (ed.), *Proceedings of the European Seminar on Advanced Jewish Studies 2010*, (Leuven: Peteers, *forthcoming*), 19-38.

—'Concerning the Origin of the Addition Found in Prov$^{LXX}$ 1:7', in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress 2010* (Society of Biblical Literature, *forthcoming*).

Dathe, Johann A., 'De ratione consensus versionis Chaldaicae et Syriacae Proverbiorum

Salomonis (Lipsiae, 1764)', in E.F.C. Rosenmüller (ed.), *Opuscula ad crisin et interpretationem Veteris Testamenti spectantia* (Leipzig: Karl Franz Köhler, 1796), 106-129.

Delitzsch, Franz, *Das salomonische Spruchbuch* (Leipzig: Dörfling und Franke, 1873).

De Troyer, Kristin, *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000).

Denis, Albert-Marie, *Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

Dick, Michael B., 'The Ethics of the Old Greek Book of Proverbs', *Studia Philonica Annual* 2 (1990), 20-50.

Dorival, Gilles, Harl, Marguerite, and Munnich, Olivier, *La bible grecque des Septante* (Paris: Cerf, 1988).

Drusius, Ioannes, *Quaestionum Ebraicarum libri tres. In quibus innumera Scripturae loca explicantur aut emendantur* (Franeker: Apud Aegidium Radaeum, 1599²).

Faulhaber, Michael, *Hohelied-, Proverbien- und Prediger-catenen* (Theologische Studien der Leo-Gesellschaft, 4; Vienna: Mayer & co., 1902).

Fernández Marcos, Natalio, 'Some Reflections on the Antiochian Text of the Septuagint', in D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J.W. Wevers (eds.), *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 219-229.

—*Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Book of Kings* (Leiden: Brill, 1994).

—*Introducción a las versiones griegas de la Biblia* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1998²).

—'The Textual Context of the Hexapla: Lucianic Texts and Vetus Latina', in A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 408-420.

—review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs?*

*Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), by J. Cook, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 30 (1999), 95-98.

Forti, Tova, *Animal Imagery in the Book of Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

Forti, Tova, and Talshir, Zipora, 'Proverbs 7 in MT and LXX: Form and Content', *Textus* 22 (2005), 129-167.

Fox, Michael V., 'The Strange Woman in Septuagint Proverbs', *JNSL* 22/2 (1996), 31-44.

—*Proverbs*, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 2000; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009).

—review of *Secondary Parallelism. A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004), by Gerhard Tauberschmidt, in *Review of Biblical Literature* 11 (2004), http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4192_4111.pdf.

—'LXX-Proverbs as a Text-Critical Resource', *Textus* 22 (2005), 95-128.

—'Editing Proverbs: The Challange of the Oxford Hebrew Bible', *JNSL* 32/1 (2006), 1-22.

Fritsch, Charles T., 'The Treatment of the Hexaplaric Signs in the Syro-Hexaplar of Proverbs', *JBL* 72 (1953), 169-181 (reprinted in Sidney Jellicoe (ed.), *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* [New York: Ktav Publ. House, 1974], 356-368).

Gammie, John G., 'The Septuagint of Job: Its Poetic Style and Relationship to the Septuagint of Proverbs', *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1987), 14-31.

Géhin, Paul, 'Un recueil d'extraits patristiques: les Miscellanea Coisliniana (*Parisinus Coislinianus* 193 et *Sinaiticus gr*. 461)', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 22 (1992), 89-130.

Gentry, Peter J., *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995).

—'Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Rôle of the Syro-Hexapla', *Aramaic*

*Studies* 1 (2003), 5-28.

Gerleman, Gillis, 'Religion och moral i Septuagintas Proverbia-översättning', *Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift* 26 (1950), 222-232.

—'The Septugint Proverbs as a Hellenistic Document', *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 8 (1950), 15-27.

—*Studies in the Septuagint. III. Proverbs* (Lund: Gleerup, 1956).

Giese, Ronald L., 'Qualifying Wealth in the Septuagint of Proverbs', *JBL* 111 (1992), 409-425.

—'Strength through Wisdom and the Bee in LXX-Prov 6,8[a-c]', *Biblica* 73 (1992), 404-411.

—'Compassion for the Lowly in Septuagint Proverbs', *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 11 (1993), 109-117.

—'Dualism in the LXX of Prov 2:17: A Case Study in the LXX as Revisionary Translation', *The Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 36/3 (1993), 289-295.

Goldingay, John E., 'Proverbs V and IX', *RB* 84 (1977), 80-93.

Göttsberger, Johann, 'Miszelle zu Prv 1,7 nach der LXX', *BZ* 2 (1904), 14.

—'Zu Prv 3,18[b] nach LXX', *BZ* 3 (1905), 139.

—'Textkritik und Kolumnenschreibung', *BZ* 4 (1906), 118.

Haar Romeny, R. Bas ter, *A Syrian in Greek Dress: The Use of Greek, Hebrew, and Syriac Biblical Texts in Eusebius of Emesa's Commentary on Genesis* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997).

Hagner, Donald A., *The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (Leiden: Brill, 1973).

Hamonville, David-Marc d', 'Le livre des Proverbes', *Autour des livres de la LXX* (Paris: Centre d'études du Saulchoir, 1995), 11-24.

Hanhart, Robert, 'L'edizione dei LXX e la fondazione gottingense che la prepara', *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 1 (1965), 351-352.

Heater, Homer, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1982).

Hemmerdinger-Iliadou, Démocratie, 'I. Éphrem grec. – II. Éphrem latin', in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique*, vol. 4 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1960), 800-819.

Hilhorst, Anthony, review of *Bibliography of the Septuagint. Bibliographie de la Septante (1970–1993)* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), by Cécile Dogniez, in *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 26 (1995), 354-358.

Hengel, Martin, *Giudaismo ed ellenismo* (trans. Sergio Monaco; Brescia: Paideia, 2001).

Jäger, Johann G., *Observationes in Proverbiorum Salomonis versionem Alexandrinam* (Meldorf: Boie, 1788).

Jellicoe, Sidney, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).

Jenkins, R. Geoffrey, 'A note on the Text of Rahlfs 928', *BIOSCS* 19 (1986), 5-6.

—'The Text of P Antinoopolis 8/210', in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the IOSCS* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987), 65-77.

Jobes, Karen H., and Silva, Moisés, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000).

Johnson, Timothy, 'Implied Antecedents in Job xl 2b and Proverbs iii 6a', *VT* 52 (2002), 278-284.

Joosten, Jan, 'Doublet Translations in Peshitta Proverbs', in P.B. Dirksen, and A. van der Kooij (eds.), *The Peshitta as a Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 63-72.

Kaminka, Armand, 'Septuaginta und Targum zu Proverbia', *Hebrew Union College Annual* 8-9 (1931–32), 169-191.

Kasser, Rodolphe, 'Introduction', in R. Kasser (ed.), *Papyrus Bodmer VI, Livre des Proverbes* (Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1960), VIII-XXX.

—'Protodialectes coptes à systèmes alphabétiques de type vieux-copte', in M. Immerzeel, and J. van der Vliet (eds.), *Coptic Studies on the Threshold of a New*

*Millennium* (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 77-124.

Kenyon, Frederic G., *The Text of the Greek Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1975³).

Kooij, Arie van der, 'On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms', *VT* 33 (1983), 67-74.

La Bonnardière, Anne-Marie, *Biblia Augustiniana. A.T. Le Livre des Proverbes* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1975).

Lagarde, Paul de, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863).

—'Anmerkungen zur griechischen übersetzung der Proverbien', in *Mittheilungen*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1884), 19-26.

Lewy, Hans, *Sobria Ebrietas. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der antiken Mystik* (Gießen: A. Töpelmann, 1929), 14-17.

Luc, Alex, 'The Titles and Structure of Proverbs', *ZAW* 112 (2000), 252-255.

Lust, Johan, 'A Lexicon of Symmachus' Translation of the Psalms', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 74/1 (1998), 87-92.

McKane, William, *Proverbs: A New Approach* (London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1970), 33-47.

McLay, Tim, *The OG and Th Version of Daniel* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1996).

Mercati, Giovanni, 'Sul significato di alcune sottoscrizioni della siroesaplare specialmente', in *Nuove note di letteratura biblica e cristiana antica* (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1941), 26-48.

Mezzacasa, Giacomo, *Il libro dei Proverbi di Salomone. Studio critico sulle aggiunte greco-alessandrine* (Rome: Istituto Biblico Pontificio, 1913).

Minissale, Antonino, 'La Settanta di *Proverbi* 10-12', in G. Bellia, and A. Passaro (eds.), *Libro dei Proverbi. Tradizione, redazione, teologia* (Casale Monferrato, AL: Piemme, 1999), 109-121.

Moro, Caterina, 'Il testo greco di "Proverbi" in Clemente Alessandrino. Analisi testuale e confronto con la versione copto-saidica', *Annali di studi religiosi* 2 (2001),

391-437.

Mulder, Martin J., 'The Use of the Peshitta in Textual Criticism', in N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Arias Montano, 1985), 37-53.

Muraoka, Takamitsu, 'A New Index to Hatch and Redpath', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 73/4 (1997), 257-276.

Nestle, Eberhard, 'Zum Codex Alexandrinus in Swete's Septuaginta', *ZAW* 15 (1895), 291-292.

Passoni Dell'Acqua, Anna, 'La sapienza e in genere l'elemento intermedio tra Dio e il creato nelle versioni greche dell'Antico Testamento. Analisi delle divergenze tra testo ebraico e versioni greche dell'Antico Testamento: Proverbi 8', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 98 (1984), 97-147.

Peters, Melvin K.H., 'The Use of Coptic for Textual Criticism of the Septuagint', in N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Arias Montano, 1985), 55-66.

Pilkington, Hugh A.W., *A Critical Edition of the Book of Proverbs in Ethiopic* (Doctoral Thesis, University of Oxford: 1978).

Pinkuss, Hermann, 'Die syrische Übersetzung der Proverbien textkritisch und in ihrem Verhältnisse zu dem masoretischen Text, den LXX und dem Targum untersucht', *ZAW* 14 (1894), 65-141, 161-222.

Prato, Gian Luigi, review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), by J. Cook, in *Adamantius* 7 (2001), 330-335.

Puech, Émile, 'Qumrân e il libro dei *Proverbi*' in G. Bellia, and A. Passaro (eds.), *Libro dei Proverbi. Tradizione, redazione, teologia* (Casale Monferrato, AL: Piemme, 1999), 169-189.

Richard, Marcel, 'Les fragments du Commentaire de S. Hippolyte sur les Proverbes de

Salomon', in *Opera minora*, vol. 1 (Turnhout: Brepols; Leuven: University Press, 1976), n. 17.

—'Le commentaire de Saint Jean Chrysostome sur les *Proverbes de Salomon*', in *Opera minora*, vol. 2 (Turnhout: Brepols; Leuven: University Press, 1977), n. 40 (99-103).

Riesenfeld, Harald, 'A Probable Background to the Johannine Paraclete', in J. Bergman, K. Drynjeff, and H. Ringgren (eds.), *Ex orbe religionum*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 266-274.

Rofé, Alexander, 'The Valiant Woman, γυνὴ συνετή, and the Redaction of the Book of Proverbs', in C. Bultmann, W. Dietrich, and C. Levin (eds.), *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 145-155.

Rüger, Hans P., 'Vier Aquila-Glossen in einem hebräischen Proverbien-Fragment aus der Kairo-Geniza', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 50 (1959), 275-277.

—'Zum Text von Prv. 31,30', *Die Welt des Orients* 5 (1969–70), 96-99.

Russiano Miles, John, *Retroversion and Text Criticism: The Predictability of Syntax in an Ancient Translation from Greek to Ethiopic* (Chico, CA: Scholar Press, 1985).

Salvesen, Alison, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (Manchester: University of Manchester, 1991).

Sandelin, Karl-Gustav, *Wisdom as Nourisher* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1986), 73-81.

Scanlin, Harold P., 'A New Edition of Origen's Hexapla: How It Might Be Done', in A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 439-449.

Schenker, Adrian, *Hexaplarische Psalmenbruchstücke. Die hexaplarischen Psalmenfragmente der Handschriften Vaticanus graecus 752 und Canonicianus graecus 62* (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1975), 272-273.

Schildenberger, Johannes, 'Die altlateinischen Proverbien-Randlesungen der Bibel von Valvanera', *Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft* 5 (1935), 97-107.

—*Die altlateinischen texte des Proverbien-Buches*, vol. 1 (Beuron: Erzabtei Beuron, 1941).

Schleusner, Johann F., *Opuscula critica ad Versiones Graecas Veteris Testamenti pertinentia* (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1812).

Schürer, Emil, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, vol. 3 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1909), 512-522.

—*The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*, New English Version ed. by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973–1987).

Serra Zanetti, Paolo, 'Osservazioni su Proverbi 19,17a in Cipriano', in E. Mazza, and D. Gianotti (eds.), *Presiedere alla carità* (Genova: Marietti, 1988), 95-101.

Sipilä, Seppo, 'Max Leopold Margolis and the Origenic Recension in Joshua', in A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 16-38.

Skehan, Patrick W., 'The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism', *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 4 (1957), 148-160.

Smit Sibinga, Joost, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr: The Pentateuch*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1963).

Sperber, Alexander, 'Hebrew Based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations', *Hebrew Union College Annual* 12-13 (1937–1938), 103-274.

—*A Grammar of Masoretic Hebrew* (Copenhagen: Munskgaard, 1959).

—*A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Leiden: Brill, 1966).

Stone, Michael E., *The Apocryphal Literature in the Armenian Tradition* (Proceeding of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 4/4; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1969), 1-20.

Swete, Henry B., *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek revised by R.R. Ottley* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914).

Talshir, Zipora, 'Double Translations in the Septuagint', in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress*

*of the IOSCS* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987), 21-63.

—*Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 2001).

Taylor, Bernard A., 'Evaluating Minority Variants Within Families of Greek Manuscripts', *BIOSCS* 23 (1990), 31-38.

—*The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns*, 2 vols. (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992–1993).

Tauberschmidt, Gerhard, *Secondary Parallelism: A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004).

Thackeray, Henry St.J., 'The Poetry of the Greek Book of Proverbs', *The Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1912), 46-66.

Tov, Emanuel, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1:1-3:8* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976).

—'The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books', in P. Casetti, O. Keel and A. Schenker (eds.), *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy* (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1981), 577-592.

—*The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1981).

—'Recensional Differences Between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs', in H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins, and T.H. Tobin (eds.), *Of Scribes and Scrolls* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1990), 43-56.

—'Some Reflections on the Hebrew Texts from which the Septuagint was Translated', *JNSL* 19 (1993), 107-122.

—'Recensional Differences Between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs', in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 419-431.

Toy, Crawford H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899).

Treu, Kurt, 'Majuskelbruchstücke der Septuaginta aus Damaskus', *Nachrichten der*

*Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen aus dem Jahre 1966. Philologisch-Historische Klasse*, 201-221.

—'Neue Berliner Septuagintafragmente', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 20 (1970), 43-65.

—'Varia Christiana', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 24-25 (1976), 113-127.

Troxel, Ronald L., *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

Turner, Priscilla D.M., 'Two Septuagintalisms with στηρίζειν', *VT* 28 (1978), 481-482.

Ulrich, Eugene, 'Characteristics and Limitations of the Old Latin Translation of the Septuagint', in N. Fernández Marcos (ed.), *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto Arias Montano, 1985), 67-80.

Vaccari, Alberto, 'Un testo dommatico e una versione biblica', *La Civiltà cattolica* 64/4 (1913), 190-205.

—'Le versioni arabe dei Profeti', *Biblica* 2 (1921), 401-423.

—'Recupero d'un lavoro critico di S. Girolamo', *Scritti di erudizione e di filologia*, vol. 2 (Rome: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1958), 83-146.

Vööbus, Arthur, 'Hexapla and Syro-Hexapla', in *The Pentateuch in the Version of the Syro-hexapla* (Louvain: Secrétariat du CSCO, 1975), 3-26.

Waard, Jan de, '4QProv and Textual Criticism', *Textus* 19 (1998), 87-96.

—'Some Unusual Translation Techniques Employed by the Greek Translator(s) of Proverbs', in S. Sipilä, and R. Sollamo (eds.), *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 185-193.

Wahl, Otto, *Der Proverbien-und Kohelet-Text der Sacra Parallela* (Würzburg: Echter, 1985).

Walters (Katz), Peter, *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).

Wolters, Al, 'Ṣôpiyyâ (Prov 31:27) as Hymnic Participle and Play on *Sophia*', *JBL* 104 (1985), 577-587.

Van Leeuwen, Raymond C., review of *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), by J. Cook, in *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 90 (2000), 505-509.

Weber, Robert (ed.), *Le psautier romain et les autres anciens psautiers latins* (Rome: Vaticana, 1953).

Weeks, Stuart, *Instruction and Imagery in Proverbs 1–9* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

Weingreen, Jacob, 'Rabbinic-Type Commentary in the LXX Version of Proverbs', in A. Shinan (ed.), *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), 407-415.

Weitzman, Michael P., 'Peshitta, Septuagint and Targum', in R. Lavenant (ed.), *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1994), 51-84.

—'The Reliability of Retroversions of the Three from the Syrohexapla: A Pilot Study in Hosea', in A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 317-359.

—'The Interpretative Character of the Syriac Old Testament', in *From Judaism to Christianity: Studies in the Hebrew and Syriac Bibles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 55-89.

Wesseling, Peter, *Observationum variarum libri duo, in quibus multi veterum auctorum loci explicantur atque emendantur* (Amsterdam: Wetstenius & Smith, 1727).

Wevers, John W., *Text History of the Greek Genesis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

—*Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978).

—*Text History of the Greek Numbers* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

—*Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).

—*Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990).

—*Text History of the Greek Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992).

—*Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993).

—*Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995).

—*Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997).

—*Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1998).

Whybray, R. Norman, *Wealth and Poverty in the Book of Proverbs* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990).

—*The Composition of the Book of Proverbs* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

—*The Book of Proverbs: A Survey of Modern Study* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

Zanolli, Almo, '"Τῶν παροιμιῶν" cod. Mediceus XXX plut. VII et "Λουκιανὸς" editio', *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* 18 (1905), 67-101.

Ziegler, Joseph, 'Der Gebrauch des Artikels in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes', in D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J.W. Wevers (eds.), *Studien zur Septuaginta – Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 83-120.

Zuntz, Günther, 'Der Antinoe Papyrus der Proverbia und das Prophetologion', *ZAW* 68 (1956), 124-184.