

A Descriptive Analysis of Septuagint Micah

by

Steve Michael Modugno
(Student number: 2011117559)

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Philosophy

in the

Faculty of the Humanities
Department of Hebrew
University of the Free State
Bloemfontein

July 2015

Supervisor: Prof. Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé
Co-Supervisor: Prof. Jacobus A. Naudé

Declaration

I, Steve Michael Modugno (student number 2011117559), declare that the thesis hereby handed in for the qualification Doctor of Philosophy in Hebrew at the University of the Free State, is my own independent work and that I have not previously submitted the same for qualification at/in another University/faculty.

I also cede the copyright of this thesis in favor of the University of the Free State.

Acknowledgments

Someone once told me that the doctoral journey is more like a marathon than a sprint. That description proved accurate. It has been long, hard and painful but crossing the finish line has proved to be greatly satisfying. Along the way, many individuals have supported me and encouraged me to finish.

I would like to thank my New Testament and biblical Hebrew professors at Talbot School of Theology for their guidance as I established my theological foundation. I would especially like to express my gratitude to Prof. John Sailhamer whose astute exegesis of Scripture inspired my pursuit of education in the Hebrew Bible.

I am grateful for the training I received at UW-Madison where Prof. Michael V. Fox modeled a sophisticated approach to textual criticism and insisted on an expert handling of biblical (and non-biblical Ancient Near Eastern) texts. Additionally, Prof. Cynthia Miller-Naudé guided me to a deep knowledge of biblical Hebrew both through understanding its historical development as well as analysing it with linguistics tools and theories. As my doctoral supervisor, she expected a high standard of excellence in research and writing. It was tiring but well worth the effort.

Prof. Jacobus Naudé, my co-supervisor, introduced me to Translation Studies, which was an important aspect of my doctoral research. He helped me realise the complex nature of ancient translations which were produced by individuals who were guided by both the norms of their historical contexts as well as their own ideologies and theologies.

I am grateful for my good friend Eric Tully who I met while studying in Jerusalem. He was an invaluable sounding board and source of support and encouragement while in Israel and throughout my education at UW.

I would like to thank the elders at Red Mountain Community Church for providing me with the time and space to work on my dissertation while serving there as a pastor.

I am grateful for my mom who always believes in me (even when I do not believe in myself). Her words of encouragement often lifted me when I was tired and discouraged during the dissertation process.

I began working on my dissertation before my daughter Gracie was born 4 years ago. She has known nothing different. But she has involuntarily sacrificed hundreds of hours with her dada and I am grateful that my relationship with her is still strong. I am happy to have more time now with her and my wife Serina.

Serina has endured as much, if not more, stress and anxiety as I have. I am so thankful for her perseverance through this journey. She has been an amazing source of encouragement, support and motivation. She deserves equal congratulations as me. I love her dearly.

Finally, I give praise to God for giving me strength and endurance to complete this task. I give him credit for sustaining Serina and Gracie during the long hours and days I could not be with them.

To him be the glory!

Abbreviations

1QpMic	Pesher to Micah found in cave 1 (also 1Q14)
4QXII ^g	Greek scroll of the Twelve Prophets found in cave 4
α'	Aquila
σ'	Symmachus
θ'	Theodotion
A	codex Alexandrinus
A'	A-106
acc	accusative
BHQ	Biblia Hebraica Quinta, <i>The Twelve Minor Prophets</i> (unless noted otherwise)
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia
c	common
CATSS	Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint/Scriptural Study
CC	Causal Conditions
CD	Qumran Damascus Document
EF	Effects
f	feminine
gen	genitive
Gk	Greek text according to <i>Duodecim Prophetæ</i> edited by Joseph Ziegler
GKC	<i>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</i> . Edited by Emil Kautzsch. Translated by Arthur Ernest Cowley. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
Ḥev	Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever
LXX	Septuagint (as a collection of various Greek translation units)
m	masculine
MT	Massoretic Text (according to BHQ)

Mur	Murabba ^c ât 88
OG	Old Greek
p	plural
S	Peshitta
Q	codex Marchalianus
s	singular
ST	Source Text (the text to be translated)
T	Targum Jonathan to the Prophets
TL	Target Language (for the current purposes, Greek)
TS	Translation Studies
TT	Target Text (the translation)
V	Vulgate
Sigla	
>	is rendered
∅	no reading, minus
x	number of times

Books of the Bible and other ancient sources follow the abbreviations found in *The SBL Handbook of Style*.

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	i
Acknowledgments.....	ii
Abbreviations.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	v
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 General background.....	1
1.2 Translation.....	2
1.3 Translation Studies.....	4
1.4 Septuagint Studies.....	6
1.5 Merging Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies.....	7
1.6 Problem statement and hypothesis.....	7
1.7 Methodological framework.....	8
1.8 Delimitation of study.....	8
1.9 Organisation.....	9
Chapter 2: Overview of studies on LXX-Micah and translation technique in the Latter Prophets.....	11
2.1 Introduction.....	11
2.2 Studies on LXX-Micah.....	11
2.2.1 John Taylor.....	11
2.2.2 Siegfried Schwantes.....	12
2.2.3 Dennis R. Magary.....	12
2.2.4 Summary.....	13
2.3 Translation technique in the Latter Prophets.....	14
2.3.1 H. St. J. Thackeray.....	14
2.3.2 Jan de Waard.....	15
2.3.3 Thomas W. Phelan.....	16
2.3.4 Jennifer M. Dines.....	16
2.3.5 John A. Beck.....	18
2.3.6 James K. Palmer.....	21
2.3.7 Theo A. W. van der Louw.....	22
2.3.8 W. Edward Glenny.....	23
2.3.9 Staffan Oloffson.....	25
2.3.10 Daniel M. O'Hare.....	27

2.3.11 Eric J. Tully.....	29
2.3.12 Summary and Evaluation.....	30
Chapter 3: Descriptive Translation Studies as the Theoretical and Methodological	
Framework	32
3.1 Introduction.....	32
3.2 Development of Descriptive Translation Studies	32
3.3 Causal Model	35
3.3.1 Causal conditions (preliminary norms).....	36
3.3.2 Translated text.....	37
3.3.2.1 Obligatory shifts	40
3.3.2.2 Non-obligatory shifts	40
3.3.2.2.1 When text understood	40
3.3.2.2.2 When text apparently <i>not</i> understood	41
3.3.3 Translation effects.....	41
3.4 Conclusion	44
Chapter 4: A comparative analysis of MT-Micah and LXX-Micah.....	46
4.1 Introduction.....	46
4.2 Micah 1	47
4.2.1 Micah 1.1	47
4.2.2 Micah 1.2	49
4.2.3 Micah 1.3	55
4.2.4 Micah 1.4	56
4.2.5 Micah 1.5	57
4.2.6 Micah 1.6	59
4.2.7 Micah 1.7	62
4.2.8 Micah 1.8	64
4.2.9 Micah 1.9	65
4.2.10 Micah 1.10	66
4.2.11 Micah 1.11	70
4.2.12 Micah 1.12	72
4.2.13 Micah 1.13	74
4.2.14 Micah 1.14	76
4.2.15 Micah 1.15	77
4.2.16 Micah 1.16	78
4.3 Micah 2	80

4.3.1 Micah 2.1	80
4.3.2 Micah 2.2	82
4.3.3 Micah 2.3	84
4.3.4 Micah 2.4	85
4.3.5 Micah 2.5	90
4.3.6 Micah 2.6	90
4.3.7 Micah 2.7	92
4.3.8 Micah 2.8	94
4.3.9 Micah 2.9	98
4.3.10 Micah 2.10	101
4.3.11 Micah 2.11	102
4.3.12 Micah 2.12	104
4.3.13 Micah 2.13	107
4.4 Micah 3	108
4.4.1 Micah 3.1	108
4.4.2 Micah 3.2	110
4.4.3 Micah 3.3	111
4.4.4 Micah 3.4	112
4.4.5 Micah 3.5	114
4.4.6 Micah 3.6	115
4.4.7 Micah 3.7	116
4.4.8 Micah 3.8	117
4.4.9 Micah 3.9	119
4.4.10 Micah 3.10	119
4.4.11 Micah 3.11	120
4.4.12 Micah 3.12	122
4.5 Micah 4	123
4.5.1 Micah 4.1	123
4.5.2 Micah 4.2	125
4.5.3 Micah 4.3	126
4.5.4 Micah 4.4	127
4.5.5 Micah 4.5	129
4.5.6 Micah 4.6	131
4.5.7 Micah 4.7	133
4.5.8 Micah 4.8	133

4.5.9 Micah 4.9	134
4.5.10 Micah 4.10	136
4.5.11 Micah 4.11	138
4.5.12 Micah 4.12	139
4.5.13 Micah 4.13	139
4.5.14 Micah 4.14	142
4.6 Micah 5	143
4.6.1 Micah 5.1	143
4.6.2 Micah 5.2	144
4.6.3 Micah 5.3	145
4.6.4 Micah 5.4	146
4.6.5 Micah 5.5	148
4.6.6 Micah 5.6	149
4.6.7 Micah 5.7	152
4.6.8 Micah 5.8	153
4.6.9 Micah 5.9	154
4.6.10 Micah 5.10	155
4.6.11 Micah 5.11	155
4.6.12 Micah 5.12	157
4.6.13 Micah 5.13	158
4.6.14 Micah 5.14	160
4.7 Micah 6	161
4.7.1 Micah 6.1	161
4.7.2 Micah 6.2	162
4.7.3 Micah 6.3	164
4.7.4 Micah 6.4	164
4.7.5 Micah 6.5	165
4.7.6 Micah 6.6	166
4.7.7 Micah 6.7	168
4.7.8 Micah 6.8	169
4.7.9 Micah 6.9	171
4.7.10 Micah 6.10	173
4.7.11 Micah 6.11	174
4.7.12 Micah 6.12	175
4.7.13 Micah 6.13	176

4.7.14 Micah 6.14	177
4.7.15 Micah 6.15	179
4.7.16 Micah 6.16	180
4.8 Micah 7	181
4.8.1 Micah 7.1	181
4.8.2 Micah 7.2	184
4.8.3 Micah 7.3	185
4.8.4 Micah 7.4	187
4.8.5 Micah 7.5	189
4.8.6 Micah 7.6	191
4.8.7 Micah 7.7	192
4.8.8 Micah 7.8	194
4.8.9 Micah 7.9	195
4.8.10 Micah 7.10	196
4.8.11 Micah 7.11	196
4.8.12 Micah 7.12	199
4.8.13 Micah 7.13	201
4.8.14 Micah 7.14	201
4.8.15 Micah 7.15	203
4.8.16 Micah 7.16	204
4.8.17 Micah 7.17	204
4.8.18 Micah 7.18	206
4.8.19 Micah 7.19	207
4.8.20 Micah 7.20	208
4.9 Conclusions.....	209
Chapter 5: Categorisation of Translation Shifts.....	212
5.1 Introduction.....	212
5.2 Verbal correlations.....	212
5.3 Morphological, lexical and syntactic shifts	236
5.4 Differences due to translation, transcription and transmission errors or a different Hebrew <i>Vorlage</i>	265
5.4.1 Translation, transcription and transmission errors.....	265
5.4.2 Different Hebrew <i>Vorlage</i>	267
5.5 Operational norms.....	272
5.5.1 Obligatory shifts.....	272

5.5.2 Non-obligatory shifts (when text understood)	274
5.5.2.1 Style	274
5.5.2.2 Clarity	275
5.5.2.2.1 Explicitisation	276
5.5.2.2.2 Concretisation	280
5.5.2.2.3 Harmonisation	281
5.5.2.2.4 Interpretation	283
5.5.2.3 Theology	285
5.5.2.4 Ideology	291
5.5.3 Non-obligatory shifts (when text apparently <i>not</i> understood)	294
5.5.3.1 Slot translations	294
5.5.3.2 Omissions	295
5.6 Summary	296
Chapter 6: Summary and Conclusions	298
6.1 Introduction	298
6.2 Summary	298
6.2.1 Chapter 1	298
6.2.2 Chapter 2	299
6.2.3 Chapter 3	300
6.2.4 Chapter 4	300
6.2.5 Chapter 5	301
6.3 Conclusions	302
6.3.1 Style	302
6.3.2 Clarity	302
6.3.3 Theology	302
6.3.4 Ideology	303
6.4 Future perspectives	304
Works Cited	306
Abstract	321
Abstrak	322

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 General background

In the 3rd century B.C.E. in Alexandria, Egypt, the first five books of the Hebrew Bible were translated into Greek. Because of the supposed 70 (or 72 translators) involved in the process, this translation was referred to as the Septuagint (LXX). Subsequent to the completion of the LXX, the rest of the Hebrew Bible was translated and completed by the 1st century B.C.E (Marcos 2000, 50). Over time, the entire collection of Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible, as well as the apocryphal and deuterocanonical books, came to be known as the LXX.¹ For simplicity, I use the term LXX to refer to the Old Greek translations within this corpus.

The focus of this study is LXX-Micah *as a translation*. As such, the goal is to discover the *characteristics* and *message* of the translation as a different text than that of the original Hebrew. Some differences reveal translation errors or a different Hebrew *Vorlage*; others reflect the interventions of the translator as an agent of change. He was rewriting a text, occasionally adjusting for style and clarity, but also infusing his idiosyncratic ideology and theology (which may not have been entirely different from the ideology and theology of his historical milieu) to meet the needs of his target audience. “Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way” (Bassnett and Lefevere 1992, vii).

¹ Hengel (2002, 19) notes that Christian authors were the first to call the Greek Old Testament οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα “the Septuaginta.”

1.2 Translation

Though the process of translation has been conducted throughout history, there has not always been a consensus on the identity of a “good” translation. The essence of (interlingual) translation,² according to Roman Jakobson, is “an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language” (Jakobson 2004, 139). So is a “good” translation the one that most accurately interprets the verbal signs of one language into those of another? Asked another way, is a “good” translation the one that most closely mirrors the linguistic image of the source language? Given that no two languages perfectly align linguistically, how do we judge the “quality” of one translation *vis-à-vis* another?

Central to the issue of translation “quality” are the ideas of *correspondence* and *equivalence*. Werner Koller (1989) relates *correspondence* and *equivalence* to Ferdinand de Saussure’s *langue* and *parole*, respectively (de Saussure 1966, 9-13). Correspondence in translation is reflected by the translator’s knowledge of the source and target *langue*; equivalence in translation is reflected by the translator’s competence with the source and target *parole* (Koller 1989, 99-104).³ When a translator possesses a high competence in the source and target *langue*, then translation differences can be attributed to either the linguistic gap or the unique *paroles* of the two languages.⁴ Correspondence relates to obligatory translation decisions or linguistic norms that guide (or even restrict) the translator; equivalence deals with non-obligatory translation decisions made as the translator determines the best way to communicate the source text (based on stylistic, cultural, ideological, theological or political criteria). According to Nord (1997, 36), “In *Skopostheorie*,

² Jakobson also distinguishes intralingual translation (rewording) and intersemiotic translation (transmutation through a nonverbal sign system) (2004, 139).

³ When assessing ancient translations, it is often difficult to determine the translator’s knowledge of *langue* or competence with *parole*. For instance, when there seems to be a more accurate way to translate a particular word, the question arises as to whether the translator was unfamiliar with the meaning of that word or whether he intentionally rendered it differently for an ideological reason (or even for a cultural, theological or political reason).

⁴ When dealing with ancient texts where the original translation setting and the transmission history are not known, other possibilities for translation differences arise (e.g. different *Vorlage*, transmission error, or redaction).

equivalence means adequacy to a *Skopos* that requires that the target text serve the same communicative function or functions as the source text” (cf. Reiss and Vermeer, 1984).

Jakobson (2004, 139) claims that “equivalence in difference is the cardinal problem of language and the pivotal concern of linguistics.” Equivalence has been a source of tension in western translation theory for the past two thousand years (Hatim et al 2004, 11). Ever since Cicero’s Latin translation of *De optimo genere oratorum* in the 1st century BCE and St. Jerome’s translation of the Vulgate in the 4th century CE (both of which were rendered in a sense-for-sense manner), there has been debate about what constitutes optimal equivalence (Munday 2008, 19). Labels for equivalence have included “literal,” “free,” and “faithful” as well as “word-for-word” and “sense-for-sense” (Munday 2008, 19). “Faithful” as a label has traditionally been used with respect to Bible translation, where anything other than “faithful” was liable to another label—“heresy.”

In the 1960s Eugene Nida challenged the notion that the most “faithful” translation of the Bible must adhere as closely as possible to the form and content of the source text.⁵ Translation, according to Nida, should capture the sense of the source text and transfer this same sense into the target text. The translation should, as a result, impact the target audience in the same way that it impacted the original source culture audience. Nida (2003, 159) suggested new categories of equivalence that he called *formal* and *dynamic*. “Formal equivalence focuses attention on the message itself, in both form and content”; “dynamic equivalence aims at complete naturalness of expression, and tries to relate the receptor to modes of behavior relevant within the context of his own culture.” Nida’s idea of dynamic equivalence highlights the tendency of translators to consider the target culture in their translations.

⁵ Whereas some translation scholars use the adjective “faithful” along with “literal” (e.g., Cook 2010b, 629), I believe it is more accurate to think of “faithful” as it relates to the source text message or the target text *skopos*. Furthermore, the label “faithful” should at times be used in instances that would be described as free renderings (cf. Aejmelaeus [1993b, 122] regarding portions of LXX-Exodus).

Nida's emphasis on the cultural element in translation prompted scholars to explore this issue further. Since a language is embedded in its culture, it carries with it various characteristics of that culture. Therefore, when a translation is conducted, the translator is not merely dealing with linguistic signs but with the cultural identity associated with those signs. Lawrence Venuti captures both the linguistic and cultural elements of translation: "Translation never communicates in an untroubled fashion because the translator negotiates the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text by reducing them and supplying another set of differences, basically domestic, drawn from the receiving language and culture to enable the foreign to be received there" (2000, 468).

1.3 Translation Studies

The field of study that considers these ideas as they relate to the process and product of translation is called "translation studies." In a paper he delivered in 1972, Robert Holmes both named and set the trajectory for this field. In his paper, Holmes divided the field of translation studies into two main areas: pure translation studies and applied translation studies. Pure translation studies has two goals: "(1) to describe the phenomena of translating and translation(s) as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience, and (2) to establish general principles by means of which these phenomena can be explained and predicted" (Holmes 1988, 71). The first goal can be achieved through "descriptive translation studies" and the second through "translation theory." Holmes divided descriptive translation studies into three focus areas: product-oriented, process-oriented and function-oriented (Holmes 1988, 73-78). Descriptive translation studies (DTS) in the branch of pure translation studies, is most relevant for this study.

Within DTS, a great deal of progress has been made to develop theories (e.g., polysystem, *skopos* and frame) and models (e.g., comparative, process and causal) for the

analysis of translations.⁶ According to Naudé (2011, 228), it is the functionalist and descriptive approaches that have “helped to steer translation studies away from the submissive viewpoint of the role of the translator” because “both view translation as a new communicative act that is aimed at serving a purpose for the target culture, even if this results in differences from the source text.” I believe that using this target-oriented or functionalist approach leads to the best description of the LXX translation.

Despite the many advances within DTS, relatively little attention has been devoted to the LXX translation.⁷ The attention it has received primarily involves assessing the LXX as a product. For instance, Barnstone (1993, 165-172) in *The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory, Practice* devotes one page to the LXX and six to the *Book of Aristeas*, in which he describes its commissioning and subsequent result. Similarly, Delisle and Woodsworth (1995, 162-4) in *Translators through History* discuss the background of the LXX (also by way of the *Book of Aristeas*) and its reception in Judaism.

Van der Louw (2007, 12) proposes several reasons for the sparse treatment of the LXX in Translation Studies and I will highlight two. First, our knowledge of the LXX as an object of study is limited (e.g., there is no established LXX source text, there are no native speakers to consult, and we know relatively little about the methods used in the translation process). Second, because of its antiquity, it is less relevant for policy-makers and hence attracts less funding.

⁶ Polysystem (Even-Zohar, 2010); *skopos* (Reiss and Vermeer, 1984); frame theory (Baker, 2006; Wilt, 2003); comparative model (Catford, 1965), process model (Nida, 1969), causal model (Chesterman, 1998, 2000).

⁷ An exception is Vermeer’s treatment of the LXX in *Skizzen zu einer Geschichte der Translation*. He concludes that the LXX is characterised by *Wörtlichkeit* “literalness” but acknowledges the existence of sections that do not exhibit that character (1992, 256-258). He suggests five causes for nonliteral translation. The first, a shift resulting from a lexical deficiency in the target language, he considers an obligatory shift. The other causes involve a changed function in the different culture and religious community, different interpretation of the passage and influence of the dragoman method (1992, 260-261).

1.4 Septuagint Studies

Over the centuries since the completion of the LXX, it has been valued for different reasons. For instance, in ca. 125 C.E., Aquila revised the LXX in order to produce a Greek translation that more closely aligned with the Hebrew text of his day. In the last century, biblical scholars have used the LXX as a means to retrovert to the original Hebrew text or the Hebrew text at a particular stage. This is the historical field of textual criticism within Septuagint Studies.

Textual criticism is a field rich with tools and theories for analysing individual translation shifts. Attention is given to the interaction of ancient versions of, and witnesses to, the Hebrew Bible. Some ancient scribal practices are identified and utilised in the evaluation of the translation, transcription and transmission of texts (e.g., scribal exegetical techniques, linguistic competencies, and orthographic errors).

However, the field of Septuagint Studies has been slow to incorporate advances in Translation Studies in order to analyse translators and their translations rather than to discover the source text. Traditionally, Septuagint Studies has given more attention to scribal practices in general than to the tendencies of individual translators. This field has tended to be myopic in its analysis of individual words and phrases to the neglect of the broader context of the passage, book or genre. As Munday (2012a, 18) argues, “The concentration on patterns of shifts, rather than individual instances, reduces the obstacle of the crucial question of interpretation.” More work could be done to assess the preliminary norms for unique translations as well as the operational norms that guided the translators. It seems that the yield of this work would be more accurate explanations for particular translation shifts (and fewer explanations which posit a different *Vorlage*).

1.5 Merging Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies

This study will utilise the strengths of both Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies toward the analysis of LXX-Micah. The strength of Septuagint Studies is its acknowledgment of the tendency for humans to error.⁸ Scribes made errors through orthographic and phonological mistakes as well through their own linguistic incompetence. This reality must not be ignored. Simultaneously, the strength of Translation Studies is its acknowledgment that the translation process involves a series of choices made by humans operating within certain linguistic and cultural contexts. Each translator, along with his linguistic competencies, theology and ideology, is unique. The norms of his linguistic and cultural context guide him through the translation process. His translation task involves navigating these norms to communicate the source text to his target audience. Translation Studies provides the tools needed to uncover translation tendencies due to cognitive, linguistic, cultural and ideological/theological factors.

1.6 Problem statement and hypothesis

Though the LXX is legitimately used to access the underlying Hebrew text, its character and nature should not be solely defined by that function. When a certain LXX text does not correspond to the Hebrew text in the expected way and it is labeled “free” or, worse yet, “bad,” then its nature has been misunderstood.⁹ Further, labels are often applied at the risk of leveling the data and over-generalising the nuanced character of the LXX (whether the entire corpus or a portion of it).

I propose that LXX-Micah can be accurately described by approaching the LXX translator as an agent of change, who was working with a *skopos* in mind (perhaps one other

⁸ Cf. Tov (2012); Würthwein (1994); Brotzman (1994); Fishbane (1985).

⁹ Both Translation Studies and Septuagint Studies scholars have given labels to the Septuagint. For example, André Lefevere (1990, 15) claims, “But the fact that the Septuagint was, in reality, a ‘bad’ translation did nothing to undermine its image... .” Bruce Waltke (1999, 164) asserts, “the translation of the Torah is excellent, but the translation of the Minor Prophets scroll is second-rate.”

than producing a literal rendering of the source text) as he rewrote the text for his target culture. From this vantage point, I will be able to analyse his work without the mental expectation that it must be either good or bad, first-rate or second-rate, faithful or unfaithful.

1.7 Methodological framework

This study utilises the Causal Model developed by Chesterman (1998, 2000).¹⁰ The advantage of the causal model is its broad scope, which incorporates the comparative and process models while also considering the importance of preliminary norms (causal conditions) and translation effects (target culture reception). While preliminary norms and translation effects must help to explain translation technique, the priority is placed on analysis of the translated text and this analysis comprises the bulk of my study. It is important to note that my text analysis involved a circular process whereby I made initial explanations, categorised translation shifts, discerned translation patterns, then refined my initial explanations.

1.8 Delimitation of study

I chose to limit this study to LXX-Micah for several reasons. First, compared to the Pentateuch, Isaiah and Jeremiah, relatively little work has been done in the Twelve Prophets using Translation Studies approaches. Through my work, I hope to contribute valuable data on translation technique in the Twelve. Second, the book of Micah is short enough to adequately analyse every morpheme. Third, Micah is long enough to compile the data necessary to discern translation patterns. Fourth, preliminary investigations in Micah indicated that there are interesting differences between the LXX and the MT that may reflect more than translation errors or a variant Hebrew *Vorlage*.

¹⁰ See §3.2 for further details on my theoretical background and methodological framework.

There is also a drawback to studying only one book in the Twelve. If, in fact, there was one translator or a group of translators for the Twelve (which is the general consensus),¹¹ then my conclusions must be tentative until similar work is conducted on the rest of the Twelve. As additional data are collected and translation patterns discerned in the Twelve, then we can refine our conclusions drawn for individual books. On the other hand, additional data may lead to the conclusion that the Twelve was not translated by a single translator or group of translators. In any case, additional work using Translation Studies approaches is necessary for a clear picture to emerge regarding the translation character of the Twelve.

1.9 Organisation

Chapter 2 presents reviews of other work conducted in LXX-Micah (in general) and LXX-Latter Prophets (using Translation Studies approaches). Chapter 3 begins with the theoretical framework and primary models of DTS. I then explain why I utilise the causal model, which incorporates the comparative and process models. The remainder of chapter 3 analyses the causal conditions (preliminary norms), the factors influencing the translation process (operational norms), and the translation effects on the target culture. Chapter 4 provides a verse-by-verse analysis of LXX-Micah. For each verse, I provide both the Hebrew text (according to BHQ) and the Greek text (according to Ziegler) with my own translation of each. Each coupled-pair (i.e., the source text word or phrase and the translation of it) along with an explanation of the translation is provided below the verse.¹² Chapter 5 begins with two large tables—the first details the correlation between Hebrew conjugations and the respective moods and tenses in Greek; the second table displays the morphological, semantic and syntactic shifts from chapter 4. Following these tables, I discuss differences due to

¹¹ Cf. Thackeray 1903c, 579; Muraoka 1989, 25-36; Dines 1991, 14; Howard 2007, 780-781; Kraus et al 2009, 1165-66; Glenny 2009, 261-262.

¹² Note that many of these explanations were made or refined after the translation patterns were discerned.

translation/transcription/transmission errors or a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. In the last section in chapter 5 I describe the operational norms (reflected by both obligatory and non-obligatory shifts) which guided the translator(s) of LXX-Micah. Finally, chapter 6 provides a summary for each chapter, the conclusions of the study organised around important translation tendencies and a prospective for future studies.

Chapter 2: Overview of studies on LXX-Micah and translation technique in the Latter Prophets

2.1 Introduction

This chapter surveys the studies that have been conducted on LXX-Micah (whether or not they were approached from a translation study perspective) as well as the studies in the Latter Prophets that have utilised translation theory. The purpose is to build upon other work but also to set apart my study as one using an innovative approach. Within each category, the survey is organized chronologically.¹

2.2 Studies on LXX-Micah

2.2.1 John Taylor

In 1890 John Taylor published a verse-by-verse commentary on the book of Micah. From a text critical point of view, his versional data are valuable. His approach to variations is sophisticated: “It is impossible for a collator to determine beforehand the value or valuelessness of any given variation: that is a point which can only be decided when the document comes to be used for critical purposes. Hence every variation, however slight, should be noted” (1890, ix).

It is Taylor’s goal that differentiates his study from the present one. In stating that “the ancient Versions supply a considerable amount of help in restoring the original,” he illuminates his goal to establish the Massoretic Text (MT) (1890, v). At the end of his study he lists thirty-nine “proposed alterations” and seven “alterations for which a fair degree of probability may be claimed” (1890, 193-195). By contrast, the present study sets out to describe the character of one of the ancient versions, the LXX, vis-à-vis the MT. It is

¹ Unfortunately, I was unable to obtain a copy of Arieti’s 1972 dissertation (*A Study in the Septuagint of the Book of Amos*).

important to gain a clear understanding of LXX-Micah as an independent work before attempting to posit a different *Vorlage* behind the translation.

2.2.2 Siegfried J. Schwantes

Schwantes states as his primary aim to present “a new attempt at clarifying some of the linguistic obscurities in the Hebrew text of the book of Micah” (1962, 2). His study proceeds through each of the seven chapters of Micah, collating the Hebrew text with the Greek, Syriac, Latin and Aramaic versions. His goal is not to describe the translation technique of any one of the versions; rather, he utilises the versions to establish a Hebrew *Vorlage* that underlies the translations. In doing so, he builds upon, and critiques, explanations and emendations by previous text critics by bringing to bear insights from the Ras-Shamra-Ugarit texts, the Lachish Ostraca and the Qumran scrolls.

2.2.3 Dennis R. Magary

Magary’s 1995 dissertation, though dealing primarily with the Peshitta of Micah, regularly consults the LXX (and Targum Jonathan) in order to explain differences between the Hebrew and Syriac. The purpose of Magary’s research is “to characterize the translation technique for the Peshitta of the book of Micah” (1995, 16). Regarding the text critical use of the Peshitta he rightly emphasises the importance of first understanding it as an interpretation of the Hebrew text. The translation technique of the Peshitta must, therefore, be analysed before it is used for text critical purposes.

In order to evaluate the translation character of the Peshitta, Magary begins with a detailed comparison of the grammatical and lexical components of the Syriac, Hebrew and Greek texts. He claims that “a detailed analysis of translation technique requires a system of representation that can account for each and every point of equivalency, even if that approach

requires making more difficult decisions regarding individual readings” (1995, 31). Magary’s statement here responds to the approach taken by Emanuel Tov and Robert Kraft in the CATSS project.² Tov suggests that “the nature of the enterprise requires that all elements of exegesis in the translation are disregarded for the purpose of notation. Our sole purpose initially is to determine which element in the Hebrew is somehow represented by an element in the LXX, and when doing so, we disregard exegesis” (1986, 38). For example, in Micah 4.5, the CATSS database aligns the Hebrew phrase *בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהָיו* “in the name of his god” with *τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ* “his own way” because “they cannot be broken down into smaller units” (1986, 41). In doing so, they are claiming that exegesis need not be taken into consideration to explain the differences in the two phrases. Magary rightly objects to this method, suggesting the need to consider exegesis through moving past formal equivalency in order to “account for each and every point of equivalency” (1995, 31). In chapter 4, I will similarly analyse each point of equivalency between the Hebrew and Greek texts. However, in chapter 5, I will draw out the translator’s theology and ideology through the categorization and analysis of translation shifts.

2.2.4 Summary

The three works surveyed above in §2.2.1-2.2.3 pay close attention to the details of the Greek text and the Hebrew *Vorlage*. I consulted each one as I labored to understand difficult Hebrew constructions and strange Greek renderings. However, these works evaluate LXX-Micah apart from the target culture and literature. They analyse the translation shifts independently and primarily use traditional text critical approaches to understand differences. Though Magary does categorise grammatical and lexical equivalencies, he does not explain how the patterns reflect the translator’s idiosyncratic ideology.

² CATSS, the Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagintal/Scriptural Study, was funded and executed to develop a computerised parallel alignment between each MT and LXX morpheme.

2.3 Translation technique in the Latter Prophets

2.3.1 H. St. J. Thackeray

In 1903, H. St. J. Thackeray published a series of studies in which he analysed the vocabulary choices of the LXX translators of various units in the prophetic literature. He first addressed the books of Jeremiah (Thackeray 1903a, 245-266) and Ezekiel (Thackeray 1903b, 398-411), suggesting two translators for each of the two books (Jeremiah α and β : chapters 1-28 and 29-51, respectively, in Greek; Ezekiel α/γ and β : chapters 1-27/40-48 and 28-39, respectively). Later in the same journal in his entry entitled “The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books” (Thackeray 1903c, 578-585), he sets forth the possibility that Jeremiah α and Ezekiel α/γ as well as the Minor Prophets were produced “if not by a single translator, at any rate by a small group of *collaborateurs*” (italics his) (Thackeray 1903c, 579). He bases this thesis upon the distinct ways in which certain phrases and words are rendered in these groups of texts over against how they are translated in LXX-Isaiah. For example, יהוה צבאות (“LORD of Hosts”) is rendered κύριος παντοκράτωρ (“Lord Almighty”) in Jeremiah and the Minor Prophets but κυρίου σαβαωθ (“Lord of Hosts”) in Isaiah (note, this Hebrew phrase does not occur in Ezekiel and it is not a distinguishing characteristic between the parts of Jeremiah) (Thackeray 1903c, 579). Similarly, translators of Jeremiah α , Ezekiel α/γ and the Minor Prophets use ἀφανισμός (“disappearance/destruction”) and τάσσω (“I appoint, place”) to render the common Hebrew words המַשֵׁי (“a devastation, waste”) / המַשֵׁי (“a waste, horror”) and שִׁי (“to put, set”) / שִׁי (“to put, place”), respectively, but these Greek words are not used in Isaiah to render the same Hebrew words (Thackeray 1903a, 248).

Thackeray is justified in his focus upon the translators’ vocabulary choices. However, translation variations do not necessarily prove translator variations.³ Whether or not his conclusions are correct regarding the identities of the prophetic literature translators, the

³ Cf. O’Hare (2010, 211-214) who lists several Hebrew words that are rendered differently within Ezekiel γ (chapters 40-48).

process of translation involves a series of decisions about how to render the parent text syntax, morphology and vocabulary (including metaphors and idioms). Beyond noticing patterns that distinguish translators, vocabulary choice patterns can be used to describe translation technique *within* a corpus deemed to be a translation by a single translator or group of translators. Since it is generally accepted that the book of Micah was the product of a single translator, the present study will focus upon the latter benefit of vocabulary study. As will be discussed in greater detail in chapter 3, translators can be motivated to render words differently based on numerous factors including the textual or cultural context, difference in ideology or theology, and the linguistic norms of the target language.

2.3.2 Jan de Waard

In 1978, Jan de Waard presented a paper entitled “Translation Techniques Used by the Greek Translators of Amos” to the Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. In it he set forth examples in LXX-Amos where “translators most obviously have to apply some translation technique” (1978, 340). It seems more appropriate to say the translator(s) *chose* to apply a translation technique or simply *displayed* a translation technique. Nevertheless, de Waard models an approach to analysing the LXX-Amos that attempts to explain translation shifts in the light of translation technique before suggesting a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. He draws on examples that exhibit explicitisation, stylistic equivalence, transformation from active to passive or causative, etc. He points out that in many cases commentators suggest emending the Hebrew text to reflect the text that the translator was reading or they offer the explanation that the translator must have understood the vocalisation differently than what is reflected in the MT. De Waard demonstrates why these solutions are often unnecessary, especially when textual support is lacking.

One criticism of de Waard's approach is its atomistic nature. He is selective in his choice of translation shifts and therefore is not able to discern and characterise translation patterns. As a result, each of his solutions, while certainly possible, is less persuasive than it would be if he had analysed all the shifts in LXX-Amos and explained them in the context of the translation patterns.

2.3.3 Thomas W. Phelan

Thomas Phelan's ultimate objective in *Translation Techniques in the Greek Minor Prophets* is not to understand the translation character of the LXX of the Minor Prophets; instead, he intends to establish its Hebrew *Vorlage* through assessing where it is literal (and valuable for retroversion) and non-literal (valueless for retroversion). He claims, "While free sections may contain stylistic variants, literal sections ideally contain only textual variants which indicate a different Hebrew text" (Phelan 1982, 13).

Phelan uses various linguistic statistics to determine the spectrum from literal to non-literal; among the statistics considered are the translator's handling of word order, non-finite verbs, and simple coordination. After averaging the percentages for each book in the Twelve, he labels the sections that are 60% and below *non-literal* and 80% or above *literal* (Phelan 1982, 89 n. 23). Among the many problems with this approach is the subjective nature of determining the line between literal and non-literal. Additionally, it is common for a section in the LXX to exhibit signs of both literalness (e.g., in word order) and non-literalness (e.g., in vocabulary choice) (cf. Glenny 2009, 26).

2.3.4 Jennifer M. Dines

In her 1991 dissertation titled *The Septuagint of Amos: A study in interpretation*, Jennifer Dines aims at describing the translation character of LXX-Amos through two

primary means. First, she analyses significant differences between LXX and MT Amos which she argues are important clues to discerning the exegetical nature of the translation. Second, Dines assesses how patristic biblical commentators, primarily in the fourth and fifth centuries C.E., understood those significant differences.

Dines (1991, 307) discerned a translation character which was marked by “fidelity to the Hebrew.” “The translator has a good grasp of Greek” and “a good working knowledge of Hebrew” (Dines 1991, 308). His “translation style is usually idiomatic and relaxed” and, when confronted with difficult passages, he prefers to make sense of smaller units rather than paraphrase (Dines 1991, 308).

Dines also noticed in the translation shifts certain translator idiosyncracies. For instance, she recognised a posture against Samaritans, Syrians and Hellenising Jews as well as a pro-Jerusalem posture. As for the prophetic utterances, the translator of Amos understands them to be “speaking to and about contemporary (or at least recent) events” (Dines 1991, 314). With regard to salvation prophecies, though he believed they were not yet fully realised, they would soon be completely fulfilled.

Dines expanded her scope of inquiry beyond the translator and his immediate target audience to the LXX-Amos interpreters in the centuries to follow. She considers there to be scant exegetical significance toward an interpretation of LXX Amos in the literature of the first three centuries C.E. However, she found interesting results in the 4th-5th century C.E. commentaries of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Cyril of Alexandria and Jerome. Their consistent historicising approach emphasises the major conquests (Assyrian and Babylonian), Babylonian exile and the return of the Judean remnant as it affects the *parousia* of Christ. Dines also noticed in LXX-Amos an awareness of (and concern for) the history that immediately followed the exile but a lack of awareness of second century B.C.E. concerns.

Though this is an excellent study that has contributed greatly to the field of Septuagint Studies, perhaps there is a deficiency due to the data that were not considered. Dines states that she identified all the differences between LXX and MT and evaluated their exegetical value. Those differences that she decided were of “exegetical interest” (“significant differences”), she considered in her analysis of translation *Tendenz*. However, it is difficult to assess the exegetical value of isolated examples without considering how they collectively illuminate the translation character or *Tendenz*. To this point, she admits that “all of this should have been presented since the interpretive effect is cumulative” (Dines 1991, 15). Further, quantitative differences are ignored “unless the sense is affected” (Dines 1991, 15 n. 12). Again, even quantitative differences (as well as paratactic ones) can collectively tell us something about translation character and *Tendenz*.

2.3.5 John A. Beck

In his 2000 book entitled *Translators as Storytellers*, John Beck correctly bases his study upon the understanding that translation involves a series of decisions. He defines translation technique as “the pattern of conscious and subconscious decisions made by the translator when transferring a text from the parent language to the target language” (Beck 2000, 2). However, Beck’s dichotomy between translators being guided either by linguistic decisions or by the desire to retell a story (and he presumes the latter) is misguided. I acknowledge that translations involve interpretation and even the infusion of the translators’ ideology but translators are nonetheless guided by the linguistic norms of the target language.

Beck analyses four narratives from each of the three major text divisions in the Hebrew Bible. In chapter two, he uses lexical and grammatical criteria to compare the Hebrew and Greek versions of each of these narratives. These criteria include such elements as morpheme preservation and noun number for lexical features, and participle and clause

coordination for grammatical features. To each of these criteria he assigns a percentage for literalness. One criterion which he does not utilise is lexical semantics. Beck (2000, 18) is aware of its importance and reports that Barr, Tov and Olofsson view this criterion as key to assessing the literalness of a translator. Nevertheless, Beck (2000, 22) claims that lexical semantics (as well as concordance, word order and the quantitative preservation of semantic content) is too “difficult to quantify and analyze statistically” and, consequently, he ignores this feature in his assessment of translation literalness. While it is not always easy to label a translated word as equivalent or not equivalent, it is, nevertheless, a crucial piece in assessing the character of a translated work. Beck (2000, 53) concludes this chapter acknowledging that “the literary insights we obtained from the analysis were intriguing but incomplete...they provide us with insufficient evidence for evaluating the literary sensitivity of the Greek translators.” Unfortunately, he attributes the shortcomings of his analysis to linguistics in general and not to a deficient linguistic approach. This leads to chapter three where Beck shifts his focus to narrative criticism.

In this chapter Beck uses narrative criticism to compare the literary character of the Hebrew text with that of the Greek text. Among the features he analyses are characterisation, the use of time, and the pattern of word play. Having dismissed the linguistic approach for assessing the character of the translation, Beck embraces a literary analysis as the means to demonstrate that the translators in each of the twelve narratives are storytellers who alter the Hebrew story to varying degrees. The problem is that he replaced one limited approach (linguistic analysis) with another (literary analysis). It is my view that any approach used to describe the translation technique of the LXX must be multifaceted in order to account for differences that arose from linguistic constraints, literary style, ideological infusion, theological positions, scribal errors, etc.

Beck's literary approach to explaining certain differences between the Hebrew and Greek text is not convincing. For example, in Beck's analysis of Jonah 1-2 and 4 (one of the three texts which he argues exhibit *significant* variation) he points out where the translators at times render the Hebrew to improve the image of Jonah and at other times to present Jonah as worse than does the Hebrew version. He draws attention to Jonah 4.1 where the translator renders *וַיִּרַע אֶל-יְיֹנָה רָעָה גְדוֹלָה* ("Jonah was greatly displeased") with *καὶ ἐλύπηθη Ἰωνᾶς λύπην μεγάλην* ("Jonah was grieved with great grief") and *וַיִּחַר לוֹ* ("and he was angry") with *καὶ συνεχύθη* ("and he was confused"). Then in 4.4, where God asks Jonah *הֲהִיטֵב תָּרָה לָךְ* ("Is it right for you to be angry?"), Beck suggests that the translation *εἰ σφόδρα λελύπησαι σὺ* ("Are you exceedingly grieved?") "makes Jonah look less spiteful and less small" (2000, 118). However, he also highlights Jonah's answer in 1.9 to the sailors' questions. In the Hebrew text Jonah skips the initial questions and moves on to provide an answer as to his national origins—*עִבְרִי אֲנִי* ("I am a Hebrew"); in the Greek, Jonah answers the first question with *δοῦλος κυρίου ἐγὼ εἰμι* ("I am a servant of the Lord"). Beck (2000, 119) concludes that this "more clearly identifies Jonah as a prophet and thereby throws his actions into even greater contrast with those of the sailors."⁴ In other words, the LXX translation makes Jonah look worse than does the Hebrew story. If the translator made changes to the text because he intended to tell his own version of the story, then which version of the Greek story should the reader follow? Did the translator intend to make Jonah look better or worse than the Hebrew version? Beck fails to identify the alternate story that the translator intended to tell.

⁴ Jonah's response in the Greek may have been the translator's way of answering the same question: Who are you? "I am a servant of the LORD (that is, I am a Hebrew)." If so, then the answer may not have implied anything about his occupation as prophet. Alternatively, *עִבְרִי* could have been mistaken by the translator for *עִבְדִי* (misreading *resh* for *daleth*) with the *yod* functioning as an abbreviation for *יהוה*. Neither of these options is set forth by Beck as a possibility.

The field of Septuagint Studies can benefit from efforts like Beck's to move *beyond* traditional linguistic methods for assessing translation technique. However, linguistic analysis should not be jettisoned or replaced. Instead, linguistic analysis should be refined to include lexical semantics and a robust understanding of target language linguistic norms. Additionally, cultural, theological and ideological factors must be considered when analysing the translation character of a particular LXX book.

2.3.6 James K. Palmer

Despite my best efforts, I was not able to acquire James Palmer's 2004 dissertation *Not made with tracing paper: Studies in the Septuagint of Zechariah*. Therefore, I will review his abstract published by Tyndale Bulletin (Palmer, 2006). The goal of his study is identifying the translator's characteristic mode of translation and determining how that reflects the translator's cultural, historical and theological context. In explaining differences between LXX and MT, this translation portrait is a critical element in choosing between "divergent *Vorlage* and diverging translator" (Palmer 2006, 317).

Chapters 2-4 focus on LXX-Zechariah's translation tendencies. Among the issues examined are *Vorlage*, stereotyping, lexical variation and word-order (in which deviations are rare). He uses Tov's six strategies to assess the translator's approach to words he did not understand. Of the six strategies, the preferred ("though probably unconscious") was contextual "manipulation," in which the translator capitalised on graphically similar consonants to render words that would better fit the context (Palmer 2006, 318). He concludes, "On the whole the translator is reliable and was evidently attempting to translate the sense of the text as he understood it, with respect for the Hebrew, but with no discernible desire to imitate its formal details apart from in the word order" (Palmer 2006, 319).

Chapters 5-7, then, assess how the translation tendencies in LXX-Zechariah reflect the translator's cultural, historical and theological context. Regarding culture, Palmer discerned emphases on other nations joining Israel to worship the LORD in Jerusalem, the spread of Israel's influence and the exclusion of the Canaanites. Historically, there are shifts that adjust the timing of the LORD's return to Jerusalem and the return of the exiles. Theologically, Palmer (2006, 319) discerned shifts that "softened down anthropomorphisms and other 'inappropriate' expressions." Among these were concerns about God being pierced, about people hating God and about God's mediator being harmed.

2.3.7 Theo A. W. van der Louw

Van der Louw's 2007 study *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* is an excellent investigation of the limited interaction between the fields of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies. He sets out to demonstrate how both fields can benefit from dialogue with one another. In chapter 1, he explains why Septuagint Studies has traditionally failed to incorporate the insights from Translation Studies and why Translation Studies has not paid much attention to the LXX as an important object of study.

In chapter 3, van der Louw provides his methodology for analysing Gen 2, Isa 1 and Prov 6. He begins by detailing different types of transformations that he deems most common in prose translations. Among these transformations are a phonological translation, loan translation / calque, change of word class and idiomatic translation. He concludes this chapter with an explanation of his approach, which, though he utilises Van der Kooij's (1986) methodology in LXX-Isaiah, also deviates in significant ways. For example, he emphasises (in contrast to Van der Kooij),

The analysis of the LXX-translation as an independent text should *precede* a comparison with MT. If no independent meaning is given to the Greek translation, it

is strictly speaking impossible to make a comparison with MT. Scholars are sometimes inclined to equate the meaning of the Greek with the (presumed) meaning of MT, for, they reason, the translators intended to render the meaning of the Hebrew faithfully into Greek” (Van der Louw 2007, 90).

What van der Louw has correctly understood is that this is *not* always what the translator(s) intended. There were many factors that potentially motivated the translator(s) to reject the literal rendering and introduce a transformation. Among these factors are style, logic, communicative purpose, culture and world view / ideology (Van der Louw 2007, 57).

In chapters 4, 5 and 6, van der Louw applies his methodology to Gen 2, Isa 1 and Prov 6, respectively. Many of his explanations for the transformations in these chapters are persuasive. His goal was to compare the literalness of these three chapters based on the density of non-obligatory transformations. He concludes that Gen 2 is the most literal and Prov 6 the most free. However, these conclusions can only be made about those three chapters and even then should be made with caution. By his own admission, the scope of one chapter per biblical book potentially limits the accuracy of his conclusions. Translation patterns, which point to translation norms, are more accurately discerned through studying the entire corpus of translated material.

2.3.8 W. Edward Glenny

Glenny is indebted to McLay’s *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (2003) for the presuppositions underlying his analysis of translation technique in LXX-Amos. In *Finding Meaning in the Text*,⁵ Glenny (2009, 4-6) presupposes the following five ideas about translation technique: 1) translation technique is descriptive; 2) translation technique involves a synchronic analysis rather than a diachronic analysis of language change; 3) translation technique distinguishes between de Saussure’s categories of *langue* and *parole*,

⁵ Cf. Glenny (2007); unfortunately, Glenny’s *Micah: A commentary based on Micah in Codex Vaticanus* appeared as this study was complete.

where the translator takes his knowledge of the source text *langue* and renders it into the *parole* of the target community; 4) analysis of translation technique involves the understanding and description of the structures of source and target languages; and 5) translation technique takes as its point of departure the source language.

Glenny also presupposes that the LXX translators believed they understood the Hebrew text and that they were translating it in a way that their audiences would understand. It follows that the LXX should be studied and interpreted as a free-standing, independent document with its own unique message. Once the message of the LXX book in question is understood, one can discern the translation technique and uncover its relationship to the MT (Glenny 2009, 15-16).

In addition to holding these presuppositions, Glenny believes that the translation technique of the LXX can be broken down into two main approaches: textual and exegetical. The textual approach uses traditional text-critical tools to reconstruct the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Scholars who use the LXX in such a way typically conclude that the differences between the LXX and MT are the result of either copyist mistakes or a different Hebrew parent text underlying the Greek translation. They assume that the translators were always aiming at a literal or formal correspondence between the Greek and Hebrew. The exegetical approach, on the other hand, views the translators as skilled readers and interpreters of the Hebrew text who “had a desire to make the texts relevant for their audiences” (Glenny 2009, 8). Glenny attempts to take advantage of both the textual and exegetical approaches in his study of LXX-Amos. However, Glenny does give priority to the exegetical approach: “where there is no known textual variant supporting the different reading in the LXX the method employed in this study is to look for possible translational explanations for the difference” (2009, 10).

Glenny’s analysis of LXX-Amos’ translation technique is based largely upon James Palmer’s 2004 study in LXX-Zechariah (*Not made with tracing paper: Studies in the*

Septuagint of Zechariah). Like Palmer, in chapter 2 Glenny assesses the LXX's literalness according to the criteria proposed by Barr and Tov using both statistical and syntactical analysis. His findings reveal that the translator was rigid when it came to following the Hebrew word order but flexible with regard to matching a given Hebrew word class with the expected equivalent in Greek. Additionally, though the translator of LXX-Amos typically standardised word equivalents, "the variation or non-stereotyping in the choice of vocabulary in LXX-Amos is found in words that are in the same context and in words that are separated in the text, and it suggests the translator of LXX-Amos did not have a systematic approach in his choice of words for his translation" (Glenny 2009, 68). Chapters 3 and 4 of Glenny's study focus on the translation of difficult words and visually ambiguous phenomena, respectively.

The results of Glenny's analysis in chapters 2-4 show that the translator of LXX-Amos "had a general knowledge of Hebrew" and was "trying to be literal" (Glenny 2009, 145). However, his lack of expertise in Hebrew limited his ability to handle difficult words and constructions. Further, the challenge of translating homonyms and homographs, and making decisions about word divisions and vocalisation led to mistakes that should not necessarily be attributed to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* (Glenny 2009, 144-145). These are valuable observations for describing the overall character of LXX-Amos as a translation. I will consider, in addition to the internal evidence from LXX-Micah, the effects of the translation *skopos* as well as the reception of the translation in the target culture. In doing so, I will assess factors that influenced, and evidence that reflects, translation decisions.

2.3.9 Staffan Oloffson

Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis: Collected Essays on the Septuagint Version, published in 2009, includes articles written by Staffan Oloffson between 1988 and

2001. Half of the articles deal directly with LXX-Psalms and the rest of the articles address translation technique in general as well as in specific instances in the Latter Prophets. Chapter 2 explores the possibility that the translator of Jer 2.18 has employed theological exegesis in his rendering of נַחֲוֹר (“Nile”) with Γηων (“Geon”). There are two important aspects of Oloffson’s procedure that should be highlighted. First, he is careful to analyse how the translator renders נַחֲוֹר (“Nile”) elsewhere in Jeremiah as well as how it is rendered in other LXX books. He concludes that the translator of Jer 2.18 did not know the meaning of the Hebrew word and relied upon context to rightly guess that it referred to the Nile. In addition to lexical analysis, Oloffson is attentive to the literary style employed by LXX translators. He claims that “variation in the parallelism is strictly adhered to in most LXX books, especially if two different Hebrew words are employed in MT” (Oloffson 2009, 40).⁶ Therefore, although the translator understood that נַחֲוֹר referred to the Nile, he did not use ποταμός (“river,” the most common rendering for Nile in the LXX) because he wanted to maintain variation in parallelism thereby rendering the parallel Hebrew word נָהָר (“river”) with ποταμῶν (“rivers”) (Oloffson 2009, 40). The latter river he understood to refer to the Euphrates but rendered it plural to include the Tigris as the other major river in Assyria. This analysis, along with an investigation of the historical background of Jer 2, led Oloffson to conclude that the translator did not have a theological motivation for rendering נַחֲוֹר (“Nile”) with Γηων (“Geon”). Instead, using the context as a clue, he guessed that נַחֲוֹר (“Nile”) referred to the Nile and used Γηων (“Geon”) instead of ποταμός (“river”) in order to maintain variation in the parallelism with his rendering of נָהָר (“river”).

His analysis of Jer 2.18 demonstrates the importance of delaying a conclusion that the translator was working from a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the MT. He starts with the

⁶ Drawing upon his work in LXX Psalms, Oloffson notes that the translator will sometimes *introduce* variation when the two Hebrew words used in parallelism are identical (Oloffson 2009, 40).

reality that “nothing indicates that the LXX had a *Vorlage* with ךָּׁׁׁ here” (Oloffson 2009, 30) and then proceeds to discover other potential factors for the unexpected rendering. In chapter 8, he discusses the issue of “*Vorlage* versus translation technique” and offers the following corrective to the typical procedure in textual criticism. Often the text critic will evaluate differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts based first upon scribal errors in translation or transmission, then upon different *Vorlage* and then occasionally on cultural or linguistic factors. Oloffson is correct in claiming that the translation technique of the particular translator must be assessed before determining the *Vorlage* that was the basis for the translation (Oloffson 2009, 176).

2.3.10 Daniel M. O’Hare

In *Have you seen, Son of Man?: A study in the translation and Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40-48*, Daniel M. O’Hare (2010, 29-30) attempts to answer the following questions: “1) How is the *Vorlage* of LXX Ezek 40-48 different from MT Ezek 40-48, and to what degree can such differences be reconstructed? 2) How does the translator implement his goals in translation?” O’Hare (2010, 26ff) relies on *Skopostheorie* to help answer these questions. He claims it is valuable toward the understanding of the LXX as a translation in the following three ways: 1) *Skopostheorie* brings together two approaches to Septuagint study (understanding how the translator read and translated his source text and understanding the target audience’s reception of the LXX as an independent document; 2) It clarifies the relationship between the Hebrew and Greek texts (*philological* – namely, close adherence to terms and grammatical structures of source language for the purpose of high recognition) as well as the relationship between different Greek texts in the LXX; 3) It provides the *Skopos* of the overall translation unit (*operative* – namely, persuasive in nature) which helps us explain the smaller translation units.

Chapters 2-5 provide the basis of the three goals for which O'Hare claims Ezek 40-48 was translated: "1) accurately and comprehensively render Ezek 40-48 into Greek; 2) convey the substance of Ezekiel's prophecy using a style and diction that signal the translator is transmitting an authoritative divine word (philological translation); 3) accommodate certain cultural aspects of Ezekiel's vision to the Hellenistic tastes of his target readership" (O'Hare 2010, 29). Chapters 2 and 3 address the second goal through describing the translator's *Übersetzungsweise* (chapter 2) as well as determining the translator's *Vorlage* (chapter 3). O'Hare describes the translator's *Übersetzungsweise* through his ("relatively faithful") rendering of the source text's grammar and syntax. By contrast, he shows the translator's relative freedom when it comes to lexical choices, which is the primary means by which the translator interprets Ezek 40-48 for his target audience. In chapter 3, O'Hare provides three categories for the pluses in the LXX Vorlage: transfer of wording from elsewhere in Jewish Scriptures (including other parts of Ezekiel), "new" material and pastiche. Interestingly, the "new" material serves to increase the temple's holiness and bolster the status of the Zadokites, who may have been responsible for these pluses (a hypothesis set forth by O'Hare) (O'Hare 2010, 122-23).

Chapter 4 serves to illuminate the translator's first goal (translation accuracy), which, for Ezek 40-48, is guided by "theme of maintaining appropriate ritual separation and distance" (O'Hare 2010, 31). O'Hare also discusses the translator's handling of sacrificial terminology, which he, at times, simply carries over from the Greek Pentateuch but, at other (more frequent) times, adapts the vocabulary to suit his interpretation of the context. Finally, chapter five focuses on the third translation goal (cultural accommodation) as it relates to Hellenistic architecture and gentile inclusion. O'Hare (2010, 31) claims that the "inclusion of many of the elements of Hellenistic temples represents one of the significant ways in which the translator takes account of the artistic and architectural tastes of his time."

2.3.11 Eric J. Tully

Eric J. Tully's 2012 dissertation titled *The Translation and the Translator of the Peshitta of Hosea* is based upon Andrew Chesterman's *Causal Model for Translation Studies* (2000). Chesterman suggests that the causal model has the ability to predict which conditions will result in a particular target text and which types of target texts will produce certain effects in the target environment. He represents this relationship with the following diagram (Chesterman 2000, 24):

CC \Rightarrow TT \Rightarrow EF (where CC = Causal Conditions, TT = Target Text, EF = Effects)

Tully effectively applies the causal model to the Peshitta of Hosea. In chapter 2 he works his way through the phases of the causal model and ends with reversing the causal model (EF to TT to CC) as a methodological framework for translation research (Tully 2012, 45-52). He states that his methodology allows one to start with the "observable phenomena" and work backwards to "the foundational values and decisions that guided the translator in producing those phenomena" (Tully 2012, 52). His dissertation is organised around this reversed flow (where chapter 3 involves the translation act, chapter 4 deals with operational norms, chapter 5 analyses the translation event and chapter 6 addresses the translator and his socio-cultural context).

While I agree that reversing the direction from EF to TT to CC is a helpful move, I do not think that description, in the way that Chesterman defines description, is the intended goal. The comparative and process models are sufficient to describe, for instance, translation shifts. What we gain by using the causal model and beginning with effects and working backward to the causal conditions is an explanation about *why* the translator introduced shifts.

2.3.12 Summary and Evaluation

The studies surveyed in §2.3 exhibit various approaches to translation description. Some have basic methodological problems. For instance, Thackeray seeks to distinguish the translators of various portions of LXX-Latter Prophets through their rendering of words and phrases. However, as important as it is to observe the translator's lexical choices, more factors must be considered in order to establish translation character. The study by Phelan demonstrates a simplistic approach for assessing translation character. He attempts to parse out the literal sections of LXX-Minor Prophets (based on an arbitrary standard of literalness) for the purpose of back-translating and accessing the Hebrew *Vorlage*, which betrays a different objective than the description of the translation character of LXX-Minor Prophets. The methodological problem with Beck's study is that he replaces one limited approach (linguistic analysis) with another (literary analysis). He claims that lexical semantics is too "difficult to quantify and analyze statistically" (Beck 2000, 22). While it is not always easy to label a translated word as equivalent or not equivalent, it is, nevertheless, a crucial piece in assessing the character of a translated work.

Other studies are sound methodologically but have other weaknesses. For instance, de Waard is selective in his choice of translation shifts and therefore is not able to discern and characterise translation patterns. Similarly, Dines decides which translation shifts are significant enough ("exegetical interest") to be considered in her analysis of translation *Tendenz*. However, it seems precarious to assess the exegetical value of isolated examples without considering how they collectively illuminate the translation character or *Tendenz*. Van der Louw's shortcoming involves the scope of his study. By his own admission, the scope of one chapter per biblical book (Gen 2, Isa 1 and Prov 6) potentially limits the accuracy of his conclusions. Translation patterns, which point to translation norms, are more accurately discerned through studying the entire corpus of translated material. Oloffson also

has a sound approach to translation description but limited his investigation in the Latter Prophets to isolated verses and passages.

Palmer, Glenny, O'Hare, Tully (and Dines) selected corpora within the LXX (and Peshitta in the case of Tully's study) that were long enough to discern translation patterns. Each scholar considers more than the translated text as part of his/her analysis of translation character. Their studies are excellent and they contribute a great deal to our understanding of the *Tendenz* of LXX translators.

I propose that my study is a unique contribution to the description of LXX-Micah. As I will discuss in chapter 3, my study involves the use of the most recent advances in translation theory to determine the purposeful, idiosyncratic shifts introduced by the translator. It is based on the polysystem theory and utilises Chesterman's causal model, which incorporates the strengths of both the comparative and process models.

Chapter 3: Descriptive Translation Studies as the Theoretical and Methodological Framework

3.1 Introduction

“Translation never communicates in an untroubled fashion because the translator negotiates the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text by reducing them and supplying another set of differences, basically domestic, drawn from the receiving language and culture to enable the foreign to be received there” (Venuti 2000, 468). The goal, then, is to enlist the proper model to uncover and describe the translation process.

As mentioned in §1.2, Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS) has developed many theories and models to analyse translations. The theories applied and models used will inevitably be determined by one’s view of the translator and his/her translation. Since I understand the translator to be an agent of change with a certain degree of freedom to render the text as he sees fit, the causal model will best enable me to describe LXX-Micah.

In §3.2 I will discuss the theoretical framework and primary models of DTS. Then, in §3.3 I will explain the appropriateness of the causal model for the description of LXX-Micah and analyse the causal conditions and translation effects for LXX-Micah. I will also introduce my approach to the translated text but its full analysis will be presented in chapters 4 and 5.

3.2 Development of Descriptive Translation Studies

Even-Zohar’s polysystem theory, which emerged in the 1970s, provided the necessary framework to advance translation studies from the mere analysis of isolated, translated texts to the study of these texts within their cultural and literary context. He defines polysystem as “a multiple system, a system of various systems which intersect with each other and partly overlap, using concurrently different options, yet functioning as one structured whole, whose members are interdependent” (Even-Zohar 2010, 42). Even-Zohar was ultimately concerned

with the relationship between translated texts and original literature within the literary polysystem. Influenced by the polysystem theory, a group of scholars, known as the Manipulation School, published papers with the central concern for a descriptive, functionalist and systemic approach to translation analysis (Munday 2012b, 178). These scholars also were concerned with “the norms and constraints that govern the production and reception of translations, in the relation between translation and other types of text processing, and in the place and role of translations both within a given literature and in the interaction between literatures” (Hermans 1985, 10-11). According to Naudé (2011, 230), these papers demonstrated the function of translations to manipulate the target culture.

Another advance in DTS came with what is called the cultural turn. The publication of *Translation, History and Culture* by Bassnett and Lefevere (1990) led the way in considering (in addition to the effects of translated texts on the target culture) the effect of the target culture on the selection and translation of literature. In 2002 Edwin Gentzler and Maria Tymoczko coined the phrase “the power turn,” which “focused on issues of agency, the ways translation can effect cultural change, and the relation of translation to dominance, cultural assertion, cultural resistance, and activism” (Tymoczko 2007, 44). This perspective highlights the translator as an agent of change, covertly and overtly infusing his/her ideology into the translated text.

Three primary translation models have emerged out of the theoretical framework of DTS—comparative, process and causal. Each model is valuable for describing a translation. The comparative model is more of a static model focusing on equivalence between coupled-pairs.¹ It asks questions such as, “How does this translation differ from the source text?” Chapter 4 utilises this model as a starting point.

¹ Cf. Catford (1965) and Vinay and Darbelnet (1995).

Another model is the process model. According to Chesterman (2000, 18), “Process models are useful if one is interested in sequential relations between different phases of the translation process.” This model tends to ask questions such as, “What metaphor is helpful for understanding this translation?” Frame theory is one approach to translation that stands behind this model.

Frame theory recognises that an individual’s reality (thinking, actions, and attitudes) is shaped by his frames of reference.² Wendland (2008, 5) illuminates the value of describing reality in terms of frames:

A possible advantage of the term **frame** is that it can be used as a verb to express the dynamic, fluid, progressively developed, etc. aspects of cognitive perception, construction, and evaluation. Thus ‘to frame’ a thought is to indicate, demonstrate, or delineate how one entity, idea, action, or quality relates to another (or others) within a larger mental structure in relation to a particular social setting.

Wilt (2003, 43) explains how frames are critical as we consider the communication process inherent in translation: “[The metaphor of frame] is useful for explaining and discussing both out-there and in-the-head phenomena which provide the background to and shape, if not govern, our communicative interactions: formation of goals, choice of strategies to meet these goals, and perception and interpretation of what we observe.”

In the same way, translators make translation decisions based upon their cultural, ideological and theological frames. Baker (2006, 110) claims that “translators and interpreters can make use of various other routines that allow them to inject the discourse with their own voice (in other words to actively frame its narrative) while signalling their intention to stay within the prescribed frame space for their activity.” Translation, therefore, involves careful

² “[World-view (WV)] is a comprehensive frame of reference that governs a person/people’s perception and interpretation of life (and death), and which accordingly guides their overt verbal and physical behavior. This WV encompasses all their beliefs, presuppositions, attitudes, ideas, norms, traditions, values – even dreams – on the one hand, while on the other, it serves to motivate as well as to validate all of their concrete social and cultural activities, speech acts, customs, social institutions, artifact construction – and most important, their current perception of reality, evaluation of experience, and future planning. WV is the ultimate ‘context,’ for it consists of the sum total of a society’s system of presuppositions about truth, reality, and human experience as lived in a particular cultural setting” (Wendland 2008, 19).

negotiation between different frames. One frame involves the commissioning or *skopos* and the other a message (target text) infused with the translator's own ideology and theology.

The third model developed by scholars in Translation Studies is the causal model. According to Chesterman (2000, 21), "A causal model is the richest and most powerful of the three models...because it also contains the other two." Through using the causal model, we can answer questions like "Why does this translation differ from the source text?" and "What conditions motivated the translator to render the source text in such and such a way?"

Chesterman suggests that the causal model has the ability to predict which conditions will result in a particular target text and which types of target texts will produce certain effects in the target environment. He represents this relationship with the following diagram (2000, 24):

CC \Rightarrow TT \Rightarrow EF (where CC = Causal Conditions, TT = Target Text, EF = Effects).

The causal model can also help to explain why certain conditions motivate a translator to render a source text in a particular way. Finally, this model is a tool for explaining the effects of the TT in the target culture.

3.3 Causal model

The causal model (Chesterman, 1998, 2000) provides the tools with which we can analyse all aspects of the translation context. We will start with the causal conditions (or preliminary norms) from which LXX-Micah emerged. There is always a translation *skopos*³ (whether or not we are privy to it) and knowing something about that will aid us in evaluating the translator's decisions. Next we consider the effects of the translation on the target culture; for LXX-Micah, we will evaluate its acceptability as is discernible primarily through how subsequent generations used the translation. Finally, we will analyse in detail the translated

³ Cf. Reiss and Vermeer (1984) and Nord (1997).

text, constantly viewing the translator from a target-oriented and functionalist perspective. He was an agent of change writing a new text with his target audience in mind. Certain aspects of the translated text will be explained in this chapter but the bulk of the analysis is presented in chapters 4 and 5.

3.3.1 Causal conditions (preliminary norms)

Though we cannot determine with any certainty the provenance of LXX-Micah, we have a general idea when it was translated. According to Tov, “Since the Prophets and several of the books of the Hagiographa were known in their Greek version to the grandson of Ben Sira at the end of the second century B.C.E., we may infer that most of the books of the Prophets and Hagiographa were translated in the beginning of that century or somewhat earlier” (2012, 131). Unfortunately, there is no internal evidence in LXX-Micah to argue for a specific time when it was produced.⁴ Nor do we have internal evidence in LXX-Micah to identify its location of origin.⁵

An important piece of preliminary data that we do possess is the *Book of Aristeas* written ca. 150-100 B.C.E.⁶ The story is well-known. The king of Egypt desired to have a copy of the Jewish scriptures in his library. In order to fulfill this desire, Demetrius commissioned Jewish scholars to translate the Torah into Greek. There were seventy-two translators gathered and they completed their task in seventy-two days with wonderfully accurate and pleasing results.

⁴ Troxel (2008, 25ff) dates LXX-Isaiah by connecting the γραμματικοί mentioned in Isaiah 33.18 with the scribes in the Alexandrian Museum.

⁵ Cf. Dines (1991, 311-313), Glenny (2009, 262-264) and Theocharous (2012, 18-20) for discussions on the date and provenance of LXX-Minor Prophets; Van der Kooij (2012, 65ff) locates the provenance of LXX-Isaiah as Heliopolis based on positive references in the LXX (over against the MT) to Jews living in Egypt; based on his conclusion that OG Isaiah was intended for liturgical use, Wagner (2013, 234) suggests its provenance to be that of the Hellenistic synagogue

⁶ Hadas (1973, 18) claims, “nothing in the linguistic evidence compels a dating below the middle of the second century B.C.E.”

Gruen (2008, 134) observes that “many scholars have found the narrative to be little more than creative fiction.” Based on this position, he reasons that the initiative to translate the Torah into Greek came not from the king of Egypt but from the Jewish community which had lost their fluency in Hebrew (2008, 134). Perhaps the diaspora’s need for a Greek version of the Pentateuch was the primary *skopos* for both the Pentateuch and all subsequent LXX translations. Furthermore, Troxel (2008, 42) argues that “Pseudo-Aristeas belongs to the era when LXX-Isaiah was produced, which means that it can provide evidence of how the LXX-Pentateuch was viewed in the translator’s day.” If LXX-Micah was produced around the time of LXX-Isaiah, then we can apply Troxel’s statement to the study of LXX-Micah.

LXX-Pentateuch was likely the only Greek translation upon which Micah’s translator could rely. According to Wevers (1996, 91), “there is no extant evidence of any translated materials into the Greek language as early as the early third century BCE in Egypt, or for that matter elsewhere in the Hellenistic world.” Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that Wevers’ (1996, 95) presuppositions about the interpretive character of the Greek Pentateuch could also be made of LXX-Micah. These presuppositions include 1) “the translators were aware that they were translating a canonical text, and so took their work very seriously,” 2) “the parent text was in the main much like the consonantal text of the MT,” 3) “the Alexandrian translators of the Pentateuch made sense,” and 4) “the Greek Pentateuch is a humanistic document of interest by and for itself, i.e. without reference to its parent text.”

3.3.2 Translated text

Analysis of the translated text is a critical step in the description of a translation. If done properly, this analysis will provide information about the translator’s competency, compliance (to norms), ideology, and style. This step involves a careful comparison of the

MT and the LXX for morphological, lexical and syntactical differences.⁷ These differences are called “translation shifts” and they relate to linguistic performance as the translator negotiates “the transfer of certain values of expression or content across a semiotic border” (Bakker et al 1998, 226). Catford (1965, 73) defines them as “departures from formal correspondence.” They include differences in verbal conjugation, word class, person, number, voice, meaning, and order, as well as pluses and minuses.

The determination of differences is sometimes subjective because it is based on *expected* differences. For instance, lexical shifts are identified by judging that the Greek word lies outside the semantic range of the translated Hebrew word (or falls within the semantic range but is, nevertheless, judged by its nuanced effect to be a translator intervention).⁸ Semantic ranges are established primarily by cognates and the context of usages so there is always the possibility that the translator renders a word according to a non-extant usage. Further, a meaning that we judge to fall *outside* the semantic range of the source text word may have been judged by the translator to fall *within* that range. Through classifying these differences between the Hebrew and Greek of Micah, I expect that translation patterns will emerge. Translation patterns (operational norms) are extremely valuable for explaining the less obvious translation shifts. In the words of Baker (1998a, 164), “One identifies norms of translational behavior by studying a corpus of authentic translations and identifying regular patterns of translation, including types of strategies that are typically opted for by the translators represented in that corpus.”

⁷ The differences must be determined through comparing “coupled-pairs” of target and source text segments. Toury (1995, 89) acknowledges that though the establishment of these coupled pairs is *ad hoc*, the pairs should be reassessed as the study proceeds in order to determine the legitimacy of their establishment. Naudé (1999, 78) provides additional guidance in discerning coupled pairs: “Entities to be compared, while differing in some respect, must share certain attributes. This requirement is especially strong in the process of contrasting, that is, looking for differences, since it is only against a background of sameness that the differences are significant.”

⁸ Cf. Munday (2012a, 22ff) regarding attitude, graduation and engagement as it pertains to semantics in appraisal theory.

There are three types of shifts: obligatory, non-obligatory and those due to error. Obligatory shifts are required by the linguistic system; non-obligatory shifts are those decided upon by the translator based on factors of culture, ideology or style (Bakker et al 1998, 228). Obligatory shifts reflect differences resulting from the linguistic constraints of the target language.

The third type of shift resulted from human error in the process of translation, transcription or transmission. Textual criticism provides the tools to identify these types of errors caused by such factors as parablepsis, dittography and metathesis. In these situations, the one responsible for the error is unaware of the mistake. He is not attempting to resolve a difficult textual issue, nor is he infusing his own ideology into the text. Rather, he assumes that he is faithfully translating, transcribing or transmitting the text.

Finally, there are (rare) times when a difference cannot be explained by error or obligatory / non-obligatory shifts (i.e., it is not a translation shift). Instead, the consonantal Hebrew text used by Micah's translator existed in a different form than that reflected in the MT. These differences are apparent, not actual, translation shifts. (In textual criticism, we call the Hebrew text used by the translator his Hebrew *Vorlage*.) Since we do not have access to original manuscripts, it is impossible to confirm conclusions that a particular apparent shift reflects a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Therefore, we should be conservative with this explanation, using it only when there is internal evidence or there are evidences from other manuscripts or versions.⁹ Further, we must evaluate each shift on a case-by-case basis and, when there is no evidence for a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, utilise operational norms to explain the shift.

⁹ Cf. Jan de Waard (1978, 339); Olofsson (1990, 67).

3.3.2.1 Obligatory shifts

Many obligatory shifts¹⁰ are constrained by the grammatical categories and rules in the target language (linguistically constrained normalisation). In other words, the translator is *obligated* to render the Greek in a way that does not seem to correspond with the Hebrew counterpart. For example, the infinitive absolute is not a grammatical form in Greek. When the translator encounters an infinitive absolute in the Hebrew text, he is faced with the decision about how to render it but he does not have the freedom to render it as an infinitive absolute in Greek. This is labeled a linguistic constraint.

3.3.2.2 Non-obligatory shifts

3.3.2.2.1 When text understood

Non-obligatory shifts¹¹ reveal various motivations of the translator. Lexical variation and metaphorisation typically elucidate the translator's desire to produce good literature for the target audience. Concretisation, explicitisation, harmonisation, and interpretive shifts (through adjustments, deletions and additions) demonstrate the translator's sense of responsibility to make sure his target audience understands the text he is presenting. Finally, ideological and theological shifts reveal that Micah's translator was motivated to infuse his own ideological and theological concerns into the text. At times, his rendering reflects knowledge of events *ex eventu*.

As discussed, Micah's translator was operating within different textual, cultural and theological frames.¹² The theological shifts in LXX-Micah uncover the theological frame of the translator. For example, an important theological frame for the translator is the idea that

¹⁰ Cf. Crisafulli (2002); Toury (1995).

¹¹ Cf. Bakker *et al* (1998).

¹² "Translators and interpreters face a basic ethical choice with every assignment: to reproduce existing ideologies as encoded in the narratives elaborated in the text or utterance, or to dissociate themselves from those ideologies, if necessary by refusing to translate the text or interpret in a particular context at all" (Baker 2006, 105).

the Israelites were judged (exiled) because they failed to rely upon and trust the Lord. Therefore, in order to avoid future judgment, the Israelites must cling tenaciously to their God. This frame can be seen in several shifts throughout the book. The examples in §5.5.2.3 will illustrate theological frames.

3.3.2.2 When text apparently *not* understood

There are also non-obligatory shifts which seem to reflect that the translator did not understand the text he was translating. In some of these cases, he uses the context to offer his best translation (slot translations). The translation strategies used in these instances range from harmonisation to interpretation to explicitisation. At other times, the translator will provide a double rendering (addition) of a single lexeme in order to avoid missing the meaning of the source text.¹³ At still other times, he will simply omit what does not fit the context (deletion).

3.3.3 Translation effects

I will focus primarily on the concept of acceptability as it relates to translation effects. For modern translations, acceptability can easily be assessed—the client can be asked if the translator did his/her job in producing an appropriate and acceptable translation. For ancient translations, acceptability is more difficult to determine, but it is nevertheless an important endeavor. One way of assessing the acceptability of a translation in its target culture is to determine how closely it adheres to the norms within the target culture's linguistic system (Toury 1980, 55).¹⁴ Another approach is to determine the attitude of the target culture toward

¹³ However, it was a common scribal practice to revise a text by offering a new rendering while leaving the original in place. Therefore, in situations where there is a double rendering, it is difficult to distinguish between the translation and the redacted or revised version.

¹⁴ Close adherence to the source culture's linguistic norms defines the translation's adequacy (Toury 1980, 55).

the translated text *vis-à-vis* non-translated texts. I will utilise the latter approach to assess the acceptability of LXX-Micah in the target culture.

If Pietersma (2006, 5-6) is correct, Aristeas speaks to the high acceptability of the LXX in its host culture “at a stage when the daughter text had declared its independence from its parent text.” It was a stage when the LXX’s “scripturalization or canonization,” rather than its production, was the central concern. According to Wevers (1996, 86), the myth described in the *Book of Aristeas* regarding the translation of the Pentateuch conducted by six men from each of the tribes of Israel from a Jerusalem copy “is pure propaganda meant to withstand Palestinian critics of a Greek Translation made in the diaspora.” Despite its propagandist tendencies, the *Book of Aristeas* is not a fabricated perspective of the LXX; rather it “reflects the LXX’s reception history—that is, the way the LXX was read, understood, and thought about subsequent to its production” (Wright 2008, 149).

Furthermore, according to Naudé (2009), whether or not the Aristeas tradition is historical or the impetus for the translation accords with the *Book of Aristeas*, it nevertheless serves as a “metatext” for the LXX. A metatext stands above a text in the sense that it provides information about the text and guides a reader in how to understand the text. An example is a preface to a modern Bible translation that describes the goals of the translators or the methods involved in translating it. Naudé (2009, 296) suggests that, as a metatext, the *Book of Aristeas* “regulates the reader’s mental preparation for reading the LXX as a free translation so as to ensure that free interpretations will be as orthodox as possible.” It is reasonable to conclude that the “mental preparation” produced by the *Book of Aristeas* for the reading of LXX-Pentateuch could also be applied to LXX-Micah.

Turning my focus to the first three centuries of the common era, I will assess the acceptability of LXX-Micah among Jews and Christians. The major revisions of the LXX—Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus—were completed by the early 3rd century C.E. They

were primarily reactions to the “polemical use of the LXX by Christians,” and were composed to realign the LXX with “the Hebrew text that had by then become normative in Palestine” (Peters 1992, 1097; cf. Marcos 2000, 109). The Jewish rejection of the LXX was a reaction to its acceptance among Christians. It is important to note that the rejection of the LXX by mainstream Judaism in the 2nd century C.E. Palestine does not imply that the translation was rejected in 2nd-1st centuries B.C.E. in Palestine or elsewhere.

It is generally accepted that the Early Christian church and the New Testament (NT) authors adopted the LXX as the official version of their Scriptures (Marcos 2000, 322).¹⁵ This can be demonstrated through the vast number of quotations in the NT taken directly from the LXX over against the Hebrew text.¹⁶ This is especially true for the NT book of Hebrews, which was written to a Jewish audience steeped in the traditions of the Mosaic law, the sacrificial system and the levitical priesthood.¹⁷ For instance, Hebrews 1.6 (προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ “let all the angels of God worship him”) quotes LXX-Deut 32.43,¹⁸ a line which is absent in the MT. A longer example occurs in Hebrews 3.7-11. This section quotes Ps 95.7-11 [Gk 94.7-11]. The length of the quote along with the

¹⁵ However, Hengel (2002, 20) notes that an ‘Alexandrian canon’ was not adopted “seamlessly” or “without deliberation” by the early church.

¹⁶ Silva (1993, 632) concludes that at times Paul quotes the MT over against the LXX but more frequently “Paul follows the LXX over against the Hebrew.” Some examples are Romans 2.24; 3.14; 4.3, 7-8; 9.29; 10.16; 1 Corinthians 6.16; 13.1; Galatians 3.6; 4.27.

¹⁷ Steyn (2009, 133ff) demonstrates the interpretive work of the author of Hebrews as he uses Hag 2.6 in Hebrews 12.26. However, the author “relies more on the eschatologically oriented wording of the LXX than on that of the MT” (Steyn 2009, 139). Though evidence from the New Testament’s use of the LXX is a few centuries removed from the target culture of the 2nd-1st centuries B.C.E., it may still indicate the trajectory set by the acceptance of LXX-Micah by the Jewish community living in Egypt.

¹⁸ This is an example of what Sommer (1998, 23) calls “exegesis” where “an exegetical text purports to explain the meaning of a specific older text.” Darrell Bock (1999, 101) claims that in quotations like this, in which there is an element of fulfillment, the author is utilising a technique called *pesher*, a technique that exposit texts in such a way that it argues for “eschatological fulfillment in the current era.” This was a technique commonly practiced in Qumran among a Jewish sect that revered the Hebrew Scriptures, especially the Torah. By analogy, the fact that the NT authors used (primarily) the LXX text as the basis for their *pesherim* demonstrates their view of the LXX as an authoritative translation.

fact that it is almost verbatim the LXX wording,¹⁹ point to the likelihood that the quote was taken from the LXX translation instead of the Hebrew text.

LXX-Micah was alluded to in Acts 14.16 by the Apostle Paul when he and Barnabas were in Lystra. After Paul heals a crippled man, the people of Lystra attempt to offer sacrifices to Paul and Barnabas. Paul explains that he and Barnabas are merely men; it is the living God who should be worshipped. Paul claims that in the past God allowed πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πορεύεσθαι ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν “all the nations to walk in their own ways.” This is an allusion to LXX-Micah 4.5 πάντες οἱ λαοὶ πορεύσονται ἕκαστος τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ “all the peoples will walk each his own way.”²⁰ The MT reads כָּל־הָעַמִּים יִלְכוּ אִישׁ בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהָיו “all the peoples will walk each in the name of his god.” Noting the significant difference between walking in one’s own way and walking in the name of one’s god, it is clear that the NT author used the LXX as the textual basis for his allusion. Sommer (1998, 18) claims that “allusion and its acknowledgment of influence may bolster the authority of a predecessor’s work or of the tradition within which the new work claims a place.” Though the evidence is scant, the *Book of Aristeas* and the New Testament’s quotations of, and allusions to, the Greek Old Testament support the high level of acceptance of the LXX in 2nd-1st centuries B.C.E. Judaism as well as among the Christian Jews in the 1st-2nd centuries C.E.

3.4 Conclusion

Though each of the models developed by DTS helps answer certain questions, I am convinced that the causal model aids us in answering questions from a target-oriented and functionalist perspective. If we view the translator as an agent of change in a position of

¹⁹ The differences are negligible (e.g., ταύτη “this” for ἐκείνη “this” and δὲ “and” for καὶ “and”); two differences in verbal forms reflect historical changes in the development of the Greek language.

²⁰ Robert Alter (1996, 112) claims that literary allusion “involves the evocation—through a wide spectrum of formal means—in one text of an antecedent literary text.” In Acts 14.16, Paul’s immediate audience would not have been familiar with the Hebrew (or Greek) Scriptures so Micah 4.5 would have been evoked only by future readers of Acts. Nevertheless, Paul’s allusion to LXX-Micah supports its acceptability in the 1st c. C.E.

power, then we want to know what factors shaped his *skopos* and operational norms. We want to understand him as a unique individual with idiosyncracies that can be discerned through observing his work. The causal model has provided some answers through an assessment of causal conditions and translation effects. The most important stage of the process is carefully analysing the translated text in order to discern the character of the translation as well as the character of its translator.

In the following chapter I will analyse the translated text through identifying the coupled pairs that reflect translation shifts. I will provide individual explanations for each of these shifts but I will not synthesise my results. In chapter 5, I will categorise the translation shifts (as well as verbal correspondences) in order to illuminate the translation patterns (operational norms) of LXX-Micah.

Chapter 4: A comparative analysis of MT-Micah and LXX-Micah

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is devoted to identifying and explaining each translation shift in LXX-Micah. In order to identify translation shifts, I first compare the source text and target text to establish corresponding segments, or coupled-pairs. I use the MT according to BHQ as the source text for the purposes of this analysis. The target text is the Greek text according to *Duodecim Prophetarum* (1984) edited by Joseph Ziegler. In footnotes I indicate instances in which the new Rahlfs-Hanhart (2006) edition of the LXX suggests a different reading.

Toury (1995, 89) notes, “beyond the boundaries of a target textual segment no leftovers of the ‘solution’ to a certain ‘problem’, posed by a corresponding segment of the source text, will be present.” He proceeds to explain that the in-depth analysis of these coupled pairs provides the basis for the translation equivalence (Toury 1995, 89). When one of the segments of the coupled pair is absent, it is indicated by Ø. Therefore, if the Hebrew segment is missing, the presence of the Greek segment a “plus”; if the Greek segment is missing, its absence a “minus.” I also provide my own English translation beneath each Hebrew and Greek verse.

All *Kethib* readings are set in a lighter font in the Hebrew text. Also, in instances where I suggest an orthographic error, I indicate the letters that may have been misread. The writing, copying and translating of Micah covered hundreds of years and during that time the Hebrew script underwent change. Therefore, I have selected two points in the history of this development as the bases for comparison (Tov 2012, 228-229). One point is the script of the Lachish inscriptions dated to the late 7th / early 6th centuries B.C.E.; this script represents

Paleo-Hebrew. The other point is the script from 1QIsa^a, which dates to the 2nd century B.C.E.; this script represents Assyrian square script.

4.2 Micah 1

4.2.1 Micah 1.1

MT דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה אֶל־מִיכָה הַמֹּרֶשֶׁתִּי בַיָּמִי יוֹתָם אֲחָז יְחִזְקִיָּה מַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה
אֲשֶׁר־חָזָה עַל־שְׁמֶרוֹן וִירוּשָׁלַם

The word of the LORD which came to Micah, the Moreshite in the days of Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, which he saw concerning Samaria and Jerusalem.

LXX καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Μιχαϊαν τὸν¹ Μωρασθι ἐν ἡμέραις Ἰωθαμ καὶ Ἀχαζ καὶ Ἐζεκιῶν² βασιλέων Ἰουδα ὑπὲρ ὧν εἶδε³ περὶ Σαμαρείας καὶ περὶ Ἱερουσαλημ
And the word of the Lord came to Michaias, the Morasthi, in the days of Ioatham and Achaz and Hezekias kings of Ioudas, about that which he saw concerning Samaria and concerning Ierousalem.

a) דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר הָיָה / καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου] There is a plus καὶ “and” as well as a minus אֲשֶׁר “which.” Gelston (2010, 65) claims that καὶ “and” was added to assimilate with Jon 1.1 but he does not provide an explanation for his conclusion. The initial five words of MT-Micah mirror those of MT-Hosea, Joel, and Zephaniah and the rendering of the latter three lack an initial καὶ “and.” However, the initial five words of LXX-Micah mirror those of LXX-Jonah, which does contain an initial καὶ “and.” Perhaps the Hebrew canonical order, in which Micah immediately follows Jonah, influenced the assimilation.

The minus אֲשֶׁר “which” may subtly change the nature of the translation. אֲשֶׁר “which” in the MT points to the content of the word of the LORD; its absence results in a mere *report* that Micah received the word of the LORD. Perhaps Micah’s translator intended to shape his target audience’s expectations for the nature of the translation. The

¹ Followed by τοῦ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

² Accent not present in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

³ εἶδεν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

target audience should not expect the translation to always mirror the word of the LORD presented in the Hebrew text; instead, it will at times deviate from the message of the Hebrew text in order to reflect a different historical context (e.g., 1.13, 2.8, 3.1, 3.9) or theology (e.g., 1.8, 2.1, 4.6, 7.13).

- b) **הַמְרִשְׁתִּי** / **τὸν Μωρασθι**] τὸν τοῦ Μωρασθι “the one of the Morashti” in other Gk mss demonstrates an understanding that **מְרִשְׁתִּי** “Moreshite” was the name of Micah’s father instead of a place name with a gentilic suffix.
- c) **מְלִכִּי** / **βασιλέων**] βασιλέως “king of” in *Hev* (Tov 2003, 33); Gelston (2010, 95*) offers dittography as possible explanation of difference in *Hev* (final *yod* in **מְלִכִּי** and initial *yod* in **יְהוּדָה**).
- d) **וְאֵז** / **καὶ Ἀγάζ**] This is a plus **καὶ** “and.”
- e) **וְיִרְוֹשָׁלַם** / **καὶ περὶ Ἱερουσαλημ**] This is a plus **περὶ** “concerning.” It is not grammatically required in Greek that the preposition be repeated before each noun it modifies (cf. Wagner [2013, 70]; see, e.g., Hos 5.6 and Isa 7.24 where only one preposition **μετὰ** “with” governs both nouns despite the Hebrew repeating the preposition). It is more common for the preposition to be repeated if the modified nouns have different cases (e.g., the plus in Job 1.5 **καὶ μὸσχον ἓνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν** “and one calf **as** a sin-offering [acc case] **for** their souls [gen case]”). However, even when the nouns occur in the same case, the repetition of the preposition can serve to explicitise and emphasise the equivalent implication for the second noun (e.g., Isa 2.1 **עַל-יְהוּדָה וְיִרְוֹשָׁלַם** “concerning

Judah and Jerusalem” > *περι* τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ *περι* Ἱερουσαλημ “**concerning** Judah and **concerning** Jerusalem”; the same construction occurs in Isa 1.1 where the translator renders על “concerning” twice as κατὰ “against,” betraying a negative interpretation of the following accusations against Judah and Jerusalem⁴). In this first verse of Micah, the translator explicitises in order to emphasise the reality that the indictments to follow apply to Jerusalem just as they do to Samaria.

4.2.2 Micah 1.2

MT שְׁמַעוּ עַמִּים כָּלֵם הַקְּשִׁיבִי אֶרֶץ וּמְלֵאָה וַיְהִי אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה בְּכֶם לְעֵד אֲדֹנָי מִהִכָּל קְדָשׁוֹ
 Hear, O peoples, all of them
 Pay attention, O land and its fullness;
 That the Lord GOD may be witness against you
 The Lord from his holy temple.

LXX ἀκούσατε λαοὶ λόγους καὶ προσεχέτω ἡ γῆ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ ἔσται κύριος ἐν ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον κύριος ἐξ οἴκου ἁγίου αὐτοῦ
 Hear, O peoples, words
 And let the earth and all those who are in it give heed
 And the Lord shall be among you as a testimony,
 The Lord from his holy house.

a) כָּלֵם / λόγους] T agrees with MT (כולהון “all of them”). Magary (1995, 321) and CATSS

explain this as a misreading of מַלְם “words” for כָּלֵם “all of them” because of the similarity of *mem* and *kaf* in the Assyrian square script (כּ/מ). While this is a possibility, it is not the only possible explanation. First, כָּלֵם occurs elsewhere in Micah and is understood by the translator as “all of them” (3.7; 7.2). Second, מַלְם (or מְלָה) occurs nowhere else in Micah, the Twelve Prophets or the rest of the Prophets. It occurs once in

⁴ Wagner (2013, 69-70) notes, “By repeating the preposition before the second conjunct object, G both magnifies the force of κατὰ and singles Jerusalem out for special attention.”

2 Sam (23.2), once in Proverbs (23.9), twice in Psalms (19.5; 139.4), twenty-four times in Daniel and thirty-four times in Job. Also, the vast majority of times that the LXX renders *λόγος* “word,” the Hebrew word that stands behind that translation is דְּבָרַי “word” (at least 91% of the time; 828 times out of about 906). Further, the third person plural pronoun in the phrase כְּלָמָם “all of them (you)” is awkward (though not unique; cf. 1 Kgs 22.28, Isa 44.23, 54.1 and Ezek 21.30). In all of these verses, the phrase כְּלָמָם “all of them (you)” is in a vocative expression. In Hebrew, a vocative is not grammatically appositional to an overt or covert second-person pronoun (see Miller 2010b; contra Waltke and O’Connor 1990: §4.7d). However, the awkwardness of a third-person pronoun within a vocative may have motivated a shift in the translation as we see in Job 17.10 (וְאוֹלָם כְּלָמָם תִּשְׁבוּ) וּבָאוּ נָא “But all of them [you], come back now” > οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ πάντες ἐρείδετε καὶ δεῦτε δῆ⁵ “Nevertheless, you all stick firmly, but come now”). In the current verse, the translator of the Peshitta also introduced a shift in the translation by rendering a second masculine plural suffix on כָּל.

The LXX translator was not constrained to formal correspondence between the Hebrew and Greek. The translator’s priority was to convey the source text to the target audience in an accurate but also meaningful way. In our current example, the abrupt switch from second person to third person may have occasioned a reassessment of the third person plural suffix on כָּל. The translator may have read the suffix as a reference to דְּבַר־יְהוָה “the word of the LORD” spoken of in the first verse, knowing that this דְּבָרַי

⁵ καὶ δεῦτε δῆ “but come now” added in the Hexapla according to θ’.

“word” was never merely a single word but always represented a plethora of words communicated by the LORD through his prophets. Instead of classifying this difference as a mistake resulting from the translator misreading a Hebrew character, it may have been an intentional translation shift used to clarify the referent of the third masculine plural pronominal suffix as *words* not *people*. It may, in fact, have been a mistake but not one of misreading a letter; rather, one of misunderstanding a referent.

Out of nine occurrences of שמע “to hear” in Micah, five are followed by direct objects (3.9; 6.1 – twice; 6.2 and 7.7). Of the four occurrences that are not followed by a direct object, the translator supplies two with direct objects (1.2 and 3.1). The other two instances of שמע “to hear” occur in 5.14 and 6.9. In 3.9, the direct object זאת “this” is rendered with ταῦτα “these.” In 6.1a, שמע “to hear” is followed by the direct object phrase אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה אָמַר “that which the LORD is speaking.” It is rendered in Greek with a direct object λόγον κυρίου “a word of the Lord” followed by the phrase κύριος εἶπεν “the Lord has spoken.” In the latter half of 6.1, the direct object is קוֹלְךָ “your voice” (pausal form) and is rendered φωνήν σου “your voice.” Then, at 6.2, τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ κυρίου “the judgment of the Lord” renders the Hebrew direct object אֶת־רִיב יְהוָה “the case of the LORD.” At 7.7, the direct object is a first person singular suffix on שמע “to hear” (שָׁמַעֲנִי “he will hear me”) and is rendered with εἰσακουσεταιί μου “he will hear me.” It is likely, therefore, that the translator expected a direct object at 1.2 and given the number of instances in the Twelve Prophets where שמע “to hear” is followed by a form of דְּבַר “word” as the direct object (Hos 4.1; Amos 3.1; 4.1; 5.1; 7.16; 8.11; Zech 7.12; and 8.9), he understood the third masculine plural suffix to refer to *words*.

- b) **הַקְשִׁיבִי / καὶ προσεχέτω**] This is a plus καὶ “and.” It is also a shift from 2fs to 3fs imperative. The translator may have mistaken the Hiphil 2fs imperative **הַקְשִׁיבִי** “pay attention” with the Hiphil 3fs *qatal* **הַקְשִׁיבָה** “she/it paid attention” (*he/yod* confusion in Paleo-Hebrew [**𐤀/𐤁**]).
- c) **אֶרֶץ וּמְלֵאָהּ / ἡ γῆ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ**] This is a shift from the vocative to the subject of the 3s imperative. Following are the vocatives that occur in Micah: 1.2 (**עַמִּים** “O peoples” > λαοὶ “O peoples”); the present example 1.2 (**אֶרֶץ וּמְלֵאָהּ** “O land and its fullness” > ἡ γῆ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ “the earth and all those who are in it”); 2.7 (**בֵּית־יַעֲקֹב** “O house of Jacob” > οἶκος Ἰακωβ “the house of Jacob”); 1.13 (**יֹשֶׁבֶת** “O inhabitant” > κατοικοῦσα “she who dwells”); 2.12 (**יַעֲקֹב בְּלָדְךָ** “O Jacob, all of you” > Ἰακωβ σὺν πᾶσιν “Jacob, with everyone”); 4.8 (**מִגְדַּל־עֵדֶר עַל־בֵּת־צִיּוֹן** “O tower of the flock, hill of the daughter of Zion” > πύργος ποιμνίου ἀρχμώδης θύγατερ Σιων “O dusty tower of the flock, daughter of Zion”); 4.10 (**בַּת־צִיּוֹן** “O daughter of Zion” > θύγατερ Σιων “O daughter of Zion”); 4.13 (**בַּת־צִיּוֹן** “O daughter of Zion” > θύγατερ Σιων “O daughter of Zion”); 4.14 [Gk 5.1] (**בַּת־גְּדוּד** “O daughter of troops” > θυγάτηρ ἐμφοραγμῶ “daughter (will be blocked) with a wall”); 5.1 [Gk 5.2] (**בֵּית־לְחֶם אֶפְרַתָּה** “O Bethlehem Ephrathah” > Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθα “O Bethlehem, house of Ephratha”); 6.3 (**עַמִּי** “O my people” > λαός μου “O my

people”); 6.5 (עַמִּי “O my people” > λαός μου “O my people”); 6.8 (אָדָם “O man” > ἄνθρωπε “O man”); and 7.8 (אִיבֹתַי “O my female enemy” > ἡ ἐχθρά μου “O my female adversary”). The shifts occur at 1.2 (second vocative), 1.13, 2.7, 2.12, and 4.14 [Gk 5.1]. In every other instance besides Micah 6.8, the translator utilises the nominative case to express the vocative.

In our present verse (1.2), the translator may have mistaken the Hiphil 2fs imperative הַקְשִׁיבִי “pay attention” for a Hiphil 3fs perfect הִקְשִׁיבָה “she/it paid attention.”

If so, the translator would have read אֶרֶץ וּמְלֶאכֶּה “land and its fullness” as the subject of the 3fs perfect instead of a vocative.

- d) אֶרֶץ וּמְלֶאכֶּה / καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ] This plus πάντες “all” was likely added to intensify the extent of the Lord’s judgment and to explicitise people as the object. Similar additions occur in the following prophetic passages: Isa 34.1 (הָאֶרֶץ וּמְלֶאכֶּה “the land and its fullness” / ἡ γῆ καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτῇ “the land and those in it”) and Amos 6.8 (עִיר וּמְלֶאכֶּה “the city and its fullness” / πόλιν σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτήν “the city with all who inhabit it”). The more common rendering of אֶרֶץ וּמְלֶאכֶּה “and its fullness” is καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς “and its fullness,” but there is precedence for the interpretation that *people* typically fill the land/city (Isa 34.1; Amos 6.8).
- e) אֶדְנִי יְהוָה / κύριος] This is a minus. This is the only occurrence of the phrase אֶדְנִי יְהוָה “Lord GOD” in Micah but the minus יְהוָה “Yahweh” is seen also in Amos 1.8; 4.2; 6.8;

7.1; 7.4 (twice); 7.6; 8.1; 8.3; and 8.11. Elsewhere, אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה “Lord GOD” is usually rendered κύριος ὁ θεός, which anticipates the MT vocalisation. In Amos 5.3, 7.2 and 7.5 it is rendered κύριος κύριος “Lord Lord.”

- f) מִהֵיכַל / ἐξ οἴκου] This is a *hapax legomenon* in MT Micah. The typical rendering of this word in the Twelve Prophets is ναός “temple.” Each rendering of הֵיכַל “temple” in Zechariah (except 8.9) is οἶκος “house” (6.12, 13, 14 and 15). Out of the 80 occurrences of הֵיכַל “temple” in the MT, the two primary renderings are ναός “temple” (55x) and οἶκος “house” (19x).

Outside of Micah where קֹדֶשׁ “holy” modifies הֵיכַל “temple” the rendering is always ναός “temple.” The rendering in Micah may have been influenced by the association between הֵיכַל קֹדֶשׁוֹ “his holy temple” in 1.2 with מִמְּקוֹמוֹ “from his place” in 1.3. The translator of 1 Kgs 8.42 rendered בַּיִת “house” as τόπος “place” (referring to the temple; similarly in the 2 Chr 6.32 parallel and the *Kethib* reading of 2 Chr 34.6). The translator of Isa 26.21 certainly connects God’s מְקוֹם “place” with his holy house or temple (τοῦ ἁγίου “his holy [house]”). It, therefore, seems reasonable to conclude that οἶκος “house” is a legitimate alternative to ναός “temple” for the translation of הֵיכַל “temple.”

4.2.3 Micah 1.3

MT כִּי־הֵנָּה יֵהוּהוּ יֵצֵא מִמְּקוֹמוֹ וַיֵּרֵד וַיְדַרְךְ עַל בְּמֹתַי בְּמֹתַי אֶרֶץ
 Look, the LORD goes out from his place,
 He comes down and treads upon the high places of the land.

LXX διότι ἰδοὺ κύριος ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτοῦ καὶ καταβήσεται καὶ ἐπιβήσεται ἐπὶ τὰ
 ὕψη τῆς γῆς
 For, behold, the Lord is coming out from his place,
 And he will come down and tread upon the heights of the earth.

- a) אֵצֵא / ἐκπορεύεται] This is a shift from a participle to the present indicative.
- b) וַיֵּרֵד / καταβήσεται] This is a shift from the modal perfect (*w^eqatal*) to the future indicative, which is the most common rendering of this conjugation in Micah (95%).
- c) וַיְדַרְךְ / ἐπιβήσεται] This is a shift from the modal perfect (*w^eqatal*) to the future indicative, which is the most common rendering of this conjugation in Micah (95%).
- d) אֶרֶץ / τῆς γῆς] This is a plus article. Mur, like MT, lacks the article (Milik 1961, 192).

However, wherever the Hebrew phrase אֶרֶץ בְּמֹתַי “the high places of the land” occurs in the MT, the article is absent (i.e., Deut 32.13, Isa 58.14 and Amos 4.13 in addition to this verse). 1QpMic (הארץ) “the land”) (Horgan 2002, 134), V, S, T and the LXX all contain the article, which likely reflects the tendency for translators to smooth out syntax (LXX contains the article in each of the three additional verses where this phrase appears).

4.2.4 Micah 1.4

MT וְנִמְסוּ הַהָרִים תַּחְתָּיו וְהַעֲמֻקִּים יִתְבַּקְּעוּ כַּדֹּנַג מִפְּנֵי הָאֵשׁ כְּמִים מִגְרִים בְּמִזְרָד
 And the mountains will melt under him
 And the valleys will split open
 Like wax before the fire
 Like water poured down a steep place.

LXX καὶ σαλευθήσεται τὰ ὄρη ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ κοιλάδες τακίσονται ὡς κηρὸς ἀπὸ
 προσώπου πυρὸς καὶ ὡς ὕδωρ καταφερόμενον ἐν καταβάσει
 And the mountains shall be shaken under him,
 And the valleys shall melt
 Like wax before fire
 And like water being carried by a slope.

- a) וְנִמְסוּ / καὶ σαλευθήσεται] The only other occurrence of מסמ “to melt” in the Twelve Prophets is rendered by θραυσμὸς “breaking” (Nah 2.11). Outside the Twelve Prophets, the common rendering is τήκομαι “to melt.” Common Hebrew words for quaking associated with mountains are רָגַז “to quake,” שַׁעַץ (proper noun for a mountain in Ephraim), לָלַל “to shake” and רָעַשׁ “to quake,” none of which is easily confused with וְנִמְסוּ “and they will melt.” However, given that it is a common metaphor in the MT for mountains to quake or shake, the translator likely concluded that the verb in Hebrew was מוֹט “to totter,” rendering it (as usual in the LXX) with σαλεύω “to shake.” The expected Niphal form נִמְוֹטוּ “they will be shaken” is orthographically similar to נִמְסוּ “they will melt” so it is likely that the translator read the latter Hebrew word. This conclusion is further supported by the slot translation of the following verb יִתְבַּקְּעוּ “they will split open” with τακίσονται “they will melt.”

LXX διὰ ἀσέβειαν Ἰακωβ πάντα ταῦτα καὶ διὰ ἁμαρτίαν οἴκου Ἰσραηλ τίς ἢ ἀσέβεια τοῦ Ἰακωβ οὐ Σαμάρεια καὶ τίς ἢ ἁμαρτία οἴκου Ἰουδα οὐχὶ Ἱερουσαλημ
 All these things are for the impiety of Jacob
 And for the sin of the house of Israel.
 What is the impiety of Jacob? Is it not Samaria?
 And what is the sin of the house of Judah? Is it not Jerusalem?

- a) **תָּאזַ / ταῦτα]** It is likely that the translator shifted to a plural to highlight the multiple consequences in 1.6-7 that will result from Jacob’s transgression. In 1.8 the translator maintains the singular (עַל־זֹאת אֲשַׁפֵּךְ הַיְיָ לְלִילָהּ “because of this I will wail and howl” > ἔνεκεν τούτου κόπεται καὶ θρηγήσει “on account of this she will lament and wail”) apparently referring to the punishment to come upon Israel. It is possible that the neuter singular τούτου “this” in 1.8 points to neuter singular κρίμα “judgment” (despite not being explicit in the context).
- b) **וּבְחַטָּאוֹת / καὶ διὰ ἁμαρτίαν]** This shift in number occurs also in H_{ev} (Tov 2003, 33). Every other occurrence of חַטָּאוֹת “sins” in the Twelve Prophets is rendered with the plural (Mic 7.9; Hos 8.13; 9.9). Gelston (2010, 66) concludes the shift was motivated by contextual assimilation, which is certainly possible. Another explanation may lie in the thinking at Qumran, a community roughly contemporaneous with the LXX target Alexandrian community. A Peshet to Micah (1Q14/1QpMic, frags. 8-10, line 4) attributes the *singular* sin of Jacob to the spreader of the lie (מְטִיף הַכִּזְבֵּ) and the *singular* sin of Judah to the corrupt priests in Jerusalem (García Martínez *et al* 1997, 8). There is no way to prove this connection but it remains a possibility.

- c) **בְּמִוֹת / ἡ ἀμαρτία**] There are shifts in number and semantics. There are at least two likely motivations for the shift in semantics: 1) the translator sought to maintain the parallelism between the stichoi – **בְּפִשְׁעֵי** “for the transgression” / **פֶּשַׁע** “transgression” > ἀσέβειαν “impiety” / ἡ ἀσέβεια “the impiety”; **וּבְחַטְאוֹת** “and for the sins” / **בְּמִוֹת** “high places” > ἀμαρτίαν “sin”/ ἡ ἀμαρτία “the sin”; 2) **בְּמִוֹת** “high places” in the MT is often associated with Canaanite cult practices and functions as metonymy for the sins of Israel/Judah (cf. Albright 1957). The current shift, then, should be considered a concretisation from **בְּמִוֹת** “high places” to ἡ ἀμαρτία “the sin.”
- d) **בְּיְהוּדָה / οἴκου Ιουδα**] The plus οἴκου “house” was added to harmonise with οἴκου Ισραηλ “house of Israel” in the second stich.⁶

4.2.6 Micah 1.6

MT **וְשִׁמְתִי שְׁמֵרוֹן לְעֵי הַשָּׂדֶה לְמִטְעֵי כָרֶם וְהִגַּרְתִּי לְגַי אֲבִנְיָהּ וְיִסְדִּיחָהּ אֲגָלָה**
 I will make Samaria a heap in the open country,
 As places to plant a vineyard,
 And I will hurl her stones down into the valley
 And uncover her foundations.

LXX καὶ θήσομαι Σαμάρειαν εἰς ὄπωροφυλάκιον ἀγροῦ καὶ εἰς φυτεῖαν ἀμπελῶνος καὶ κατασπάσω εἰς χάος τοὺς λίθους αὐτῆς καὶ τὰ θεμέλια αὐτῆς ἀποκαλύψω
 And I will make Samaria a hut for a garden-watcher of the field
 And a planting of a vineyard.
 And I will pull down her stones into an abyss
 And I will reveal her foundations.

⁶ Gelston (2010, 66) labels the shift contextual assimilation.

- a) **הֵלְ / εἰς ὄπωροφυλάκιον**] There are only five occurrences of **הֵלְ** “heap” in the MT. Besides here in 1.6, the LXX renders **הֵלְ** “heap” with *ὄπωροφυλάκιον* “a hut for a garden-watcher” in Ps 79.1 [Gk 78.1] and Mic 3.12. It is rendered *ἐμαυτὸν* “myself” in Job 30.24 (perhaps mistaking **הֵלְ** “in a heap” for **עָלַי** “upon myself” [cf. Gen 27.12; Deut 17.14] or **בִּי** “by myself” [cf. Gen 22.16; Isa 45.23]) and *ἄβατος* “untrodden” in Jer 26.18 [Gk 33.18]. The LXX uses *ὄπωροφυλάκιον* “a hut for a garden-watcher” to render **מְלוּנָה** “hut” in Isa 1.8 and 24.20.

With regard to the rendering in Mic 3.12, Renaud (1977, 141) argues that the translator intended to mitigate the effects of the judgment on Jerusalem. Though the Hebrew text claims that Jerusalem will become **הֵלְ** “heaps of ruins,” the LXX translation reveals that Jerusalem was only reduced to *ὄπωροφυλάκιον* “a hut for a garden-watcher.” Renaud (1977, 14) suggests that LXX-Micah 1.6 reflects a similar translation shift with regard to the prophecy against Samaria. Wolff (1990, 42) argues that LXX-Micah 1.6 “weakens the force of the threat after the manner of Isa. 1:8ab.”

Theocharous (2012, 106) is likely correct to label this shift a “euphemistic cliché” based on LXX-Isaiah’s use of *ὄπωροφυλάκιον* “a hut for a garden-watcher” to render the impact of God’s judgment on Daughter Zion (1.8). Although a different Hebrew word (**מְלוּנָה** “hut”) stands behind LXX-Isaiah 1.8, according to Theocharous (2012, 106), “It is not unlikely that Isaiah’s description of the *ὄπωροφυλάκιον* had become a cliché so well known that it was evoked whenever the troublesome **הֵלְ** was encountered...**הֵלְ** would trigger the adoption of this cliché.”

- b) **הַשָּׂדֶה / ἀγροῦ]** This is a minus article. I agree with Gelston (2010, 95*) that the minus does not indicate a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.
- c) **לְמַטְעֵי / καὶ εἰς φυτεῖαν]** This is a plus καὶ “and” as well as a shift in number. Gelston (2010, 95*) suggests that the plus in the LXX, S and H_{ev} “may be only a stylistic variation.” It seems much more likely that the translator added the conjunction in order to explicitise the parallel dependence of **לְמַטְעֵי כָרָם** “as places to plant a vineyard” upon the verb **וְשָׂמַתִּי** “I will make.”⁷
- d) **וְהִגַּרְתִּי / καὶ κατασπάσω]** This is a unique rendering in the LXX. The Hophal stem of **גָּרַגַּר** “to pour” is rendered καταφέρω “being carried” (present passive participle) in Mic 1.4. Elsewhere it is rendered παραδίδωμι “to give over” (Ps 63.11 [Gk 62.11]), ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ “before him” (Ps 77.3 [Gk 76.3]), ἀθροίζω “to gather together” (Jer 18.21), ἐγκαθίζω “to take one’s seat” (Ezek 35.5), καταπίνω “to swallow up (passive: to be drowned)” (Lam 3.49), and ἐκκενόω “to pour out” (Ps 75.9 [Gk 74.9]).
- e) **לְצִי / εἰς χάος]** There is a minus definite article though consonantly there is no difference in the Hebrew. We see the same rendering of **צִי** “valley” in Zech 14.4 (which is the only other use of χάος “abyss” in the LXX), though it is usually rendered φάραγξ “valley” (including twice in Zech 14.5).

⁷ Cf. Magary (1995, 339).

4.2.7 Micah 1.7

MT וְכָל־פְּסִילֶיהָ יִכְתּוּ וְכָל־אֲתָנֻנֶיהָ יִשְׂרְפוּ בְאֵשׁ וְכָל־עֲצָבֶיהָ אֲשֵׁים שְׂמָמָה כִּי מֵאֲתָנֻן זֹנָה
קִבְּצָה וְעַד־אֲתָנֻן זֹנָה יָשׁוּבוּ

And all her carved images will be crushed
And all her wages will be burned in the fire,
And all her idols I will lay waste
For from the wage of a whore she collected,
And unto the wage of a whore they will return.

LXX καὶ πάντα τὰ γλυπτὰ αὐτῆς κατακόψουσιν καὶ πάντα τὰ μισθώματα αὐτῆς ἐμπρήσουσιν ἐν πυρὶ καὶ πάντα τὰ εἰδωλα αὐτῆς θήσομαι εἰς ἀφανισμόν διότι ἐκ μισθωμάτων πορνείας συνήγαγε⁸ καὶ ἐκ μισθωμάτων πορνείας συνέστρεψε
And all her carved images they will cut
And they will burn with fire all her wages,
And all her idols I will make destruction
Because from the wages of whoredom she gathered,
And from the wages of whoredom she brought together.

- a) **יִכְתּוּ / κατακόψουσιν**] This is a shift in agent (carved images passively crushed > ambiguous “they” will cut the carved images) despite there being an explicit first person subject in the third stich. The same semantic rendering for **כָּתַת** “to crush” (the most common) occurs in Mic 4.3, Zech 11.6, Num 14.45 and 2 Chr 34.7. Possibly the assumed subject “they” is the same subject as in Mic 4.3, namely “strong nations.” If this is correct, then the shift is an example of explicitisation of the subject (shifting from the Lord as implied agent of the passive verb to the strong nations as explicit agentive subject of the active verb).
- b) **יִשְׂרְפוּ / ἐμπρήσουσιν**] Consistent with the previous shift in the first stich, this is a shift in agent (her wages passively burned > ambiguous “they” will burn her wages) despite the explicit first person subject in the third stich.

⁸ συνήγαγεν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- c) **וְיָנִין / μισθωμάτων]** These are shifts in number (fourth and fifth stichoi).
- d) **וְעַד / καὶ ἐκ]** Lacking orthographic similarity between **עַד** (prefix preposition that typically lies behind ἐκ “from”) and **וְעַד**, it is unlikely that this shift represents a mistake. Instead, the best explanation for this shift is the translator harmonising with the preposition **מִן** “from” in the fourth stich.⁹ This is congruent with the following shift.
- e) **וְיָשׁוּבוּ / συνέστρεψεν]** This is a unique rendering in the LXX. There are shifts in meaning and tense of the verb as well as a shift in subject (“they” > “she”). The MT claims that by the wage of a prostitute “she” gathered, and unto the wage of a prostitute “they” will return. The LXX renders the Hebrew in a parallel sense—from the wages of whoredom she gathered *and* she brought together. Wolff (1990, 58) is correct in understanding Micah’s message as addressing the “commercial goods and tribute” Samaria gave to Assyria in return for the “wages” used to build the royal residences that will be returned (“stones hurled down” and “foundations uncovered” in v.6). The LXX renders **זוֹנָה** “whore” as an abstract noun *πορνείας* “whoredom” and likely understands Samaria to be the subject of *συνήγαγεν* “she gathered” and *συνέστρεψεν* “she brought together” while her idols are the objects. The translator’s understanding of the last two stichoi as parallel lines motivated the present shifts. The translator did not read a Hiphil 3fs **הִשִּׁיבָהּ** (“she brought back”) for **וְיָשׁוּבוּ** “they will return” but shifted the meaning to fit the understood context.

⁹ Also Gelston 2010, 96*.

4.2.8 Micah 1.8

MT עֲלִיזָאת אֶסְפְּדָה וְאֵילִילָה אֵילִכָּה שִׁלְלִי שׁוֹלֵל וְעָרוֹם אֶעֱשֶׂה מִסְפַּד כְּתַנִּים וְאַבְּלִי
כְּבָנוֹת יַעֲנָה

Because of this I will wail and howl
I will go barefoot and naked
I will let out a wailing like the jackals
And a mourning like ostriches.

LXX ἔνεκεν τούτου κόπεται καὶ θρηνήσει πορεύσεται ἀνυπόδετος καὶ γυμνή ποιήσεται κοπετὸν ὡς
δρακόντων καὶ πένθος ὡς θυγατέρων σειρήνων
On account of this she will lament and wail;
She will go barefoot and naked,
She will let out lamentation like dragons
And mourning like daughters of sirens.

- a) **הַסְפָּדָה / κόπεται]** This is a shift in person from 1cs to 3s. The four shifts from first person to third person are theologically motivated. The context describes the punishment the LORD will bring upon Samaria for her misdeeds. In 1.8, the prophet describes his own mourning as a result of the punishment Samaria will have to endure. The translator either himself read the mourning as a description of how the LORD would lament or was worried that his target audience would read it this way. The LORD lamenting in nakedness was likely too scandalous for the translator. Therefore, he rendered the verse in such a way (four shifts in person) that the audience would understand the acts of mourning as those that Samaria would carry out. S shifted to 2fs imperatives and T shifted to 3p *yiqtol*s, presumably for the same reason. Gelston (2010, 96*) suggests that the shifts were “perhaps caused by doubt as to the identity of the subj.” It seems more likely that the translator understood the subject to be the prophet and did not want to risk his audience reading the Lord as the subject of the present context.¹⁰

¹⁰ Rösel (2006, 247) notes a similar theological shift in Numbers 3.16 and 3.39 where the translator changes the meaning from עַל־פִּי יְהוָה “by the mouth of the LORD” to διὰ φωνῆς κυρίου “by the voice of the Lord” to avoid the anthropomorphic idea of God having a physical mouth.

- b) אִילִיָּהּ / θρηνησει] This is a shift in person from 1cs to 3s.
- c) אִילָכָה / πορεύσεται] This is a shift in person from 1cs to 3s.
- d) אֶשְׁאָל / ποιήσεται] This is a shift in person from 1cs to 3s.
- e) פְּתַנִּים / ὡς δρακόντων] This is the usual rendering (same in Jer 9.10 and Lam 4.3 [*Kethib* is תַּנִּין]). תַּנִּין “serpent/dragon” is rendered Σειρήν “siren” in Job 30.29; Isa 34.13; 43.20. δράκων “dragon” is the common rendering for תַּנִּין “serpent/dragon,” which could be easily confused for תַּנִּים “jackals” because of the similarity of *nun* and *mem* in paleo-Hebrew script (𐤏/𐤍) (cf. Tov 2012, 228).
- f) בְּבָנוֹת יַעֲנָה / ὡς θυγατέρων σειρήνων] We see the same rendering in Isa 13.21 and Jer 50.39 (interestingly, the contexts of Isa 13.21 and Jer 50.39 involve the state of Babylon, which may have influenced the shifts here in Micah where Babylon is the exilic destination of God’s people). בַּת הַיַּעֲנָה “ostrich” is rendered στρουθιον “ostrich” in Lev 11.16, Deut 14.15, Job 30.29 and Isa 34.13. In Isa 43.20 בְּנֹת יַעֲנָה “ostriches” is rendered θυγατέρες στρουθῶν “daughters of ostriches.”

4.2.9 Micah 1.9

- MT כִּי אֲנוּשָׁה מִכּוֹתֶיהָ כִּי־בָאָה עַד־יְהוּדָה נִגַּע עַד־שַׁעַר עַמִּי עַד־יְרוּשָׁלַם
 For her wounds are incurable
 For it has come as far as Judah
 It has reached as far as the gate of my people, as far as Jerusalem.

LXX ὅτι κατεκράτησεν ἡ πληγὴ αὐτῆς διότι ἦλθεν ἕως Ιουδα καὶ ἦψατο ἕως πύλης λαοῦ μου ἕως Ἱερουσαλημ
 Because her wound has prevailed,
 For it has come as far as Judah
 And it has reached as far as the gate of my people, as far as Jerusalem.

a) **הַשְּׁנֵי / κατεκράτησεν**] This is a unique rendering in the LXX. שְׁנֵי “incurable” is rendered στερεός “severe” in Jer 15.18. שְׁנֵי לְשִׁבְרֶךָ “your hurt is incurable” is rendered ἀνέστησα σύντριμμα “I have caused destruction” in Jer 30.12. This is likely a slot translation. By contrast, Gelston (2010, 67) suggests it was the translator taking translational liberty.

b) **הַמְּבוֹתָיָה / ἡ πληγὴ αὐτῆς**] This is a shift in number from plural to singular. Though it is acceptable in Hebrew for there to be lack of agreement between a preceding predicate and its subject (GKC, §145o), it nevertheless warrants a shift in translation to smooth the syntax.

c) **וַנֵּן / καὶ ἦψατο**] This is a plus καὶ “and.”

4.2.10 Micah 1.10

MT בְּגַת אֶל־תִּגִּידוּ בְּכוֹ אֶל־תִּבְכוּ בְּבַיִת לְעַפְרָה עֲפָר הַתְּפִלְשִׁי הַתְּפִלְשִׁי

Tell (it) not in Gath, weep not at all;
 In Beth-leaphrah, roll yourself in the dust.

LXX οἱ ἐν Γεθ μὴ μεγαλύνεσθε οἱ ἐν Ακιμ μὴ ἀνοικοδομεῖτε ἐξ οἴκου καταγέλωτα¹¹ γῆν καταπάσασθε καταγέλωτα¹² ὑμῶν
 Those of you in Geth, do not exalt yourselves;
 Those of you in Akim, do not rebuild from a house an object of derision;
 Strew soil on your object of derision.

a) **וְלֹא־תִגְדְּלוּ / μὴ μεγαλύνεσθε]** α' and σ' attest οἱ ἐν γεθ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλητε “those in Gath, tell it not,” which is likely a correction to the familiar imperative in 2 Sam 1.20. Wolff (1990, 43n.10a) suggests that μὴ μεγαλύνεσθε “do not exalt yourselves” reflects the original Hebrew text **וְלֹא־תִגְדְּלוּ** “do not exalt yourselves” which he says makes better sense of the context. He claims it also helps explain S “do not rejoice.” Magary (1995, 346-348) suggests that S does not necessarily reflect a different Hebrew *Vorlage* but the tendency of translators to specify (explicitise in TS). He argues that in contrast to the command not to weep, the command to not tell (it) in Gath was specified to not rejoicing. The context of 2 Sam 1.20 (**פֶּן־תִּשְׂמְחוּ־מִנָּה** “lest they rejoice”; **פֶּן־תִּגְדְּלוּ־מִנָּה** “lest they exult”) might have influenced S translator’s rendering (though Magary does not mention this). It seems equally unnecessary to propose a different Hebrew *Vorlage* to explain the Greek translation. This is not an intentional shift (as Magary proposes for S), but a mistake in which the translator read **וְלֹא־תִגְדְּלוּ** “do not exalt yourselves.” Though Taylor (1890, 19) proposes that the Greek μὴ μεγαλύνεσθε “do not exalt yourselves” reflects a Hitpaël, not a Hiphil, stem, in Job 19.5 we see the Hiphil of **גָּדַל** “to be great” rendered by the exact same Greek form μεγαλύνεσθε “exalt yourselves.”

¹¹ κατὰ γέλωτα in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

¹² κατὰ γέλωτα in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

b) **בְּכוֹ** / **οἱ ἐν Ακιμ**] This must have been misread as a proper noun parallel to Γεθ “Geth.”

However, there are no other occurrences of Ακιμ in the LXX with which we could compare. Perhaps, through a phonological error, the translator assumed there was an *ayin* or *aleph* after the *bet* preposition. I cannot explain the *mu* ending on the place name.

c) **אַל־תִּבְכוּ** / **μη ἀνοικοδομεῖτε**] Through a *nun/kaf* confusion, the translator misread

אַל־תִּבְכוּ “do not weep” as **אַל־תִּבְנוּ** “do not (re)build.”¹³

d) **בְּבֵית** / **ἐξ οἴκου**] This shift in preposition resulted from a contextual interpretation based

on misreading **אַל־תִּבְכוּ** “do not weep” for **אַל־תִּבְנוּ** “do not (re)build” in the previous phrase (though the orthographic confusion of *bet* and *mem* is common [Tov 2012, 228]).

e) **לְעִפְרָה** / **κατὰγέλωτα**] There is a minus *lamed* preposition and a lexical shift. Perhaps the

translator mistook **לְעִפְרָה** “Leaphrah” for **חֲרָפָה** “reproach” (metathesis of *pe* and *resh* and *khet/lamed-ayin* confusion¹⁴ in Assyrian square script [**ח/ע**]) or for an unattested

substantival form of **חֲפָרָה** “to be ashamed” (**חפרה**; rendered with **καταγελάω** “to laugh at” in 3.7). The latter explanation would have resulted from a *khet/lamed-ayin* confusion

without metathesis. Gelston (2010, 67) claims the shift from **בְּבֵית לְעִפְרָה** “in Beth-

leaphrah” to **ἐξ οἴκου κατὰγέλωτα** “from a house an object of derision” is elusive.

¹³ Also Gelston (2010, 67).

¹⁴ The *lamed-ayin* form a ligature, where “various letters were joined together to form one graphic entity which could easily be confused with single letters” (Tov 2012, 231-232).

f) **עָפַר הַתְּפִלָּשְׁתִּי / γῆν καταπάσασθε]** Mur attests the *Qere* (התפלשי) (Milik 1961, 192). Jer

6.26 also contains the command **בְּאַפָּר הַתְּפִלָּשׁי** “roll in the dust” (Hitpael fs imperative, which is the same as the *Qere* in the present verse). The same Greek verb is used to render the command in Jeremiah. The Hitpael stem of **פִּלַּשׁ** “to roll oneself” is rendered with *κόπτω* in the middle voice (“lament”) in Jer 25.34 [Gk 32.34] and *ὑποστρωννύω* “spread underneath” (referring to ashes) in Ezek 27.30. *καταπάσσω* “to sprinkle” renders **זָרַק** “to sprinkle” in Job 2.12. The situation here in Micah represents an intentional, contextual shift from the Hitpael fs imperative (*Qere*) or Hitpael *qatal* 1cs (*Kethib*) to a plural imperative.¹⁵

g) **עֲבְרִי לְכֶם (from 1.11) / κατὰγέλωτα ὑμῶν]** Gelston (2010, 96*) admits “G’s rendering is

hard to explain, but G attaches these words to the previous verse, where it has already used *κατὰγέλωτα*.” It is difficult to explain but the repeated use of *κατὰγέλωτα* “an object of derision” may be a clue to the explanation. If the translator mistook **לְעֶפְרָה** “Leaphrah” for a substantival form of **הִפָּר** “to be ashamed” (see above, *הפרה* in §4.2.10e), he may have read **עֲבְרִי** “pass on” as a substantival form of **הִפָּר** “to be ashamed.” It is unlikely that it resulted from a series of orthographical errors (*khet-ayin*, *pe-bet* and *he-yod*); rather, it resulted from contextual harmonisation. The motivations for this shift are the awkward construction **עֲבְרִי לְכֶם** “pass on your way” as well as the lack of agreement between **לְכֶם** “to you” (mp) and **עֲבְרִי** “pass” (fs) / **יוֹשְׁבֵת** “inhabitant” (fs).

¹⁵ Gelston (2010, 67) similarly suggests the shift represents a contextual assimilation.

4.2.11 Micah 1.11

MT עֲבָרִי לְכֶם יוֹשְׁבֵת שְׁפִיר עָרִיה־בְּשֵׁת לֹא יֵצֵאָה יוֹשְׁבֵת צֶאֱנָן מִסְפֵּד בֵּית הָאֶצֶל יִקַּח
מִכֶּם עֲמֻדָתָו

Pass on your way, inhabitant of Shaphir, in nakedness and shame;
The inhabitant of Zaanan does not come out;
The wailing of Beth-ezel: “he will take from you its support.”

LXX κατοικοῦσα καλῶς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς οὐκ ἐξῆλθε¹⁶ κατοικοῦσα Σεννααν κόψασθαι οἶκον ἐχόμενον αὐτῆς λήμψεται ἐξ ὑμῶν πληγὴν ὀδύνης
(Though) she inhabits her cities well, the inhabitant of Sennaan did not come out to mourn a house next to her; she will receive from you a painful blow.

a) עֲבָרִי לְכֶם / κατὰγέλωτα ὑμῶν (from 1.10)] This translation is explained above in

§4.2.10g.

b) שְׁפִיר / καλῶς] The Hebrew word is a *hapax legomenon* in the Hebrew Bible (possibly a

mistake for שְׁמִיר “Shamir,” which occurs in Josh 15.48). The shift is perhaps due to the

lack of knowledge of the place name combined with a meaning for שְׁפִיר in Aramaic as

“fair, beautiful.”¹⁷ Given the multiple occurrences of X-יוֹשְׁבֵת in Mic 1.11-15 which the

translator renders with “inhabitant of X,” Joosten (2012, 58-59) suggests that the

translator would have known that Hebrew term שְׁפִיר “Shaphir” referred to a city.

However, “the identification of the word as שְׁפִיר, ‘beautiful’, was a starting point from

which he set out to make sense of the verse” (Joosten 2012, 58-59).

¹⁶ ἐξῆλθεν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

¹⁷ Wasserstein *et al* (2006, 5) lend support to this explanation: “It is clear that in the fifth century, the language of [fifth century B.C.E. Jews in Egypt] was Aramaic. But this changed gradually with time. In the period following the Persian domination, although a few Jewish inscriptions found in Egypt are written in Aramaic, most are written in Greek.”

- c) **עָרֶיהָ / τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς]** The translator read **עָרֶיהָ** “her cities” (same consonants, different vocalisation).
- d) **תִּשָּׁ / Ø]** This was omitted because it did not fit the context (of the translated text).¹⁸
- e) **דַּבָּר / κόψασθαι]** This is a shift from a noun to an infinitive. It is not likely a mistake given that **דַּבָּר** “wailing” is rendered with the typical *κοπετός* “lamentation” in 1.8.
- f) **לְצִדְדָּהּ / ἐχόμενον αὐτῆς]** This is rendered as the preposition **לְצִדְדָּהּ** “beside” instead of the proper noun. The *αὐτῆς* “her” pronoun was either added or understood as a pronominal suffix through far metathesis (**הִלְצִדְדָּהּ** “beside her” for **לְצִדְדָּהּ** “Ezel”). Gelston (2010, 67) also explains the rendering as a lexical error but does not account for the pronoun *αὐτῆς* “her.”
- g) **קִבְּ? / λήμψεται]** Though the Greek form could be rendered “he will receive” or “she will receive,” the context confirms the translator’s understanding that the subject of *λήμψεται* “she will receive” was the female inhabitant of Sennaan.
- h) **יִתְדָּמַג / πληγὴν ὀδύνης]** The Hebrew word is a *hapax legomenon* in the Hebrew Bible. Gelston (2010, 97*) says, “G and S seems to offer a second rendering of **מכּם**, via **נכה**” and goes on to say that “G’s *ὀδύνης* is hard to explain, unless as a clarifying expansion of *πληγὴν*.” It seems that this explanation is mostly correct. I would suggest that *ὀδύνης* “of

¹⁸ Both of *θ*’s readings (the second we know from the Syrohexapla) incorporate the noun *αἰσχύνη* “shame.”

pain” is not a clarifying expansion of πληγὴν “blow” but a slot translation influenced by עֲמָל “trouble,” which is rendered by ὀδύνη “pain” three times in Job (4.8, 7.3 and 15.35).

4.2.12 Micah 1.12

MT בִּי־הִלָּה לְטוֹב יוֹשְׁבַת מְרוֹת בִּי־רָד רַע מֵאֵת יְהוָה לְשַׁעַר יְרוּשָׁלַם

For the inhabitant of Maroth writhes (anxiously) for good,
Because disaster has come down from the LORD to the gate of Jerusalem.

LXX τίς ἤρξατο εἰς ἀγαθὰ κατοικοῦση ὀδύνας ὅτι κατέβη κακὰ παρὰ κυρίου ἐπὶ πύλας Ἱερουσαλημ

Who has made a beginning for good things for her who dwells in sorrow?
For calamities have come down from the Lord upon the gates of Jerusalem.

a) בִּי / τίς] The translator misread בִּי “because” as מִי “who,” confusing the *kaf* and *mem* in the Assyrian square script (כ/מ).

b) הִלָּה / ἤρξατο] The translator read the verb as חָלַל “to begin” (as the unattested form חָלַח “she began”) instead of חוּל “to writhe.” א’ (ἠρρώστησεν “she became sick”) reflects an attempt to retrovert the Greek text to reflect his understanding of the proto-MT Hebrew text (likely חָלַח “she is sick”). Magary (1995, 351) notes that S’s rendering reflects the same understanding: “P took the verb to be חָלַח ‘to be sick’ rather than חוּל ‘writhe (in anxious longing)’.” א’ and S may have both been influenced by חָלַחְתִּי “I make sick” in Mic 6.13. θ’ (ἀναμένουσα “she is waiting” according to the Syrohexapla) and σ’ (ἤλπισεν “she hoped”) retroverted according to their reading of the Hebrew text as חָלַח “she

waits” (from יחל “to wait, hope”). In 6.13, the LXX-Micah translator misread חלה “to be sick” as חלל “to begin.”

- c) מְרוֹת / ὀδύνας] The translator understood it not as a place name but as a noun from the verbal root מרר “to be bitter” modifying יושבת “inhabitant.”¹⁹
- d) רָע / κακά] This is a theological shift. The translator understood רָע “bad thing” as a collective and rendered it with a plural adjective. This same shift in number occurs also at 2.1, 3; 4.9. (See explanation in §5.5.2.3 for more details.)
- e) לְשַׁעַר יְרוּשָׁלַם / ἐπὶ πύλας Ἱερουσαλημ] This is a shift from singular שַׁעַר “gate” to plural πύλας “gates.” Singular שַׁעַר עַמִּי “gate of my people” in 1.9 was rendered with singular πύλης λαοῦ μου “gate of my people” but Mic 1.12 is the only occurrence in the MT of singular שַׁעַר “gate” in construct with יְרוּשָׁלַם “Jerusalem” (the phrase שַׁעַר יְרוּשָׁלַם “gates of Jerusalem” occurs eight times in MT – Jer 1.15; 17.19, 21, 27; 22.19; Lam 4.12; Neh 7.3; 13.19). The rendering in the LXX may have been motivated by the unexpected singular form. Gelston (2010, 68) similarly suggests it resulted from assimilation to the typical form of the Hebrew expression.

¹⁹ θ’'s εἰς ὕψος “on high” resulted from metathesis of the *mem* and *resh*.

4.2.13 Micah 1.13

MT רַתֵּם הַמְרֻכָּבָה לְרֶכֶשׁ יוֹשֶׁבֶת לָכִישׁ רֵאשִׁית חַטָּאת הִיא לְבַת־צִיּוֹן כִּי־בָדָד נִמְצְאוּ
פְּשָׁעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Harness the chariot to the steed, O inhabitant of Lachish;
She is the beginning of sin to the daughter of Zion
For in you were found the transgressions of Israel.

LXX ψόφος ἄρμάτων καὶ ἵππευόντων κατοικοῦσα Λαχίς ἀρχηγὸς ἀμαρτίας αὐτὴ ἐστὶ²⁰ τῆ θυγατρὶ
Σιων ὅτι ἐν σοὶ εὐρέθησαν ἀσέβειαι τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ
Noise of chariots and horsemen. She who dwells in Lachis,
She is the founder of sin to daughter Zion,
Because in you were found the impious acts of Israel.

a) רַתֵּם / ψόφος] This is a *hapax legomenon* in the MT and the LXX and is likely a slot

translation. Schwantes (1962, 45) suggests that רַתֵּם “harness” is the remnant of an

original אָסַרְתָּ “tie” (Qal *qatal* 2fs) (cf. Gen 46.29, Exod 14.6) where the *alef* and *samek*

were lost due to the damaged right-hand margin. Further, he proposes that the *he* article

on הַמְרֻכָּבָה “the chariot” was a redactional correction and the *mem* on רַתֵּם “harness”

resulted from dittography or is an enclitic *mem*. Though this explanation is possible, by

the time the Greek translation was made, the Hebrew word in question (רַתֵּם “harness”)

likely read as it does in the MT (perhaps the following word הַמְרֻכָּבָה “the chariot” lacked

the *he* article). Otherwise, the Greek rendering for אָסַרְתָּ “tie” would likely have been

ζεύγνυμι “join” as in Gen 46.29 and Exod 14.6.

b) הַמְרֻכָּבָה / ἄρμάτων] This is a shift in number and a minus article.

²⁰ ἐστὶν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- c) **לְרִכְּשׁ / ἰππευόντων]** This is a minus preposition and a shift in number. **רִכְּשׁ** is a rare word in the MT (only three occurrences) none of which is rendered with *ἰππεύω* “to ride horses.” It is likely that the translator read **רָכַב** “to ride on a horse” given that the other two occurrences of *ἰππεύω* “to ride horses” in LXX both render **רָכַב** “to ride on a horse” (Ezek 23.23 and 2 Kgs 9.16). Perhaps there was a graphical error (**ב/שׁ** [script from Isaiah scroll, ca., 2nd c. B.C.E.]).
- d) **יֹשְׁבֵת / κατοικοῦσα]** This shift from the vocative was influenced by the first shift in the verse where **רְתָם** “harness” was rendered as a noun instead of an imperative. It was also motivated by the third person perspective in the second stich.
- e) **רֵאשִׁית / ἀρχηγός]** This is a unique rendering. **רֵאשִׁית** is usually rendered by *ἀπαρχή* “firstfruits” (18x)²¹ or *ἀρχή* “beginning” (16x);²² *ἀρχηγός* “leader/prince” usually renders **רֵאשׁ** “head” (12x).²³ This is either an accidental shift which resulted from missing the *yod* and the *tav* in **רֵאשִׁית** “beginning” (the latter through haplography caused by the *khet* in **תַּטָּא** “sin”), or an intentional shift which resulted from the translator considering *ἀρχηγός* “founder” to make better sense of the context than **רֵאשִׁית** “beginning.”

²¹ Exod 23.19; Lev 2.12; 23.10; Num 15.20, 21; 18.12; Deut 18.4 (2x); 26.2, 10; 33.21; 1 Sam 2.29; 2 Chr 31.5; Neh 10.38; Ps 78.51; 105.36; Ezek 20.40; 44.30.

²² Gen 1.1; 10.10; 49.3; Num 24.20; Deut 11.12; 21.17; Job 40.19; Ps 111.10; Prov 1.7; 8.22; 17.14; Eccl 7.8; Jer 2.3; 26.1; 49.35; Amos 6.1.

²³ Exod 6.14; Num 10.4; 13.3; 14.4; 25.4; Deut 33.21; Judg 9.44; 1 Chr 5.24; 12.21; Neh 7.69, 70; Lam 2.10.

4.2.14 Micah 1.14

MT לִבְנֵי תִתְּנִי שְׁלוּחִים עַל מוֹרְשֵׁת גַּת בְּתֵי אַחְזִיב לְאַחְזִיב לְמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
 Therefore, you shall give parting gifts to Moresheth-gath;
 The houses of Achzib shall be deceptive to the kings of Israel.

LXX διὰ τοῦτο δώσεις ἐξαποστελλομένους ἕως κληρονομίας Γεθ οἴκους ματαίους εἰς κενὰ ἐγένετο τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν²⁴ Ἰσραηλ
 Therefore, you shall give ones being sent out as far as the inheritance of Geth—
 worthless houses—it became meaningless to the kings of Israel.

a) שְׁלוּחִים / ἐξαποστελλομένους] שְׁלוּחִים “parting gifts” occurs elsewhere only in Exod 18.2

(ἄφεσις “release”) and 1 Kgs 9.16 (ἀποστολή “parting gift” / “dowry”). Perhaps the translator read the consonants as a Qal passive participle mp שְׁלוּחִים “ones being sent” (cf. Jer 49.14 [Gk 30.8]; Ezek 3.5; 23.40).

b) מוֹרְשֵׁת / κληρονομίας] Jer 26.18 has הַמּוֹרְשֵׁתִי “Moreshethite.” The translator read

מוֹרְשֵׁת “possession” through a *tav/he* confusion in the Assyrian square script (ת/ה) (rendered κληρονομία “inheritance” in Deut 33.4; Ezek 11.15; 25.4, 10). There is a similar shift in 1.15 (מַרְשָׁה “Mareshah” > κληρονομία “inheritance”).

c) עַל / ἕως] The translator misread עַל “to, on, upon” for עַד “unto” through a *lamed/dalet*

confusion in the Assyrian square script (ל/ד).

d) אַחְזִיב / ματαίους] μάταιος “worthless” usually renders אִשָּׁן “emptiness, vanity” and הֶבֶל

“vanity, vapor.” כָּזַב “to lie” is usually rendered with ψευδής “false” (12x)²⁵ or ψεῦδος

²⁴ Followed by τοῦ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

“falsehood” (10x)²⁶ but seven times it is rendered μάταιος “worthless” (Ezek 13.6, 7, 8, 9, 19; Amos 2.4; Zeph 3.13). Here, the translator likely read an adjectival form of כָּזַב “to lie.”

- e) **כָּזַב / κενός** κενός “meaningless” usually renders רִיקָם “emptily, vainly” or רִיק “empty, vain.” The rendering for אַכְזִיב “Achzib” likely influenced the translation of אַכְזִיב “deceptive.” Twice in the LXX כָּזַב “to lie” is rendered with κενός “meaningless” (Hos 12.2, where κενός “meaningless” and μάταιος “worthless” appear together; Hab 2.3 with the verb כָּזַב “to lie”). Given the translator’s tendency for lexical variation, this is likely not a mistake but a contextually based rendering.

4.2.15 Micah 1.15

MT עד הִירֵשׁ אָבִי לְךָ יוֹשֶׁבֶת מְרֻשָּׁה עַד־עַדְלָם יָבֹא כְבוֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל
Yet I will bring the possessor to you who live in Mareshah,
To Adullam will come the glory of Israel.

LXX ἕως τοὺς κληρονόμους ἀγάγω σοι κατοικοῦσα Λαχίς κληρονομία ἕως Οδολλαμ ἥξει ἡ δόξα τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἰσραηλ
Until I lead the heirs to you, O inheritance inhabiting Lachis,
The glory of the daughter of Israel will come as far as Odollam.

- a) **עַד / ἕως**] Gelston (2010, 68) attributes this shift to the intention of the tradent to assimilate based on context. It seems equally, if not more, likely that the translator expected and read עד “until.”

²⁵ Judg 16.10, 13; Job 24.25; Ps 40.5; 62.10; Prov 6.19; 21.28; 23.3; 30.6, 8; Ezek 21.34; 22.28.

²⁶ Ps 4.3; 5.7; 58.4; 62.5; Prov 14.5, 25; Isa 28.15, 17; Hos 7.13; Mic 2.11.

- b) **הַיָּרֵשׁ / τοὺς κληρονόμους]** This is a shift in number.
- c) **∅ / Λαγίς]** This plus was influenced by the mention of the inhabitant of Lachish in 1.13.
- d) **מְרֻשָּׁה / κληρονομία]** מְרֻשָּׁה “Mareshah” in Jos 15.44; 1 Chr 2.42; 4.21; 2 Chr 11.8; 14.8, 9; 20.37 (each instance is rendered either Μαρησα or Μαρισα—transliterations of the Hebrew). The translator read מְרֻשָּׁה (rendered κληρονομία “inheritance” in Deut 33.4; Ezek 11.15; 25.4, 10). A similar shift occurs in 1.14 (מְרֻשֶּׁת “Moresheth” > κληρονομίας “inheritance”).
- e) **∅ / τῆς θυγατρὸς]** This is a plus. Gelston (2010, 97*) questions whether the addition could have “arisen as a vertical dittograph from **יֹשְׁבֵת** earlier in the verse.” Perhaps the translator expected it as in the phrase **בָּנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל** “daughters of Israel” (albeit plural) in Deut 23.18, Judg 11.40 and 2 Sam 1.24. Less likely, there was a dittograph from the last three letters of **כְּבוֹד** “glory” where the translator mistook the *vav-dalet* for a *tav* (ligature).

4.2.16 Micah 1.16

- MT **קְרַחִי וְגִזִּי עַל-בְּנֵי תַעֲנוּגֵיךָ הַרְחֲבִי קְרַחְתֶּךָ כַּנֶּשֶׁר כִּי גָלוּ מִמֶּךָ**
 Become bald and shave your head for the children of your delight,
 Enlarge your baldness like the eagle for they will go from you into exile.
- LXX **ξύρησαι καὶ κείραι ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα τὰ τρυφερά σου ἐμπλάτυνον τὴν χηρείαν σου ὡς ἀετός ὅτι ἠχμαλωτεύθησαν ἀπὸ σοῦ**
 Shave and cut your hair for your delicate children,
 Enlarge your widowhood like an eagle because they were taken from you captive.

- a) **קָרַח** / **ξύρησαι**] Outside Mic 1.16, **קָרַח** “to make bald” appears four times (Lev 21.5; Jer 16.6; Ezek 27.31; 29.18). In Lev 21.5, it is rendered **φαλάκρωμα οὐ ξυρηθήσεσθε** “you shall not shave baldness”; in Jer 16.6, **οὐ ξυρήσονται** “they shall not shave”; minus in Ezek 27.31; Ezek 29.18, **φαλακρὰ** “bald.”
- b) **יָגַז** / **καὶ κείρω**] **κείρω** “to shear, cut off” is the typical rendering for **יָגַז** “to shear” so this is not a shift.
- c) **תְּעֻנָּה** / **τὰ τρυφερά σου**] This is the common rendering (also Prov 19.10; Song 7.7; Mic 2.9 **τρυφή** “luxury”; Eccl 2.8 **ἐντρυφήμα** “delight”).
- d) **קָרַח** / **τὴν χηρείαν σου**] **φαλάκρωμα** “baldness” is the typical rendering (6x).²⁷ Widowhood is normally **יָמְלָא** “widowhood,” **יָמְלָא** “widowed” or **תַּנְמָלָא** “widowhood.” In Isa 47.9, **יָמְלָא** “widowhood” is rendered **χηρεία** “widowhood.” In that context, we also have bereavement (**שָׂכַח** “bereavement” > **ἀτεκνία** “childlessness”) so the exiling of children in this context may have motivated the translator’s concretisation of baldness to widowhood. **תַּנְמָלָא** “widowed” is rendered **χήρευσις** “widowhood” in Gen 38.14 and 19, **χήρα** “widow” (typical rendering for **יָמְלָא** “widow”) in 2 Sam 20.3, and **χήρειος** “widowed” in Isa 54.4.

²⁷ Deut 14.1; Isa 3.24; 15.2; Jer 47.5; Ezek 7.18; Amos 8.10.

- e) **יָלְךְ / ἠχμαλωτεύθησαν**] There is a shift in voice from active to passive perhaps because the translator read a Hophal (יָלְךְ “they were led into captivity”). Also, the *qatal* conjugation is rendered with an aorist despite the context requiring a future tense. Perhaps, the translator simply chose the usual tense to render the *qatal*. The typical renderings for **יָלְךְ** in the sense of “go away / lead into exile” are ἀποικίζω “to send away” (27x),²⁸ αἰχμαλωτεύω “to take captive” (8x, including Mic 1.16),²⁹ μεταοικίζω “to resettle” (8x),³⁰ αἰχμάλωτος “captive” (6x)³¹ and ἀποικία “a colony settlement” (2x).³²

4.3 Micah 2

4.3.1 Micah 2.1

MT **הוּי חֲשָׁבֵי-אָוֶן וּפְעֻלֵי רָע עַל-מִשְׁכְּבֹתָם בְּאוֹר הַבֹּקֶר יַעֲשׂוּהָ כִּי יֵשׁ-לָאֵל יָדַי**
 Woe to those who devise wickedness who plot evil on their beds;
 In the light of the morning they do it for it is in the power of their hands.

LXX ἐγένοντο λογιζόμενοι κόπους καὶ ἐργαζόμενοι κακὰ ἐν ταῖς κοίταις αὐτῶν καὶ ἅμα τῇ ἡμέρᾳ συνετέλουν αὐτὰ διότι οὐκ ἦραν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν
 They came devising troubles and working evil deeds on their beds,
 And when it was day they accomplished these things for they did not lift their hands to God.

- a) **יָהּ / ἐγένοντο**] Though **יָהּ** “to be, happen” plus participle is more common in later Hebrew, the translator may have read **יָהּ** “they were” for **הוּי** “woe” through metathesis of *yod/vav* (Hillers 1984, 31 n. a). More likely, the translator seized the opportunity to

²⁸ 1 Sam 4.22; 2 Kgs 15.29; 16.9; 17.6, 11, 23, 26, 28, 33; 18.11; 24.14, 15; 25.21; 1 Chr 9.1; 2 Chr 36.20; Ezra 2.1; 4.10; 5.12; Neh 7.6; Jer 13.19; 24.1; 27.20; 29.4, 7; 40.7; 43.3; Lam 4.22.

²⁹ Esth 2.6; Ezek 12.3; 39.23; Amos 1.5, 6; 5.5 (2x); Mic 1.16.

³⁰ 1 Chr 5.6, 26; 8.6; Jer 20.4; 22.12; Lam 1.3; Hos 10.5; Amos 5.27.

³¹ Esth 2.6; Isa 5.13; 23.1; Amos 6.7; 7.11, 17.

³² Judg 18.30; Jer 13.19.

update the historical context to explicitise that the actions of the wicked oppressors occurred in the past. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

- b) **קָוָה** / **κόπους**] This is a shift in number. It is the typical lexical rendering in the Twelve Prophets (also Hab 1.3, 3.7 and Zech 10.2). Outside the Twelve Prophets, however, the typical rendering is ἀνομία “lawlessness” (26x).³³
- c) **רָעָה** / **κακὰ**] This is a shift in number (also Micah 1.12; 2.3; 4.9). (See explanation in §5.5.2.3 for more details.)
- d) **יִשְׁפֹּטוּ** / **συνετέλουν αὐτά**] This is a shift from *yiqtol* to Greek imperfect indicative (see §5.5.2.4 for further explanation) and in number for the direct object pronoun. It corresponds with number shifts in the same verse—κόπους “troubles” and κακὰ “evil deeds.”
- e) **יְדֵי לִשְׁלֵטָה** / **οὐκ ἦσαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν**] The other occurrences of the idiom **יְדֵי לִשְׁלֵטָה** “there is power in the hand” are Gen 31.29, Prov 3.27 (with **בְּהִיֹּת** “when there is” rather than **יֵשׁ** “there is”), and Deut 28.32 and Neh 5.5 (with negative particle **אֵין** “there is not” rather than **יֵשׁ** “there is”). In each of these occurrences, the LXX captures the sense of the Hebrew, which leads us to believe that the Micah translator understood the Hebrew idiom.³⁴ Several possible explanations present themselves. First, the translator confused **יֵשׁ** “there is” for a form of the verb **אָשַׁח** (**אֲשַׁחֵם** or **אֲשַׁחֵם**) [Ezek

³³ Job 31.3; Ps 5.6; 6.9; 14.4; 36.4, 5, 13; 41.7; 53.5; 55.4, 11; 59.3, 6; 64.3; 92.8, 10; 94.4, 16, 23; 101.8; 119.133; 125.5; 141.4, 9; Isa 59.4, 6.

³⁴ Cf. Dogniez (2002) for a discussion of LXX translators’ treatment of Hebrew idioms.

39.26]) “they lift up” and then added the negative particle οὐκ “not” (cf. Deut 32.40 for the idea of lifting hands to heaven and swearing; 2 Sam 18.28 for lifting hands against the king; Ps 28.2 for David lifting his hands toward the sanctuary as he cries for help). Second, the LXX rendering reflects a different Hebrew *Vorlage*³⁵ (at least in the positive sense of praying to God, which is how S renders the Hebrew).³⁶ Third, the translator intentionally changed the sense of this verse in order to attribute the cause of their misdeeds to their failure to pray to God (i.e., not aligning themselves with God which led them to carry out their evil devices). Given that α', σ', θ' and T all support the MT, the LXX translator was likely not reading a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Also, we can assume that the translator understood the Hebrew idiom that occurred in basically the same form in the four verses listed above (Gen 31.29; Prov 3.27; Deut 28.32; Neh 5.5). It seems highly likely that the translator intentionally shifted the meaning to reflect his theology—their failure to pray to God caused the misdeeds that led to their exile.

4.3.2 Micah 2.2

MT וְחָמְדוּ שָׂדוֹת וַיִּגְזְלוּ בָתַיִם וַיִּשְׂאוּ וַעֲשׂוּ קוֹבָר וּבֵיתוֹ וְאִישׁ וַיִּגְזְלוּ
 And they covet fields and steal (them)
 And (they covet) houses, so they take (them);
 And they oppress a strong man and his household,
 And (they oppress) a man and his inheritance.

LXX καὶ ἐπεθύμουν ἀγροὺς καὶ διήρπαζον ὀρφανοὺς καὶ οἴκους κατεδυνάστευον καὶ διήρπαζον
 ἄνδρα καὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἄνδρα καὶ τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ
 And they desired fields and were plundering orphans
 And were oppressing households;
 And they would plunder a man and his house
 (And they would plunder) a man and his inheritance.

³⁵ Gelston (2010, 97*) rejects this conclusion.

³⁶ Given that S renders this idiom in Mic 2.1 similarly to the LXX (though does not render the idiom negatively), S may have relied on the LXX, where the LXX translator was reading a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, made a mistake or introduced an intentional shift. If the Hebrew *Vorlage* contained the idea of praying (or not praying) to God, the translators may have arrived at their translations independently. More likely S's translator utilised both the Hebrew and Greek texts. While the LXX may have guided his understanding of the idiom, the Hebrew text clearly lacked the negative.

There are four Hebrew verbs in the consecutive perfect conjugation (וּדְרָקוּ, וּלְגַבְּלוּ, וּשְׁקָוּ, וּשְׁאָפוּ) that are rendered as Greek imperfects (ἐπεθύμουν, διήρπαζον, κατεδυνάστευον, διήρπαζον). There are 55 occurrences of consecutive perfect in MT-Micah and only five are rendered other than future (four are rendered as imperfects in 2.2; one is rendered as an aorist in 3.5). The conjugation shifts in 2.2 represent the translator’s attempt to update the historical situation to reflect the past sinful actions of the wicked oppressors introduced in 2.1. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

- a) **וּלְגַבְּלוּ / καὶ διήρπαζον**] The usual rendering is ἀρπάζω “to seize” (15x)³⁷ but διαρπάζω “to plunder” is the second most common rendering (7x)³⁸ (διαρπάζω “to plunder” is rendered in connection with ὀρφανός “orphan” in Jer 22.3).
- b) **∅ / ὀρφανούς**] Though Schwantes (1962, 58) suggests that the plus may have resulted from dittography of “the following וַיִּבְתְּוּ confused as plural of וַיִּתְּוּ” (וַיִּתְּוּ “orphans”), it was more likely added to supply the implied object in Hebrew (לְגַבְּלוּ “to steal” and וַיִּתְּוּ “orphan” are related in Job 24.9, Isa 10.2 and Jer 22.3). Gelston (2010, 97*) similarly rejects the explanation that a different Hebrew *Vorlage* lies behind the plus and considers whether Job 24.9 *may* have influenced the LXX translator.
- c) **וּשְׁקָוּ וּשְׁאָפוּ / καὶ...κατεδυνάστευον καὶ διήρπαζον**] Andersen and Freedman (2000, 270) and Wolff (1990, 69) suggest that the LXX reversed the order of the verbs but they offer

³⁷ Lev 5.23; 19.13; Deut 28.31; Judg 21.23; 2 Sam 23.21; Job 20.19; 24.2; Ps 69.5; Isa 10.2; Ezek 18.7, 12, 16, 18; Mic 3.2.

³⁸ Deut 28.29; Judg 9.25; Ps 35.10; Jer 21.12; 22.3; Ezek 22.29; Mic 2.2.

no explanation for the reversal.³⁹ The following two reasons explain the potential motivation for the reversal. First, a common rendering for עֲשֶׂק “to oppress” is καταδυναστεύω “to oppress” (8x)⁴⁰ but it never renders נָשָׂא “to lift up.” Second, the direct object of διαρπάζω “to plunder” in the LXX is rarely οἶκος “house”⁴¹; rather the direct object is often an individual (cf. Jer 22.3; Judg 9.25; 1 Sam 14.36).

- d) **וְאִישׁ / ἄνδρα]** This is a minus *vav* “and” conjunction. Perhaps the translator gapped not only the verb from the third stich (διήραζον “they would plunder”) but also the καὶ “and” conjunction. (However, in the parallel syntax of 6.15 the translator renders the *vav* “and” conjunction before the gapped πίεσεις “you will press.”)

4.3.3 Micah 2.3

MT לְכֵן כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה הַגִּנִּי חֶשֶׁב עַל־הַמִּשְׁפָּחָה הַזֹּאת רָעָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִמְשִׁי מִשָּׁם
צְוֹאֲרֹתֵיכֶם וְלֹא תֵלְכוּ רוֹמָה כִּי עַתָּה רָעָה הִיא

Therefore, thus says the LORD,
“Behold, I am devising against this family calamity
From which you will not remove your necks
And you will not walk erect
For it is a disastrous time.”

LXX διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει κύριος ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ λογίζομαι ἐπὶ τὴν φυλὴν ταύτην κακά ἐξ ὧν οὐ μὴ ἄρῃτε τοὺς τραχίλους ὑμῶν καὶ οὐ μὴ πορευθῆτε ὀρθοὶ ἐξαίφνης ὅτι καιρὸς πονηρὸς ἐστὶν
Therefore, this is what the Lord says:
“Behold I myself am devising evils against this tribe
From which you will not remove your necks,
Nor walk upright suddenly
Because it is an evil time.”

³⁹ In fact, Wolff (1990, 69) says the translator “nonsensically reverses the order.”

⁴⁰ 1 Sam 12.3, 4; Jer 7.6; 50.33; Hos 5.11; 12.8; Amos 4.1; Zech 7.10.

⁴¹ οἶκος “house” is the direct object of διαρπάζω “to plunder” in the Theodotian revision of Daniel 2.5 and the second object of the double accusative in Mic 2.2.

- a) **רָעָה / κακά]** This is a shift in number (also Micah 1.12; 2.1; 4.9). (See explanation in §5.5.2.3 for more details.)
- b) **תָּמִישׁוּ / ἄρῃτε]** This is a unique rendering. The common renderings for מוֹשׁ “to remove” are ψηλαφάω “to feel about” / “to handle” and ἐκλείπω “to cease” / “to fail.”
- c) **רוֹמָה / ὀρθοὶ ἐξαίφνης]** This is a *hapax legomenon* in the MT. ὀρθοὶ “upright” (renders יָשָׁר “to be upright” elsewhere in Micah) approximates the meaning of רוֹמָה “lifted up” / “erect.” Adding the adverb ἐξαίφνης “suddenly” softens the extent of the judgment; instead of never walking upright again (Hebrew), they will eventually walk upright but not suddenly (Greek).
- d) **כִּי עַתָּה רָעָה הִיא / ὅτι καιρὸς πονηρός ἐστὶν]** Phelan (1982, 38) incorrectly labels הִיא “it” as a “pleonastic” pronoun. However, without the pronoun, עַתָּה רָעָה “disastrous time” is an ungrammatical clause. The translator renders the Hebrew clause with the copula ἐστὶν “it is” in which the subject is embedded in the verb.

4.3.4 Micah 2.4

MT בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא יִשָּׂא עֲלֵיכֶם מְשָׁל וְנָהָה נָהִי נִהְיָה אָמַר שְׂדוּד נִשְׁדָּנוּ חֵלֶק עַמִּי יִמִּיר אֵיךְ
יִמִּישׁ לִי לְשׂוֹבֵב שְׂדֵינוּ יְחַלֵּק

On that day, he will lift up a taunt song against you
And sing a lament and say,⁴² “We are utterly ruined,
He changes the portion of my people.
How can he remove (it) from me.
To an apostate he alots our fields.”

⁴² וְנָהָה נָהִי [נִהְיָה] אָמַר may have been introduced through dittography with the previous נִהְיָה.

LXX ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ λημφοθήσεται ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς παραβολή καὶ θρηνηθήσεται θρῆνος ἐν μέλει λέγων ταλαιπωρία ἐταλαιπωρήσαμεν μερὶς λαοῦ μου κατεμετρήθη ἐν σχοινίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ κωλύσων αὐτὸν τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι οἱ ἀγροὶ ἡμῶν διεμερίσθησαν
 On that day, a parable will be taken up against you,
 And a dirge will be sung with mourning⁴³
 Saying, “We suffered intense misery,
 A portion of my people was measured out with a line
 And there was no one preventing him, to turn (him) away;
 Our fields have been divided.”

The shifts in this verse reflect a different historical setting (exilic to post-exilic lament) and perhaps a lament over both the re-allotment of land *and* the removal of the Judahites from their land. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

a) **נִשָּׂא / λημφοθήσεται**] This shift from active to passive occurs throughout the verse. The

translator might have read **נִשָּׂא** “it will be taken up” (missing the *nun*).

b) **נְהִי נְהִי נְהִי / καὶ θρηνηθήσεται θρῆνος ἐν μέλει**] **נְהִי נְהִי** is attested in Mur (Milik

1961, 193). In 4QXII^e, we read **נְהִי נְהִי**, which Ulrich (2013, 615) suggests is either an

orthographic difference or a variant (see discussion for **נְהִי** and **נְהִי** in the next two

paragraphs, (c) and (d), respectively).

c) **נְהִי / θρηνηθήσεται**] This is from **נְהִי** “he laments”; it is a shift from active to passive

but there is no shift in person or number.

d) **נְהִי / ἐν μέλει**] Given the difficulty of the Hebrew form **נְהִי** “it will be” in the context

and the orthographic similarities between *bet/nun* and *gimel/yod* in Paleo Hebrew (𐤁/𐤃

⁴³ Muraoka 2003, 362; cf. Ezek 2.10 (נְהִי “moaning” > μέλος “mourning”).

and \aleph/\aleph), the translator may have understood בהגה “in moaning.” Ezek 2.10 may have been the precedent needed to influence this shift (הגה “moaning” is rendered with μέλος “a mourning”).

- e) **דָּוָשׁ / τάλαιπωρία]** This is a shift from an infinitive absolute to a noun. This shift was constrained by the target language not having a grammatical category of infinitive absolute. Thackeray (1909, 48) notes the use of a participle and the dative of the cognate noun as one of the two most common renderings for the Hebrew infinitive absolute plus *yiqtol*.
- f) **נִשְׁדָּנוּ / ἐταλαιπωρήσαμεν]** Though *qatal* > aorist indicative is not usually considered a shift, this is an example of the translator rendering the Hebrew contrary to the author’s intention. In the future, people will lament the *present* consequences of the judgement brought upon them by God. The three following Hebrew verbs in the *yiqtol* conjugation (יָמִיר, יָמִישׁ, and יִחַלֵּק) dictate the timing of the lament as being present, not past. However, the translator shifts the timing of the lament to the past by rendering the verbs in the last four Greek stichoi in the aorist tense. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)
- g) **יָמִיר / κατεμετρήθη]** Gelston (2010, 98*) suggests that MT’s reading is confirmed by the assonance with יָמִישׁ “he removes.” This is a shift in meaning and voice from active to passive as well as a shift from *yiqtol* to aorist. The same lexical shift occurs in Ezek 48.14. In both cases the translator probably read יָמִיר “he will measure” (with common *vav/yod* and *dalet/resh* confusions) or יָמִיר “it will be measured” (the active to passive shift occurs

also in Ezek 48.14). Gelston (2010, 98*) says the mistake may have been influenced by **קָבֵל** “a line” in 2.5 and Amos 7.17 (**בַּקֶּבֶל תִּחְלֶק** “[your land] will be divided with a line” > **ἐν σχοινίῳ καταμετρηθήσεται** “[your land] will be measured with a line”). The indefinite subject in the Hebrew text (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, §4.4.2) likely motivated the shifts in voice here and in the last stich of this verse. Perhaps there was also a shift from a lament only about land reallocation to a mourning over land reallocation *and* human exile (“he changes the portion of my people” > “a portion of my people was measured out with a line”).

- h) **∅ / ἐν σχοινίῳ**] Perhaps this plus was influenced by the idea of casting the line by lot in Micah 2.5 (also, **καταμετρέω** “to measure out” and **ἐν σχοινίῳ** “with a line” occur together in Amos 7.17).
- i) **אֵין / καὶ οὐκ ἦν**] This is a plus **καὶ** “and” as well as a (mis)reading of **אֵין** “there is/was not” for **אֵין** “how” (*kaf/nun* confusion may have occurred in the Assyrian square script [**כ/נ**]). Gelston (2010, 98*) asserts, “It is unlikely that they misread the *Vorlage* as **אֵין**, since the negative required before **יָמִישׁ** would be **לֹא**.” However, if the translator read the following **יָמִישׁ** “he removes” as **מַמְיִשׁ** “one removing,” then the clausal adverb **אֵין** “there is/was not” would not be unusual (cf. Waltke and O’Connor 1990, §37.5d). Most likely, neither **אֵין** “how” nor **יָמִישׁ** “he removes” was misread, but the shift was contextually motivated, harmonising with the other past time references in the Greek. **Α’, σ’** and **θ’** all attest **πῶς** “how.”

- j) **שׂמַיָּ / ὁ κωλύσων]** This is a unique rendering. The common renderings for שׂמַיָּ “to remove” are ψηλαφάω “to feel about” / “to handle” and ἐκλείπω “to cease” / “to fail.” It is doubtful that the translator read שׂמַיָּ “one removing” but that he shifted the meaning and adjusted from a finite verb to a participle according to his understanding of the verse. Instead of the people lamenting that God has removed their portion of land, the translator understood the stich as a lament about no one being present to intervene with God from him exiling his people. A' (ἀποδοθήσεται “it will be restored”) attempted to make sense of the Hebrew phrase by rendering it as a lament about how the portion of land might be restored to their neighbors (τοῖς γείτοσι).
- k) **לִי / αὐτὸν]** This is perhaps an orthographic error (*vav/yod* confusion) but more likely a contextually and lexically motivated shift (in accord with the motivation for the previous shift—no one present to prevent God from exiling his people). The meaning “from” for the *lamed* preposition is unusual (cf. Ps 68.21 [Gk 67.21]; 84.12 [Gk 83.12]) so the translator rendered the preposition plus indirect object pronoun as a direct object pronoun.
- l) **לְשׁוּבָב / τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι]** The translator read this as a *lamed* preposition prefixed to an infinitive (לְשׁוּבָב “to turn back”). It is rendered appositionally with ὁ κωλύσων αὐτὸν “preventing him” instead of a clause connected with the last stich. The two most common renderings for שׁוּבָב “to turn” / “to return” (from which שׁוּבָב “apostate” is derived) are ἐπιστρέφω “to turn (around/back)” and ἀποστρέφω “to turn away.”

m) **קָהַלְךָ / διεμερίσθησαν**] This is a shift from active to passive and from *yiqtol* to aorist indicative. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.) Lexically, it is the common rendering. Gelston (2010, 69) categorises this shift as contextual harmonisation.

4.3.5 Micah 2.5

MT **לֹכֵן לֹא־יִהְיֶה לְךָ מִשְׁלִיךְ תְּבַל בְּגוֹרָל בְּקֶהֱל יְהוָה**
Therefore, you will not have anyone to cast a line by lot in the assembly of the LORD.

LXX διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔσται σοι βάλλων σχοινίον ἐν κλήρῳ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ κυρίου
Therefore, you will not have anyone to cast the line by lot in the assembly of the Lord.

a) **מְשַׁלֵּךְ / βάλλων**] This is the common verb used in the Twelve Prophets to render casting lots (also Joel 4.3; Obad 11; Jonah 1.7 (2x); Nah 3.10).

4.3.6 Micah 2.6

MT **אֲלֹתֵי־תַטְפוּ יִטִּיפוּן לֹא־יִטְפוּ לְאַלְהָהּ לֹא יִסַּג בְּלִמּוֹתַי**
“Do not drip [foam],” they drip [foam]. “They should not drip [foam] for such things; humiliation will not overtake (us).”⁴⁴
OR “Do not drip [foam],” they drip [foam]. If they do not drip [foam] for such things, humiliation will not be turned away.⁴⁵

LXX μη κλαίετε δάκρυσι⁴⁶ μηδὲ δακρυέτωσαν ἐπὶ τούτοις οὐ γὰρ ἀπώσεται ὀνειδίη
Do not weep with tears, neither let them weep concerning these things; for he will not remove disgrace.

⁴⁴ Requires emending **יִסַּג** “turn away” to **יִסַּג** “overtake” or **יִסַּג** “overtake” (from **יָשַׁג** “to reach, overtake” or **יָסַג** “to reach, overtake”).

⁴⁵ Requires assumption that **אֲלֹתֵי־תַטְפוּ לֹא־יִטְפוּן** “they should not drip [foam] for such things” be understood as the protasis of a conditional sentence although it is not explicitly marked as such.

⁴⁶ δάκρυσι in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- a) **וַתִּטְפוּ / κλαίετε**] CD iv. 20 (Gelston, 2010, 69) attests only **הִטְפוּן יִטְפוּן** “they will surely spout” (for **וַתִּטְפוּ יִטְפוּן** “‘Do not drip [foam],’ they drip [foam]”). The common renderings for **הִטְפוּ** “he drips” are **στάζω** “to drip” in the context of the heavens dripping rain or hands dripping myrrh and **ἀποστάζω** “to drip” for lips dripping nectar or honey. Gelston (2010, 98*) suggests that “G and S interpret the verb as ‘weeping,’ despite recognizing its sense in Amos 7:16.” The translator knows the meaning “to drip” (cf. Mic 2.11) but did not understand the metaphorical connection between dripping [foam] and prophesying. Instead, he assumed the dripping referred to tears.
- b) **וַתִּטְפוּ / δάκρυσι**] In conjunction with the rendering of the above command (**וַתִּטְפוּ** “do not drip [foam]” > **μὴ κλαίετε** “do not weep”), the translator understood the context to be weeping. Orthographically, there is no similarity with **דְּמָעָה** “tears” so these renderings do not exhibit mistakes but slot translations.
- c) **וַתִּטְפוּ / μὴδὲ δακρυέτωσαν**] Though the *yiqtol* is preceded by **לֹא** “not” instead of **אַל** “do not,” the translator, nevertheless, renders the verb as an imperative. Within this verse, we see the sequence **וַתִּטְפוּ...וַתִּטְפוּ** “do not drip (foam)...they should not drip (foam)” rendered with two different Greek verbs (**μὴ κλαίετε** “do not weep” and **μὴδὲ δακρυέτωσαν** “neither let them weep”). This is a clear example of the translator’s desire to vary the lexicon in the translation.
- d) **יִסְגֶּ / ἀπόσεται**] The translator likely read this verb as a Hiphil **יִסְגֶּ** “he will remove” (also Gelston 2010, 98*).

the original prophecies, not with his own historical context. The latter shift (2.12) may have also been motivated by a desire to harmonise with the parallel second stich in which “remnant of Israel” is not a vocative.

- c) **קָצַר / παρώργισε]** This is a minus interrogative resulting in a shift from a question about the spirit of the Lord growing impatient to a statement that the house of Jacob has provoked the spirit of the Lord to anger. *παροργίζω* “to provoke to anger” is a unique rendering for **קָצַר** “to be short (impatient).” Following are the ways **קָצַר** “to be short” is rendered outside Micah: in Num 21.4 and Judg16.16 **קָצַר** “to be short” is rendered *ὀλιγοψυχέω* “to become impatient”; in Prov 14.29, **קָצַר־רוּחַ** “faint of spirit” is rendered *ὀλιγόψυχος* “impatient of spirit”; in Exod 6.9, **קָצַר רוּחַ** “faint of spirit” is rendered *ὀλιγοψυχία* “impatience of spirit”; in Job 21.4, **אִם־מִדּוֹעַ לֹא־תִקְצַר רוּחִי** “Should I not be impatient?” is rendered *διὰ τί οὐ θυμωθήσομαι* “Should I not be angry?” Gelston (2010, 99*) suggests that the LXX translator (as well as that of S) vocalised this verb as a Hiphil but says “it is not clear whether they also presuppose a different root or merely translate freely.” In either case, the translator was taking the opportunity to claim that the house of Jacob provoked the Spirit of the Lord in the past. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)
- d) **אִם / εἰ]** Though this is the natural rendering, it cannot function as an introduction of the protasis in a conditional sentence because the apodosis would then have to be provided by the new speaker (the LORD). Reading **אִם־אֵלֶּה מַעַלְלָיו** “if these are his deeds” as the

protasis required the translator to make the shift (next paragraph) from דְּבַרִּי “my words”

to οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ “his words.”

e) דְּבַרִּי / οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ] This shift from a 1cs suffix pronoun to a 3ms pronoun is due to the

translator reading דְּבַרִּי “my words” as part of the apodosis of the conditional sentence

instead of the LORD’s speech.

f) עִם הַיְשָׁר הַזֶּה / μετ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὀρθοὶ πεπόρευνται] This is a plus καὶ “and” and a plus

αὐτοῦ “him.” (Gelston 2010, 70) attributes the latter plus to contextual harmonisation.

There is also a shift from the LORD’s words accomplishing good for the one walking

uprightly to the LORD’s words being trustworthy because they have proceeded upright.

4.3.8 Micah 2.8

MT אֶתְמוּל עָמִי לְאֹיֵב יְקוּמִם מִמּוּל שְׁלֵמָה אָדָר תִּפְשֹׁטוּן מֵעֲבָרִים בְּטָח שׁוּבֵי מִלְחָמָה

But recently my people have risen up as an enemy;
From the front of *the* outer garment you strip off *the* cloak
From those crossing securely, returnees of war.

LXX καὶ ἔμπροσθεν ὁ λαός μου εἰς ἔχθραν ἀντέστη κατέναντι τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ τὴν δорὰν αὐτοῦ

ἐξέδειραν τοῦ ἀφελέσθαι ἐλπίδα συντριμμὸν πολέμου
And previously my people resisted in hostility;
In opposition to⁴⁸ his welfare they stripped off his skin
To remove hope in the ruin of war.

a) אֶתְמוּל / καὶ ἔμπροσθεν] This is a unique rendering in the LXX. אֶתְמוּל

“yesterday/recently” is usually rendered ἐχθές “yesterday.” Here, the translator intended

to place some distance (in time) between the contemporary historical context and the time

when the Israelites resisted in hostility (described in the second and third stichoi of this

⁴⁸ Translation from Muraoka (2003, 310).

verse). Furthermore, both finite verbs in the verse reflect the same shift from a contemporary to a past setting (*yiqtol* > aorist). (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

- b) **לְאֹיִבַי** / εἰς ἔχθραν] **אֹיִבַי** “enemy” is usually rendered with ἐχθρός “enemy,” an adjective functioning as a noun (250x, including Mic 4.10; 5.8; 7.6). Four times in the LXX (including here, Mic 7.8 and 7.10; also Isa 63.10) it is rendered with the noun ἔχθρα “hostility.” ἔχθρα “hostility” normally renders שׂנְאָה “hatred” but also אִיבָה “enmity.”

Given the great frequency that **אֹיִבַי** “enemy” is rendered with ἐχθρός “enemy” in the LXX (including three times in Micah), the rendering here represents an intentional theological shift. It is a shift away from calling God’s people “enemies of God” to people who merely acted in hostility against God. It is a subtle shift away from a focus upon the character of the Israelites to a focus upon their actions. In sum, it serves to highlight the temporary, reformable rebellious posture of the people.

- c) **יָקוּמוּ** / ἀντίστη] The Polel of קוּם “to raise up” occurs only four times in the MT, referring here to enemies rising up. Each of the four instances is rendered by a different Greek verb. In general, ἀντίστημι “to resist” renders עָמַד “to stand” or יָצַב “to take one’s stand” but five times (including here) it renders a form of קוּם “to arise” (Deut 28.7; Josh 7.13; Ps 17.7 [Gk 16.7]; Nah 1.6). Here (along with תִּפְּשׁוּן “you strip off” > ἐξέδειραν “they stripped off” later in the verse), there is a shift from *yiqtol* to aorist to make explicit the time frame for the Israelites’ rebellion. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

- d) **ממול / κατέναντι**] This is a unique rendering. Usually κατέναντι “opposite, in opposition to” renders **נגד** “in front of” (16x) or **לפני** “before” (12x). This rendering represents an interpretive shift influenced by the translator’s understanding of the rest of the verse. This serves to clarify the opposition of the people against someone (perhaps the welfare of the prophet Micah).
- e) **שלמה / τῆς ειρήνης αὐτοῦ**] This is a plus αὐτοῦ “his” and lexical shift. Clearly the translator read some form of **שלום** “wholeness, peace” or **שלם** “complete, at peace” (also Gelston 2010, 70). The *he* was perhaps read as an archaic 3ms *he* pronoun. Alternatively, the translator added the pronoun to explicitise whose welfare was being threatened (perhaps the welfare of the prophet Micah).
- f) **אָדָר / τὴν δорὰν αὐτοῦ**] This is a plus αὐτοῦ “his” and lexical shift. This is likely a slot translation.⁴⁹ This nominal form occurs in the MT only here and Zech 11.13, where it is rendered with σκέπτομαι “I examine” (possibly reading **אבר** “I will choose” or **אראה** “I will see”). **אָדָר** “cloak” (which may have been the original form in Mic 2.8 with the *tav* lost through haplography) is understood by translator as some form of skin in Gen 25.25 (δopά “skin”) and Zech 13.4 (δέppις “skin”). Other possibilities for the shift include harmonisation with Mic 3.2-3 (where the leaders stripped the skin off the people) or a metaphorical shift from **אָדָר** “cloak” to δopά “skin” as two different forms of protection in war.

⁴⁹ Gelston (2010, 70) similarly explains the shift as lexical ignorance.

- g) **תִּפְשׁוּן / ἐξέδειραν]** This is a contextual shift from 2mp to 3p, keeping with the subject ὁ λαός μου “my people.”⁵⁰ There is also a shift from *yiqtol* to aorist (קוּמִים; “they rise up” > ἀντέστη “they resisted”) to make explicit the time frame for the Israelites’ rebellion. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)
- h) **מַעְבְּרִים / ἀφαιρέσθαι]** This is a minus מִן “from” and shift from mp participle to aorist infinitive. Though ἀφαιρέω “remove” is not the most common rendering for עָבַר “pass over,” it is rendered this way eight other times in the LXX (six of those rendering the Hiphil).⁵¹ The translator possibly read a Hiphil infinitive construct הַעֲבִיר “to cause to pass over,” confusing the initial *mem* with a *he* in the Assyrian square script (ע/ה) and metathesising the *yod* and *bet* (the final *mem* was read with the following word בָּטַח “securely” as explained in the next paragraph). The translator may alternatively have read a Hiphil participle מַעְבְּרִים “removing” (cf. 1 Sam 2.24 for verbal form and 2 Sam 3.10 for meaning “to take away”) and בָּטַח “hope” as the object of the participle (Gelston 2010, 99*).
- i) **בָּטַח / ἐλπίδα]** Perhaps the final *mem* of מַעְבְּרִים “those crossing” was read with בָּטַח “securely” ending up with מְבִטָּח “confidence” which is rendered most commonly with ἐλπίς “hope.” Gelston (2010, 99*) offeres a different explanation in which the translator

⁵⁰ Gelston (2010, 99*) suggests the shift may have been made to make sense of the context.

⁵¹ Exod 13.12; 1 Kgs 15.12; Esth 8.2, 3; Isa 40.27; Jer 11.15; Ezek 48.14; Mic 2.8; Zech 3.4.

rendered the noun as the object of **מַעְבְּרִים** “from those crossing” rather than as an adverb.⁵²

- j) **שׁוֹבֵי / συντριμμὸν**] Cf. Wolff (71, n. 8e). The translator likely read **שָׁבַר** “crushing” (also Gelston 2010, 70) (**שָׁבַר** “crushing” rendered with συντριμμός “ruin” in Jer 4.20 and Zeph 1.10) by missing the *vav* and confusing the *yod/resh* in the Assyrian square script (**ר/ו**). Schwantes’ (1962, 70) emendation **מַעְבְּרִים בְּטַח הַשְּׁבִים מִלְחָמָה** “removing trust, plotting war” is possible but does not help to explain συντριμμὸν “ruin.”

4.3.9 Micah 2.9

MT **נָשִׂי עַמִּי תִגְרָשׁוּן מִבֵּית תִּעְנִיגָהּ מֵעַל עַלְלֶיהָ תִקְחוּ הַדְרֵי לְעוֹלָם**
 You drive out the women of my people from her delightful house;
 From her children you take my splendor forever.

LXX διὰ τοῦτο ἡγούμενοι λαοῦ μου ἀπορριφήσονται ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν τρυφῆς αὐτῶν διὰ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν ἐξώσθησαν ἐγγίσατε ὄρεσιν αἰωνίοις
 Therefore, leaders of my people shall be cast out of their luxurious houses
 Because of their evil practices they have been expelled;
 Draw near the everlasting mountains.

- a) **Ø / διὰ τοῦτο**] This is a plus. It was supplied to explicitise the relationship between 2.8 and 2.9 as cause and effect. As a result of God’s people resisting in hostility, the leaders will be cast out of their luxurious houses. 2.9b provides additional reason for the judgment. Then, the plus ἐγγίσατε “draw near” informs the audience of their expected action in response to the promised judgment.

⁵² **בְּטַח** “securely” is commonly rendered with ἐλπίς “hope” (18x).

- b) **נְשִׂי / ἡγούμενοι**] The translator read either **נְשִׂי** “ruler,” which is the rendering six times in the LXX (also Gelston 2010, 70) (plural construct form is **נְשִׂאֵי** “rulers”), or a Niphal mp construct participle from **נָשָׂף** “to lift up” (**נְשִׂאֵי** “lifted up ones”). **נְשִׂי בְּעַמְּךָ** “ruler of your people” occurs in Exod 22.27 but the rendering is ἄρχοντας τοῦ λαοῦ σου “rulers of your people.”
- c) **נִתְגַּדְּשׁוּן / ἀπορριφήσονται**] This is a shift from Piel *yiqtol* 2mp to future passive 3p.
- d) **מִבֵּית תַּעֲנִיגָה / ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν τροφῆς αὐτῶν**] This is a shift from singular **בֵּית** “house” to plural τῶν οἰκιῶν “houses” and from 3fs suffix to 3p pronoun to harmonise with the plural object **נְשִׂי** “women” (which was read as **נְשִׂאֵי** “rulers” or **נְשִׂאֵי** “lifted up ones”).
- e) **מֵעַל עֲלֵלֶיהָ / διὰ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν**] The shift from a 3fs suffix to a 3p pronoun served to harmonise with the plural object **נְשִׂי** “women” (which was read as **נְשִׂאֵי** “rulers” or **נְשִׂאֵי** “lifted up ones” earlier in the same verse). The shift in meaning may have resulted from parablepsis (reading **מֵעַל לְעֵלֶיהָ** “her [evil] deeds” for **מֵעַל עֲלֵלֶיהָ** “from her children”). **מֵעַל** “from” was rendered first as διὰ “because” then read with **עֲלֵלֶיהָ** “her children” and rendered τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν “their evil practices.”
- The weakness of this explanation is that nowhere else in the LXX is **מֵעַל** “from” rendered διὰ “because.” Gelston (2010, 70) suggests that **מֵעַל** “from” was vocalised instead as **מֵעַל**

“unfaithfulness”; however, the plus διὰ “because” still has to be explained. Similarly, מַעֲלָל “deed” is by far the most common word behind the rendering ἐπιτήδευμα “practice,” including three other times in Micah (2.7; 3.4; and 7.13). Gelston (2010, 70) simply says ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν “their practices” is derived via the root √לעל.

- f) וַחֲזָרָה / ἐξώσθησαν] This is a shift from 2mp to 3p and from active to passive in order to harmonise with the context. In the vast majority of occurrences, לקח “to take” is rendered λαμβάνω “to take” (808x) and this is the only time it is rendered by ἐξωθέω “to drive out.” ἐξωθέω “to drive out” usually renders תָּרַח “thrust” (including Mic 4.6). Might the translator have read וַחֲזָרָה “they were scattered”?
- g) Ø / ἐγγίσατε] This is a plus. It usually renders שָׁגַב “draw near” or קָרַב “approach” but nothing in the verse resembles these verbs (orthographically or phonetically). Perhaps the translator read קָנָה “to wait for,” rendered with ἐγγίζω “to draw near” in Hos 12.7. More than likely, this is an example of theological intervention by the translator to guide his target audience in the remedy to judgment—namely, drawing near the Lord.
- h) הַרְרֵי / ὄρεσι] This was read as הַרְרֵי “mountains of” (cf. Ps 76.5 [Gk 75.5]). However, the construct הַרְרֵי “mountains of” followed by לְעוֹלָם “forever” is syntactically unintelligible. There are examples of construct nouns before prepositional phrases but not *lamed* prepositional phrases (cf. Waltke and O’Connor 1990, 155). Gelston (2010, 99*)

suggests that the translator misread הַדָּרִי “my splendor” via הַר “mountain” and added ἐγγίσατε “draw near” to make sense of it.

4.3.10 Micah 2.10

MT קוּמוּ וּלְכוּ כִּי לֹא־זֹאת הַמְּנוּחָה בְּעֵבֹר טְמֵאָה תִּחְבֵּל וְחָבַל נִמְרָץ

Arise and go, for this is not the resting place;

On account of it being unclean, it destroys and the destruction is grievous.

LXX ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύου ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι⁵³ σοι αὕτη ἢ ἀνάπαυσις ἕνεκεν ἀκαθαρσίας διεφθάρητε φθορᾷ

Arise and go, for this rest is not for you,

On account of uncleanness you were utterly corrupted.

a) **הַמְּנוּחָה / לֹא־זֹאת** / οὐκ ἔστι σοι αὕτη ἢ ἀνάπαυσις] The plus σοι “for you” as part of the shift from “this is not the resting place” to “this rest(ing place) is not *for you*” may have anticipated the 2s object from 2.11 (לְךָ “to/for you”).

b) **טְמֵאָה / ἀκαθαρσίας]** The Cairo codex of the prophets vocalises the consonantal text as a Qal 3fs *qatal*. The Leningrad codex (reflected in the MT) vocalises the consonantal text as a noun, which is how the LXX translator read it.

c) **תִּחְבֵּל / διεφθάρητε]** This is a shift from the active to passive voice; perhaps the translator understood it as a Niphal but Prov 13.13 contains the only attested Niphal of חָבַל “to be ruined.” This is also a shift of conjugation from a *yiqtol* to an aorist indicative, a shift in the subject of the verb from הַמְּנוּחָה “resting place” to the audience and a shift in person from 3fs to 2p. I agree with Gelston (2010, 100*) that the translator understood the verb

⁵³ ἔστιν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

as 2p because he read the *vav* conjunction in the next word as the 2p ending of the verb. The shift in time again reflects a period in Israelite history that is different from that of the target audience. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

- d) **וְהָבֵל / φθορᾱ̃]** The minus *vav* “and” is explained in the previous paragraph.
- e) **נִמְרָץ / κατεδιώχθητε]** (Gk from 2.11) **נִמְרָץ** “to be grievous” occurs only three other times in the MT and each time it is rendered differently (1 Kgs 2.8 – ὀδυνηρός “with grief”; Job 6.25 – φαῦλος “worthless”; Job 16.3 – παρενοχλέω “cause difficulty [for]”). This is likely a slot translation based on the translator’s understanding of the following verb **הָלַךְ** “to go” rendered as διώκω “to pursue.” Gelston (2010, 100*) suggests it was translated via **רוץ** “he ran.” Though the 2p form of **רוץ** does not resemble **נִמְרָץ** “grievous” the translator may have had this root in mind while translating. In Joel 2.4 **רוץ** “he ran” is rendered with καταδιώκω “I pursue closely” and six times it is rendered by διώκω “I pursue.”⁵⁴

4.3.11 Micah 2.11

MT **לֹא-אִישׁ הָלַךְ רוּחַ וְשִׁקָּר בְּיָבֵשׁ אֶתְּךָ לֵאמֹר וְלִשְׂכַר וְהָיָה מִטִּיף הָעָם הַזֶּה**
 If a man pursuing wind and falsehood would lie,
 “I will prophecy (drip [foam]) for you in exchange for wine and beer”
 Then he would be a prophet (dripper [of foam]) of this people.

LXX κατεδιώχθητε οὐδενὸς διώκοντος πνεῦμα ἔστησε⁵⁵ ψεῦδος ἐστάλαξέ⁵⁶ σοι εἰς οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα καὶ ἔσται ἐκ τῆς σταγόνης τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου
 You were pursued closely; no one pursuing (the) spirit has established
 falsehood;
 It has dropped on you for wine and beer.
 But it will be that from the dropping of this people,

⁵⁴ Jer 51.31 (3x); Amos 6.12; Hab 2.2; Hag 1.9.

⁵⁵ ἔστησεν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

⁵⁶ ἐστάλαξέν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- a) **לֹא־אִישׁ / οὐδενός]** The translator understood the independent hypothetical particle **לֹא** “if” to be **לֹא** “no, not.” Mur attests **לֹא** “no, not” (Milik 1961, 193). Gelston (2010, 100*) posits that the original consonantal text was probably **לֹא** which could be vocalised as either **לֹא** “if” or **לֹא** “no, not.” The *alef* was lost through haplography.
- b) **הֲלֵךְ / διώκοντος]** Gelston (2010, 70) suggests this is a case of assimilation based on Lev 26.17 and 36.
- c) **רוּחַ / πνεῦμα]** The translator understood **רוּחַ** as “spirit” not *ἄνεμος* “wind.”
- d) **בִּזְבַּב וְשָׁקַר / ἔστησε ψεῦδος]** This is a unique rendering of *ἔστησε* “established” for **בִּזְבַּב** “lied” but the sense of the clause is rendered effectively. The translator may have read “no one pursues the spirit and has lied with falsehood.” Gelston’s (2010, 100*) suggestion that the translator may have read **שָׁקַל** “he will weigh” is unnecessary.
- e) **הִטָּא / ἐστάλαξέ]** This is a shift from *yiqtol* to aorist and from 1cs to 3s. The translator knew the concrete meaning of **הִטָּא** “to drop, drip” but probably did not know the metaphorical meaning to preach or act the prophet (cf. Mic 2.6, §4.3.6). Here Schwantes (1962, 76) suggests the translator confused the Hiphil *yiqtol* with the Aramaic Afel.

- f) **מִטֵּיף** / **ἐκ τῆς σταγόνας**] The translator likely read the **מִן** “from” preposition plus some nominal form of **הִטַּף** “to drop, drip” (perhaps **הִטַּף** “drop,” which is rendered in Job 36.27 as **σταγόνες** “drops [of rain]”).

4.3.12 Micah 2.12

MT **אֶסְפֹּף אֶסְפֹּף יַעֲקֹב כְּלֶךְ קִבְץ אֶקְבֹּץ שְׂאֵרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יַחַד אֲשִׁימְנוּ כְּצֹאן בְּצֶרֶה כְּעֹדֵר
בְּתוֹךְ הַדְּבָרוֹ תִּהְיֶינָה מֵאָדָם**

I will surely assemble, O Jacob, all of you;
I will surely gather the remnant of Israel.
I will set them together like sheep in an enclosure,
Like a flock in the midst of its pasture, bleating (in fear) of men.

LXX **συναγόμενος συναχθήσεται** **Ἰακωβ** **σὺν πᾶσιν ἐκδεχόμενος ἐκδέξομαι** **τοὺς καταλοίπους τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ θήσομαι τὴν ἀποστροφὴν αὐτῶν ὡς πρόβατα ἐν θλίψει ὡς ποιμνιον ἐν μέσῳ κοίτης αὐτῶν ἐξαλοῦνται ἐξ ἀνθρώπων**
Jacob will surely be gathered together with everyone.
I will surely receive⁵⁷ the remnant of Israel together,
I will establish their return like sheep in affliction,
Like a flock in the midst of their fold they will leap forth from men.

- a) **הִטַּף** / **συναγόμενος**] This is a shift from active to passive. The infinitive absolute is rendered with a passive participle.⁵⁸ Since there is no infinitive absolute in Greek, the translator rendered infinitives absolute in various ways throughout Micah.⁵⁹ Both infinitives absolute in this verse are followed by *yiqtol* conjugations of the same verbal root. These Hebrew constructions are rendered as participles with the same finite verbs (or verbs with similar semantics).⁶⁰ It is possible, though not likely, that the translator

⁵⁷ Muraoka 2002, 159.

⁵⁸ Aejmelaeus (1993a, 8) notes this translation choice (with the finite form of the same verb) as one of six uses of the *participium coniunctum*.

⁵⁹ Mic 1.10 (mistake), 2.4 (dative of the cognate noun – noted by Thackeray [1909, 48] as one of the two most common renderings for Hebrew infinitive absolute plus *yiqtol*), 2.12 (explained in the present entry), 6.8 (present infinitive plus adjective), and 6.13 (future indicative).

⁶⁰ See Thackeray (1909, 48).

read here a Niphal participle **הִתְקַבְּלִי** “being gathered” or Pual participle **הִתְקַבְּלָה** “being gathered.”

- b) **הִתְקַבְּלִי** / **συναχθήσεται**] **יְעֻקֵּב** “O Jacob” was read not as a vocative but as the subject of **הִתְקַבְּלִי הִתְקַבְּלִי** “I will surely assemble.” For this rendering we would expect **הִתְקַבְּלִי** “he was gathered/assembled.” This possibly resulted from a misreading of *alef* for *yod* in paleo-Hebrew script (**א**/**י**). See §§ 4.3.7 and 5.5.2.4 for significance of vocative shift.
- c) **הִתְקַבְּלִי** / **σὺν πᾶσιν**] Plus **σὺν** “with.” Since **יְעֻקֵּב** “O Jacob” was read not as a vocative but as the subject of **הִתְקַבְּלִי הִתְקַבְּלִי** “I will surely assemble,” the shift here was purposeful to make sense of the syntax (possibly reading **כֻּלָּם** “all of them” for **הִתְקַבְּלִי** “all of you” by misreading *kaf* for *mem* in the Assyrian square script [**כ**/**מ**]). Gelston (2010, 100*) says “G is probably trying to make sense of a difficult passage.”
- d) **קָבַץ קָבַץ** / **ἐκδέχομενος ἐκδέξομαι**] **קָבַץ** “to gather” is usually rendered **συνάγω** “to gather together” (71x, including Mic 1.7 and 4.12) but where **ἐκδέχομαι** “to receive / welcome” is used, it usually renders **קָבַץ** “to gather” (cf. Hos 9.6 and Nah 3.18). **ἐκδέχομαι** “to wait for / expect” also renders **קָבַץ** “to take/give on pledge” (Gen 43.9; 44.32; Ps 119.122 [Gk 118.122]). In Mic 4.6, **קָבַץ** “to gather” is rendered **εἰσδέχομαι** “to welcome.” In both contexts (here and 4.6) **הִתְקַבְּלִי** “to assemble” is used first. This may reflect the translator’s

desire for lexical variation. More likely it was the translator taking the opportunity to explicitise the Lord's emotion of acceptance.

- e) **תַּחַי / ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ**] No lexical shift. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ is a common Greek idiom meaning “together” or “at the same time”; in the Twelve Prophets, the sense is predominantly “together” (cf. Hos 2.2; Amos 1.15; 3.3). The translator read תַּחַי “together” with second stich.
- f) **וַיָּשׁוּבוּ / θήσομαι τὴν ἀποστροφήν αὐτῶν**] It appears that the 3ms suffix was explicitised as τὴν ἀποστροφήν αὐτῶν “their return.”
- g) **בְּצָרָה / ἐν θλίψει**] Understood as “enclosure for sheep,” this is a *hapax legomenon* in the MT. The translator read it as בְּצָרָה “in distress” (Gelston 2010, 71) or possibly בְּצָרָה “destitution.”
- h) **וַיִּדְבְּרוּ / κοίτης αὐτῶν**] דְּבַר “pasture” occurs only here and Isa 5.17. It is likely the translator did not know the meaning of the word and rendered it with a slot translation according to context.
- i) **וַיִּהְיֶינָה / ἐξάλοῦνται**] הוּה in the Hiphil “to be noisy” occurs only here and Ps 55.3 [Gk 54.3], where it is rendered ἐταράχθην “I was troubled.” It is likely a slot translation. Gelston (2010, 71) similarly classifies this rendering as liberty with regard to semantics.

4.3.13 Micah 2.13

MT עֲלֵה הַפְּרָץ לְפָנֵיהֶם פָּרְצוּ וַיַּעֲבְרוּ שְׁעַר וַיֵּצְאוּ בּוֹ וַיַּעֲבֵר מִלְּפָנֵיהֶם וַיְהִי בְּרֹאשָׁם

He who breaks out will go up before them;
They break through and pass over (the) gate and go out by it.
And their king passes over before them with the LORD at their head.

LXX διὰ τῆς διακοπῆς πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν διέκοψαν καὶ διήλθον πύλην καὶ ἐξῆλθον δι' αὐτῆς καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτῶν πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν ὁ δὲ κύριος ἡγήσεται αὐτῶν
They have broken through the breach before them
And have passed through the gate and gone out through it.
And their king has gone out before them but the Lord shall lead them.

- a) עֲלֵה הַפְּרָץ / διὰ τῆς διακοπῆς] The translator possibly read עָלְיָהּ “through it” (the Greek noun τῆς διακοπῆς “the breach” is feminine) and הַפְּרָץ “the one breaking through” appositionally as הַפְּרָץ “the breach” (פָּרְצוּ “they break through” was read with the first stich and provides its main verb).⁶¹ διὰ with genitive “through” is the rendering for עַל “on, for” in Zeph 2.15; Ezek 16.8; 45.17.
- b) וַיַּעֲבֵר / καὶ ἐξῆλθεν] It is not clear why the translator rendered this with ἐξέρχομαι “to go out” instead of διέρχομαι “to pass through.”
- c) וַיְהִי / ὁ δὲ κύριος] Out of 180 occurrences of the *vav* “and” conjunction in Micah, only three are rendered δὲ “but” (here, 4.5, and 7.7). Aejmelaeus (1993c, 51) notes, “[connectives and other grammatical words] convey no information by themselves, but become meaningful only in the context of other words, thus participating in the meaning

⁶¹ Gelston (2010, 71) suggests haplography (of the *he* on עֲלֵה “he goes up”). This explanation is similar to the one I provided.

of the whole.” The use of δὲ “but” instead of καὶ “and” likely served to explicitise that it will not be the king but the Lord who will lead them.

- d) **בְּרָאשֵׁי / ἡγήσεται αὐτῶν**] This is not the most common rendering of רֹאשׁ “head” but it is used 10 times including here and Mic 3.9 and 11. There is a shift from the prepositional phrase with possessive pronoun to a verb with direct object. ἡγέομαι “to lead” concretises the metaphor of being at the head. Gelston (2010, 71) explains the shift as liberty with respect to syntax.

4.4 Micah 3

4.4.1 Micah 3.1

MT **וַאֲמַר שְׁמַעוּנָא רְאשֵׁי יַעֲקֹב וְקִצְיֵי בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל הֲלוֹא לְכֶם לְדַעַת אֶת־הַמִּשְׁפָּט**
 And I said, “Listen, you heads of Jacob
 And rulers of the house of Israel,
 Is it not for you to know justice?”

LXX καὶ ἐρεῖ ἀκούσατε δὴ ταῦτα αἱ ἀρχαὶ οἴκου Ιακωβ καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι οἴκου Ισραηλ οὐχ ὑμῖν ἐστι⁶² τοῦ γνῶναι τὸ κρίμα
 And he will say, “Hear now these things, you heads of the house of Jacob,
 And you who are left of the house of Israel,
 Is it not for you to know judgment?”

- a) **וַאֲמַר / καὶ ἐρεῖ**] This is a shift from first person *wayyiqtol* to third person future (same shift in S). The consonants are the same for *w^eqatal* and *wayyiqtol* forms. Though this shift does not exhibit a change in the consonantal text, it is a shift nonetheless, because it reflects the translator’s tendency to adjust the message according to his own ideology. This shift dramatically increases the level of authority for the following rebukes. No longer is it the prophet who reprimands the “heads of Jacob” and “rulers of the house of Israel”; it is Yahweh himself who warns the “heads of the house of Jacob” and those “left

⁶² ἐστιν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

of the house of Israel.” The translator had the perfect opportunity to interfere without risking acceptability (no textual shift). This shift also represents a historicising shift congruent with the shift later in the verse from **וּקְצִינֵי בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל** “and rulers of the house of Israel” to **καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι οἴκου Ἰσραήλ** “and you who are left of the house of Israel.” It was necessary for there to be a *future* command if the translator’s contemporary audience were to also receive the warning. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

- b) **∅ / ταῦτα**] This is a plus. This harmonisation from 3.9 (also Gelston 2010, 71) may refer to τὰ ῥήματα “words” (but λόγος “word, saying” in 1.2) motivated by expectation for direct object (same in S).
- c) **∅ / οἴκου**] This is a plus οἴκου “house.” It reflects another harmonisation from 3.9 (same in S).
- d) **וּקְצִינֵי / οἱ κατάλοιποι**] Many commentators suggest that the shift here (and in 3.9) reflects a mistaken reading of **וּקְצִינֵי** “chief, ruler” as some form of **קָצַף** “to cut off,” **קָץ** “end,” **קָצָה** “to cut off,” or **קָצָה** “end.”⁶³ A better explanation is that it was a historicising shift motivated by an ideological agenda. Aaron Scharf (2011, 2285) argues that the shift here reflects the translator’s intention to include the diaspora in the threats to follow. The diaspora has already been mentioned in 2.12 in the context of future gathering and restoration. Here (and in 3.9), the diaspora Jews in Alexandria are grouped together with the rulers in Jacob to be chastened, reflecting the translator’s post-exilic historical context. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.) This explanation is strengthened by the

⁶³ Gelston 2010, 71; Magary 1995, 377; Taylor 1890, 76; Wolff 1990, 90n.1d; Schwantes 1962, 84; Hillers (1984, 41n.d) suggests that this explanation is *ad hoc* but does not offer any other explanation.

fact that the renderings in 3.1 and 3.9 are unique in the LXX. In the majority of occurrences of קִצֵּץ “chief, ruler,” the rendering reflects an idea of rulership (Judg 11.6, 11; Isa 3.6, 7 – ἀρχηγός “leader”; Isa 1.10; 22.3 – ἄρχων “ruler”; Prov 25.15 – βασιλεύς “king”).

4.4.2 Micah 3.2

MT שְׂנְאֵי טוֹב וְאַהֲבֵי רָעָה רָע גִּזְלֵי עוֹרָם מִעֲלֵיהֶם וְשֹׂאֲרָם מֵעַל עֲצָמוֹתָם
 You haters of good and lovers of evil
 You who tear their skin from them
 And their flesh from their bones.

LXX οἱ μισοῦντες τὰ καλὰ καὶ ζητοῦντες τὰ πονηρὰ ἀρπάζοντες τὰ δέρματα αὐτῶν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτῶν
 You haters of good [things] and seekers of evil [things]
 Who tear off their skin from them
 And their flesh from their bones.

a) אַהֲבֵי רָעָה / καὶ ζητοῦντες τὰ πονηρὰ] There is a parallel to this Hebrew clause at Ps 52.5

[Gk 51.5]. “To seek harm” is a more common notion in the Bible (Num 35.23; 1 Sam 24.10; 25.26; 1 Kgs 20.7; Ps 71.13, 24; and Esth 9.2) and each of these occurrences (except 1 Sam 24.10 where the ψυχή “soul” of David is being sought and intent is to do him harm; minus at Esth 9.2) are rendered in Greek with ζητέω “to seek” plus κακός “bad, evil,” κακία “malice, evil” or κακοποιέω “to do evil, harm.” Everywhere else in the Twelve Prophets, forms of אָהַב “to love” are rendered with forms of ἀγαπάω “to love” (except in Hosea where Israel’s lovers are rendered with ἐραστής “lover”). Hillers (1984, 41) says, “the LXX may represent מְבַקְשֵׁי” but that “the MT is preferable because it has the rare form.” This shift should not be viewed as a mistake or as a rendering from a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Instead, it should be explained as the translator explicitising what it

means to love evil, an idea that would resonate with the target audience. Gelston (2010, 71) explains this shift as an assimilation to Amos 5.14 where the audience is exhorted to “seek good and not evil.”

b) **וּשְׂאֵרָם / καὶ τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν]** This is the common rendering for **שְׂאֵר** “flesh” (3x).⁶⁴

4.4.3 Micah 3.3

MT **וְאִשָּׁר אָכְלוּ שְׂאֵר עַמִּי וְעוֹרָם מִעֲלֵיהֶם הִפְשִׁיטוּ וְאֶת־עַצְמֹתיהֶם פָּצְחוּ וּפְרָשׁוּ כְּאִשָּׁר
בְּסִיר וּכְבֶּשֶׂר בְּתוֹךְ קִלְחַת**

Who eat the flesh of my people
And strip their skin from them
And break their bones in pieces
And scatter like that which is in a pot
And like flesh in a cauldron.

LXX **ὄν τρόπον κατέφαγον τὰς σάρκας τοῦ λαοῦ μου καὶ τὰ δέρματα αὐτῶν ἀπ’⁶⁵ αὐτῶν ἐξέδειραν
καὶ τὰ ὀστέα αὐτῶν συνέθλασαν καὶ ἐμέλισαν ὡς σάρκας εἰς λέβητα καὶ ὡς κρέα εἰς χύτραν
As they devoured the flesh of my people
And stripped their skin from them
And crushed their bones
And cut (them) in pieces like flesh in a pot
And like meat in a cauldron.**

a) **וְאִשָּׁר / ὄν τρόπον]** ὄν τρόπον “as” typically renders **כְּאִשָּׁר** “as” or the preposition **כִּ** alone.

But it also renders **אֲשֶׁר** “which” at Lev 7.38; Num 34.13; Deut 2.22; Ezek 42.3; Mic 5.7; and Zech 11.13. Wolff (1990, 91) suggests the translator read **כְּאִשָּׁר** “as” but this is unlikely given the rendering of **ἀνθ’ ὧν** “because” for **כְּאִשָּׁר** “because” in v.4.

⁶⁴ Mic 3.2, 3a (and likely 3.3b); Ps 78.27 [Gk 77.27].

⁶⁵ ἀπὸ followed by τῶν ὀστέων in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- b) **וּפְרָשׁוּ / καὶ ἐμέλισαν**] This is a unique rendering. Typically, μερίζω “I cut into pieces” renders נתח “he cut into pieces.” Gelston (2010, 101*) is likely correct in understanding the Hebrew text as an “orthographic variant of פּרַס.”
- c) **בְּאֶשׁר / ὡς σάρκα**] This is most likely not a shift but a translation of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. We see the same rendering in 3.2b and 3.3a for אֶשׁר “flesh.” Parallelism in the last stich (וּכְבָּשָׁר “and like flesh”) strongly supports this conclusion. The defective MT text arose by metathesis of *alef* and *shin*.⁶⁶

4.4.4 Micah 3.4

MT אִזְיַעְקוּ אֶל־יְהוָה וְלֹא יַעֲנֶה אֹתָם וְיִסְתַּר פְּנֵיו מֵהֵם בְּעֵת הַהִיא בְּאֶשׁר הִרְעוּ
מַעֲלֵלֵיהֶם

Then they will cry out to the LORD
But he will not answer them
And he will hide his face from them at that time
Because they made their deeds evil.

LXX οὕτως κεκράξονται πρὸς κύριον καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούσεται αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποστρέψει τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκεῖνῳ ἀνθ’ ὧν ἐπονηρεύσαντο ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν ἐπ’ αὐτούς
Thus they will cry out to the Lord
But he will not listen to them
And he will turn his face from them at that time
Because they did evil against them in their practices.

- a) **אִזְ / οὕτως**] This is an unusual rendering. אִזְ “then” is rendered οὕτως “thus” only one other time in the LXX (Job 11.15), where the translator renders כִּי־אִזְ “surely then” with

⁶⁶ Also Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (2003, 549); Gelston (2010, 101*).

οὕτως γὰρ “for thus.” In Ezek 32.14, the translator renders יִשְׁ “then” with οὕτως τότε “so then.” τότε “then” is by far the most common rendering for יִשְׁ “then.”

- b) **יִשְׁנָה / εἰσακούσεται]** This is not the most common rendering but it is common enough in the LXX (22x)⁶⁷ that it should not be considered a shift.
- c) **יִסְתָּר / καὶ ἀποστρέψει]** Gelston (2010, 72) considers this an exegetically motivated rendering. This is difficult to confirm given that it is the most common rendering in the LXX (28x),⁶⁸ along with κρύπτω “to conceal” (27x).⁶⁹
- d) **כְּאַשְׁרֵ / ἀνθ’ ὧν]** Though this is an unusual rendering, it is attested in Jer 5.19. The typical rendering is καθά “just as.”
- e) **∅ / ἐπ’ αὐτούς]** Hillers (1984, 42 n. n) suggests the plus might be due to dittography (מַעֲלִיָּהֶם > עֲלֵיהֶם “upon them”)⁷⁰ but admits that these words are very different. This explanation does not account for the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν αὐτῶν “in their practices.” Perhaps this is a theological shift in which the translator added the preposition and pronoun to remind the reader that the target of the rulers’ evil deeds is God’s people.

⁶⁷ Job 9.15; 30.20; 35.12; Ps 4.2; 13.4; 18.42; 22.3; 27.7; 38.16; 55.3; 69.17; 86.7; 91.15; 102.3; 120.1; 143.7; Prov 1.28; 21.13; Isa 46.7; 58.9; Jonah 2.3; Mic 3.4.

⁶⁸ Exod 3.6; Deut 31.17, 18; 32.20; Ps 10.11; 13.2; 22.25; 27.9; 30.8; 44.25; 51.11; 69.18; 88.15. 89.47; 102.3; 104.29; 143.7; Isa 8.17; 50.6; 54.8; 57.17; 59.2; 64.6; Jer 33.5; Ezek 39.23, 24, 29; Mic 3.4.

⁶⁹ Gen 4.14; Num 5.13; Deut 7.20; 1 Sam 20.2, 5, 19, 24; 23.19; 1 Kgs 17.3; 2 Kgs 11.2; 2 Chr 22.11; Job 13.20, 24; 14.13; 28.21; 34.22, 29; Ps 38.10; 54.2; 55.13; Prov 25.2; 27.5; Isa 29.14; 32.2; Jer 16.17; 23.24; Hos 13.14.

⁷⁰ Also Wolff (1990, 91); Gelston (2010, 101*).

4.4.5 Micah 3.5

MT כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה עַל־הַנְּבִיאִים הַמְתַּעֲמִים אֶת־עַמִּי הַנִּשְׁכָּחִים בְּשִׁיחָהֶם וְקָרְאוּ שְׁלוֹם וְאָשְׁרוּ
לְאִי־תָן עַל־פִּיהֶם וְקִדְּשׁוּ עָלָיו מִלְחָמָה

Thus says the LORD concerning the prophets who are misleading my people,
Who bite with their teeth
And proclaim peace
But when a man puts nothing in their mouth,
They consecrate against him war.

LXX τάδε λέγει κύριος ἐπὶ τοὺς προφήτας τοὺς πλανῶντας τὸν λαόν μου τοὺς δάκνοντας ἐν τοῖς
ὁδοῦσιν αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσοντας ἐπ’ αὐτὸν εἰρήνην καὶ οὐκ ἐδόθη εἰς τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν
ἡγείραν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν πόλεμον
Thus says the Lord against the prophets who are misleading my people,
Who bite with their teeth
And proclaim peace to him,
But when nothing was put in their mouth
They raised up war against him.

- a) Ø / ἐπ’ αὐτὸν] This is a plus. The reconstruction of Ἡεῦ (ἐπ’ αὐτ]ὸν) (Tov 2003, 37) allows for the possibility that the Hebrew text contained this prepositional phrase in its *Vorlage* (Gelston 2010, 101*). However, if it did not, the translator’s addition fits his tendency to explicitise (see the plus ἐπ’ αὐτούς “against them” in the previous verse).
- b) יָתַן / ἐδόθη] The shift from active to passive may have been motivated by the lack of an explicit subject in Hebrew. The translator may have read the Niphal (יָתַן “it is / will be given”).⁷¹ There is also a shift from *yiqtol* to aorist indicative which is not easily explained apart from an intentional change to refer to the past actions of the false prophets, which led to them waging war (following shift from וְקִדְּשׁוּ “they consecrate” to ἡγείραν “they raised up”). (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

⁷¹ Gelston (2010, 72) also posits a different vocalisation but does not provide it.

c) **וְקִדְּשׁוּ / ἡγείραν]** This is a unique rendering. There are only two other occurrences of **קִדְּשׁ** “to consecrate” in the Piel stem with the sense of commissioning/preparing for war, each rendered differently in the LXX (Jer 6.4 παρασκευάζω “to prepare” and 22.7 ἐπάγω “to bring upon”).⁷² The shift only regards time (consecutive perfect to aorist indicative). The fact that out of 55 consecutive perfects in MT-Micah only one is rendered with an aorist (and four with imperfects) lends support to this being an intentional historicising shift in conjunction with the previous *yiqtol* to aorist indicative shift. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

4.4.6 Micah 3.6

MT לָכֵן לַיְלָה לְכֶם מְחֹזוֹן וְחֹשֶׁכָה לְכֶם מִקֶּסֶם וּבֹאָה הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ עַל־הַנְּבִיאִים וְקִדְּרָ עֲלֵיהֶם הַיּוֹם

“Therefore, it shall be night to you without a vision
And it will grow dark for you without divination.”
And the sun will go down over the prophets
And the day will be dark over them.

LXX διὰ τοῦτο νύξ ὑμῖν ἔσται ἐξ ὀράσεως καὶ σκοτία ὑμῖν ἔσται ἐκ μαντείας καὶ δύσεται ὁ ἥλιος ἐπὶ τοὺς προφήτας καὶ συσκοτάσει ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἡ ἡμέρα
Therefore, it will be night to you without a vision,
And darkness to you without divination
And the sun will set upon the prophets
And the day will grow dark upon them.

a) **וְחֹשֶׁכָה / καὶ σκοτία]** This is a shift from a verb to a noun through alternative vocalisation

(**חֹשֶׁכָה** “darkness”).⁷³

⁷² α' corrects to ἡγίασαν “they sanctified.”

⁷³ Gelston (2010, 101*).

4.4.7 Micah 3.7

MT ובשו החזים וְחָפְרוּ הַקְּסָמִים וְעָטוּ עַל-שְׂפָם בְּלֶם בִּי אִין מַעֲנָה אֱלֹהִים
 And the seers will be embarrassed
 And the diviners will be ashamed
 And all of them will cover (the) moustache
 For there will be no answer (from) God.

LXX καὶ καταισχυνθήσονται οἱ ὀρῶντες τὰ ἐνύπνια καὶ καταγελασθήσονται οἱ μάντις καὶ
 καταλαλήσουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν πάντες αὐτοὶ διότι οὐκ ἔσται ὁ εἰσακούων αὐτῶν
 Those who see dreams will be put to shame
 And those who divine will be ridiculed
 And they will all speak against them
 For no one will listen to them.

a) **וְחָפְרוּ / οἱ ὀρῶντες τὰ ἐνύπνια]** This is a plus τὰ ἐνύπνια “dreams.” Often the MT provides an object for what the seer sees (e.g., Isa 47.13; Ezek 13.9, 16). However, it is not uncommon for the MT to simply refer to the office of seer and not specify what they see (e.g., 1 Sam 9.9; 2 Sam 15.27; Isa 29.10; Amos 7.12). Elsewhere, the LXX translator leaves “seer” without an object (e.g., Amos 7.12; 2 Chr 33.18) so it is likely that here, in Mic 3.7, τὰ ἐνύπνια “dreams” was added to explicitise the profession of “seer.” ὀράω “to see” + ἐνύπνιον “a dream” usually renders חָלַם “to dream” or חָלַם “to dream” + חָלַם “dream.” Gelston (2010, 72) labels the shift amplification.

b) **וְחָפְרוּ / καὶ καταγελασθήσονται]** καταγελάω “to ridicule” usually renders קָחַץ “to laugh at” or עָגַל “to deride.” It is not clear why the translator did not choose a word with a closer meaning to חָפַר “to be ashamed” such as αἰσχύνομαι “to be ashamed.” Perhaps the translator produced an interpretive shift to change the focus from how the seers and diviners would feel to what would be done to them. This explanation coincides with the shifts in the third and fourth stichoi (see paragraphs (c)-(e)).

- c) **עֲלֵ-שִׁפְפִים וְעָטוּ / καὶ καταλαλήσουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν**] Hillers (1984, 44 n. h) explains as the translator not understanding the idiom **עֲלֵ-שִׁפְפִים וְעָטוּ** “and they will cover the mouth.” It seems that the translator sought to shift the focus from what the seers/prophets will do (cover their moustaches) to what others will do to them (speak against them). The translator may have understood **עָטָה** “to wrap, grab” as **עֵיט** “to scream”⁷⁴ (cf. 1 Sam 25.14) and **שִׁפְפִים** “moustache” as **שִׁפְתָם** “their lip” (cf. Ezek 24.22), which was then concretised as **αὐτῶν** “them.”⁷⁵
- d) **מַעֲנֶה / ὁ εἰσακούων**] Perhaps the translator read an Hiphil participle **מַעֲנֶה** “one causing to answer” (also Gelston 2010, 72) (cf. Eccl 5.19).
- e) **אֶלֵהֶם / αὐτῶν**] Perhaps the translator read **אֶלֵהֶם** “to them” (also Gelston 2010, 72), **אֶלֵהֶם** “to them,” or **עָלֵהֶם** “to them.” If not a mistake, it may have been an intentional shift to keep the focus on how others will treat the seers/prophets (consistent with the shifts in the first three stichoi).

4.4.8 Micah 3.8

MT **וְאִנִּי מְלֵאֲתִי כַח אֶת־רוּחַ יְהוָה וּמִשְׁפָּט וּגְבוּרָה לְהַגִּיד לְיַעֲקֹב פְּשָׁעוֹ
וּלְיִשְׂרָאֵל חַטָּאתוֹ**

But as for me, I am filled with power, with the spirit of the LORD
And with justice and strength to declare to Jacob his transgression
And to Israel his sin.

⁷⁴ Gelston (2010, 72) offers the same solution.

⁷⁵ Gelston (2010, 101*) suggests that the mistaken rendering of **שִׁפְפִים** “(the) moustache” resulted from the “erroneous interpretation of **וְעָטוּ**.”

LXX ἐὰν μὴ ἐγὼ ἐμπλήσω ἰσχὺν ἐν πνεύματι κυρίου καὶ κρίματος καὶ δυναστείας τοῦ ἀπαγγεῖλαι τῷ Ἰακωβ ἀσεβείας αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἀμαρτίας αὐτοῦ
 If not I will fill up with strength in the spirit of the Lord
 And of judgment and power to declare to Jacob his impious acts
 And to Israel his sins.

- a) **אֲוֹלָם / ἐὰν μὴ**] This is a unique rendering; usually **אֲוֹלָם** is rendered ἀλλά “but” or οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ “however” (ἐὰν δὲ “but if” in 1 Kgs 20.23 [Gk 21.23]). Since this is the only occurrence of **אֲוֹלָם** “but” in the Latter Prophets, the translator may not have known the meaning of the word (cf. transliteration of **לֹא אֲוֹלָם** “but Luz” as Ουλαμλους “Ulam-luz” in Gen 28.19). The conditional likely refers to the mistranslated previous stich (**כִּי אֵין אֵין אֲוֹלָם** “for there will be no answer [from] God” > διότι οὐκ ἔσται ὁ εἰσακούων αὐτῶν “for no one will listen to them”). In other words, if it comes to pass that the people *do* listen to the false prophets, then Micah will fill up with strength in the spirit of the Lord and of judgment and power to declare to Jacob his sins. The present shift influenced the next shift from *qatal* to future.
- b) **אֲוֹלָם / ἐμπλήσω**] The previous shift to a conditional influenced this shift from *qatal* to future.
- c) **אֲוֹלָם / ἀσεβείας αὐτοῦ**] This is a shift from singular to plural. (See explanation in §5.5.2.3 for more details.)
- d) **אֲוֹלָם / ἀμαρτίας αὐτοῦ**] This is a shift from singular to plural. (See explanation in §5.5.2.3 for more details.)

4.4.9 Micah 3.9

MT שְׁמַעו־נָא זֹאת רְאֵשֵׁי בַיִת יַעֲקֹב וּקְצִינֵי בַיִת יִשְׂרָאֵל הַמְתַּעְבִּים מִשְׁפָּט וְאֵת כָּל־הַיִּשְׁרָה יַעֲקֹשׁוּ

Listen to this you heads of the house of Jacob
And you rulers of the house of Israel
Who abhor justice
And twist everything that is straight.

LXX ἀκούσατε δὴ ταῦτα οἱ ἡγούμενοι οἴκου Ιακωβ καὶ οἱ κατάλοιποι οἴκου Ισραηλ οἱ βδελυσσόμενοι κρίμα καὶ πάντα τὰ ὀρθὰ διαστρέφοντες
Hear now these things, you leaders of the house of Jacob
And you who are left of the house of Israel,
Who abhor judgment
And distort everything that is upright.

- a) **נָא / ταῦτα**] This is a shift from singular to plural. It may refer to τὰ ῥήματα “words” (but λόγος “word, saying” in 1.2; Mic 4.4 κυρίου παντοκράτορος ἐλάλησεν ταῦτα “the Lord Almighty has spoken these [words]”).
- b) **רְאֵשֵׁי / οἱ ἡγούμενοι**] This is the same ideological shift as 2.13 and 3.11.
- c) **וּקְצִינֵי / οἱ κατάλοιποι**] See explanations in §§4.4.1 and 5.5.2.4 for further explanation.
- d) **הַיִּשְׁרָה / τὰ ὀρθὰ**] This is a common rendering (13x);⁷⁶ however, the more common rendering is εὐθείας “upright” (31x).⁷⁷

4.4.10 Micah 3.10

MT בָּנָה צִיּוֹן בְּדַמִּים וְיִרוּשָׁלַם בְּעוֹלָה
Who builds Zion with blood,
And Jerusalem with iniquity.

⁷⁶ Prov 4.11; 8.9; 11.6; 12.6, 15; 14.12; 16.13, 25; 21.8; Jer 31.9; Ezek 1.7; Mic 2.7; 3.9.

⁷⁷ Judg 14.3; 1 Sam 12.23; 2 Kgs 10.15; Ezra 8.21; Neh 9.13; Ps 7.11; 11.2; 19.9; 25.21; 32.11; 33.1; 36.11; 37.14; 49.15; 64.11; 94.15; 97.11; 107.7, 42; 111.1; 112.2, 4; 125.4; 140.14; Prov 2.13; 20.11; 28.10; 29.10; Isa 40.3; 45.13; Hos 14.10.

LXX οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες Σιών ἐν αἵμασι⁷⁸ καὶ Ἱερουσαλημ ἐν ἀδικίαις
Who build Zion with blood,
And Jerusalem with unrighteousness.

- a) בָּנָה / οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες] This is a shift from singular to plural. Wolff (1990, 92) suggests emending the Hebrew to a plural participle but it is difficult to imagine why the Hebrew text would have reverted to a singular participle (which seems to be the more difficult reading, probably referring to the king). Instead, the versions (including the LXX translator) shifted from singular to plural to harmonise with the context.⁷⁹

4.4.11 Micah 3.11

MT רֹאשֵׁי בְשֹׁחַד יִשְׁפְּטוּ וְכֹהֲנֵיהֶּ בְּמַחִיר יִזְרוּ וְנְבִיאֵיהֶּ בְּכֶסֶף יִקְסְמוּ וְעַל־יְהוָה יִשְׁעֲנוּ
לֹא־מֵר הָלֹא־יְהוָה בְּקִרְבָּנוּ לֹא־תָבוֹא עָלֵינוּ רָעָה

Its heads judge for a bribe,
And its priests teach for a price,
And its prophets divine for money,
And upon the LORD they lean saying,
“Is not the LORD in our midst?
No calamity will come upon us.”

LXX οἱ ἡγούμενοι αὐτῆς μετὰ δώρων ἔκρινον καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς αὐτῆς μετὰ μισθοῦ ἀπεκρίνοντο καὶ οἱ προφῆται αὐτῆς μετὰ ἀργυρίου ἐμαντεύοντο καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐπανεπαύοντο λέγοντες οὐχὶ κύριος ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστὶν οὐ μὴ ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς κακά
Her leaders were judging for gifts,
And her priests were giving answer for a wage,
And her prophets were divining for money,
And upon the Lord they were resting saying,
“Is the Lord not among us?
Evil will not come upon us.”

The four conjugation shifts in this verse from *yiqtol* to Gk imperfect indicative reflect historicising shifts. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

- a) רֹאשֵׁי / οἱ ἡγούμενοι αὐτῆς] This is the same concretising shift as in 2.13 and 3.9.

⁷⁸ αἵμασιν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

⁷⁹ Gelston (2010, 101*); Andersen and Freedman (2000, 382-383).

- b) **יִשְׁפֹּטוּ / ἔκρινον**] This is a shift from *yiqtol* to Gk imperfect indicative.
- c) **יִרְוּ / ἀπεκρίνοντο**] This is a shift from *yiqtol* to Gk imperfect indicative. It is a unique rendering; usually διδάσκω “to teach” or συμβιβάζω “to instruct.” ἀποκρίνομαι “to answer” usually renders עֲנָה “to answer” or שׁוּב in Hiphil (+ דָּבַר) “to return an answer.” The graphical resemblance of יִרְוּ “they teach” and either עֲנָה “to answer” or שׁוּב “to return” is not close enough to suggest there was an orthographic error. It was possibly an intentional shift based on an understood role of priests as intercessors between the people and God for the purpose of receiving answers (however, there are also many examples of priests teaching the law – cf. Lev 10.8-11; Deut 24.8; 2 Kgs 12.3; 17.27, 28; 2 Chr 15.3). Gelston (2010, 102*) highlights the role of priests in answering ritual questions (e.g., Hag 2.11, 13; Zech 7.3).
- Another possibility is that the translator connected teaching law with soliciting answers from God. This connection could be drawn from Exod 18.15-16, for example, which links inquiring of God for answers and being taught the law in response (Ps 99.6 [Gk 98.6] identifies Moses as one of God’s priests).
- d) **יִקְסְמוּ / ἐμαντεύοντο**] This is a shift from *yiqtol* to Gk imperfect indicative.
- e) **יִשְׁעֲנוּ / ἐπανεπαύοντο**] This is a shift from *yiqtol* to Gk imperfect indicative.

4.4.12 Micah 3.12

MT לָכֵן בַּגְּלָלְכֶם צִיּוֹן שָׂדֵה תִּחְרַשׁ וִירוּשָׁלַם עֵינֵי תִהְיֶה וְהָר הַבַּיִת לְבָמוֹת יַעַר
 Therefore, because of you
 Zion will be plowed (like) a field
 And Jerusalem will become heaps of ruins
 And the mountain of the house as high places of thicket.

LXX διὰ τοῦτο δι' ὑμᾶς Σιων ὡς ἀγρὸς ἀροτριαθήσεται καὶ Ἱερουσαλημ ὡς ὀπωροφυλάκιον ἔσται
 καὶ τὸ ὄρος τοῦ οἴκου εἰς ἄλσος δρυμοῦ
 Therefore, on account of you
 Zion will be plowed as a field
 And Jerusalem will be like a hut for a garden-watcher
 And the mountain of the house into a grove of a thicket.

- a) **הָרָה / ὡς ἀγρὸς**] Formally, this is a plus ὡς “like” but it is implied in the Hebrew.
- b) **עֵינֵי / ὡς ὀπωροφυλάκιον**] This is a plus ὡς “as,” a shift from plural to singular and the same lexical shift as in 1.6 (see 4.2.6a for the explanation of the lexical shift). Along with the employment of ὀπωροφυλάκιον “a hut for a garden-watcher” as a “euphemistic cliché” (Theocharous 2012, 106), the addition of ὡς “as” served to soften the impact of the judgment on Judah. The idea that translators might choose to soften the impact of God’s judgment on Judah may be supported by Jer 26.18 [Gk 33.18] where the elders of Judah quote Mic 3.12. Instead of עֵימִם “heaps of ruins,” LXX-Jeremiah 33.18 weakens the force by rendering it ἄβατον “untrodden.”
- c) **לְבָמוֹת / εἰς ἄλσος**] This is a shift in number and meaning. The same rendering occurs in Jer 26.18 [Gk 33.18]. The typical renderings are ὑψηλός “high” and Βαμα “Bama” (transliterated proper place name). Gelston (2010, 102*) posits that the versions may have rendered this word in the singular “in assimilation to עֵינֵי.”

4.5 Micah 4

4.5.1 Micah 4.1

MT באַחַר־יְמֵי יְהוָה הָרַב־יְהוָה נִבְנֶה בְּרֹאשׁ הַהָרִים וְנִשָּׂא הוּא מִגְבְּעוֹת
וְנָהְרוּ עָלָיו עַמִּים

And it will be at the end of days
That the mountain of the house of the LORD will be established at the top of
the mountains
And it will be lifted up more than the hills
And peoples will flow over it.

LXX καὶ ἔσται ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐμφανὲς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ κυρίου ἕτοιμον ἐπὶ τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν
ὄρέων καὶ μετεωρισθήσεται ὑπεράνω τῶν βουνῶν καὶ σπεύσουσι⁸⁰ πρὸς αὐτὸ λαοί
And it will be in the last days
The mountain of the Lord will be manifest
Prepared upon the tops of the mountains
And it will be raised to a height above the hills
And peoples will hasten to it.

a) בַּיִת / Ø] This is a minus. Isa 2.2, which is part of a parallel passage to Mic 4.1-4, reads

like the MT here (הָרַב־יְהוָה “mountain of house of the LORD”). Hillers (1984, 49b)

suggests בַּיִת “house of” was added in MT Mic 4.1 and Isa 2.2 possibly under the

influence of Mic 3.12 and 4.2. The Gk of Isa 2.2 reads τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ

“the mountain of the Lord and the house of God.” הָרַב־יְהוָה “mountain of house of the

LORD” occurs also at 2 Chr 33.15. A simple explanation from Gelston (2010, 73) is that

the translator was assimilating to Mic 4.2.

b) יְהוָה / ἐμφανὲς] The translator rendered יְהוָה “it will be” as ἐμφανὲς “manifest” because he

read נִבְנֶה “it will be established” not as the complement verb of יְהוָה “it will be” but as the

main verb in the following clause. Gelston (2010, 102*) is probably correct in positing a

⁸⁰ σπεύσουσιν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

double rendering of נָבֹן “established” with ἐμφανὲς “manifest” and ἔτοιμον “prepared.”

Where נָבֹן “established” occurs in the parallel Isa 2.2 it is rendered ἐμφανὲς “manifest”;

then ἔτοιμον “prepared” is translated in the position that נָבֹן “established” occurs in Mic

4.1.

- c) **נָבֹן / ἔτοιμον**] This is a shift from a verb to an adjective but there is no semantic shift.
- d) **אֲנִשָּׂא / καὶ μετεωρισθήσεται**] This is a unique rendering. μετεωρίζω “to raise to a height” typically renders רוּם “to be high.”
- e) **הוּא / Ø**] This is a minus; it was likely deleted to harmonise with Isa 2.2, which also lacks the pronoun (also Gelston 2010, 73).
- f) **מִן / ὑπεράνω**] This is not a shift. The translator correctly rendered the comparative מִן “from.”
- g) **וְנִהְרֹו / καὶ σπεύσουσι**] This is a unique rendering. It is rendered ἦκω “to come” in Isa 2.2 and Jer 31.12 [Gk 38.12]. It was either confused for מְהֵרָה “to hasten” (Gelston 2010, 73) or it was an intentional shift created to heighten the urgency/motivation for going to the mountain of the Lord.

4.5.2 Micah 4.2

MT וְהָלְכוּ גוֹיִם רַבִּים לָכוּ וְנִגְלָה אֶל־הֶרֶר־יְהוָה וְאֶל־בַּיִת אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב וַיִּזְרְנוּ מִדְרָכָיו
וְנִלְכָה בְּאַרְחֻתָיו כִּי מִצִּיּוֹן תֵּצֵא תּוֹרָה וּדְבַר־יְהוָה מִירוּשָׁלַם

And many nations will come
And they will say, “Come, let us go up to the mountain of the LORD
And to the house of the God of Jacob
And he will teach us his ways
And we will walk in his paths.”
For out of Zion instruction will go out
And the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.

LXX καὶ πορεύσονται ἔθνη πολλὰ καὶ ἐροῦσιν δεῦτε ἀναβῶμεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος κυρίου καὶ εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακωβ καὶ δείξουσιν ἡμῖν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ πορευσόμεθα ἐν ταῖς τρίβοις αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἐκ Σιων ἐξελεύσεται νόμος καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἱερουσαλημ

And many nations will come
And they will say, “Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord
And to the house of the God of Jacob
And they will show us his way
And we will walk in his paths”
For out of Zion law will go out
And a word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

- a) וַיִּזְרְנוּ / καὶ δείξουσιν ἡμῖν] This is a shift from 3ms to 3p. יָרָה (in Hiphil) “to teach” is usually rendered διδάσκω “to teach” or συμβιβάζω “to instruct.” The same rendering occurs at Exod 15.25 (there in the sense of “show”), 1 Sam 12.23 and Job 34.32 (the sense of Hebrew could be “teach” or “show”). Perhaps the translator read וַיִּרְאוּנוּ “and they will show us” (Hiphil of רָאָה) or וַיִּרְוּנוּ “and they will teach us” (as in 1QIsa^a) for וַיִּזְרְנוּ “and he will teach us” (metathesis of *vav/resh*). Alternatively, בַּיִת אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב “house of the God of Jacob” > οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ Ἰακωβ “house of the God of Jacob” was understood as the people of Israel who will not be teaching but simply directing the nations toward God’s ways (this understanding may coincide with reading וַיִּרְוּנוּ “and

they will teach us” for וְיִוְרְנֵנוּ “and he will teach us” with the intentional shift to “showing”).

- b) מְדַרְכָּיו / τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ] This is a shift from plural to singular (the only difference in consonants between the plural and singular is a *yod*). Given that the plural בְּאַרְחָתָיו “his paths” is maintained in the next stich, the present shift likely *does not* represent an intentional shift for ideological/theological reasons.

4.5.3 Micah 4.3

MT וְשָׁפַט בֵּין עַמִּים רַבִּים וְהוֹכִיחַ לְגוֹיִם עֲצָמִים עַד־רְחֹק וּכְתַתּוּ חַרְבֵיהֶם לְאַתִּים
וְחִנִּיתֵיהֶם לְמִזְמֵרוֹת לֹא־יִשְׂאוּ גּוֹי אֶל־גּוֹי חֶרֶב וְלֹא־יִלְמְדוּן עוֹד מִלְחָמָה

And he will judge between many peoples
And decide for strong nations far away
And they will beat their swords into plowshares
And their spears into pruning hooks.
Nation will not lift up sword against nation
And they will not learn war anymore.

LXX καὶ κρινεῖ ἀνὰ μέσον λαῶν πολλῶν καὶ ἐξελέγξει ἔθνη ἰσχυρὰ ἕως εἰς γῆν μακράν καὶ κατακόψουσι⁸¹ τὰς ῥομφαίας αὐτῶν εἰς ἄροτρα καὶ τὰ δόρατα αὐτῶν εἰς δρέπανα καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ ἀντάρη ἔθνος ἐπ’ ἔθνος ῥομφαίαν καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ μάθωσι⁸² πολεμεῖν

And he will judge among many peoples
And reprove strong nations far away
And they will cut their swords into plows
And their spears into pruning hooks
And nation will no longer lift up sword against nation
And they will learn war no more.

- a) וְהוֹכִיחַ / καὶ ἐξελέγξει] This is the common rendering. ἐξελέγγω “to reprove” falls within

the semantic range of הִכָּה in the Hiphil “to decide, rebuke” but the parallelism with שָׁפַט

⁸¹ κατακόψουσιν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

⁸² μάθωσιν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

“to judge” indicates a sense of settling disputes. All renderings of שפט “to judge” in the LXX have the sense of rebuke, reprove, reproach or refute (except for Gen 24.14, 44, where יכח means “prepare, appoint” and is translated by ἐτοιμάζω “to prepare”).

- b) **וַיִּכְתֹּם / καὶ κατακόψουσιν**] The same rendering of כתת “to beat” occurs in Mic 1.7, Zech 11.6, Num 14.45 and 2 Chr 34.7 (also, συγκόπτω “to break up” in Deut 9.21; Ps 89.24 [Gk 88.24]; Isa 2.4; and Joel 4.10).
- c) **לְאִתִּים / εἰς ἄροτρα**] The Hebrew word means “plowshare” but the Greek broadens the reference to the entire plow. Though Greek has the technical term ἀροτρόπους “plowshare,” it never renders את “plowshare.” The occurrences of את “plowshare” are rendered ἄροτρον “plow” (Mic 4.3; Isa 2.4; Joel 3.10), θέριστρον “sickle” (1 Sam 13.20) or ὀδούς “tooth” (1 Sam 13.21).
- d) **לֹא יִלְמְדוּ / οὐκέτι μὴ ἀντάρῃ**] This is a plus οὐκέτι “no longer.” עוד...לא “no longer” is not present in this Hebrew stich but it is present in the following (last) stich **וְלֹא יִלְמְדוּ** “and they will not learn anymore.” It is likely that the translator added οὐκέτι “no longer” to harmonise the two phrases.

4.5.4 Micah 4.4

MT **וַיָּשְׁבוּ אִישׁ תַּחַת גִּפְנוֹ וְתַחַת תְּאֲנָתוֹ וְאִין מִחֲרִיד כִּי־פִי יְהוָה צָבָאוֹת דִּבֶּר**
 And every man will sit under his vine and under his fig tree,
 And there will not be anyone causing terror
 For the mouth of the LORD of hosts has spoken.

LXX καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ἕκαστος ὑποκάτω ἀμπέλου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος ὑποκάτω συκῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἐκφοβῶν διότι τὸ στόμα κυρίου παντοκράτορος ἐλάλησε⁸³ ταῦτα
 And each one will rest under his vine and each one under his fig tree,
 And there will not be anyone causing terror
 Because the mouth of the Lord Almighty has spoken these things.

a) **וַיִּשְׁבּוּ / καὶ ἀναπαύσεται**] This is a shift in number from plural to singular. Semantically, it

is a unique rendering. When referring to “sitting,” **וַיִּשְׁבּוּ** is usually rendered with καθίζω “to sit down” or κάθημαι “to sit.” The translator was likely explicitising the action of resting as the purpose of sitting. Other positive references to the vine and fig tree occur in 1 Kgs 5.5 [Gk 1 Kgs 2.46g] (**וַיִּשְׁבּוּ** “and he dwelt” > καὶ κατοικεῖ “and he was dwelling”); 2 Kgs 18.31; Isa 36.16; Joel 2.22; Zech 3.10 (**וְיָקָרְאוּ אִישׁ לְרֵעֵהוּ וְיָבִיאוּ אֵלֶיךָ תַּחַת אֲרֵז וְתַחַת תְּאֵנָה**) “you shall invite each man his neighbor under a vine and under a fig tree” > συγκαλέσετε ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ ὑποκάτω ἀμπέλου καὶ ὑποκάτω συκῆς “you shall call together every man his neighbor under a vine and under a fig tree”). Mic 4.4 and Zech 3.10 are both references to the peaceful existence in the eschaton (day of the LORD).

b) **אִישׁ / ἕκαστος**] This rendering falls within the semantic range of **אִישׁ** “man, each.”

c) **∅ / ἕκαστος (2nd occurrence)**] This is a plus. Though it was unnecessary to repeat this adjective, the translator may have added it to distinguish between those sitting under vines and those sitting under fig trees.

⁸³ ἐλάλησεν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- a) **תְּבִיאֹת / παντοκράτορας**] This is a shift in semantics and in number from plural to singular. תְּבִיאֹת הַיְהוָה “LORD of Hosts” is rendered κύριος παντοκράτωρ “Lord Almighty” in Jeremiah and the Twelve Prophets but κυρίου σαβαωθ “Lord of Hosts” in Isaiah.
- b) **∅ / ταῦτα**] This is a plus. It was added also in 3.1 in order to harmonise with 3.9. It was added here because of the expectation of a direct object, possibly referring to τὰ ῥήματα “words” (cf. λόγος “word, saying” in 1.2).

4.5.5 Micah 4.5

MT כִּי כָל־הַעַמִּים יֵלְכוּ אִישׁ בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵיו וְאֶנְחֲנוּ גֵלְךָ בְּשֵׁם־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד
 For all the peoples will walk each one in the name of his god,
 But we will walk in the name of the LORD our God forever and ever.

LXX ὅτι πάντες οἱ λαοὶ πορεύσονται ἕκαστος τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς δὲ πορευσόμεθα ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου θεοῦ ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπέκεινα
 For all the peoples will walk each his own way
 But we will walk in the name of the Lord our God forever and beyond.

- a) **יֵלְכוּ אִישׁ בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהֵיו / πορεύσονται ἕκαστος τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ**] The string [הלך + אר/ח/דרך + אלהים/ו] “to walk in the ways / paths of God” is a well-known idiom in the Bible (Deut 8.6; 19.9; 26.17; 28.9; 30.16; Isa 2.3) as well as the near context of Mic 4.2. The string [הלך + שם + אלהים] “walk in the name of God” is only attested in Mic 4.5 and the closest parallel is “coming in the name of the LORD” in Ps 118.26 [Gk 117.26] but this idea is not the same as walking or living in God’s ways. Wolff (1990, 113) does not provide an explanation for his claim that “Gk interprets by adding.” Hillers (1984, 50) simply points out the difference and says “the MT is preferable because it is unique.”

LXX Mic 4.5 does not picture the people still walking in the names of their gods (as in the MT) but in their own ways. The translation shift here represents two phenomena. First, based on the intratextual frame of reference, it is a harmonisation. If in the last days the λαός “people” will hasten to the mountain of the Lord (4.1) and he will judge between them (4.3), then it may have seemed inconsistent for them to still be walking in the names of their gods (4.5). Second, considering the theological frame, the future idyllic state pictured in Mic 4.1-4 should not involve the λαός “people” walking in the names of their own gods. Instead, they should be attracted to and submitting to the God of Israel. Mic 4.5a, then, reflects ideological and theological translation shifts. Similarly, Gelston (2010, 102*) claims “G evidently wishes to avoid giving implicit recognition to the existence of other gods.”

- b) **וְגַם וְנִגְזְרוּ / ἡμεῖς δὲ πορευσόμεθα]** This is one of the three shifts from *vav* “and” to δὲ “but” (out of a total of 180 occurrences of *vav* “and” in Micah). (See §4.3.13c for further explanation.) Here it serves to highlight the important contrast between those (all the peoples) who will walk in their own ways and those (the prophet with God’s people) who will walk in the name of the Lord their God.
- c) **וְעַד לְעוֹלָם / εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπέκεινα]** This is a unique rendering. Besides here, the Hebrew phrase occurs 7x in the MT.¹ In each occurrence except Micah, the phrase is essentially rendered εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος “for ever and ever.” This does not represent a shift but either ignorance of the Hebrew idiom in Exodus, Psalms and Daniel, or possibly a misreading for **וְעַד** “more.”

¹ Exod 15.18; Ps 9.6; 119.44 [Gk 118.44]; 145.1 [Gk 144.1]; 145.2 [Gk 144.2]; 145.21 [Gk 144.21]; Dan 12.3 (the Theodotion version of Dan 12.3 renders the Hebrew phrase as εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας καὶ ἔτι “forever and presently”).

4.5.6 Micah 4.6

MT בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא נֶאֱמַר יְהוָה אֲסַפֶּה הַצְּלֵעָה וְהַנְּדָחָה אֶקְבֹּצָהּ וְאֶשְׂרֵר הַרְעֵתִי
 On that day, declares the LORD
 I will assemble the lame female
 And the female who is driven away I will gather
 Even her whom I injured.

LXX ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ λέγει κύριος συνάξω τὴν συντετριμμένην καὶ τὴν ἐξωσμένην εἰσδέξομαι
 καὶ οὓς ἀπώσαμην
 In that day says the Lord,
 I will assemble her who is crushed
 And her who is driven out I will welcome²
 And those whom I rejected.

a) **הַצְּלֵעָה / τὴν συντετριμμένην]** Outside of Mic 4.6 and 7, **עֲלָץ** “to limp” occurs only two times (Gen 32.32 and Zeph 3.19). In Gen 32.32, the translator renders **עֲלָץ** “to limp” with **ἐπισκάζω** “to limp” and, in Zeph 3.19, renders **עֲלָץ** “to limp” with **ἐκπιέζω** “to oppress.” So here (and in 4.7), the rendering is either a slot translation or the translator was focusing on the action that resulted in lameness.

b) **אֶקְבֹּצָהּ / εἰσδέχομαι]** This is not an instance of the translator’s lack of adequate semantic knowledge. **קָבַץ** “to gather” is rendered with the most common word **συνάγω** “to gather” in Mic 1.7 and 4.12. However, his rendering in this verse may not represent a shift because **εἰσδέχομαι** “to receive, welcome” is used 13 other times in the LXX for **קָבַץ** “to gather.”³ Perhaps the translator deviates from the parallelism between **אֲסַפֶּה** “to assemble”

² Muraoka (2002, 153).

³ Jer 23.3; Ezek 11.17; 20.34, 41; 22.19, 20; Hos 8.10; Hab 2.5; Zeph 3.8, 19, 20; Zech 10.8, 10.

and קָבַץ “to gather” in order to communicate God’s positive emotion (“I will welcome”) as he assembles his people.

c) וְאֲשֶׁר / καὶ οὗς] The difference in number resulted from an interpretive decision and does not represent a shift. Because the object is not specified, it is likely that the Hebrew author was referring to the singular female objects already specified in the verse (i.e., the lame and driven-out females are those whom God has afflicted). The translator explicitises the ambiguous אֲשֶׁר “who” as a reference to all those in Israel who have been afflicted/rejected by God. In 4.7, וּמֶלֶךְ יְהוָה עֲלֵיהֶם “and the LORD will reign over *them*” probably motivated this rendering.

d) הִרְעֵתִי / ἀποσάμην] This is a unique rendering. רָעַע “to injure” is typically rendered κακόω “to harm,” πονηρέυομαι “to act wickedly,” or κακοποιέω “to do wrong.” This shift is likely an example of the translator mitigating the implications of God injuring his people. Instead, LXX softens God’s actions to merely rejecting his people for their sin. This is supported by the translator choosing one of the common Greek verbs πονηρέυομαι “to act wickedly” to render רָעַע “to injure” in 3.4 because the action is carried out by unjust rulers in Jacob.

4.5.7 Micah 4.7

MT וְשִׁמְתִי אֶת־הַצִּלְעָה לְשָׂאֲרֵי־תְהַנְהִלָּאָה לְגוֹי עֲצוּם וּמִלֵּךְ יְהוָה עָלֵיהֶם בְּהָר צִיּוֹן
מֵעַתָּה וְעַד־עוֹלָם

And I will make the lame female a remnant
And her who is removed a strong nation
And the LORD will reign over them on mount Zion
From that day until eternity.

LXX καὶ θήσομαι τὴν συντετριμμένην εἰς ὑπόλειμμα καὶ τὴν ἀπωσμένην εἰς ἔθνος ἰσχυρόν καὶ βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἐν ὄρει Σιών ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ ἕως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα
And I will make her who is crushed a remnant
And her who is rejected into a strong nation
And the Lord will reign over them in mount Zion
From now until eternity.

a) הַצִּלְעָה / τὴν συντετριμμένην] See comment on this rendering in 4.6.

b) הַתְּהַנְהִלָּאָה / καὶ τὴν ἀπωσμένην] This is a *hapax legomenon* in the MT. ἀπωθέω “to reject”

typically renders סָאַמָּ “to reject,” הִנְחִי “to reject” or שָׁטַח “to forsake.” This likely

represents a slot translation based upon its usage in 4.6 to render רָעַע “to do harm.” It

harmonises the reference to οὓς ἀπώσάμην “those whom the Lord rejected” in 4.6 with τὴν

ἀπωσμένην “her who is rejected” in 4.7. Gelston (2010, 102*) suggests the translator may

have “guessed at the meaning by picking up its rendering of the final words of v.6, or it

may have interpreted via הַלְּאָה (perhaps in the light of הַנְּדַחָה).”

4.5.8 Micah 4.8

MT וְאַתָּה מִגְדַּל־עֵדָר עֲפֹל בֵּת־צִיּוֹן עֲדִיךָ תֵּאָתֶה וּבָאָה הַמְּמִשְׁלָה הָרִאשׁוֹנָה מִמְּלֶכֶת
לְבַת־יְרוּשָׁלַם

And you, O tower of the flock, hill of the daughter of Zion,
To you it will come;
And it will come, the former dominion,
Kingship for the daughter of Jerusalem.

LXX καὶ σὺ πύργος ποιμνίου ἀρχμώδης θύγατερ Σιών ἐπὶ σὲ ἤξει καὶ εἰσελεύσεται ἡ ἀρχὴ ἢ πρώτη βασιλεία ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος τῆς θυγατρὸς Ἰερουσαλήμ
 And you, O dusty tower of the flock, daughter of Zion,
 Upon you it will come and enter in,
 The former dominion,
 A kingdom from Babylon to the daughter of Jerusalem.

a) **לָפֶל** / ἀρχμώδης] Perhaps the translator read **עָפָר** “dust,” mistaking *lamed* for *resh* (ל/ר)

[script from Isaiah scroll, ca., 2nd c. B.C.E.]), but this is an unlikely orthographic mistake.

Instead, he may have associated **לָפֶל** “tower” with **לְפֶלֶס** “darkness” (Gelston 2010, 102*;

Hillers 1984, 56 n. c). This could have resulted through a phonological mistake.

b) **Ø** / ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος] This plus was an ideological addition to identify the attacker unveiled in 4.10. Instead of understanding the verse as part of the future restoration of the exiles, the translator read it in connection with the verses of judgment to follow (4.9ff).

4.5.9 Micah 4.9

MT עָתָה לָמָּה תִּרְיַעֵי רַע הַמֶּלֶךְ אִין־בָּךְ אִם־יִוָּעַצְךָ אֶבֶד בִּי־הַחַיִּיקָה חֵיל בְּיִלְדָה
 Now why do you raise aloud a shout?
 Is there no king among you?
 Has your counselor perished
 that pain has seized you like a woman in labor?

LXX καὶ νῦν ἵνα τί ἔγνωσ κακά μὴ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἦν σοι ἢ ἡ βουλή σου ἀπόλετο ὅτι κατεκράτησάν σου ὠδῖνες ὡς τικτούσης
 And now, why did you know calamities?
 Was there no king for you?
 Or did your counsel perish
 Because birth pains prevailed over you like one giving birth?

a) **עָתָה** / καὶ νῦν] This plus καὶ “and” may have been added to harmonise with the structure in 4.11.

- b) **תִּדְעִי / ἔγνομς]** Perhaps the translator read **תִּדְעִי** “you will know” or **תּוֹדִיעִי** “you will make known” for **תִּרְיִעִי** “raise a shout” (common *resh/dalet* confusion in the Assyrian square script [**ר/ד**] or paleo-Hebrew script [**ר/ד**] and missed *yod* or added *vav*). Gelston (2010, 102*) posits that this rendering derived from either **רעה** (with V) or **דע** (through *resh/dalet* confusion).

As in 2.8 and 2.10, the shift here from *yiqtol* to aorist indicative is an example of historicising (a harmonisation with *qatal* **אָבַד** “he perished” in the same verse). The translator attributes their past calamities to an absence of good leadership and counsel. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

- c) **רַע / κακά]** The translator read **רַע** “evil, bad” for **רַע** “a shout.” **רַע** “shout” is correctly rendered φίλοις “friends” in 7.5 (meaning II for **רַע** “friend”). Having read it as **רַע** “evil, bad,” we should classify it as a shift also in number to plural **κακά** “calamities”— similarly in 1.12; 2.1, 3. (See explanation in §5.5.2.3 for more details.)

- d) **אִין אִין־בָּרַךְ / μὴ βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἦν σοι]** Though the adverb of negation **אִין** “there is/was not” can be understood as referring to past time, this is an example of exegetical explicitisation. In the light of the following question about the counselors having perished, the translator took the opportunity to clarify the time reference for the target audience. (See §5.5.2.4 for further explanation.)

- e) **יִוְעָצֶיךָ / ἡ βουλή σου**] This was a shift from a concrete to an abstract noun. We would expect βουλή “counsel” to render יִוְעָצֶיךָ “counsel.” Gelston (2010, 102*) suggests the translator either presupposed יִוְעָצֶיךָ “your counsel” or rendered freely.
- f) **חֵיל / ὠδίνες**] This was a shift from singular to plural. However, חֵיל “pain” does not occur in the plural and of the six times it occurs,⁴ five are rendered with plural ὠδίν “birth pains” (Jer 22.23 is the exception).
- g) **הִקְזִיקְךָ / κατεκράτησάν σου**] Gelston (2010, 74) identifies this as an indeterminate shift. However, $\sqrt{\text{חזק}}$ in the Hiphil stem is rendered with the same verb in Jer 8.5; 50.43 and Nah 3.14 (the Piel of $\sqrt{\text{חזק}}$ in Nah 3.14 is rendered in the same way).

4.5.10 Micah 4.10

- 4.10 MT חוֹלִי וְגַחִי בַת־צִיּוֹן כִּי־יֵלְדָה כִּי־עָתָה תֵצֵאִי מִקִּרְיָהּ וְשָׁכַנְתָּ בַשָּׂדֶה וּבָאתַ עַד־בָּבֶל שָׁם תִּנְצָלִי שָׁם יִגְאָלְךָ יְהוָה מִכַּף אִיְבֹיֶיךָ
- Writhe and burst forth,⁵ O daughter of Zion, like a woman in labor
For now you will go forth from the city and dwell in the open country.
You will go to Babylon, there you will be rescued;
There the LORD will redeem you from the hand of your enemies.

⁴ Exod 15.14; Jer 6.24; 22.23; 50.43; Mic 4.9; Ps 48.7.

⁵ **גַּחִי**] This could be an imperative from **גַּחַ** “burst forth” or **נָגַח** “push.” The versions do not help with the decision.

LXX ὤδινε καὶ ἀνδρίζου καὶ ἔγγιζε θύγατερ Σιων ὡς τίκτουσα διότι νῦν ἐξελεύσῃ ἐκ πόλεως καὶ κατασκηνώσεις ἐν πεδίῳ καὶ ἤξεις ἕως Βαβυλῶνος ἐκεῖθεν ῥύσεται σε καὶ ἐκεῖθεν λυτρώσεται σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν σου
Suffer birth pangs and be courageous and come near, O daughter of Zion, like one in labor
For now you will go forth from a city and dwell in the open country
And you shall come as far as Babylon.
From there he will rescue you
And from there the Lord your God will redeem you from the hand of your enemies.

- a) **יָלַח / ὤδινε καὶ ἀνδρίζου**] The first two Greek verbs seem to be double renderings of the one Hebrew command **יָלַח** “writhe.” ὤδινε “suffer birth pangs” is a common rendering for **יָלַח** “to writhe,” while ἀνδρίζομαι “to be courageous” usually renders **קָזַח** “to be strong.” The double rendering may have come about through a confusion of **יָלַח** “writhe” with some form of **יָלַח** “to be strong.” The Syrohexapla reflects διατεινῶ “exert yourself” instead of ἀνδρίζου “be courageous” (Ziegler 1943, 216), which may represent another attempt to translate **יָלַח** “writhe.”
- b) **יָגַח / καὶ ἔγγιζε**] ἐγγίζω “to come near” usually renders **שָׁגַח** “to draw near” (the imperative form is **שָׁגַח** “draw near” so a *shin/khet* confusion could have caused the misreading) or **קָרַב** “to approach” (with no orthographic similarity). **פָּצַח** “to burst forth” is rendered variously in Gk – ἐπέρχομαι “to come to” in Judg 20.33; μαϊμάσσω “to rush out” in Job 38.8; προσκρούω “to beat against” in Job 40.23; and κρατίζω “to push” in Ezek 32.2. This was likely a slot translation.

- c) **תִּנְצְלִי / ῥύσεται σε**] This was a shift from a Niphal *yiqtol* 2fs to a future 3s with a 2s direct object plus. The translator likely harmonised with the 3ms *yiqtol* + 2ms suffix in the last stich (הַיְהוָה יִגְאָלֶךָ “the LORD will redeem you”). Gelston (2010, 74) categorises this shift as contextual assimilation.
- d) **∅ / ὁ θεός σου**] This is a plus. In Mic 6.8, the translator adds κυρίου “Lord” to אֱלֹהֶיךָ “your God.” The addition here in 4.10 serves to explicitise the identity of the Lord as the audience’s God who will rescue the Israelites from Babylon.⁶

4.5.11 Micah 4.11

MT ועתה נאספו עליך גוים רבים האמרים תחנה ותחזו בציון עינינו
 And now many nations are assembled against you;
 They say, “Let her be defiled,
 And let our eyes gaze upon Zion.”

LXX καὶ νῦν ἐπισυνήχθη ἐπὶ σὲ ἔθνη πολλὰ οἱ λέγοντες ἐπιχαρούμεθα καὶ ἐπόψονται ἐπὶ Σιών οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν
 And now many nations have been assembled against you;
 They say, “We will rejoice
 And our eyes shall gaze upon Zion.”

- a) **תִּחְנַח / ἐπιχαρούμεθα**] This is a shift in person, voice, number and meaning. ἐπιχαίρω “to rejoice over” usually renders תִּחְנַח “to rejoice.” In the context of the positive statement in the last stich, this rendering likely reflects an ideological shift. Gelston (2010, 75) suggests it is a contextual assimilation.

⁶ Support for this conclusion can be found in Wade’s (2003, 161) assessment of the pluses ὁ θεός σου “your God” (Exod 13.5, 11) in the Tabernacle Accounts. She claims that the pluses identify the Lord referred to in the LXX as God.

4.5.12 Micah 4.12

MT והמה לא ידעו מחשבות יהוה ולא הבינו עצתו כי קבצם כעמיר גרנה
 And they do not know the thoughts of the LORD
 And they did not understand his counsel
 For he has gathered them as sheaves (to the) threshing floor.

LXX και⁷ αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν λογισμὸν κυρίου καὶ οὐ συνήκαν τὴν βουλήν αὐτοῦ ὅτι
 συνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ὡς δράγματα ἄλωνος
 And they did not know the thought of the Lord
 And they did not understand his counsel
 For he has gathered them together as sheaves of a threshing floor.

a) **מחשבות / τὸν λογισμὸν**] This shift from plural מחשבות “thoughts” to singular τὸν λογισμὸν “thought” indicates the broader shift from not knowing the LORD’s thoughts in general to not knowing the specific plan of the LORD. Again, Gelston (2010, 75) classifies this shift as contextual assimilation.

4.5.13 Micah 4.13

MT קומי ודושי בתציון ביקרניך אשים ברזל ופרסתיך אשים נחושה והדקות עמים
 ליהוה בצעם וחילם לאדון כל־הארצות וההרמותי⁸
 Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion
 For I will make your horn iron
 And I will make your hoofs bronze
 And you will beat to pieces many peoples
 And you will devote their gain to the LORD
 And their wealth to the lord of all the earth.

LXX ἀνάστηθι καὶ ἀλόα αὐτοὺς θύγατερ Σιων ὅτι τὰ κέρατά σου θήσομαι σιδηρᾶ καὶ τὰς ὀπλάς
 σου θήσομαι χαλκᾶς καὶ κατατήξεις⁹ λαοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ ἀναθήσεις τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ πλῆθος
 αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς
 Arise and thresh them, O daughter of Zion,
 For I will make your horns iron
 And your hoofs I will make bronze
 And you will liquidate many peoples,
 And devote their multitude to the Lord
 And their strength to the Lord of the whole earth.

⁷ δὲ in postpositive position instead of καὶ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

⁸ Archaic form of the 2fs (GKC, §44h).

⁹ Followed by ἐν αὐτοῖς ἔθνη καὶ λεπτονεῖς in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- a) \emptyset / αὐτούς] This is a plus. Phelan (1982, 168) says perhaps it is based on a Hebrew *Vorlage* that contained וְדוּשִׁים “and thresh them.” Before positing a different *Vorlage*, we should consider the possibility of an intentional, if not subconscious, shift. Since דוּשׁ “to thresh” is usually followed by the object that is threshed, the translator likely supplied the expected object (e.g., Judges 8.7 וְדִשְׁתִּי אֶת־בְּשָׂרְכֶם “and I will thresh your bodies” and תְּדוּשׁ גּוֹיִם “you thresh the nations”).
- b) קַרְנֵי / τὰ κέρατά σου] This was a shift from singular to plural. Throughout the Bible קַרְנֵי “horn” is used metaphorically for power and strength (e.g., 2 Sam 22.3; Ps 148.14; Lam 2.17). Here, the translator seems to be understanding it metaphorically but in a different sense than the Hebrew—along with פְּרָסוֹת “hoofs” > ὀπλάς “hoofs,” κέρατά “horns” were understood metonymically, representing the entire animal that will thresh and crush many peoples.
- c) וְהִדְקוֹת / καὶ κατατήξεις] The Greek rendering is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX. Several Gk manuscripts (A', Q, 198, 233', 534, 764) attest λεπυνεῖς “you will make fine” (Ziegler 1943, 216), which Schwantes (1962, 119) explains as a misreading of הַרְקוֹת from רָקַק “to spit.” It appears that he meant רַקוֹת “thin” (Gen 41.20, 27) in which case there would be no reason to suggest a misreading because Gen 41.3, 4 attest דְּקוֹת “thin.” Further, the most common rendering for דְּקַק “to beat to pieces” is λεπύνω “to make fine” so it is far

more likely that λεπτόνω “to make fine” was added later in place of the *hapax legomenon* κατατήκω “to liquidate.”

- d) **וְהִתְרַמְתִּי / καὶ ἀναθήσεις]** Phelan (1982, 168) suggests a Hebrew *Vorlage* of **וְהִתְרַמְתִּי**.

While his suggestion is possible, another explanation is that the Greek rendering is not a translation shift. It may, instead, preserve an archaic form of the 2fs (GKC, §44h) that was not corrected by the Massoretes nor marked by the *Qere* reading (cf. Jer 2.33; 3.4, 5; 31.21; 46.11).¹⁰

Even if the Hebrew verb should be understood as a 1cs (**וְהִתְרַמְתִּי** “and I will devote”), the translator has intervened so frequently in this context that it likely happened here as well. The LORD has commanded daughter Zion to arise and thresh that he might strengthen her and that she might defeat her enemies and devote their wealth to the LORD. A switch to the prophet speaking in the last two stichoi would not have made sense to the translator, leading him to render **וְהִתְרַמְתִּי** as a second person singular. Given the translator’s tendency to clarify the text for his target audience (e.g., supplying the object αὐτούς “them” earlier in the same verse), we should resist the temptation to explain these differences as reflecting a different Hebrew *Vorlage* (unless, of course, something in the context points to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* [cf. 2.1 and 5.6 (Gk 5.7)]).

- e) **בְּעָצָב / πλῆθος αὐτῶν]** This is a unique rendering. Usually **עָצָב** “wealth” is rendered with πλεονεξία “greediness” (3x)¹¹ or ὠφέλεια “gain” (2x).¹² Gelston (2010, 75) suggests it is an instance of semantic liberty taken by the translator.

¹⁰ Schwantes (1962, 120) cites **וְהִתְרַמְתִּי** “muster” in Mic 4.14 as another example of the preservation of the archaic form. However, this is the normal Hitpolel *yiqtol* 2fs form.

¹¹ Ps 119.36; Jer 22.17; Hab 2.9.

4.5.14 Micah 4.14 [5.1]

- MT עָתָה תִּתְגַּדְדִי בַת־דָּוִד מְצֹר שָׁם עָלֵינוּ בַּשִּׁבְט יָבוּ עַל־הַלְחִי אֵשׁ שֶׁל יִשְׂרָאֵל
 Now gather in the troops, O daughter of troops;
 He has laid a siege against us;
 With a rod they strike upon the cheek
 The judge of Israel.
- LXX νῦν ἐμφοραθήσεται θυγάτηρ¹³ ἐμφοραγμῶ¹⁴ συνοχὴν ἔταξεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν ῥάβδῳ
 πατάξουσιν ἐπὶ σιαγόνα τὰς φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ
 Now the daughter will be walled in with a wall;
 He appointed a siege against us
 With a rod they will smite upon the cheek
 The tribes of Israel.

- a) **יִתְגַּדְדִי / ἐμφοραθήσεται**] Hitpolel of **דָּגַג** “to gather” is rendered variously in Gk— κόπτω “to strike” (Jer 41.5 [Gk 48.5]; 47.5 [Gk 29.5]), ἐντομίδας οὐ μὴ ποιήσωσιν “to make bald” (Jer 16.6), καταλύω “to lodge” (Jer 5.7), κατατέμνω “to cut in pieces” (1 Kgs 18.28), and φοιβάω “to cleanse” (Deut 14.1). The verb **דָּגַג** “to gather in troops” was mistaken for **דָּגַג** “to wall up” (also Gelston 2010, 75) (common *dalet/resh* confusion). The translator may have missed the final *yod*, resulting in the shift from 2fs to 3s.
- b) **דָּוִד־בַּת / θυγάτηρ ἐμφοραγμῶ**] **בַּת** “O daughter of” was not understood as part of the vocative phrase but as the subject of ἐμφοραθήσεται “she will be walled in.” **דָּוִד** “troop” is usually rendered μονόζωνος “lightly armed man” (10x)¹⁵ or γεδδουρ “troop” (5x),¹⁶ and ἐμφοραγμός “a wall” occurs only here and Sirach 27.14 so it is impossible to determine what it normally renders. The lexical shift was a mistake (similar to reading **דָּגַג** “to wall

¹² Job 22.3; Ps 30.10.

¹³ Followed by Ἐφραῖμ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

¹⁴ ἐν φραγμῶ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

¹⁵ 2 Sam 22.30; 2 Kgs 5.2; 6.23; 13.20, 21; 24.2 (4x); Job 29.25.

¹⁶ 1 Sam 30.8, 15 (2x), 23; 1 Chr 12.22.

up” for דָּרָג “to gather in troops” earlier in the verse) where the noun דָּרָג “troop” was mistaken for דָּרַג “wall” (common *dalet/resh* confusion).¹⁷

- c) **מְצוֹר** / συνοχή] This was also rendered συνοχή “siege” in Jer 52.5. Usually it is rendered with περιοχή “blockade.”
- d) **שֹׁפֵט** / τὰς φυλάς]¹⁸ φυλή “tribe” typically renders מְטֵה “tribe” or שֹׁבֵט “tribe.” The translator likely misread שֹׁבֵט “tribe” for שֹׁפֵט “judge” mistaking *pe* for *bet* in the Assyrian square script (𐤑/𐤒).

4.6 Micah 5

4.6.1 Micah 5.1 [5.2]

MT וְאַתָּה בֵּית־לְחֶם אֶפְרַתָּה צָעִיר לְהִיּוֹת בְּאַלְפֵי יְהוּדָה מִמָּדָּד לִי יֵצֵא לְהִיּוֹת מוֹשֵׁל בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וּמוֹצָאֲתוֹ מִקֶּדֶם מִימֵי עוֹלָם

But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah,
Too little to be among the thousands of Judah,
From you shall go out for me
One who is to be ruler in Israel
And his goings out are from of old, from ancient days.

LXX καὶ σύ Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Εφραθα ὀλιγοστὸς εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰουδα ἐκ σοῦ
μοι ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ καὶ αἱ ἔξοδοι αὐτοῦ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἐξ ἡμερῶν
αἰῶνος
And you, O Bethlehem, house of Ephratha,
Are (too) few in number to be among the thousands of Judah;
One from you shall go out for me
To become a ruler in Israel
And his goings out are from the beginning, from ancient days.

¹⁷ Also Gelston (2010, 103*).

¹⁸ This shift is not noted by Gelston.

- a) Ø / οἶκος] This is a plus. Schwantes (1962, 126) suggests that the plus may have resulted from dittography but this is unlikely because of the spacially intervening לֶחֶם “bread.” Perhaps the translator, aware of 1 Chr 2.50-51, where Bethlehem is identified as the grandchild of Ephrathah, added οἶκος “house” to clarify the relationship between Bethlehem and Ephrathah. Furthermore, Ephrathah and Bethlehem are parallel in Ruth 4.11. Alternatively, בֵּית אֶפְרַתָּה “house of Ephrathah” may have been original and בֵּית-לְחֶם “Bethlehem” was a later gloss.¹⁹

4.6.2 Micah 5.2 [5.3]

MT לָכֵן יִתְּנֵם עַד-עֵת יוֹלְדָה יוֹלְדָה וְיָתֵר אֶחָיו יָשׁוּבוּן עַל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
Therefore, he will give them up
Until the time when she who is in labor has given birth;
Then the rest of his brothers
Will return to the sons of Israel.

LXX διὰ τοῦτο δώσει αὐτοὺς ἕως καιροῦ τικτούσης τέξεται καὶ οἱ ἐπίλοιποι τῶν ἀδελφῶν
αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέψουσιν ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ
Therefore, he will give them up
Until the time when she who is in labor gives birth,
And the rest of their brothers
Will return to the sons of Israel.

- a) יִלְדָּה / τέξεται] Though *qatal* to future indicative is rare, it should not be considered a shift. The setting of the verse is clearly future and the *qatal* was used in a persistent (future) perfective sense (Waltke and O’Connor 1990, §30.5.1d).
- b) יָתֵר / τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν] This is an interpretive shift from a 3ms suffix to a 3p pronoun to harmonise with the 3p object pronoun in the first stich.

¹⁹ Hev attests καὶ σύ οἶκο[ς ...ε]φραθα (Tov 2003, 41) which is potentially reconstructed as “and you, hous[e of E]phratha.”

4.6.3 Micah 5.3 [5.4]

MT עָמַד וְרָעָה בְּעֹז יְהוָה בְּגִיאֹן שֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו וַיֵּשְׁבוּ כִּי־עָתָה יִגְדַּל עַד־אַפְסֵי־אָרֶץ
 And he will stand and shepherd (his flock) in the strength of the LORD,
 In the majesty of the name of the LORD his God,
 And they shall dwell (secure)
 For then he will be great to the ends of the earth.

LXX καὶ στήσεται καὶ ὄψεται καὶ ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποῖμνιον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἰσχύι κυρίου καὶ ἐν τῇ
 δόξῃ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν ὑπάρξουσιν²⁰ διότι νῦν μεγαλυνθήσεται ἕως ἄκρων
 τῆς γῆς
 And he will stand and see and tend his flock in the strength of the Lord
 And they will exist in the glory of the name of the Lord their God
 For now he shall be great to the ends of the earth.

a) Ø / καὶ ὄψεται] This is a plus. Following Ryssel (1887, 85), Schwantes (1962, 131-132)

argues that ὄψεται “he will see” resulted from a confusion of רָעָה “to shepherd” for רָאָה
 “to see,” which was later corrected but “both original mistranslation and correction were
 left standing side by side.”

b) Ø / τὸ ποῖμνιον αὐτοῦ] This is a plus added to explicitise the object of his tending.

c) וַיֵּשְׁבוּ וַיֵּשְׁבוּ / καὶ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν

ὑπάρξουσιν] The translator omits the *vav* conjunction on וַיֵּשְׁבוּ “and they will dwell
 (secure)” because he apparently read this word together with the preceding words. This
 misreading motivated the harmonising shift of the 3ms suffix on אֱלֹהָיו “his God” to the
 3p pronoun in τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτῶν “their God.” In the Hebrew syntax, וַיֵּשְׁבוּ “and they will
 dwell (secure)” is a new clause and בְּגִיאֹן שֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו “in the majesty of the name of

²⁰ ὑπάρξουσιν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

the LORD his God” modifies וְרָעָה “and he will shepherd.” The translator read this clause as a modifier for how they will exist (ὕπαρξουσιν “they will exist”).

- d) וַיָּשְׁבוּ / ὕπαρξουσιν] This is not a common rendering (Ps 55.20 is the only other example). It is unclear why the translator chose this rendering.

4.6.4 Micah 5.4 [5.5]

MT וְהָיָה זֶה שְׁלוֹם אֲשׁוּר כִּי־יָבֹא בְּאַרְצֵנוּ וְכִי יִדְרֹךְ בְּאַרְמְנֵינוּ וְהִקְמֵנוּ עָלָיו שְׁבָעָה רָעִים וְשְׁמֹנֶה נְסִיכֵי אָדָם

And he will be (their) peace.
When the Assyrian comes into our land
And tread in our palaces,
Then we will raise against him seven shepherds
And eight princes of men.

LXX καὶ ἔσται αὕτη εἰρήνη Ἀσσύρ²¹ ὅταν²² ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῆ ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπεγεροθήσονται ἐπ’ αὐτὸν ἑπτὰ ποιμένες καὶ ὀκτὼ δῆγματα ἀνθρώπων
And this will be peace.
When Assour comes against our land
And when he embarks on our country
Then seven shepherds will be stirred up against him
And eight stings of people.

- a) הָיָה / αὕτη] This is an interpretive shift from a masculine to a feminine pronoun, which results in the depersonalisation of the people’s peace. Instead of it being embodied by the shepherding ruler, it is merely a peaceful circumstance.
- b) בְּאַרְמְנֵינוּ / ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ὑμῶν] At least three explanations exist. First, the translator read בְּאַרְמְנֵינוּ “in our palaces” as בְּאַרְמְתָנוּ “in our open country” (*resh/dalet* confusion

²¹ Ἀσσύριος in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

²² Occurs before Ἀσσύριος in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

and omission of the first *nun*). Tov (1984, 57-58) points to other renderings of אֶרְמוֹן “palace” as γῆ “earth” or χώρα “country.” Second, the translator made an intentional shift to maintain the parallelism with בְּאֶרְצֵנוּ “in our land.” Third, a mistranslation occurred at Amos 3.9 (תַּרְמוֹנוֹת “fortresses” > τὰς χώρας “countries” [2x]),²³ which influenced all subsequent translations of this word in the Twelve Prophets. Before Amos 3.9, it is rendered with the expected θεμέλιον “foundation” (Hos 8.14; Amos 1.4, 7, 10, 12, 14; 2.2, 5). After Amos 3.9, it is rendered with the unexpected (erroneous) χώρα “country” (Amos 3.10, 11; 6.8; Mic 5.4). The third explanation seems most likely.

- c) **וַיִּקְמְנוּ / καὶ ἐπεγεροθήσονται**] This is a shift from Hiphil *w^eqatal* 1cp to future passive 3p.

Perhaps the translator read a Hophal וַיִּקְמְנוּ “and they will be raised up” (omission of *nun*).

- d) **נְסִיךְ / δῆγματα**] This is a *hapax legomenon* in the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible

(it also occurs in Wisdom 16.5, 9). נְסִיךְ “prince” normally renders ἄρχων “ruler” (Jos 13.21; Ps 83.12 [Gk 82.12]; Ezek 32.30). Hillers (1984, 68) suggests that the translator’s rendering of נְסִיךְ “prince” may have come from נֶשֶׁךְ “a bite” (also Wolff 1990, 132n4e; Schwantes 1962, 134; Gelston 2010, 76).

²³ Gelston (2010, 80*) suggests “G may have misread a possibly damaged *Vorlage* as תַּרְמוֹת.”

4.6.5 Micah 5.5 [5.6]

MT וְרָעוּ אֶת־אֶרֶץ אַשּׁוּר בַּחֶרֶב וְאֶת־אֶרֶץ נִמְרֹד בַּפְּתָחֶיהָ וְהֵצִיל מֵאֲשׁוּר כִּי־יָבוֹא
בְּאֶרְצֵנוּ וְכִי יִדְרֹךְ בְּגִבּוֹלֵנוּ

They will shepherd the land of Assyria with the sword
And the land of Nimrod at its entrances;
And he will deliver (us) from the Assyrian
When he comes into our land
And when he treads within our border.

LXX καὶ ποιμανοῦσι²⁴ τὸν Ἀσσοῦρ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ τὴν γῆν τοῦ Νεβρωδ ἐν τῇ τάφρῳ αὐτῆς
καὶ ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ Ἀσσοῦρ ὅταν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑμῶν καὶ ὅταν ἐπιβῆ ἐπὶ τὰ ὅρια ὑμῶν
And they will tend Assour with the sword
And the land of Nebrod with her ditch
And he will rescue (us) from Assour
When he comes against our land
And when he embarks upon our borders.

- a) אֶת־אֶרֶץ / Ø] There are at least three possible explanations for the minus. First, unlike texts where the construct chain אֶרֶץ אַשּׁוּר “the land of Assyria” is rendered ἐν χώρᾳ Ἀσσυρίων “the country of Assyrians” (Isa 7.18), ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων “the country of the Assyrians” (Isa 27.13) and γῆς Ἀσσυρίων “the land of Assyrians” (Hos 11.11), in Mic 5.5 אַשּׁוּר “Assyrian” is rendered τὸν Ἀσσοῦρ “Assour.” Here in 5.5 [5.6], the translator likely deleted אֶרֶץ “land” in order to harmonise the context. It is an individual (Assour) who will be dealt with and lands are typically not associated with an individual. Second, אֶרֶץ “land” may have been lost through *homoioarchon* (*alef* at beginning of אֶרֶץ “land” and אַשּׁוּר “Assyrian”). Third, אֶרֶץ “land” was inserted into the Hebrew text (before it was translated into Greek) to parallel its use with נִמְרֹד “Nimrod” in the following stich (Hillers 1984, 68; Schwantes 1962, 135).

²⁴ ποιμανοῦσιν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

b) בַּפְּתִיחָהּ / ἐν τῇ τάρφῳ αὐτῆς] This is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX. The typical rendering is θύρα “door.” Perhaps a metathesis caused the translator to read פֶּתַח “pit” (also Gelston 2010, 76). Since פֶּתַח “entrance” does not parallel חֶרֶב “sword” the translator may have struggled with the rendering (α’, trying to maintain the parallelism, rendered it ἐν σειρομασταις αὐτῆς “with its spears”). Another possibility is that the Hebrew *Vorlage* was בַּפְּתִיחָהּ “dagger.”

c) בְּגִבּוֹלוֹ / τὰ ὄρια ὑμῶν] This is a shift from singular to plural.

4.6.6 Micah 5.6 [5.7]

MT וְהָיָה שְׂאֵרֵית יַעֲקֹב בְּקֶרֶב עַמִּים רַבִּים כְּטֵל מֵאֵת יְהוָה בְּרַבִּיבִים עַל־יַעֲשֹׁב אֲשֶׁר
לֹא־יִקְנֶה לְאִישׁ וְלֹא יִחַל לְבְנֵי אָדָם

Then the remnant of Jacob will be in the midst of many people
Like dew from the LORD
Like showers on the grass
Which do not wait for a man
Or delay for the sons of man.

LXX καὶ ἔσται τὸ ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ἰακωβ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν πολλῶν ὡς δρόσος
παρὰ κυρίου πίπτουσα καὶ ὡς ἄρνες ἐπ’²⁵ ἄγρωσιν ὅπως μὴ συναχθῆ μηδεὶς μηδὲ ὑποστῆ ἐν
υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων
And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the nations
In the midst of many peoples
Like dew falling from the Lord
And like lambs in the grass
In order that none among the sons of men will assemble or resist.

a) Ø / ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] This is a plus. The absence of this phrase in the MT disrupts the parallel structure both in v. 6 [Gk v. 7] and between v. 6 and v. 7 [Gk v. 7 and v. 8]. It is, therefore, likely that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of v. 6 contained בְּגוֹיִם “among the nations”

²⁵ ἐπὶ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

and was lost through *homoioarchon* (*bet* at beginning of בְּגוֹיִם “among the nations” and בְּקֶרֶב “in the midst of”). Gelston (2010, 104*) suggests that the clause was in the Hebrew *Vorlage* in v.7 [Gk v.8] but added here. H_{ev} and 4QXII^e are followed by a lacuna but the space does not seem to allow for the additional word.

- b) Ø / πίπτουσα] This is a plus supplied to explicitise how the dew comes from the Lord (cf. 2 Sam 17.12, which states that δρόσος “dew” πίπτει “falls” on the ground).
- c) כְּרִבְיָיִם / καὶ ὡς ἄρνες] The same addition occurs in the parallel construction in 5.7 [Gk 5.8] (כְּכַפִּיר “like a young lion” > καὶ ὡς σκύμνος “and like a lion cub”). Gelston (2010, 104*) suggests the addition “may be merely stylistic or contextual assimilation.”
- d) כְּרִבְיָיִם / ὡς ἄρνες] It is difficult to explain this lexical shift given the parallelism of טל “dew” and רִבְיָיִם “showers.” Perhaps the translator did not know the meaning of רִבְיָיִם “showers” and provided a slot translation (out of the five other times it occurs in MT, it is rendered σταγών “drop” [Ps 65.11 (Gk 64.11); 72.6 (Gk 71.6)], νιφετός “falling snow” (Deut 32.2), ποιμήν “shepherd” (Jer 3.3) and πλησμονή “fullness” (Jer 14.22). The rendering in Jer 3.3 (ποιμήν “shepherd”) may have influenced the translator of Micah. Alternatively, כְּרִבְיָיִם “like showers” became כְּרָבִים through haplography of a *bet/yod* cluster, then through metathesis and a *bet/kaf* confusion the translator read כְּכָרִים “like he-lambs” (cf. Jer 51.40 [Gk 28.40 = ἀρήν “lamb”]). Gelston (2010, 104*) posits “inner-Greek corruption of ρανίδες.”

- e) אֲשֶׁר / ὅπως] This is an unusual rendering, but אֲשֶׁר “which” or וְאֲשֶׁר “and which” is rendered this way twelve other times²⁶ in the LXX (out of 4,952).
- f) יִקְוֶה / συναχθῆ] The translator likely read יִקְוֶה “he/it will be collected” (Niphal of קָוָה) instead of יִקְוֶה “he/it will wait” (the same translation shift occurs in Gen 1.9 and Jer 3.17; in Jer 8.15, the translator rendered the Piel stem of קָוָה with συναγω “to gather”).
- g) לֹא־שׁ / Ø] This is a minus. This was deleted because it was unnecessary for the new syntax (the combined parallel Hebrew lines into one Greek line).
- h) יִיחַל / ὑποστανῆ] This is a unique rendering. Usually יִחַל “to wait” is rendered ἐλπίζω “to hope, expect” (15x),²⁷ ὑπομένω “to remain, wait” (6x, including Mic 7.7)²⁸ or ἐπελπίζω “to base hope” (6x).²⁹ The proximate renderings (especially in Mic 7.7) indicate that the translator knew the meaning of יִחַל “to wait” but rendered it this way to fit the context, which had already shifted from waiting (יִקְוֶה “it will wait”) to assembling (συναχθῆ “he will assemble”). The last two Hebrew lines describe the dew from the LORD and the showers on the grass. The translator adjusted their purpose to describe how the remnant of Jacob being scattered among the nations will deter the nations from assembling against or resisting God’s people.

4.6.7 Micah 5.7 [5.8]

²⁶ Exod 20.26; Deut 4.10; 6.3; 1 Kgs 22.16; 2 Chr 1.11; Neh 8.14, 15; 13.1; Eccl 7.21, 22; 8.12; Dan 1.8.

²⁷ Ps 31.25; 33.18, 22; 38.16; 42.6, 12; 43.5; 69.4; 71.14; 130.5, 7; 131.3; 147.11; Isa 42.4; 51.5.

²⁸ 2 Kgs 6.33; Job 6.11; 14.14; 32.16; Lam 3.21; Mic 7.7.

²⁹ Ps 119.43, 49, 74, 81, 114, 147.

MT וְהָיָה שְׂאֲרֵית יַעֲקֹב בְּגוֹיִם בְּקֶרֶב עַמִּים כְּאֲרִיָּה בְּבֵהֲמוֹת יַעַר כְּכַפִּיר
בְּעֵדְרֵי־צֹאן אֲשֶׁר אִם עָבַר וְרָמַס וְטָרַף וְאִין מֵצִיל

And the remnant of Jacob will be among the nations
In the midst of many peoples
Like a lion among the beasts of the forest
Like a young lion among flocks of sheep
Which when it passes through, tramples down and tears (its prey),
There is no deliverer.

LXX καὶ ἔσται τὸ ὑπόλειμμα τοῦ Ἰακωβ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐν μέσῳ λαῶν πολλῶν ὡς λέων ἐν
κτῆνεσιν ἐν τῷ δρυμῷ καὶ ὡς σκύμνος ἐν ποιμνίῳ προβάτων ὃν τρόπον ὅταν διέλθῃ καὶ
διαστεύλας ἀρπάσῃ καὶ μὴ ἧ ὁ ἐξαιρούμενος
And the remnant of Jacob shall be among the nations
In the midst of many peoples
Like a lion among animals in the forest,
And like a lion cub among flocks of sheep,
As when it passes through and after making a selection,
It seizes (its prey) and there is no deliverer.

a) **כְּכַפִּיר / καὶ ὡς σκύμνος]** A similar καὶ “and” addition occurs in the previous verse

(**כְּרַבִּיבִים** “like showers” > καὶ ὡς ἄρνες “and like lambs”). It is not noted by Gelston but it is
also likely a stylistic assimilation.

b) **אֲשֶׁר אִם / ὃν τρόπον ὅταν]** This phrase normally renders **כְּאֲשֶׁר** “as when.” It is a unique
rendering in the LXX but does not seem to represent a translation shift.

c) **וְרָמַס / καὶ διαστεύλας]** This is a unique rendering. **רָמַס** “to trample” is usually rendered
καταπατέω “to trample underfoot” (9x),³⁰ συμπατέω “to trample underfoot” (5x),³¹ or

³⁰ 2 Chr 25.18; Ps 7.6; 91.13; Isa 16.4; 28.3; 41.25; Ezek 26.11; 34.18; Dan 8.10.

³¹ 2 Kgs 7.17, 20; 9.33; 14.9; Nah 3.14.

πατέω “to trample” (2x).³² διαστέλλω “to make a selection” usually renders בָּדַל in Hiphil “to divide” (13x).³³

- d) וְטָרַף / ἀρπάσῃ] There is a minus *vav* “and” conjunction. This is the most common rendering for טָרַף “to tear.” Schwantes (1962, 139) suggests this is a “free” rendering, but this seems unlikely since it is usually rendered this way.³⁴ As for the minus *vav* “and” conjunction, the deletion was linguistically motivated. Aejmelaeus (1993c, 55) claims, “the omission of ו in an apodosis has quite a different significance from its omission in an ordinary clause. In an apodosis καὶ is incorrect in Greek, and the omission corrects the mistake.”³⁵ In the same way, a καὶ “and” in the second clause of a temporal sentence is incorrect Greek syntax. Therefore, in order to maintain correct Greek syntax, the translator did not render the *vav* “and.” Aejmelaeus (1993c, 57) further states, “the choice between the two alternatives, καὶ or omission, is not indifferent. The decision for the latter shows that the translator saw the problem and wanted to avoid a grammatically unacceptable expression.”

4.6.8 Micah 5.8 [5.9]

MT תָּרַם יָדְךָ עַל-צָרֶיךָ וְכָל-אֹיְבֶיךָ יִכָּרְתוּ
 Your hand will be lifted up over your adversaries
 And all your enemies will be cut off.

³² Isa 1.12; 26.6.

³³ Lev 10.10; 11.47; Num 8.14; 16.9; Deut 10.8; 19.2, 7; 29.20; 1 Kgs 8.53; Ezra 8.24; Ezek 22.26; 39.14; 42.20.

³⁴ Gen 37.33; Ps 7.3; 22.14; 50.22; 104.21; Ezek 19.3, 6; 22.25, 27; Hos 5.14; 6.1; Amos 1.11; Nah 2.13.

³⁵ Technically there is no mistake; however, choosing not to render the *vav* “and” avoids a mistake.

LXX ὑψωθήσεται ἡ χεὶρ σου ἐπὶ τοὺς θλίβοντάς σε καὶ πάντες οἱ ἐχθροὶ σου
ἐξολεθρευθήσονται
Your hand will be lifted up against those oppressing you,
And all your enemies will be utterly destroyed.

- a) **צָרֶיךָ / τοὺς θλίβοντάς σε]** This is a shift from a plural noun + 2ms suffix to mp participle + direct object 2s pronoun. There is one occurrence in the MT of the participial form of **צָר** “to treat as an enemy” in Esth 8.11. The translator likely read **צָרֶיךָ** “your adversaries” as **צָרֶיךָ** “those treating you as an enemy.”
- b) **יִכְרְתוּ / ἐξολεθρευθήσονται]** This is the usual rendering. The second most common rendering is διατίθημι “to decree,” which is typically used in the context of making a covenant (**כָּרַת בְּרִית** “to cut a covenant”).

4.6.9 Micah 5.9 [5.10]

MT **וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם־הַהוּא נֶאֱמַר־יְהוָה וְהִכְרַתִּי סוּסֶיךָ מִקִּרְבְּךָ וְהֶאֱבַדְתִּי מִרְכָּבְתֶיךָ**
But it will happen on that day, declares the LORD,
That I will cut off your horses from your midst
And I will destroy your chariots.

LXX καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ³⁶ λέγει κύριος ἐξολεθρεύσω τοὺς ἵππους σου ἐκ μέσου σου καὶ ἀπολῶ τὰ ἄρματα σου
And it will be in that day, says the Lord,
I will utterly destroy your horses from your midst
And I will destroy your chariots.

- a) **וְהִכְרַתִּי / ἐξολεθρεύσω]** This is a minus *vav* “and.” See analysis in §4.6.7d for the explanation of this linguistically constrained translation shift (deleted *vav* “and”). See analysis of the previous verse (§4.6.8b) for the explanation of the lexical shift.

³⁶ Occurs before τῇ ἡμέρᾳ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

4.6.10 Micah 5.10 [5.11]

MT וְהִכַּרְתִּי עָרֵי אֶרְצְךָ וְהִרְסֹתִי בְּלִמְבַצְרֶיךָ
And I will cut off the cities of your land
And throw down all your fortifications.

LXX καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω τὰς πόλεις τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐξαρῶ πάντα τὰ ὀχυρώματά σου
And I will utterly destroy the cities of your land
And remove all your strongholds.

a) **וְהִכַּרְתִּי / καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω**] See analysis in 5.8 [Gk 5.9] for the lexical shift.

b) **וְהִרְסֹתִי / καὶ ἐξαρῶ**] This is a unique rendering. הִרְס “to throw down” is usually rendered by καθαίρω “to throw down” (16x)³⁷ or κατασκάπτω “to tear down” (11x).³⁸ ἐξάιρω “to remove” usually renders נָסַע “to pull up” (39x)³⁹ or כָּרַת “to cut off” (19x).⁴⁰ This is likely an example of the translator shifting the metaphor of throwing down fortifications to the concrete idea of removing them (concretising).

4.6.11 Micah 5.11 [5.12]

MT וְהִכַּרְתִּי בְּשִׁפְיִים מִיָּדְךָ וּמַעֲוֹנָנִים לֹא יִהְיוּ-לְךָ
And I will cut off sorceries from your hand,
And there will be no soothsayers among you.

LXX καὶ ἐξαρῶ τὰ φάρμακά σου ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου καὶ ἀποφθεγγόμενοι οὐκ ἔσονται ἐν σοί
And I will remove your sorceries from your hands,
And there will be no diviners among you.

³⁷ Exod 23.24; Judg 6.25; 1 Kgs 19.14; 2 Kgs 3.25; Ps 11.3; 28.5; Isa 14.17; 49.17; Jer 24.6; 31.28, 40; 42.10; 45.4; Lam 2.2, 17; Ezek 36.36.

³⁸ 1 Kgs 18.30; 19.10; 1 Chr 20.1; Prov 11.11; 24.31; 29.4; Jer 50.15; Ezek 13.14; 16.39; 36.35; Joel 1.17.

³⁹ Gen 35.5; Exod 13.20; 14.19 (2x); 15.22; 19.2; Num 1.51; 2.9, 16, 17, 24, 31, 34; 4.5, 15; 9.19; 10.5, 6, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 21, 22, 25, 29, 33, 34, 35; 12.15, 16; 21.11, Judg 16.14; Ezra 8.31; Eccl 10.9; Jer 4.7; Zech 10.2.

⁴⁰ 1 Sam 20.15 (2x), 16; 1 Kgs 8.25; 9.5, 7; 2 Chr 7.18; Ezek 14.8, 13, 17; 17.17; Jer 1.5; Joel 1.5, 9; Obad 9, 10; Mic 5.11; Nah 2.1; Zeph 1.3, 4.

- a) **וְהִכָּרְתִּי / καὶ ἐξαρῶ]** **כָּרַת** “to cut off” is more commonly rendered with ἐξολεθρεύω “to utterly destroy” (80x, including Mic 5.8, 9, 10, 12 [Gk 5.9, 10, 11, 13]) or διατίθημι “to decree” (72x). Though ἐξαίρω “to remove” is used nineteen times to render **כָּרַת** “to cut off,” the choice to use ἐξαίρω “to remove” here seems to be a clear departure from the norm in this context.

Wolff (1990, 158) notes that **כְּשָׁפִים** “sorceries” refers not only to the practice of sorcery but the means used in the practice. The means “refers to objects that can be cast ‘from the hand,’ such as arrows, oracular lots, liver (Ezek. 21:26), staves (Hos. 4.12), peeled rods, and mandrakes (Gen. 30:14f., 37ff.).” If he is correct, then the translator may have shifted to a verb with the sense of removing because once the means of sorcery is removed from the hand, the source of evil power is removed (see the explanation below [§4.6.11a] for the concretising shift **מִיָּדְךָ** “from your hand” > ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου “from your hands”). It is interesting that the sorcerers will not be removed, only their means for evil and destruction. This may be explained by the following suggestion from Wolff (1990, 158): “The destruction of such implements of sorcery means the end of the sorcerers.”

It is also possible that this shift was not intentional and resulted from parablepsis in transmission. After copying σου “your” at the end of 5.10 [Gk 5.11] the translator’s eye went back to σου “your” earlier in the same verse and he recopied καὶ ἐξαρῶ “and I will remove.” Then his eye saw the end of the original καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω “and I will utterly destroy” and he continued copying with τὰ φάρμακά σου “your sorceries.”

- b) **כְּשֵׁפִים / τὰ φάρμακά σου**] This is a plus 2s pronoun σου “your.” This plus was likely motivated by the other 2s suffixes in vv. 9-14 [Gk 10-15] (Schwantes 1962, 140; Wolff 1990, 151).
- c) **מִיָּדָי / ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου**] This is a shift from singular to plural. The Hebrew seems to treat “hand” metaphorically, referring to possession. The translator shifts from the “hand” metaphor to literal hands (concretising) that hold the implements of sorcery; see explanation earlier in the verse (§4.6.11a) for the shift from **וְהִכַּרְתִּי** “and I will cut off” > **καὶ ἐξαρῶ** “and I will remove.”
- d) **וּמַעֲוֹנוֹתָי / καὶ ἀποφθεγγόμενοι**] The most common rendering is κληδονίζω “to practice divination” (3x)⁴¹ but this should not be considered a shift.

4.6.12 Micah 5.12 [5.13]

MT **וְהִכַּרְתִּי פְסִילֶיךָ וּמַצְבֹּתֶיךָ מִקִּרְבְּךָ וְלֹא־תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה עוֹד לְמַעֲשֵׂה יָדַיךָ**
 And I will cut off your idols and your pillars from your midst
 And you will no longer bow down to the work of your hands.

LXX **καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω τὰ γλυπτά σου καὶ τὰς στήλας σου ἐκ μέσου σου καὶ οὐκέτι μὴ προσκυνήσῃς τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν σου**
 And I will utterly destroy your carved images and your steles from your midst
 And no longer will you worship the works of your hands.

- a) **וְהִכַּרְתִּי / καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσω**] See analysis in 5.8 [Gk 5.9] for the lexical shift.
- b) **לְמַעֲשֵׂה / τοῖς ἔργοις**] This is a singular to plural shift. (See explanation in §5.5.2.3 for more details.)

⁴¹ Deut 18.10; 2 Kgs 21.6; 2 Chr 33.6.

- c) **חָרַף / τῶν χειρῶν σου**] This is a singular to plural shift. (See explanation in §5.5.2.3 for more details.)

4.6.13 Micah 5.13 [5.14]

MT **וְנִשְׁתַּחֲרַף אֲשֵׁרֵיךָ מִקִּרְבְּךָ וְהִשְׁמַדְתִּי עָרֶיךָ**
 And I will uproot your Asherim from your midst
 And I will destroy your cities.

LXX καὶ ἐκκόψω τὰ ἄλση σου ἐκ μέσου σου καὶ ἀφανιῶ τὰς πόλεις σου
 And I will cut off your groves from your midst
 And I will cause your cities to vanish.

- a) **וְנִשְׁתַּחֲרַף / καὶ ἐκκόψω**] This is a unique rendering. **נִשְׁתַּחֲרַף** “to uproot” is usually rendered **ἐξαιρῶ** “to remove” (4x)⁴² or **ἐκτίλλω** “pluck out” (3x).⁴³ **ἐκκόπτω** “to cut off” usually renders **כָּרַת** “to cut off” (11x),⁴⁴ **נָכָה** “to smite” (5x),⁴⁵ **גָּדַע** “to hew” (4x)⁴⁶ or **נָקַר** “to bore/dig” (3x).⁴⁷ The rendering here in Mic 5.13 was not a mistake or the result of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*; instead the translator was harmonising with the typical way to describe (and translate the description) of destroying the Asherim/groves. In the MT, it is typical to describe the action with **כָּרַת** “to cut off” + **אֲשֵׁרָה** “Asherah”⁴⁸ and the normal rendering in the LXX is **ἐκκόπτω** “to cut off” + **ἄλσος** “grove.”⁴⁹

⁴² Deut 29.27; 2 Chr 7.20; Jer 12.17; 18.7.

⁴³ Jer 24.6; 42.10; 45.4.

⁴⁴ Exod 34.13; Deut 20.19, 20; 1 Kgs 15.13; Job 14.7; Jer 6.6; 10.3; 22.7; 44.7, 8; 46.23.

⁴⁵ Gen 32.9; 36.35; Josh 15.16; 2 Chr 14.13, 14.

⁴⁶ Deut 7.5; Judg 21.6; 2 Chr 14.2; 31.1.

⁴⁷ Num 16.14; Judg 16.21; Prov 30.17.

⁴⁸ Exod 34.13; Jgs 6.25, 26, 28, 30; 1 Kgs 15.13; 2 Kgs 18.4; 23.14; 2 Chr 15.16.

⁴⁹ Exod 34.13; Deut 7.5, 12.3; 1 Kgs 15.13; 2 Chr 14.2; 31.1.

b) אֲשֵׁרָה / τὰ ἄλση σου] This is the common rendering (33x).⁵⁰ אֲשֵׁרָה “Asherah” is rendered similarly in Isa 17.8 and 27.9 (δένδρον “tree”). Day (1992a, 485) argues that the “ancient versions failed to recognize that OT Asherah was the name of a goddess.” Furthermore, when the LXX translators render אֲשֵׁרָה “Asherah” as some form of living tree, they may not recognise its cultic association. Day (1992a, 486) claims that “it is impossible to suppose that the Asherim were living trees.” Though the rendering in 2 Chr 34.7 (θυσιαστήριον “altar”) betrays a connection with the cult, the translator understood it as an altar upon which sacrifices were made instead of a wooden pole representing the goddess.

The renderings ταῖς Ἀστάρταις “the Astartes” in 2 Chr 24.18 and τῇ Ἀστάρτη “to Astarte” in 2 Chr 15.16 betray an understood connection between the Asherim and the Canaanite goddess who was the consort of Baal. Day (1992b, 492) suggests that the plural rendering for this goddess may be a way of referring to Canaanite gods and goddesses generally (parallel to the use of “Baals”).

It is unlikely that the rendering here in Mic 5.13 represents a translation shift. Instead, it betrays the understanding that cutting off groves of trees and causing cities to vanish is the way the Lord will execute vengeance on the nations that did not obey (5.14).

c) אֲפָרַח / καὶ ἀφανιῶ] This is a common rendering (12x – all except two are in the Hiphil stem; the exceptions are Judg 21.16 and Prov 14.11).⁵¹ We also see ἐξολεθρεύω

⁵⁰ Exod 34.13; Deut 7.5; 12.3; 16.21; Jugs 3.7; 6.25, 26, 28, 30; 1 Kgs 14.23; 15.13; 16.33; 18.19; 2 Kgs 13.6; 17.10, 16; 18.4; 21.3, 7; 23.4; , 6, 7, 14, 15; 2 Chr 14.2; 17.6; 19.3; 31.1; 33.3, 19; 34.3, 4; Mic 5.13.

⁵¹ Judg 21.16; 1 Sam 24.22; 2 Sam 22.38; 2 Kgs 10.17, 28; 21.9; Esth 3.6, 13; Prov 14.11; Ezek 14.9; Dan 11.44; Mic 5.13.

“to utterly destroy” (33x)⁵² and ἐξάiro “to remove” (13x – all except one are in the Hiphil stem; Hos 10.8 is the exception).⁵³

4.6.14 Micah 5.14 [5.15]

MT וְעָשִׂיתִי בְּאַף וּבַחֲמָה נִקְמָה אֶת־הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר לֹא שָׁמְעוּ
And in wrath and anger I will execute vengeance on the nations
That did not listen.

LXX καὶ ποιήσω ἐν ὀργῇ καὶ ἐν θυμῷ ἐκδίκησιν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀνθ' ὧν οὐκ εἰσήκουσαν
And in anger and wrath I will execute vengeance on the nations
Because they did not listen.

a) אֲשֶׁר / ἀνθ' ὧν] This is a shift from אֲשֶׁר “that” as a relative pronoun (to introduce a relative clause which modifies “the nations”) to the causative construction ἀνθ' ὧν “because,” which introduces the reason God will take vengeance. אֲשֶׁר “that” is rarely used in the causative sense (cf. Gen 30.18; Joel 4.19). Out of the 4,952 times where אֲשֶׁר “that” or וְאֲשֶׁר “and that” occurs, it is rendered with ἀντί “for” + ὅς “which” only 6 times (including this verse).⁵⁴ Here the translator is explicitising the cause of the Lord’s vengeance. Instead of merely identifying who will receive the Lord’s vengeance, the translator reminds the audience why the nations will be punished.

⁵² Deut 1.27; 6.15; 7.4, 23, 24; 9.3, 8, 14, 19, 20, 25; 12.30; 28.20, 45, 48, 61, 63; 31.3, 4; Josh 9.24; 11.20; 23.15; 24.8; 2 Sam 21.5; 1 Kgs 15.29; 2 Chr 20.10; Ps 37.38; 83.11; 92.8; 106.23, 34; 145.20; Jer 48.8.

⁵³ Num 33.52; Josh 7.12; 2 Sam 14.7, 11, 16; 1 Chr 5.25; 2 Chr 33.9; Hos 10.8; Amos 2.9 (2x); 9.8 (2x); Zech 12.9.

⁵⁴ Gen 30.18; Ezek 39.29; Joel 4.5, 19; Mic 5.14 [Gk 5.15]; Zech 1.15.

4.7 Micah 6

4.7.1 Micah 6.1

MT שְׁמַעו־נָא אֶת אֲשֶׁר־יְהוָה אָמַר קוּם רִיב אֶת־הַהָרִים וְתִשְׁמַעְנָה הַגְּבָעוֹת קוֹלִי
 Hear what the LORD says,
 Arise, plead your case with the mountains
 And let the hills hear your voice.

LXX ἀκούσατε δὴ λόγον κυρίου κύριος εἶπεν ἀνάστηθι κρίθητι πρὸς τὰ ὄρη καὶ ἀκουσάτωσαν βουνοὶ⁵⁵ φωνήν σου
 Hear now a word of the Lord,
 The Lord has said, Arise, render judgment before the mountains,
 And let hills hear your voice.

a) אֲשֶׁר אֶת / λόγον κυρίου] Some commentators (e.g., Robinson 1964, 144) suggest

inserting הַדְּבָר “the word” or דְּבַר־יְהוָה “the word of the LORD” to reconstruct the

Hebrew *Vorlage*. Another explanation seems more likely. The אֲשֶׁר clause is a covertly

headed (also referred to as a “null head” or “headless”) relative clause. Holmstedt (2002,

71) notes that “What is significant for our understanding of these covertly headed

relatives is that the semantic content of the phonologically null head must be inferred

from the context.” While it is certainly possible that a word or phrase was lost from the

Hebrew text, it is more likely that the LXX rendering reflects the translator explicitising

for the reader what had to be inferred from the context. It was a word of the Lord that the

translator wants his audience to hear. A form of דְּבָר “word” following the command to

listen is common in the Twelve Prophets (Hos 4.1; Amos 3.1; 4.1; 5.1; 7.16; 8.11; Zech

7.12; and 8.9; also, see the explanation of Mic 1.2 in §4.2.2a).

b) אָמַר / εἶπεν] This is a shift from a participle to an aorist verb.

⁵⁵ oi is present before the noun in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- c) **הַגְּבְעוֹת / βουνοὶ**] This is a minus article. Gelston (2010, 105*) claims that the minus reflects a different Hebrew *Vorlage* but he does not provide the rationale for his conclusion. The article is present in various Greek manuscripts as well as α', σ' and θ', reflecting that it was likely lost in translation through haplography and later added to correct toward the Hebrew text.

4.7.2 Micah 6.2

MT שְׁמְעוּ הַרִים אֶת־רִיב יְהוָה וְהָאֲתָנִים מִסְדֵי אָרֶץ כִּי רִיב לִיהוָה עַם־עַמּוֹ וְעַם־יִשְׂרָאֵל
יְתוֹכַח

Listen, O mountains, to the case of the LORD
And (listen), you enduring streams, foundations of the earth,
For the LORD has a case against his people
And with Israel he will contend.

LXX ἀκούσατε λαοί⁵⁶ τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ αἱ φάραγγες θεμέλια τῆς γῆς ὅτι κρίσις τῷ κυρίῳ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ διελεγχθήσεται
Hear, you peoples, the judgment of the Lord
And (hear), you chasms, foundations of the earth
For the Lord has a judgment against his people
And with Israel he will dispute.

- a) **הַרִים / λαοὶ**] A similar shift occurs in Hab 3.10 (הַרִים “mountains” > λαοὶ “people”). The present rendering may have been influenced by 1.2 (שְׁמְעוּ עַמִּים “Hear, O peoples” > ἀκούσατε λαοὶ “Hear, O peoples”) (also Gelston 2010, 77). This overt theological intrusion by the translator shifts the audience of the divine speech from merely witnesses of the trial scene to the witnesses *and* those on trial.

- b) **וְהָאֲתָנִים**⁵⁷ / καὶ αἱ φάραγγες] This is a unique rendering. אֲתָנָן “enduring stream” is usually rendered with a word for “ruler” δυνάστης (e.g., Job 12.19), “power” κράτος (e.g.,

⁵⁶ βουνοὶ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

Gen 49.24), or “strong” ἰσχυρός (e.g., Num 24.21). Muraoka (1973, 22) argues that the translator was ignorant of the meaning of הַאֲתָנִים “the enduring streams” and resorted to a parallel summoning in Ezek 6.3. There, the LORD commands Ezekiel to call out to the mountains (הַרִים) and hills (גְּבוּעוֹת), ravines (אֲפִיקִים > φάραγξ) and valleys (גְּאִית). Theocharous (2012, 215) suggests a “certain monocularity” to Muraoka’s approach due in part to his assumption that LXX-Minor Prophets and LXX-Ezekiel (α) were translated by the same person. Instead, Theocharous argues that the translator of LXX-Micah rendered הַאֲתָנִים “the enduring streams” according to the association of נַחַל “wadi” and אֵיתָן “perennial” in Amos 5.24 and Deut 21.4 (given that φάραγξ “ravine” most commonly renders נַחַל “wadi” in the LXX). Whether the translator drew his understanding of אֵיתָן “perennial” from Ezekiel, Amos, Deuteronomy or simply the immediate context (appositional מְסֻדֵי אֲרֶץ “foundations of the earth”), it seems clear that he did not know its exact meaning and provided a slot translation.

- c) **יְתַנְּבֹחַ / διελεγχθήσεται]** This is the only occurrence of the Hitpael of יָבַח “to contend” in MT but Niphal of יָבַח “to reason together” is rendered with διέλεγχω “to dispute” in Isa 1.18.

⁵⁷ Some commentators suggest emending to הַאֲזִינִי “give ear” based on its parallel with שְׁמַעוּ “listen” here as well as in Isa 1.2 and Judg 5.3 (Wolff 1990, 164; Smith 1984, 50).

4.7.3 Micah 6.3

MT בִּי עַמִּי מָה־עָשִׂיתִי לָךְ וּמָה הִלְאַתִּיךָ עֲנֵה לִּי
 O my people, what have I done to you?
 And how have I wearied you?
 Answer me!

LXX λαός μου τί ἐποίησά σοι ἢ τί ἐλύπησά σε ἢ τί παρηνώχλησά σοι ἀποκρίθητί μοι
 O my people, what have I done to you?
 Or how did I grieve you?
 Or how did I annoy you?
 Answer me!

a) וּמָה הִלְאַתִּיךָ / ἢ τί ἐλύπησά σε ἢ τί παρηνώχλησά σοι] הִלְאַתִּי “to be weary” occurs only here

in the Twelve Prophets. Perhaps the translator did not know the meaning of the term and rendered it two different ways (double translation) to increase the likelihood that he would catch the meaning in one of the renderings (cf. Wolff 1990, 165; Schwantes 1962, 147; Hillers 1984, 76 n. e). Elsewhere in the LXX it is rendered *παρέγω* “to contend” (Isa 7.13 [2x]), *δύναμαι* “to be able” (Exod 7.18 and Prov 26.15), *κοπιάω* “to toil, become weary” (Isa 16.12 and 47.13), *ἐκλύω* “to become weary” (Jer 12.5), and *παραλύω* “to weaken” (Gen 19.11).

4.7.4 Micah 6.4

MT כִּי הִעֲלִיתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וּמִבֵּית עֲבָדִים פְּדִיתִיךָ וְאֶשְׁלַח לְפָנֶיךָ אֶת־מֹשֶׁה אֶהֱרֹן וּמִרְיָם

For I brought you up from the land of Egypt
 And from the house of slavery I ransomed you
 And I sent before you Moses, Aaron and Miriam.

LXX διότι ἀνήγαγόν σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου⁵⁸ ἐξ οἴκου δουλείας ἐλυτρώσάμην σε καὶ ἐξαπέστειλα πρὸ προσώπου σου τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ Ααρων καὶ Μαριαμ
 For I brought you up from the land of Egypt
 From a house of slavery I redeemed you
 And I sent before you Moses and Aaron and Mariam.

⁵⁸ Followed by καὶ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

a) **וְ** / **καὶ Ααρων**] This is a plus **καὶ** “and.”

4.7.5 Micah 6.5

MT **עמי זכרנא מהיעץ בלק מלך מואב ומהענה אתו בלעם בן־בעור מן־השטים**
עד־הגלגל למען דעת צדקות יהוה

O my people, please remember what Balak the king of Moab devised
 And what Balaam son of Beor answered him
 (remember what happened) from Shittim to Gilgal
 In order that you may know the righteous acts of the LORD.

LXX **λαός μου μνήσθητι δὴ τί ἐβουλεύσατο κατὰ σοῦ Βαλακ βασιλεὺς Μωαβ καὶ τί ἀπεκρίθη**
αὐτῷ Βαλααμ υἱὸς τοῦ Βεωρ ἀπὸ τῶν σχοίνων ἕως τοῦ Γαλγαλ ὅπως γνωσθῆ ἡ δικαιοσύνη
τοῦ κυρίου
 O my people, now remember what Balak king of Moab devised against you
 And what Balaam son of Beor answered him
 (remember what happened) from the reeds as far as Gilgal
 In order that the justice of the Lord might be known.

a) **∅ / κατὰ σοῦ**] The same plus occurs in S. This is perhaps a case of the translator explicitising the people as the subject of the offense.

b) **השטים / τῶν σχοίνων**] Three times in the LXX it is rendered as the proper noun **Σαττιν** “Sattin” (Num 25.1; Josh 2.1; 3.1). Twice it is rendered **τῶν σχοίνων** “the reeds” (Mic 6.5 and Joel 4.18).

c) **דעת / γνωσθῆ**] This is a shift from Qal infinitive construct to aorist passive subjunctive 3s.

d) **צדקות / ἡ δικαιοσύνη**] This is a shift from plural to singular, which appears to shift from calling on the audience to know the righteous *acts* of the LORD to recalling that the

LORD's involvement with Balak, Balaam and the events from the reeds to Gilgal were intended to show forth his righteous *character*.

4.7.6 Micah 6.6

MT בַּמָּה אֶקְדָּם יְהוָה אֶכְפֹּף לְאֱלֹהֵי מְרוֹם הָאָרְצִים בְּעוֹלוֹת בְּעֹגְלִים בְּנֵי שָׁנָה
 With what should I approach the LORD?
 (with what) should I bow myself to God on high?
 Should I approach him with burnt offerings, with calves a year old?

LXX ἐν τίνι καταλάβω τὸν κύριον ἀντιλήμψομαι θεοῦ μου ὑψίστου εἰ καταλήμψομαι αὐτὸν ἐν ὀλοκαυτώμασιν ἐν μόσχοις ἐνιαυσίοις
 With what should I lay hold of the Lord?
 (with what) should I secure my God most high?
 Should I lay hold of him with whole burnt offerings, with calves a year old?

a) אֶקְדָּם / καταλάβω] אֶקְדָּם “to approach” is rendered with καταλαμβάνω “to lay hold of”

only here and 6.6c. אֶקְדָּם “to approach” is usually rendered with προφθάνω “to come before” (15x)⁵⁹ or συναντάω “to meet with” (4x).⁶⁰ The verb אֶקְדָּם “to approach” occurs nowhere else in the Twelve Prophets except Jonah 4.2 where its sense is “to make haste” not the normal “to approach” and is rendered with προφθάνω in the sense of “to anticipate.” καταλαμβάνω “to seize” usually renders נִשְׁגָּ “to overtake” (27x)⁶¹ or לָכַד “to capture” (19x).⁶² It is likely that the translator knew the meaning of the verb אֶקְדָּם “to approach” (113 occurrences in MT) but harmonised its rendering with what he perceived to be the meaning of אֶכְפֹּף “I will bow myself” in 6.6b. It seems that the translator also

⁵⁹ 2 Sam 22.6, 19; 2 Kgs 19.32; Job 30.27; Ps 17.13; 18.6, 19; 21.4; 59.11; 68.26; 88.14; 95.2; 119.147, 148; Jonah 4.2.

⁶⁰ Deut 23.5; Neh 13.2; Job 3.12; Isa 21.14.

⁶¹ Gen 31.25; 44.4; Exod 15.9; Lev 26.5 (2x); Deut 19.6; 28.15, 45; Josh 2.5; 1 Sam 30.8 (3x); 2 Sam 15.14; 2 Kgs 25.5; Ps 7.6; 18.38; 40.13; 69.25; Prov 2.19; Isa 35.10; 51.11; 59.9; Jer 52.8; Lam 1.3; Hos 2.9; 10.9; Zech 1.6.

⁶² Num 21.32; Josh 8.19; 11.10; 19.47; Judg 1.8; 7.24; 9.45, 50; 2 Sam 5.7; 12.26, 27, 29; 2 Kgs 18.10; 2 Chr 22.9; 33.11; Neh 9.25; Job 5.13; Prov 16.32; Isa 20.1.

seeks to evoke an emotional response in the target audience. It is not enough to “approach” and “bow down to” God; one must “lay hold of” and “secure” God most high. This shift from “approach” to “lay hold of” is an example of what Munday (2012a, 22ff) calls the affect parameter in the attitude domain of appraisal and represents a theological shift.

- b) **לְאֱלֹהֵי / θεοῦ μου**] This plus 1s pronoun may reflect a misreading of the construct or, more likely, given the other shifts in the verse, it reveals the theological intervention of the translator, making God more personal for the target audience.
- c) **אֶפְרָח / ἀντιλήμψομαι**] This is a unique rendering. **אֶפְרָח** “to bow down” occurs only four other times in the MT (Ps 57.7 [Gk 56.7] – κατακάμπτω “to bow down”; 145.14 [Gk 144.14] and 146.8 [Gk 145.8] – κατερραγμένους “broken down”; and Isa 58.5 – κάμπτω “to bow”). ἀντιλαμβάνομαι “to secure” typically renders **קָזַח** “to seize” (10x).⁶³ Here, the translator seems to understand **אֶפְרָח** “to bow oneself” as a denominative from **אֶפְרָח** “palm” or a form of **אֶפְרָח** “to subdue,” which occurs once in Prov 21.14.
- d) **אֶפְרָח / καταλήμψομαι αὐτὸν**] See discussion of same rendering in §4.7.6a.

⁶³ Lev 25.35; 1 Kgs 9.9; 2 Chr 7.22; 28.15; 29.34; Isa 41.9; 51.18; 64.6; Jer 23.14; Ezek 16.49.

4.7.7 Micah 6.7

MT הִירְצָה יְהוָה בְּאַלְפֵי אֵילִים בְּרַבְבוֹת נַחְלֵי־שֶׁמֶן הָאֶתָּן בְּכוֹרֵי פִשְׁעֵי פְרִי בִטְנִי חַטָּאת
נַפְשִׁי

Will the LORD be pleased with thousands of rams
With tens of thousands of rivers of oil?
Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression,
The fruit of my belly for the sin of my life?

LXX εἰ προσδέξεται κύριος ἐν χιλιάσι⁶⁴ κριῶν ἢ ἐν μυριάσι⁶⁵ χειμάρρων πiónων εἰ δῶ πρωτότοκά μου ἀσεβείας καρπὸν κοιλίας μου⁶⁶ ἀμαρτίας ψυχῆς μου
Will the Lord welcome thousands of rams
Or tens of thousands of rivers of fattened (animals)?
Should I give my firstborns for ungodliness,
The fruit of my belly for the sin of my life?

- a) **הִירְצָה / προσδέξεται]** הִירְצָה “to be pleased with” is usually rendered with εὐδοκέω “to think it well” (22x) but προσδέχομαι “to welcome, receive well” is also common (12x).
- b) **שֶׁמֶן / πiónων]** Despite “rivers” relating better to oil than fat, the translator read שֶׁמֶן “oil” as πiónων “fat” (likely based on the parallel with אֵילִים “rams”). Gelston (2010, 105*) suggests, “The variants in G and V are probably occasioned by the unfamiliar notion of sacrifices of oil.”
- c) **בְּכוֹרֵי / πρωτότοκά μου]** This is a shift from singular to plural. The difference occurs only in the pointing so the shift might even be expected in the context of a myriad of sacrifices. It must reflect an understanding of firstborn animals because a human cannot have multiple firstborn children (interpretive shift). Perhaps this was an ideological shift intended to avoid the idea of child sacrifice.

⁶⁴ χιλιάσιν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

⁶⁵ μυριάσιν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

⁶⁶ Followed by ὑπὲρ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- d) **פָּשַׁעַי / ἀσεβείας]** There is a minus 1cs suffix. Along with the previous singular to plural shift (בְּכוֹרִי “my firstborn” > πρωτότοκά μου “my firstborns”), the present deletion indicates an interpretive shift from the prophet speaking (hypothetically) about offering his firstborn child for his own transgression to him offering his firstborn animals for the ungodliness of Jacob. Everywhere else in LXX-Micah, ἀσέβεια “ungodliness” is attributed to God’s people (1.5 [2x], 1.13, 3.8, 6.12 and 7.18). This interpretive shift does not, however, negate the prophet’s acknowledgement of his own (hypothetical) culpability (as demonstrated by an absence of any shifts in the last stich).

4.7.8 Micah 6.8

MT הַגִּיד לְךָ אָדָם מַה־טוֹב וּמַה־יְהוָה דּוֹרֵשׁ מִמֶּךָ כִּי אִם־עֲשׂוֹת מִשְׁפָּט וְאַהֲבַת חֶסֶד
וְהִצַּנַּע לְכַת עִם־אֱלֹהֶיךָ

He has told you, O man, what is good
And what the LORD seeks from you
But to do justice and to love mercy
And to walk humbly with your God.

LXX εἰ ἀνηγγέλη σοι ἄνθρωπε τί καλόν ἢ τί κύριος ἐκζητεῖ παρὰ σοῦ ἀλλ’ ἢ τοῦ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ ἀγαπᾶν ἔλεος⁶⁷ καὶ ἕτοιμον εἶναι τοῦ πορευέσθαι μετὰ κυρίου θεοῦ σου
Has it been told to you, O man, what is good
Or what the Lord seeks from you
But to do judgment and to love mercy
And to be ready to walk with the Lord your God?

- a) **הַגִּיד / εἰ ἀνηγγέλη]** Perhaps the translator read הַגִּיד “it has been told” for הַגִּיד “he has told.” However, the *he* of the Hiphil stem seems to have been read as an interrogative *he* so that one *he* would have been lost through haplography. Wolff (1990, 165) argues instead that the translator correctly understood the verb as having an indefinite subject. If the translator understood the Hebrew text and intentionally changed it, then the change

⁶⁷ ἔλεον in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

would represent a theological shift which calls into question whether the audience has yet been informed about what is good or what the Lord seeks from it.

- b) **מִשְׁפָּט / κρίμα**] This is the usual rendering (κρίμα “judgment” 172x and κρίσις “judgment, justice” 134x in the MT).
- c) **וְהִצַּגְתָּ / καὶ ἔτοιμον**] This is a *hapax legomenon* in MT. The translator rendered the Hebrew infinitive absolute followed by an infinitive construct with an adjective plus two present infinitives (וְהִצַּגְתָּ לְכַת “and to walk humbly” > καὶ ἔτοιμον εἶναι τοῦ πορεύεσθαι “and to be ready to walk”). ἔτοιμος “ready” usually renders כּוּן “to be ready, established” (15x),⁶⁸ מְכוּן “a fixed place” (9x)⁶⁹ or מְרֻט “polished” (3x).⁷⁰ This appears to be a slot translation (S likely follows Gk) based on the translator’s lack of adequate semantic understanding.
- d) **אֱלֹהֶיךָ / κυρίου θεοῦ σου**] This is a plus κυρίου “Lord.” Ryssel (1887, 100 n. 3) suggests that the translator added κυρίου “Lord” because of the mental connection with the common phrase אֱלֹהֶיךָ יְהוָה “the LORD your God” in the Pentateuch (e.g., Exod 20.5, 7, 10; Deut 6.1, 2, 5). This is a reasonable explanation but the translator could simply have been harmonising with the same phrase later in the same book (7.10) or elsewhere in the Twelve Prophets (Hos 12.10; 13.4; 14.2; Zeph 3.17).

⁶⁸ Exod 19.11, 15; 34.2; Josh 4.3; 8.4; 1 Sam 26.4; 1 Kgs 2.45; Ps 38.18; 57.8 (2x); 93.2; 108.2; 112.7; Hos 6.3; Mic 4.1.

⁶⁹ Exod 15.17; 1 Kgs 8.39, 43, 49; 2 Chr 6.2, 30, 33, 39; Ps 33.14.

⁷⁰ Ezek 21.15, 16 (2x).

4.7.9 Micah 6.9

MT קול יהוה לעיר יקרא ותושיה יראה שמך שמעו מטה ומועד העיר⁷¹
 The voice of the LORD cries out to the city
 And it is sound wisdom to acknowledge your name.
 Hear, O tribe, and assembly of the city.

LXX φωνή κυρίου τῇ πόλει ἐπικληθήσεται καὶ σώσει φοβουμένους τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἄκουε φυλή
 καὶ τίς κοσμήσει πόλιν
 The voice of the Lord will be proclaimed in the city
 And he will save those who fear his name.
 Hear, O tribe, and who will adorn a city?

- a) **יקרא / ἐπικληθήσεται**] This is a shift from active to passive so the agent doing the proclaiming is not the same in the Hebrew and Greek. The shift is understandable for two reasons: 1) the Niphal contains the same consonants (יקרא “it will be proclaimed”) and, 2) it is common to call out with a loud voice (קרא “to call” + בקול-גדול “with a loud voice”) but there is only one other instance where קול “voice” is the agent doing the calling (Isa 40.3). Gelston (2010, 106*) simply says “G interprets the verb as a passive.” I think this is true but that choice reflects the translator’s interpretation of the passage. This is an ideological shift which reflects an understanding that it is not the Lord speaking directly to the city but the prophet speaking in the name of the Lord to the city.
- b) **ותושיה / καὶ σώσει**] תושיה “sound wisdom” occurs 12x⁷² in the MT (in Prov 2.7 it is rendered with σωτηρίαν “salvation”). σώζω “to save” typically renders some form of ישע “to save.” Perhaps the translator read ותושיע “and you will save” (which is close

⁷¹ MT עדה ומי יעד of 6.10; emendation following Wellhausen (1963, 148).

⁷² Job 5.12; 6.13; 11.6; 12.16; 26.3; 30.22; Prov 2.7; 3.21; 8.14; 18.1; Isa 28.29; Mic 6.9.

orthographically and phonetically to וְתוֹשִׁיָהּ “and sound wisdom”) then shifted to third person (along with a pronoun shift שְׁמֶךָ “your name” > τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ “his name”).

Another possibility is that the translator read וְהוֹשִׁיעַ “and he will save.”

- c) **יִרְאֶה / φοβουμένους]** This is a shift from Qal *yiqtol* 3ms to present middle accusative mp participle. The MT יִרְאֶה “he sees” carries the sense of “regard” or “acknowledge” (as in Deut 33.9; Isa 5.12; 26.10). The translator understood the verb as יִרֵא “to fear” instead of יִרְאֶה “to see” (same mistake in S). The latter reading/mistake makes sense given the context and the identical consonants (יִרְאֶה “fear” v. יִרְאֶה “he will see”). It is also a much more common concept to *fear* the name of the LORD rather than to *see* the name of the LORD. This likely reflects a theological shift.
- d) **שְׁמֶךָ / τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ]** Though this could have been an orthographic error (confusion of *kaf* and *nun*), it is more likely an intentional shift to harmonise with the third person reference to the Lord (to whom the “name” refers) in the first stich. Gelston (2010, 78) understands the shift as syntactical facilitation.
- e) **וּמוֹעֵד הָעִיר / καὶ τίς κοσμήσει πόλιν]** κοσμέω “to adorn” usually renders עָדָה “to adorn.”⁷³ It is likely the translator read וּמִי יַעֲדָה עִיר “and who will adorn a city” (עָדָה “to adorn”⁷⁴ instead of יַעֲד “to appoint” or מוֹעֵד “assembly”).

⁷³ Jer 4.30; Ezek 16.11, 13; 23.40.

4.7.10 Micah 6.10

MT **בֵּית רָשָׁע אֶצְרוֹת רָשָׁע וְאֵיפֹת רְזוֹן זְעוּמָה הֲאֶשָּׂה**⁷⁵
 Can I forget, O wicked house, the storehouses of wickedness
 Or the scant, hated ephah?

LXX **μη̄ πυρ̄ καῑ οἶκος ἀνόμου [θησαυρίζων]**⁷⁶ **θησαυροῦς ἀνόμους καῑ μέτρον ὕβρεως ἀδικία**
 (Is there) not a fire and a lawless house
 [Storing up] lawless treasures and a measure of arrogance—unrighteousness?

a) **הֲאֶשָּׂה / μη̄ πυρ̄**] The Hebrew text may have had **שָׂה** “is there”⁷⁷ when the translation

was made, which would have been easily misunderstood as an interrogative + **שָׂה** “fire.”

The expected positive answer could have motivated the addition of the negative particle in **μη̄ πυρ̄** “(Is there) not a fire?”

b) **רָשָׁע אֶצְרוֹת / [θησαυρίζων] θησαυροῦς ἀνόμους**] **θησαυρίζων** “storing up” is a tentative

plus (it is omitted by ms 106 and, hence, bracketed by Ziegler). Hillers (1984, 81n.h) considers it to be an interpretive expansion. Alternatively, it resulted from a dittographic error in the Hebrew text (e.g., **רָצָה** “storing up”), then after being translated, it was lost in the proto-MT.

c) **רְזוֹן / ὕβρεως**] This is a unique rendering. **רְזוֹן** “scant” occurs only two other times in the

MT with the sense of leanness, scantness or wasting, both times rendered differently in the LXX (**πλησμονή** “gratification” in Ps 106.15 [Gk 105.15]; **ἀτιμία** “dishonor” in Isa 10.16). The rendering could represent a slot translation or the translator may have read

⁷⁴ Also Gelston (2010, 78).

⁷⁵ MT **שָׂה** “is there”; **עוֹד** “still” at beginning of verse emended and added to end of 6.9.

⁷⁶ Omitted by ms 106.

⁷⁷ Also Gelston 2010, 106*; see **שָׂה** “there is” in 2 Sam 14.19 and **שָׂה** in Prov 18.24 (Fox 2009, 647).

the more common **יָדַי** “insolence” (metathesis of *zayin* and *dalet* and *dalet/resh* confusion). The rendering of ὑβρις “arrogance” for **יָדַי** “insolence” is the most common (4x).⁷⁸

- d) **עוֹמָה / ἀδικία**] This also is a unique rendering. Typically **עָמַי** “to be indignant” is rendered with a word for anger (ὀργή),⁷⁹ indignation (ἐμβρόμημα),⁸⁰ or cursing (καταράομαι⁸¹ / ἐπικαταράομαι⁸²). This rendering seems to be an evaluation of the actions of the lawless house—unrighteous (cf. Mic 3.9-10).

4.7.11 Micah 6.11

MT **הֲאֶזְכָּה בְּמִאֲזַנֵּי רֶשַׁע וּבְכִסֵּי אֲבָיִי מִרְמָה**
Shall I acquit (a man) with wicked scales
Or with a bag of deceptive weights?

LXX **εἰ δικαιωθήσεται ἐν ζυγῷ ἄνομος καὶ ἐν μαρσίππῳ στάθμια δόλου**
Shall a lawless one be justified by a pair of scales,
Or deceitful weights in a bag?

- a) **הֲאֶזְכָּה / εἰ δικαιωθήσεται**] This is a shift from active 1cs to passive 3s. **זכה** “to be/make clean” occurs only 8 times in the MT. The most common rendering is **δικαιώω** “to justify” (here and Ps 73.13 [Gk 72.13]).

- b) **רֶשַׁע בְּמִאֲזַנֵּי / ἐν ζυγῷ ἄνομος**] This is a shift in class from a noun (**רֶשַׁע** “wickedness”) to an adjective (ἄνομος “a lawless one”). Instead of the scales being modified by **רֶשַׁע**

⁷⁸ Prov 11.2; 13.10; Jer 50.32; Ezek 7.10.

⁷⁹ Ps 7.12; 38.4; 69.25; 78.49; 102.11; Isa 10.5, 25; 26.20; 30.27; 50.25; Ezek 21.36; 22.24; Dan 8.19; 11.36; Nah 1.6.

⁸⁰ Lam 2.6.

⁸¹ Num 23.8 (2x).

⁸² Num 23.7.

“wickedness,” the LXX understands ἄνομος “a lawless one” as the subject of the verb and the one who undergoes the action of justifying. In the MT, the object of acquitting is implicit and his moral character is not explicit. In the LXX, the person’s character is explicit (“lawless one”) but the first stich does not tell us that the scales are dishonest.

4.7.12 Micah 6.12

MT אֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂי־רִיָּהּ מְלֵאוֹ חֶמְסַ וַיִּשְׁבְּרִיָּהּ דְּבָרוֹ שֶׁקֶר וּלְשׁוֹנָם רַמְיָהּ בְּפִיָּהּ
Because her rich are full of violence
And her inhabitants have spoken falsehood
And their tongue is deceitful in their mouth,

LXX ἐξ ὧν τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν ἀσεβείας ἔπλησαν καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες αὐτήν ἐλάλουν ψευδῆ καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτῶν ὑψώθη ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν
From these they filled their wealth with ungodliness
And her inhabitants were speaking lies
And their tongue was lifted up in their mouth.

- a) אֲשֶׁר / ἐξ ὧν] This is a shift from causal relative אֲשֶׁר “because” to a preposition + pronoun referring to the deceitful weights of 6.11 (both neuter plural). It seems that the translator understands the relative as “by which.”
- b) חֶמְסַ וַיִּשְׁבְּרִיָּהּ מְלֵאוֹ / τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν ἀσεβείας ἔπλησαν] Instead of the rich themselves being full of violence, the translator understood the Hebrew to be describing the people (inhabitants) gaining wealth through ungodly means. This may have been motivated in part by reading the Qal מְלֵאוֹ “they are full” as a Piel מְלֵאוֹ “they fill” so that the agents of filling are the people.
- c) עֲשִׂי־רִיָּהּ / τὸν πλοῦτον αὐτῶν] This is a shift from a 3fs to a 3pl suffix.

- d) רְמִיָּה / ὑψώθη] The translator read רְמִיָּה “deceit” as a form derived from רוּם “to be high.” Gelston (2010, 106*) proposes the same explanation, noting the difficulty the LXX translator had in Hos 7.16 with the same word.

4.7.13 Micah 6.13

MT וְגַם־אֶגְיִ הַחֲלִיתִי הַבּוֹתָהּ עַל־חַטָּאתֶיךָ
I will make (you) sick by striking you,
Making (you) desolate because of your sins.

LXX καὶ ἐγὼ ἄρξομαι τοῦ πατάξαι σε ἀφανίω σε ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις σου
And I will begin to strike you,
I will cause you to vanish because of your sins.

- a) וְגַם־אֶגְיִ / καὶ ἐγὼ] This is a minus גַּם “also.” וְגַם “and also / because / besides” is often rendered with only καὶ “and” / “also.”
- b) הַחֲלִיתִי / ἄρξομαι] The translator misread חָלָה “to be sick” as לָלַח “to begin.” In 1.12, the translator read חָלָה “she writhes” as a form of חָלַל “to begin.”
- c) עֲשֵׂה / ἀφανίω σε] This is a plus σε “you” supplied to explicitise the object of the Lord’s destruction. This is also a linguistically constrained shift from infinitive absolute to future active indicative 1s. Because ἀφανίζω “to cause to vanish” is the common rendering for עֲשֵׂה “to make desolate,” there is no lexical shift.

4.7.14 Micah 6.14

MT **וְלֹא תִפְלֹט אֶתְּךָ תֹאכַל וְלֹא תִשְׂבֵּעַ וְיִשְׁחָד בְּקִרְבְּךָ וְתִשָּׂא** ⁸³ **וְלֹא תִחַרְב** ⁸⁴

וְתִתֵּן

You shall eat but you will not be sated,
And your emptiness will be within you,
You will capture (prey) but not carry (it) off,
And what you carry off I will give to the sword.

LXX σὺ φάγεσαι καὶ οὐ μὴ ἐμπλησθῆς καὶ σκοτάσει ἐν σοὶ καὶ ἐκνεύσει καὶ οὐ μὴ διασωθῆς καὶ ὅσοι ἐὰν διασωθῶσιν εἰς ῥομφαίαν παραδοθήσονται
You will eat and you will not be sated,
And it shall grow dark in you,
And he will turn aside and you will not escape,
And all who might escape will be handed over to the sword.

a) **וְיִשְׁחָד** / **καὶ σκοτάσει**] This is a *hapax legomenon* in the MT. Not knowing the meaning

of the word, the translator read it as **וְיִשְׁחָד** “to grow dark” (metathesising the *shin* and *khet*) (also Gelston 2010, 107*).

b) **וְתִשָּׂא** / **καὶ ἐκνεύσει**] This is a shift from 2ms to 3s which appears to be an interpretive

shift (along with **וְתִפְלֹט** “you will carry off” > **διασωθῶσιν** “he might escape,” explained in the following paragraph). It seems likely that the translator did not read **וְתִשָּׂא** “and you will capture” (emended form) but **וְתִשָּׂא** in Hiphil “to displace” yet the rendering is semantically unique.⁸⁵ It is usually rendered with **ἀποστρέφω** “to turn away” (8x),⁸⁶

⁸³ Emended from **וְתִשָּׂא** “and you will displace” (Hillers 1984, 81 n.o).

⁸⁴ Emended from Piel stem **וְתִפְלֹט** “you will deliver” to Hiphil stem **וְתִפְלֹט** “you will carry off.”

⁸⁵ Aquila and Symmachus both attest forms that reflect the emended Hebrew **וְתִשָּׂא** “and you will displace” (**καὶ καταληψή** “and you will overtake” and **καὶ ἔξεις** “and you will have,” respectively).

⁸⁶ 2 Sam 1.22; Ps 35.4; 40.15; 70.3; 78.57; 129.5; Isa 42.17; Jer 38.22.

ἀφίστημι “to keep away” (4x),⁸⁷ or μετατίθημι “to bring back” (3x).⁸⁸ Still, it captures the sense of גּוּס in Hiphil “to displace” so it should not be considered a semantic shift.

- c) **טָפַלְתָּ אֵלָי / καὶ οὐ μὴ διασωθῆς]** טָפַלְתָּ אֵלָי “and you will not carry (it) off” (cf. Isa 5.29

where the only other occurrence of טָפַלְתָּ “to escape” in the Hiphil stem is used for a lion carrying off his prey) was likely read as a Qal stem (with the following Piel stem טָפַלְתָּ “you will deliver”) which differs in consonants only by *yod*.

- d) **טָפַלְתָּ רַשָׁאִים / καὶ ὅσοι ἐὰν διασωθῶσιν]** This is a shift from Hiphil *yiqtol* 2ms to aorist

passive subjunctive 3pl (this is an interpretive shift like גָּבַהְתָּ “and you will capture” > καὶ ἐκνεύσει “and he will turn aside” earlier in the verse). Wherever the construction ὅσοι ἐὰν “all who” occurs in the LXX, an aorist subjunctive third person always follows (Deut 4.6; Josh 2.19; Mic 6.14; Zech 14.16, 17; Jer 27.8 [Gk 34.8]).

- e) **תָּתַן / παραδοθήσονται]** This is a shift from *yiqtol* 1cs to future passive indicative 3p. The

Greek rendering reflects תָּתַן “they will be given” which has too little orthographic similarity with the Hebrew to suggest a visual error. Instead, this reflects a theological shift intended to distance the Lord from actively handing over his people to the sword.

⁸⁷ Ps 44.19; 80.19; 59.13, 14.

⁸⁸ Deut 27.17; Prov 23.10; Hos 5.10.

4.7.15 Micah 6.15

MT אַתָּה תִזְרַע וְלֹא תִקְצוֹר אַתָּה תִדְרֹךְ-זֵיתִים וְלֹא-תִסּוֹךְ שֶׁמֶן וְתִירוֹשׁ וְלֹא תִשְׁתֶּה-יַיִן
 You shall sow but not reap
 You shall tread olives but not anoint with oil
 And (you shall tread) new wine but you will not drink wine.

LXX σὺ σπερεῖς καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀμήσης σὺ πιέσεις ἐλαίαν καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀλείψῃς ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον καὶ οὐ μὴ
 πίητε καὶ ἀφανισθήσεται νόμιμα λαοῦ μου
 You will sow but you will not reap
 You will press the olive but you will not anoint with oil
 And (you will press) wine but you will not drink (it)
 And the precepts of my people will vanish.

- a) **תִּדְרֹךְ / πιέσεις**] This is a unique rendering. דָּרַךְ “to tread” is usually rendered ἐπιβαίνω “to embark” (11x),⁸⁹ πατέω “to tread” (8x),⁹⁰ or ὁδηγέω “to guide” (4x).⁹¹ Nowhere else in the MT is the verb דָּרַךְ “tread” used with זֵיתִים “olives” so this may have motivated the shift.
- b) **וְתִירוֹשׁ / καὶ οἶνον**] The author gapped תִּדְרֹךְ “you shall tread” from the previous stich and used תִּירוֹשׁ “new wine” metonymically for grapes. The translator rendered it concretely (οἶνος “wine”).
- c) **וְלֹא תִשְׁתֶּה-יַיִן / καὶ οὐ μὴ πίητε**] The minus יַיִן “wine” likely occurred because the translator did not have another Greek word to provide lexical variety. (οἶνος “wine” is used in the LXX for both יַיִן “wine” and תִּירוֹשׁ “new wine.”)⁹²

⁸⁹ Deut 1.36; 11.25; 33.29; Josh 1.3; 14.9; 1 Sam 5.5; Ps 91.13; Amos 4.13; Mic 1.3; 5.4, 5.

⁹⁰ Deut 11.24; Judg 9.27; Neh 13.15; Job 22.15; 28.8; Isa 42.16; Jer 48.33; Lam 1.15.

⁹¹ Ps 25.5, 9; 107.7; 119.35.

⁹² The only semantic variation for יַיִן “wine” and תִּירוֹשׁ “new wine” occurs in Job 32.19 where γλεῦκος “sweet new wine” renders יַיִן “wine.”

- d) **וְיִשְׁתַּמְרֵן חֻקֹת עֹמְרִי / καὶ ἀφανισθήσεται νόμιμα λαοῦ μου]** The Hebrew phrase is connected with 6.16 and analysed there (§4.7.16a and b).

4.7.16 Micah 6.16

MT **וְיִשְׁתַּמְרֵן חֻקֹת עֹמְרִי וְכָל מַעֲשֵׂה בֵּית־אֲחָאָב וַתֵּלְכוּ בְּמַעֲצוֹתָם לְמַעַן תִּתִּי אֶתְךָ**
לְשִׁמָּה וְיִשְׁבְּיָהּ לְשָׂרְקָה וְחִרְפַּת עַמִּי תִשָּׂאוּ

For the ordinances of Omri are kept
 and all the works of the house of Ahab
 And you have walked in their counsel
 So that I will give you over to waste
 And its inhabitants to a hissing
 And you shall bear the reproach of my people.

LXX **καὶ⁹³ πάντα τὰ ἔργα οἴκου Αχασβ καὶ ἐπορεύθητε ἐν ταῖς βουλαῖς αὐτῶν ὅπως παραδῶ σε εἰς**
ἀφανισμόν καὶ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας αὐτήν εἰς συρισμόν καὶ ὄνειδη λαῶν λήμψεσθε
 And all the works of the house of Achab
 And you have walked in their counsels
 That I will hand you over to a vanishing
 And its inhabitants to hissing
 And you will receive reproaches of peoples.

- a) **וְיִשְׁתַּמְרֵן / καὶ ἀφανισθήσεται]** Translation is from the previous verse. The translation reflects a reading of **וְיִשְׁתַּמְדֵן** “and it will be destroyed” through a *resh/dalet* confusion (cf. Mic 5.13 [Gk 5.14]).

- b) **עֹמְרִי / λαοῦ μου]** Translation is from the previous verse. The translator missed the *resh* and misread **עֹמְרִי** “Omri” as **עַמִּי** “my people.”

- c) **תִּתִּי / παραδῶ]** This is a change from infinitive construct + 1cs suffix to aorist active subjunctive 1s but semantically it is the same. Because an equivalent grammatical

⁹³ Followed by ἐφύλαξας τὰ δικαιώματα Ζαμβρι καὶ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

construction (infinitive + suffix) does not exist in Greek, it should be considered a shift due to linguistic constraints.

d) **וְהָרְפָתָ / καὶ ὀνειδέη]** This is a shift from singular to plural. Perhaps the translator read

וְהָרְפָתָ “reproaches.” More likely this is an ideological shift emphasising the extent of the punishment.

e) **עַמִּי / λαῶν]** The minus 1cs suffix was possibly influenced by the more generic phrase in

Ezek 36.15 (**עַמִּי** “reproach of peoples”).

4.8 Micah 7

4.8.1 Micah 7.1

MT **אֲלֵלִי לִי כִּי הֵייתִי כְּאֶסְפִּיקוֹן בְּעֵלְלֵת בְּצִיר אֵין־אֶשְׁכּוּל לְאֶכּוֹל בְּכוֹרָה אֲוֹתָהּ נִפְשִׁי**
 Woe is me!
 For I have become like (one at the time of) the gathering of summer fruit,
 Like (one at the time of) the gleanings of the harvest
 There is no cluster to eat
 (No)⁹⁴ early fig which my soul desires.

LXX οἴμμοι ὅτι ἐγενόμην ὡς συνάγων καλάμην ἐν ἀμῆτῳ καὶ ὡς ἐπιφυλλίδα ἐν τρυγίτῳ οὐχ ὑπάρχοντος βότρυος τοῦ φαγεῖν τὰ πρωτόγονα οἴμμοι ψυχή
 Woe is me!
 For I have become like one gathering stubble at harvest,
 And as (one gathering) grape-gleanings at vintage,
 When there is no cluster (for me) to eat the firstlings,
 Woe is me, O soul.

⁹⁴ Miller (2005, 52) notes the conditions negative ellipsis “Ellipsis of the negative without the verb (or verb phrase) can be understood to have occurred only when a number of syntactic features are present: the two clauses must be coordinate, the negative must appear in initial position in the first clause, and the constituent structures of the two clauses must be identical with the constituents either in identical order or in chiasmic order.”

a) **קִיץ־פִּי־סָאָף** / **ὡς συνάγων καλάμην ἐν ἀμήτω**] Schwantes (1965, 176) offers the explanation that the Gk includes both the mistaken **καλάμην** “stubble” for **קִיץ** “stubble” (most common rendering) as well as the corrected **ἐν ἀμήτω** “at harvest” for **קִיץ** “summer (fruit).” Jer 8.20 may lend support to Schwantes’ explanation but it is difficult to know if the translator there rendered **ἄμητος** “harvest” for **קִיץ** “summer (fruit)” or if he switched the first two phrases and rendered **ἄμητος** “harvest” for **קָצִיר** “harvest” and **θέρους** “summer” for **קִיץ** “summer (fruit).” Given the high frequency in which **קָצִיר** “harvest” is rendered **ἄμητος** “harvest” and the infrequency in which **קִיץ** “summer (fruit)” is rendered **ἄμητος** “harvest” (only Mic 7.1, Prov 26.1 and possibly Jer 8.20), the latter option for understanding the translation in Jer 8.20 seems more likely.⁹⁵

The simplest explanation is that the translator took the opportunity to insert into this woe oracle a term (**καλάμη** “stubble”) associated throughout the Twelve Prophets with judgment (cf. Joel 2.5; Obad 18; Nah 1.10; Mal 3.19). This verse also reflects a shift from the preposition + construct plural noun **פִּי־סָאָף** “like the gatherings of” to a preposition + singular participle **ὡς συνάγων** “like one gathering.” Gelston (2010, 107*) suggests this shift resulted from the translator reading a participle with *hîreq compaginis* (**פִּי־סָאָף**).

⁹⁵ Symmachus’s **ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἐσχάτοις τῆς σποράς** “as in the last (gleanings) of the fruit” reflects a reading of **קִיץ־פִּי־סָאָף** “like the gathering of summer fruit” as **קִיץ־סָאָף** “as the ceasing of the summer fruit” (in Isa 45.22 and Jer 16.19, **סָאָף** “ceasing, end” is rendered with **ἐσχάτος** “last”). Schwantes (1962, 176) offers a similar explanation for Symmachus’s reading but he twice mistakes **סָאָף** “ceasing, end” for **קָצִיר** “to gather.”

- b) אֵין / οὐχ ὑπάρχοντος] εἰμί “I am” is by far the most common rendering for אֵין “none, there is none” but ὑπάρχω “to exist” occurs frequently enough (31x),⁹⁶ including in the next verse, that this should not be classified as a shift.
- c) בְּבוֹרָה / τὰ πρωτόγονα] The only shift here is reading בְּבוֹרָה “early fig” with the third stich instead of the last, which was likely motivated by the misunderstanding of אֶתְהָא “I desire” in the last stich (see the immediately following explanation).
- d) אֶתְהָא / οἴμμοι] The translator read בְּבוֹרָה “early fig” with the fourth stich. As a result, he had to render נַפְשִׁי אֶתְהָא “my soul desires” independently. Hillers (1984, 83 n. c) suggests that the translator connected אֶתְהָא “I desire” with אֹי “woe” (also Schwantes 1962, 177). Though אֹי “woe” is rendered οἴμμοι “woe” in Jer 4.31, 15.10 and 45.3, orthographically אֶתְהָא “I desire” is much closer to אֶהָא “alas” (cf. Ezek 9.8, 11.13; Joel 1.15). Perhaps the translator did not recognise the ellipsis of the negative אֵין “none, there is none” across the fourth and fifth stichoi.
- e) נַפְשִׁי / ψυχῆ] This is a minus possessive pronoun. While it is possible that the translator failed to read the *yod* possessive pronoun, there is precedence for rendering the vocative נַפְשִׁי “O my soul” without the possessive pronoun (Ps 42.6 [Gk 41.6]; 42.12 [Gk 41.12]; 43.5 [Gk 42.5]).

⁹⁶ Gen 42.13, 32; Exod 14.11; 22.2; Ps 37.10; 59.14; 69.21; 72.12; 103.16; 104.35; Prov 11.14; 29.18; Isa 59.10; Jer 5.13; 7.32; 46.19; 50.20; Lam 1.2; 5.3 (2x); 5.7 (2x); Ezek 26.21; 28.19; 38.11; Joel 1.18; Mic 7.1, 2; Hab 3.17; Hag 2.3; Zech 8.10.

4.8.2 Micah 7.2

MT אֲבָד חֲסִיד מִן־הָאָרֶץ וַיִּשָׁר בְּאֶדָם אִין כָּל־מִיִּם יִאָּרְבוּ אִישׁ אֶת־אָחִיהוּ וַיִּצְוּוּ
חַרֵּם

The faithful has perished from the land
And there is no one upright among men;
They all lie in wait for blood;
They hunt, each his brother, (with) a net.

LXX ὅτι ἀπόλωλεν εὐλαβῆς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ κατορθῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις οὐχ ὑπάρχει πάντες εἰς
αἵματα δικάζονται ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ ἐκθλίβουσιν ἐκθλίβῃ
Because the devout has perished from the land
And there is none among people who is upright
All give judgment for blood
They afflict, each his neighbor, with affliction.

- a) Ø / ὄτι] This plus was inserted so that this verse explains the prophet’s feelings in 7.1 and to explicitise the causes (7.2-7.4b) for the judgment (7.4c).
- b) יִאָּרְבוּ / δικάζονται] This is a unique rendering. δικάζω “to judge” often renders רִיב “to contend” so perhaps the translator read יִרִיבוּ “they contend” for יִאָּרְבוּ “they lie in wait” (metathesis of *alef* and *resh* plus *alef/yod* confusion in paleo-Hebrew script [𐤀/𐤅]). Gelston (2010, 80) similarly attributes the shift to the translator reading some form of רִיב.
- c) יִצְוּוּ / ἐκθλίβουσιν] This is a unique rendering. צוּד “to hunt” is rendered ten times by θηρεύω “to hunt” and was therefore likely known by the translator. צַו in the Hiphil stem “to distress, bring into straights” is rendered twice with ἐκθλίβω “to afflict” (Isa 29.2 and Judg 16.16) so perhaps the translator of Mic 7.2 read יִצִּיקוּ “they distress” for

יְצִידוּ “they hunt”—*qof/dalet* and *yod/vav* confusion in Assyrian square script (𐤑/𐤕 and 𐤕/𐤕).

- d) **חָרָם** / ἐκθλιβῆ] This is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX. If the explanation above for the shift (previous paragraph) from יְצִידוּ “they hunt” > ἐκθλίβουσιν “they afflict” is correct, the translator read חָרָם “net” as some form of חָרָם “a thing devoted to destruction” (also Gelston 2010, 107*).

4.8.3 Micah 7.3

MT עַל-הָרַע בְּפִים לְהִיטִיב הַשָּׂר שְׂאֵל וְהַשֹּׁפֵט בְּשִׁלּוֹם וְהַגְּדוֹל דִּבֶּר הַיּוֹת נִפְשׁוּ הוּא
וַיַּעֲבִתוּהָ

Upon evil are (their) hands to do (it) well,
The prince asks and the judge (asks) for a bribe,
And the great man speaks; it is the desire of his soul
And they weave it together.

LXX ἐπὶ τὸ κακὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐτοιμάζουσιν ὁ ἄρχων αἰτεῖ καὶ ὁ κριτῆς εἰρηνικοὺς λόγους ἐλάλησε⁹⁷ καταθύμιον ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ ἐστὶ⁹⁸ καὶ ἐξελοῦμαι τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν
Upon evil they prepare their hands,
The ruler asks and the judge has spoken peaceful words,
It is the desire of his soul.
And I will take away their good things

- a) **בְּפִים** / τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν] This is a plus αὐτῶν “their.” BHS (1967, 1042) suggests emending the Hebrew text to **בְּפִיהֶם** “their hands.” However, suggesting emendation (i.e., positing a different Hebrew *Vorlage*) is unnecessary given the tendency of the

⁹⁷ ἐλάλησεν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

⁹⁸ ἐστὶν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

translator to add pronouns to explicitise (cf. 7.11 [חֶקֶן “ordinance, boundary” > νόμιμά σου “your ordinances”]; 7.16 [פֶּה “mouth” > τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν “their mouth”]).

- b) לְהִיטִיב / ἐτοιμάζουσιν] ἐτοιμάζω “to prepare” usually renders בּוֹן “to prepare, establish.”

The Hiphil 3p form of בּוֹן “to prepare, establish” (הִכְיִינוּ) does not show enough orthographic similarity to לְהִיטִיב “to do well” to suggest an orthographic error. I agree with Phelan (1982, 184) who suggests, “Difficulty in conveying the sense of the infinitive construct לְהִיטִיב (to do well) combined with a propensity for explanatory additions rather than a variant Hebrew text account for the Greek reading.”

- c) הַשֵּׁר שְׂאֵל וְהַשְׁפֵּט בְּשָׁלוֹם וְהַגְדוֹל דָּבַר / ὁ ἄρχων αἰτεῖ καὶ ὁ κριτῆς εἰρηνικοὺς λόγους

ἐλάλησεν] The Hebrew here (and in 7.3a) is difficult and many commentators suggest emending it in different ways.⁹⁹ If we analyse the MT as it is, then we see that the translator divided the verse differently—the ruler asks and the judge has spoken peaceful words. (The translator connects וְהַגְדוֹל דָּבַר “and the great man speaks” from the third stich with the second stich.)

- d) בְּשָׁלוֹם וְהַגְדוֹל דָּבַר / εἰρηνικοὺς λόγους] שְׁלוֹם “bribe” occurs only two other times in the

MT (Isa 34.8 and Hos 9.7) so it understandable why the translator would have read this as שְׁלוֹם “peace.” The translator either rendered וְהַגְדוֹל דָּבַר “and the great man speaks”

⁹⁹ Hillers (1984, 84, n. g), for example, claims, “The MT is corrupt beyond convincing restoration, and where the versions are more intelligible they seem to have wrested a meaning from the same Hebrew text, rather than to have had a better one.”

together as λόγους “words” (perhaps a great word = many words) or he omitted וְהַגְדוֹל “and the great one.”

- e) וַיִּעְבְּרוּהָ / καὶ ἐξέλοῦμαι] עֲבַת “to weave, wind” is a *hapax legomenon* in the MT. ἐξαίρεω “I take away” renders נָצַל “to rescue” the vast majority of times in the LXX. Perhaps the translator did not know the meaning of the Hebrew verb and read it as the Hiphil stem of עָבַר (וְהֵעֲבַרְתִּי “and I will cause to pass”) (Gelston 2010, 108*). The numerous graphical differences between וְהֵעֲבַרְתִּי “and I will cause to pass” and וַיִּעְבְּרוּהָ “and they weave it together,” however, weakens this proposal. Whatever the correct explanation, the translator read the present verb with טוֹבָם “their good” from the next verse.
- f) טוֹבָם (from 7.4) / τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν] This is a shift in number. In Mic 7.4, טוֹבָם “their good” is the subject of the verbless clause כְּחֵדֶק טוֹבָם “the best of them is like a briar” but here the translator read it as the object of καὶ ἐξέλοῦμαι “and I will take away.” This is likely a theological shift. It seems that the translator, given the difficulty of the passage, took the opportunity to insert a comment about the consequences for the evil that is being carried out—the Lord will take away their good things.

4.8.4 Micah 7.4

MT טוֹבָם כְּחֵדֶק יֵשֶׁר מִמְּסוּכָה יוֹם מִצְפִּיָּךְ פִּקְדֹתֶיךָ בָּאָה עֵתָה תִּהְיֶה מְבוֹכָתָם
 The best of them is like a briar
 The upright is from a thorn hedge.
 The day of your watchmen, of your visitation, has come;
 Now will be their confusion.

LXX ὡς σῆς ἐκτρώγων καὶ βαδίζων ἐπὶ κανόνος ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σκοπιᾶς [οὐαὶ οὐαὶ]¹⁰⁰ αἱ ἐκδικήσεις σου
 ἦκασιν νῦν ἔσονται κλαυθμοὶ αὐτῶν
 Like a consuming moth
 Walking on a rod
 In the day of watching
 Woe! Woe! Your punishments have come
 Now will be their weeping.

- a) **מָוֶת / τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν**] Gk from previous verse (see comments on 7.3 for analysis).
- b) **מְחַרֵּק / ὡς σῆς ἐκτρώγων**] Perhaps this rendering resulted from reading a participle of **חָרַק** “to grind teeth” (**מְחַרֵּק** “as a tooth grinder” – cf. Ps 37.12) and understanding it as **σῆς ἐκτρώγων** “a consuming moth.”
- c) **יָשָׁר / καὶ βαδίζων**] This is a plus καὶ “and.” **βαδίζων** “walking” may have come from reading the participle of **יָשָׁר** “to go straight” (cf. 1 Sam 6.12).
- d) **מְסוּכָה / ἐπὶ κανόνος**] **מְסוּכָה** “hedge” is a *hapax legomenon* in the MT and its rendering **κανόνος** “canon, rod” appears nowhere else in the LXX as a rendering for any Hebrew word (i.e., this Greek word only appears in LXX books that are not part of the MT canon). There is no need to suggest (as does Gelston 2010, 108*) that there is a minus here in the LXX.
- e) **מְצַפֵּי / σκοπιᾶς**] This is a minus 2ms suffix and a shift from plural to singular.

¹⁰⁰ Bracketed by Ziegler (1943, 224) due to its marking as a plus in the Syrohexapla.

- f) Ø / οὐαὶ οὐαὶ] This plus is bracketed by Ziegler (1943, 224) due to its marking as a plus in the Syrohexapla. It may be an ideological insertion to mark the arrival and urgency of the judgment.
- g) אָתָּה / αἱ ἐκδικήσεις σου] This is a shift from singular to plural. This is likely a theological shift emphasising the extent of the judgment.
- h) תְּהִיָּה / ἔσονται] This is rendered in the plural in order to agree with the following word rendered in the plural.
- i) מְבוֹכָתָם / κλαυθμοὶ αὐτῶν] This is shift from singular to plural. This Hebrew word occurs only here and Isa 22.5 where it is rendered with πλάνησις “a making to wander.” Usually κλαυθμός “weeping” renders בָּכָה “weeping” (22x)¹⁰¹ or a form of בָּכָה “to weep” (3x);¹⁰² here it seems that the translator understood the word as derived from בָּכָה “to weep.”

4.8.5 Micah 7.5

MT אֲל־תִּאֱמִינוּ בְרַע אֲל־תִּבְטְחוּ בְאֵלוֹי מִשְׁכַּבְתָּ חִיקָי שְׁמַר פִּתְחֵי־פִי
 Put no trust in a neighbor;
 Do not be confident in a friend;
 From her who lies (in) your bosom,
 Guard the openings of your mouth.

LXX μὴ καταπιστεύετε ἐν φίλοις καὶ μὴ ἐλπίζετε ἐπὶ ἡγουμένοις ἀπὸ τῆς συγκοίτου σου φύλαξαι τοῦ ἀναθέσθαι τι αὐτῇ
 Put no trust in friends,
 And do not hope in leaders;
 From your bedmate,
 Guard against declaring anything to her.

¹⁰¹ Gen 45.2; Judg 21.2; 2 Sam 13.36; 2 Kgs 20.3; Ezra 3.13; Job 16.16; Ps 6.9; 30.6; 102.10; Isa 15.3; 16.9; 22.12; 38.3; 65.19; Jer 3.21; 31.9, 15, 16; 48.5, 32; Joel 2.12; Mal 2.13.

¹⁰² Job 30.31; Isa 30.19; Jer 22.10.

- a) **קַטְוִינִי / καταπιστεύετε]** This is a unique rendering. Out of the 51 occurrences of **קַטְוִינִי** in the Hiphil stem “to believe,” all except three are rendered with **πιστεύω** “to believe” (the three exceptions are **ἐμπιστεύω** “entrust” in 2 Chr 20.20 and Jonah 3.5, and **πείθω** “to trust” in Prov 26.25).
- b) **בָּרַעַ / ἐν φίλοις]** This is a shift only in number.
- c) **וְאֵלֵּי־תַבְחָחוּ / καὶ μὴ ἐλπίζετε]** This is a plus **καὶ** “and.”
- d) **תַּבְחָחוּ / ἐλπίζετε]** The most common rendering for **תַּבְחָחַ** “to trust / be confident” is **πείθω** “to trust” (73x)¹⁰³ but **ἐλπίζω** “to hope for” is used enough in the MT (47x)¹⁰⁴ to not classify this as a shift.
- e) **בְּאַלְפֵּי / ἐπὶ ἡγουμένοις]** This is a shift in number. It is a unique rendering. The common rendering is **ἡγεμών** “leader” which reflects one of the meanings of **אַלְפֵּי** “leader.” The rendering here with the verb **ἡγέομαι** “to lead” captures the same meaning but the translator missed the parallelism in the Hebrew with **רֵעַ** “friend/neighbor.” Perhaps the translator did not know the other meaning of **אַלְפֵּי** (“friend,” rendered **φίλος** “friend” only in Prov 16.28 and 17.9) and did not interpret the second stich as synonymous parallelism.

¹⁰³ Lev 25.18, 19; Deut 28.52; 33.12, 28; Judg 8.11; 18.27; 1 Sam 12.11; 1 Kgs 5.5 2 Kgs 18.19, 20, 21 (2x), 22; 19.10; 2 Chr 32.10; Job 11.18; 39.11; 40.23; Ps 25.2; 49.7; 115.8; 118.8; 125.1; 135.18; 146.3; Prov 3.5, 23, 29; 10.9; 11.28; 14.16; 16.20; 28.1, 25, 26; 29.25; Isa 12.2; 31.1; 32.11, 17; 36.4, 5, 6 (2x), 7, 9; 37.10; 42.17; 47.8; 50.10; 59.4; Jer 5.17; 7.4, 8, 14; 9.3; 12.5; 17.7; 23.6; 28.15; 29.31; 32.37; 39.18; 46.25; 48.7; 49.4, 11; Ezek 16.15; 33.13; Amos 6.1; Hab 2.18; Zeph 3.2.

¹⁰⁴ Judg 9.26; 20.36; 2 Kgs 18.5, 24; 1 Chr 5.20; Job 24.23; Ps 4.6; 9.11; 13.6; 21.8; 22.5 (2x), 6; 26.1; 27.3; 28.7; 31.7, 15; 32.10; 33.21; 37.3, 5; 40.4; 41.10; 44.7; 52.10; 55.24; 56.4, 5, 12; 62.9, 11; 78.22; 84.13; 86.2; 91.2; 115.9, 10, 11; 118.9; 119.42, 143.8; Isa 26.4; 30.12; Jer 13.25; Hos 10.13; Mic 7.5.

Another possibility is that the translator did know both meanings of אֲלוֹהִים but chose “leader” to expand the number of relationships with which one must be wary (friends, leaders and bedmates in this verse and the list continues in 7.6).

- f) מְשַׁכְּבֵת חֵיקָךְ / ἀπὸ τῆς συγκαίτου σου] σύγκαίτος “bedmate” is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX so we are not aided by other occurrences. The translator maintains the same feminine gender but renders it directly rather than with a circumlocution as in the Hebrew. This is an example of explicitisation.
- g) שְׁמֵר פִּתְחֵי־פִיךָ / φύλαξαι τοῦ ἀναθέσθαι τι αὐτῇ] τι αὐτῇ “anything to her” is a plus. Also, the Hebrew שְׁמֵר פִּתְחֵי־פִיךָ “guard the openings of your mouth” literally means to be careful about what one speaks. The translator renders שְׁמֵר “to guard” literally but concretises “guarding the openings of the mouth” to “being careful to avoid saying anything to her.”

4.8.6 Micah 7.6

MT כִּי־בֶן מְנַבֵּל אָב בַּת קָמָה בְּאִמָּה כָּלָה בְּחַמְתָּהּ אִיבִי אִישׁ אֲנָשִׁי בֵּיתוֹ

For a son treats (his) father with insolence;
A daughter rises up against her mother;
A daughter-in-law (rises up) against her mother-in-law;
A man’s enemies are the men of his house.

LXX διότι υἱὸς ἀτιμάζει πατέρα θυγάτηρ ἐπαναστήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτῆς νόμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτῆς ἐχθροὶ ἄνδρὸς¹⁰⁵ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ

For a son dishonors (his) father;
A daughter will rise up against her mother;
A daughter-in-law (will rise up) against her mother-in-law;
A man’s enemies are the men who are in his house.

¹⁰⁵ Followed by πάντες in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- a) מִנְבֵּל / ἀτιμάζει] This is a unique rendering but it captures the sense of the Hebrew (non-shift).

4.8.7 Micah 7.7

MT וְאֲנִי בִיהוָה אֶצְפָּה אוֹחִילָה לְאֱלֹהֵי יְשׁוּעֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
 But as for me, I will closely watch the LORD;
 I will wait for the God of my salvation;
 My God will hear me.

LXX ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐπιβλέψομαι ὑπομενῶ ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτήρῳ μου εἰσακούσεται μου ὁ θεός μου
 But as for me, I will anticipate the Lord;
 I will wait for God my savior;
 My God will hear me.

- a) וְאֲנִי / ἐγὼ δὲ] This is one of the three shifts from *vav* “and” to *δὲ* “but” (out of a total of 180 occurrences of *vav* “and” in Micah). (See §4.3.13c for more explanation.) Here it highlights the contrast between the deeds (e.g., familial dysfunction) of the unfaithful in the land and the prophet’s faithfulness as he waits for God’s salvation.
- b) בִּיהוָה / ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον] The ב preposition “in” is rendered ἐν “in” 8786 times but ἐπὶ “on, above” only 712 times. This rendering (along with the same rendering of the ל preposition “to, for” later in the verse) contributes to the theological shift explained in the next paragraph.
- c) אֶצְפָּה / ἐπιβλέψομαι] This rendering occurs only here and Ps 66.7 [Gk 65.7]. The translator could have chosen other verbs to render צפה “to watch closely” (e.g., σκοπέω “to contemplate,” ἀποσκοπεύω “to keep watch,” and ὁράω “to see”). His choice of the

verb ἐπιβλέπω “to anticipate” for צפּה “to watch closely” exemplifies a subtle intervention by the translator. Though the Greek word falls within the semantic range of the Hebrew word,¹⁰⁶ the translator’s lexical choice represents a translation shift. Munday (2012a, 33) discusses “engagement” as a term that refers to “the stance adopted by the text producer to a phenomenon or object and the relative position the producer allows to the text receiver.” The translator’s stance falls along a cline from monogloss (constrictive) to heterogloss (expansive). In 7.7, the translator constricts the way the target audience can receive the message of the verse. The reader’s theological interpretation of the idea of “closely watching the Lord” is constricted to “anticipating the Lord” for judgment, salvation and sustenance (cf. 7.8ff). The shifts in this verse served to highlight these positive response of the prophet to anticipate the judgment, salvation and sustenance of the Lord.

- d) אֲשַׁרְיָ / ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτήρῳ μου] יְשׁוּ. “salvation” is more commonly rendered with the noun σωτηρία “salvation” but LXX translators also use σωτήρ “savior” (as here), especially in the Psalms and Isa (cf. Ps 24.5 [Gk 23.5]; 25.5 [Gk 24.5]; 27.1 [Gk 26.1]; 65.6 [Gk 64.5]; Isa 17.10; 62.11). Out of the 85 times ὑπομένω “to wait” occurs in the LXX (including the Apocrypha), only here is the verb followed by ἐπὶ “upon.” As for the rendering of the preposition, לְ “to, for” is translated εἰς “into” 2305 times but ἐπὶ “on, above” only 219 times.

¹⁰⁶ According to Muraoka (2003, 212), the semantic range for ἐπιβλέπω “to anticipate” (in the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets) includes “to look or watch attentively: caringly, with affection” and “to look forward to, anticipate.”

4.8.8 Micah 7.8

7.8 MT אֲל־תִּשְׂמְחִי אִיבֹתַי לִי כִי נִפְלַתִּי קָמְתִי כִי־אֵשֵׁב בְּחֹשֶׁךְ יְהוָה אֹרֶךְ לִי
 Do not rejoice, O my female enemy, over me;
 When I fell, I rose;
 When I sit in darkness,
 The LORD will be light to me.

LXX μὴ ἐπίχαιρέ μοι ἢ ἐχθρά μου ὅτι πέπτωκα καὶ ἀναστήσομαι διότι ἐὰν καθίσω ἐν τῷ
 σκότει κύριος φωτιεῖ μοι
 Do not rejoice over me, O my female adversary,
 For I have fallen but I will rise;
 For though I will sit in darkness,
 The Lord will give me light.

a) **קָמְתִי / καὶ ἀναστήσομαι**] There is a plus καὶ “but” and a shift from *qatal* to future. The

prophet (standing for God’s people) argues in the last three stichoi why their enemy should not rejoice about the LORD judging his people. In the past, they fell but then they

rose (**נִפְלַתִּי** “I fell” + **קָמְתִי** “I rose” without conjunction); in the future, they will sit in

darkness but the LORD will be their light (**אֵשֵׁב בְּחֹשֶׁךְ** “I will sit in darkness” + **יְהוָה אֹרֶךְ**

לִי “the LORD will be light to me”). The translator added the καὶ “but” to contrast the past

“fall” with the future “rising.” Perhaps the translator was pointing forward to the details

in v.9. In that case, the “fall” to which he refers is the sin the prophet (or Israelites)

committed against the Lord and his (or their) “rising” is the Lord’s vindication. This is an

ideological shift.

b) **יְהוָה אֹרֶךְ לִי / κύριος φωτιεῖ μοι**] It is likely that the future time inherent in **אֵשֵׁב** “I will

sit” guides the tense of this verbless clause (**יְהוָה אֹרֶךְ לִי** “the LORD will be light to me”).

The translator may not have read this as a verbless clause but as a *qatal* finite verb אֹר “he became light”

“he became light” or as an ms participle אֹר “he/it is shining.”

4.8.9 Micah 7.9

MT זַעַף יְהוָה אֶשָּׂא כִּי חָטָאתִי לוֹ עַד אֲשֶׁר יָרִיב יְרִיבִי וְעָשָׂה מְשַׁפְּטֵי יוֹצִיאֲנִי לְאוֹר
אֶרְאֶה בְּצִדְקָתוֹ

I must bear the anger of the LORD for I have sinned against him
Until he pleads my cause
And executes judgment for me.
He will bring me out into the light;
I will see his vindication.

LXX ὀργὴν κυρίου ὑποίσω ὅτι ἥμαρτον αὐτῷ ἕως τοῦ δικαιῶσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου καὶ ποιήσει
τὸ κρίμα μου καὶ ἐξάξει με εἰς τὸ φῶς ὄψομαι τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ
I will endure the wrath of the Lord because I sinned against him
Until he will vindicate my cause
And he will execute my judgment
And he will lead me into the light;
I will see his justice.

a) יְרִיב יְרִיבִי / τοῦ δικαιῶσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου] Normally יְרִיב “to contend” and יְרִיב

“cause” are rendered with κρίνω “to judge” (25x)¹⁰⁷ and κρίσις “judgment” (27x),¹⁰⁸

including Mic 6.1-2. However, there are instances outside Mic 7.9 where יְרִיב “to

contend” and יְרִיב “cause” are rendered δικαιῶ “to justify” (cf. Isa 1.17) and δίκη

“cause.”¹⁰⁹ This is not a shift.

¹⁰⁷ Gen 26.21; Judg 21.22 (2x); 1 Sam 24.16; 25.39; 2 Chr 19.8; Job 9.3; 10.2; 13.19; 31.13; Ps 119.154; Prov 22.23; 23.11; Isa 19.20; 49.25; 50.8; 51.22; Jer 2.9 (2x); 50.34; 51.36; Lam 3.36; Hos 2.4 (2x); Mic 6.1.

¹⁰⁸ Exod 23.3, 6; Deut 17.8; 1 Sam 24.16; 25.39; 2 Sam 15.2; 2 Chr 19.10; Job 13.6; 40.2; Ps 119.154; Prov 15.18; 22.23; 23.11; 30.33; Isa 1.23; 3.13; 34.8; 41.21; 58.4; Jer 25.31; 50.34; Ezek 44.24; Hos 4.1; 12.3; Mic 6.2 (2x); Hab 1.3.

¹⁰⁹ Job 29.16; 33.13; Ps 35.23; 43.1; 74.22; Lam 3.58; Amos 7.4.

4.8.10 Micah 7.10

MT ותרא איבתי ותכסה בוששה האמרה אלי אי יהוה אלהיך עיני תראינה בה עתה
תהיה למרמס בטט חוצות

Then my female enemy will see and shame will cover her
Who says to me, “Where is the LORD your God?”
My eyes will look at her;
Then she will be for trampling like mire in the streets.

LXX και ὄψεται ἡ ἐχθρά μου καὶ περιβαλεῖται αἰσχύνην ἢ λέγουσα πρὸς με ποῦ κύριος ὁ θεός σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου ἐπόψονται αὐτήν νῦν ἔσται εἰς καταπάτημα ὡς πηλὸς ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς
And my female adversary will see and she will be covered in shame,
She who says to me, “Where is the Lord your God?”
My eyes will look at her;
Now she will be for trampling like the clay in the streets.

- a) **ותכסה / καὶ περιβαλεῖται**] This is a shift from active to passive. Perhaps the translator chose to depersonify the inanimate subject “shame.”

4.8.11 Micah 7.11

MT יום לבנות גדרך יום ההוא ירחקתך
A day for the building of your walls.
In that day the boundary will be extended.

LXX ἡμέρας ἀλοιφῆς πλίνθου ἐξάλειψίς σου ἢ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη καὶ ἀποτριπεται νόμιμά¹¹⁰ ἢ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη¹¹¹
A day of forming brick;
Your obliteration will be that day;
That day will rub out ordinances.

- a) **לבנות / ἀλοιφῆς πλίνθου**] This is a unique rendering. The translator likely understood the infinitive construct of **בנה** “to build” as a nominal form of **לבנה** “brick.”¹¹² Though Schwantes (1962, 193) argues the translator read (unattested) **לבנות** “bricks,” the plural

¹¹⁰ Followed by σου in in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

¹¹¹ The second ἢ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη phrase begins v.12 in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

¹¹² Gelston (2010, 82) explains as a different vocalisation and an amplification but does not specify any motivation for the amplification.

form in the MT is לְבִנִּים “bricks.” So, either the translator did not know the plural form of לְבִנָּה “brick” and assumed its plural was formed like normal feminine nouns, or he misread the *vav-tav* ending as a *he* (the rendering πλίνθου “brick” is a singular noun). In either case, the translator has expanded (and hence, explicitised) the translation from “a day of brick” to “a day of forming brick.” Schwantes (1962, 193) suggests that the translator’s choice of ἀλοιφῆς “forming, smearing” was a play on his understanding of the subsequent חֲדָרֶיךָ “your walls” as a form of עָרַךְ “to diminish,” rendering it ἐξάλειψίς σου “your obliteration / wiping away” (in Num 27.4 ἐξάλειφω “to obliterate / wipe away” renders עָרַךְ “to diminish”).

- b) חֲדָרֶיךָ / ἐξάλειψίς σου] חֲדָרֶיךָ “your walls” was understood as some form of עָרַךְ “to diminish” (in Num 27.4 ἐξάλειφω “to obliterate / wipe away” renders עָרַךְ “to diminish”) (Schwantes 1962, 193). Though this is the best explanation, there are difficulties with it—1) a nominal form of עָרַךְ “to diminish” is not attested in the MT, and 2) this explanation assumes (at least) that the translator missed the *yod*, and confused the *dalet/resh* and the *resh/ayin* (ד/ר and ר/א [script from Lachish inscriptions]).
- c) קָרַךְ / καὶ ἀποτριβεται] This is a plus καὶ “and.” Rendering קָרַךְ “to be distant / make distant” ἀποτριβω “to rub out” is unique in the LXX. It is usually rendered with μακρύνω “to prolong,” μακράν “far” (by itself or + ποιέω “to make,” γίνομαι “to become,” or εἰμί “to be”), ἀφίστημι “to be/keep away” (by itself or + μακράν “far”), ἀπέχω “to be distant” (by itself or + μακράν “far”) or πόρρω “far” (by itself or + ποιέω “to make,” γίνομαι “to

become”). ἀποτριβῶ “to wear out, rub out” occurs only twice (the other instance is in Hos 8.5 to render חָנַף “to reject”). It is doubtful that the translator *did not* know the meaning of this word; instead, because he rendered חֹק “ordinance, boundary” as νόμιμά σου “your ordinances” (§4.8.11e), it made better sense in the context that their ordinances would disappear, not be extended (perhaps he read קָרַח “to be distant / make distant” as מָחַק “to annihilate,” מָחַה “to rub/wipe out” or קָרַח “to make bald”).

The context is difficult to sort out. In vv. 8-10, a female speaker (possibly Zion) tells of her fall but eventual restoration. In vv. 11-13, the MT positively describes how Zion’s boundary will expand and foreigners will fill it. However, in the LXX, vv. 11b-13 are entirely negative for God’s people (obliteration, loss of ordinances, leveling of cities, water and uproar). This interpretive difference affects the individual translation decisions in this section.

d) **הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה / ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη**] This phrase is part of 7.12 in the Hebrew (as well as in Rahlfs-Hanhart). Nevertheless, it was clearly read by the translator with 7.11 as the subject of ἀποτριβῶ “to wear out, rub out.”

e) **חֹק / νόμιμά σου**] The plus σου “your” was added to explicitise the ordinances as theirs. There is also a shift in number from singular to plural and in meaning from חֹק “boundary” to νόμιμά “ordinances.”

4.8.12 Micah 7.12

MT יום הוא ועד־ךָ יבוא למני אשור וערי מצור ולמני מצור ועד־נהר וים מים והר ההר
 That day even to you he will come,
 From Assyria and the cities of Egypt,
 From Egypt to the river,
 And from sea to sea,
 And from mountain to mountain.

LXX καὶ αἱ πόλεις σου ἥξουσιν εἰς ὀμαλισμὸν καὶ εἰς διαμερισμὸν [Ἀσσυρίων]¹¹³ καὶ αἱ πόλεις
 σου αἱ ὀχυραὶ εἰς διαμερισμὸν ἀπὸ Τύρου ἕως¹¹⁴ ποταμοῦ¹¹⁵ ἡμέρα ὕδατος καὶ θορύβου
 And your cities will come to a leveling
 And (come) to a dividing [of the Assyrians]
 And your strong cities to a dividing
 From Tyre as far as a river—
 A day of water and uproar.

a) יום הוא / ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη] This phrase is rendered in 7.11; see 7.11 for analysis.

b) ועד־ךָ יבוא למני אשור וערי מצור ולמני / καὶ αἱ πόλεις σου ἥξουσιν εἰς ὀμαλισμὸν καὶ εἰς
 διαμερισμὸν [Ἀσσυρίων] καὶ αἱ πόλεις σου αἱ ὀχυραὶ εἰς διαμερισμὸν] This section
 demonstrates a complex interplay between mistakes and harmonisations / interpretive
 shifts. It is difficult to discern, in any given instance, the cause of the shift—translator
 deficiency or divergent interpretation.

First, through a *dalet/resh* confusion the translator read ועריך “and your cities”

for ועד־ךָ “even to you.” Second, he translated למני אשור “from Assyria” in reverse

¹¹³ This is a later editorial insertion intended to provide the accurate rendering for אשור “Assyria” (the mistaken translation remains as well).

¹¹⁴ Followed by τοῦ in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

¹¹⁵ Followed by Συρίας in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

order.¹¹⁶ The rendering εἰς ὀμαλισμὸν “to a leveling” suggests the translator read אֲשׁוּר “Assyria” as a denominative of the Piel stem of יָשַׁר “to make level” (Ziegler [1943, 225] deems Ἀσσυρίων as questionable). Third, לְמַנִּי “from” appears twice and is rendered the same way (εἰς διαμερισμὸν “to a dividing”) via some denominative form of מָנָה “to number, apportion.” (The καὶ “and” is added to smooth the syntax.) Fourth, though מִצְוֹר “Egypt” in 7.12c was mistakenly rendered ἀπὸ Τύρου “from Tyre,” the present מִצְוֹר “Egypt” is preceded by the construct עָרֵי “cities of” leading the translator to make a different mistake—understanding מִצְוֹר “Egypt” as a modifier of cities (“strong cities”). This mistake arose either from understanding מִצְוֹר “Egypt” as “strong” like the translator of 2 Chr 8.5 or misreading it as בְּצֻר “fortified” through a *mem/bet* confusion (in 13 instances the LXX renders בְּצֻר “fortified” with ὀχυρός “strong”).¹¹⁷ There is also a plus σου “your” to explicitise who possesses the strong cities.

c) **מִצְוֹר / ἀπὸ Τύρου**] Instead of understanding מִצְוֹר “Egypt” as the poetic form of מִצְרַיִם

“Egypt,” the translator read it as מִן “from” + צוֹר “Tyre” (S read it the same way).

d) **יוֹם / ἡμέρα**] The translator read יוֹם “day” likely through the metathesis of *yod* and *vav*.

¹¹⁶ Gelston (2010, 109*) describes one of the difficulties with this verse: “It is clear from the repetition of εἰς διαμερισμὸν later in the verse that it represents לְמַנִּי, but why the two words are inverted here in G, and how אֲשׁוּר comes to be rendered by εἰς ὀμαλισμὸν, remain obscure.”

¹¹⁷ Num 13.28; Deut 3.5; 28.52; 2 Sam 20.6; 2 Kgs 18.13; 19.25; 2 Chr 17.2; 19.5; Isa 25.2; 36.1; 37.26; Ezek 36.35; Zeph 1.16.

- e) מִיַּם / ὕδατος] The translator read מִיַּם “water.”
- f) וְהָרָה הָהָר / καὶ θορύβου] θόρυβος “uproar” usually renders הָמוֹן “uproar.” It seems that the translator used his understanding of the context to sort out the strange sequence of consonants (והרההר).

4.8.13 Micah 7.13

- MT וְהִיתָה הָאָרֶץ לְשָׂמָמָה עַל־יִשְׁבֵּיָהּ מִפְּרֵי מַעַלְלֵיהֶם
And the land will be a waste on account of her inhabitants
Because of the fruit of their deeds.
- LXX καὶ ἔσται ἡ γῆ εἰς ἀφανισμὸν σὺν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτήν ἐκ καρπῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτῶν
And the land will be destroyed together with them that inhabit it
Because of the fruit of their practices.

- a) עַל / σὺν] This rendering, though it reflects an uncommon meaning of עַל “with,” falls within its semantic range (cf. Gen 32.12; Exod 35.22). However, the translator’s choice reflects a strikingly different theology. Not only will the land be destroyed (MT) but so will all those who inhabit it.

4.8.14 Micah 7.14

- MT רָעָה עֲמֶךָ בְּשִׁבְטֶיךָ צֹאן נַחֲלָתְךָ שֹׁכְנֵי לְבָדָד יַעַר בְּתוֹךְ כְּרָמְךָ יִרְעוּ בְּשֵׁן וְגִלְעָד כִּימֵי עוֹלָם
Shepherd your people with your staff,
The flock of your inheritance
Who dwell alone,
A forest in the midst of a garden-land;
Let them graze in Bashan and Gilead as in the days of old.

LXX ποιμαίνε λαόν σου ἐν ῥάβδῳ σου πρόβατα κληρονομίας σου κατασκηνοῦντας καθ' ἑαυτοῦς δρυμόν ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Καρμήλου νεμήσονται τὴν Βασανίτιν καὶ τὴν Γαλααδίτιν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος
 Shepherd your people with your staff,
 The sheep of your possession,
 Inhabiting alone
 A forest in the midst of Carmel,
 They shall feed in Basanitis and Galaaditis as the days of old.

- a) **רָבַד / πρόβατα**] This is a shift from singular to plural.
- b) **שָׁכַן / κατασκηνοῦντας**] This is a shift from ms to mp participle (agrees with previous shift in subject number).
- c) **עָרַב / νεμήσονται**] The same verb is used here for the people/sheep grazing (הֵעָרַב) as is used at the beginning of Mic 7.14 to command the leaders to shepherd. The translator renders the command with the expected ποιμαίνω “to shepherd” but since the semantic range of ποιμαίνω “to shepherd” does not include “grazing,” the translator rendered it νέμω “to feed.” This would be considered a linguistically constrained shift.
- d) **כַּרְמֶל / τοῦ Καρμήλου**] This is not a shift; the Hebrew could be translated with the place name.
- e) **בָּשָׁן / τὴν Βασανίτιν**] The usual rendering is Βασαν “Basan” (38x) but the present rendering occurs 13 times.¹¹⁸
- f) **גְּלָד / τὴν Γαλααδίτιν**] The usual rendering is Γαλααδ “Galaad” (90x) but the present rendering occurs 9 times.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ Josh 13.11, 12, 30, 31; 17.1; 20.8; 21.27; 22.7; Ezek 27.6; Amos 4.1; Mic 7.14; Nah 1.4; Zech 11.2.

4.8.15 Micah 7.15

MT נִפְלְאוֹתַי כִּי מִי צִאתָךְ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם אֶרְאֶנּוּ ¹²⁰
 As in the days when you came out of the land of Egypt,
 I will show him marvelous things.

LXX καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐξοδίας σου ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ὄψεσθε θαυμαστά
 And according to the days of your departure from Egypt,
 You will see marvelous things.

a) מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם / ἐξ Αἰγύπτου] There is a minus מֵאֶרֶץ “from the land.” Phelan (1982, 185)

suggests it is a stylistic simplification. Schwantes (1962, 200) suggests (based on meter) that מֵאֶרֶץ “from the land of” was likely a later intrusion due to dittography or the frequency of the phrase אֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם “land of Egypt.” Given the similar consonants shared by מֵאֶרֶץ “from the land of” and מִצְרַיִם “Egypt,” it is likely that מֵאֶרֶץ “from the land of” was lost during the transmission of the Hebrew text through *homoioarchon*. If this explanation is correct, then the translator had a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Alternatively, אֶרֶץ “the land of” could have been dropped through parablepsis during the translation process.

b) אֶרְאֶנּוּ / ὄψεσθε] This is a shift from *yiqtol* 1cs in Hiphil to future middle indicative 2pl and a minus 3ms suffix. If the translator understands the speaker to be the prophet, then this shift is theological, suggesting that the prophet would not have the ability to show them marvelous things. Further, the second person perspective has already appeared in this verse (צִאתָךְ “when you came out”).

¹¹⁹ Josh 13.11; 17.1; 2 Sam 2.9; 1 Chr 26.31; Ezek 47.18; Amos 1.13; Obad 19; Mic 7.14; Zech 10.10.

¹²⁰ Many commentators suggest reading הִרְאֵנּוּ “show us” (Hillers 1984, 88 n. o; Wolff 1990, 214 n.15b; Schwantes 1962, 201). Andersen and Freedman (2000, 592-593) leave the consonantal text and suggest reading it as an archaic preterit recital from Yahweh “I showed him.”

4.8.16 Micah 7.16

MT יִרְאוּ גוֹיִם וַיִּבְשׁוּ מִכָּל גְּבוּרָתָם יְשִׁימוּ יָד עַל־פִּה אֲזִינָהֶם תִּחְרֹשְׁנָה
 Nations will see and be ashamed
 Of all their might;
 They will put (their) hand over mouth;
 Their ears will be deaf.

LXX ὄψονται ἔθνη καὶ καταισχυνθήσονται ἐκ πάσης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτῶν ἐπιθήσουσιν χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸ
 στόμα αὐτῶν τὰ ὦτα αὐτῶν ἀποκωφωθήσονται
 Nations will see and be put to shame
 From all their might;
 They will place (their) hands upon their mouth;
 Their ears will become deaf.

a) **הַפִּה / χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν]** There is a shift in number (דָּ “hand” > χεῖρας

“hands”) and plus αὐτῶν “their.” The MT **יָד עַל־פִּה** “hand over mouth” is idiomatic; the

LXX concretises the idiom with χεῖρας ἐπὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν “hands upon their mouth.”

4.8.17 Micah 7.17

MT יִלְחֲכוּ עָפָר כַּנְחָשׁ כְּזֹחֵלִי אֶרֶץ יִרְגְּזוּ מִמִּסְגְּרֹתֵיהֶם אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יִפְחָדוּ וַיִּרְאוּ
 מִמֶּנּוּ

They will lick dust like a serpent,
 Like the crawling things of the land;
 They will (come) trembling from their strongholds
 To the LORD our God they will (come) in dread;
 And they will fear because of you.

LXX λείξουσι¹²¹ χοῦν ὡς ὄφεις¹²² σύροντες γῆν συγχυθήσονται ἐν συγκλεισμῷ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ
 θεῷ ἡμῶν ἐκστήσονται καὶ φοβηθήσονται ἀπὸ σοῦ
 They will lick dust like a snake;
 While dragging soil;
 They will be confounded in their enclosure;
 They will be amazed at the Lord our God
 And they will fear because of you.

¹²¹ λείξουσιν in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

¹²² ὄφεις in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- a) **כְּזוֹחֵלִי / σύροντες]** לָחַל with the sense of “to crawl” occurs only one other time in the MT (Deut 32.24) and there it is also rendered with σύρω “to drag.” The translator understood this plural participle as referring to the nations in 7.16—instead of introducing another creature that compares to the nations, the participle was understood as further modifying what snakes do when they crawl on the ground. Perhaps the translator ignored the *kaf* preposition. Another possibility is that the translator understood the Hebrew word as an infinitive construct with *kaf* preposition (“when crawling” > “while dragging”).¹²³
- b) **אֶרֶץ / γῆν]** Whereas אֶרֶץ “earth” is in a construct relationship, γῆν “earth” is the direct object (accusative) of the particle σύροντες “while dragging.”
- c) **רָגַז / συγχύθισονται]** Though this is not the most common rendering for רָגַז “to tremble” (more common is ταρασσώ “to throw into confusion”¹²⁴ and ὀργίζω “to be angry”¹²⁵), it is also rendered συγχέω “to confuse” in Joel 2.1 and 10. Where συγχέω “to confuse” is used in the LXX, it renders רָגַז “to tremble” most often. This appears to be a lexical shift. The translator could have used σείω “to shake, tremble.”
- d) **מִמְקַגְרָתֵיהֶם / ἐν συγκλεισμῷ αὐτῶν]** This is a shift in number but not in semantics (מִמְקַגְרָתֵיהֶם “stronghold” is most commonly rendered συγκλεισμός “enclosure” in the LXX). The shift in preposition (מִן “from” to ἐν “in”) was motivated by the previous shift from

¹²³ In Mic 3.11 the infinitive construct is rendered with a participle.

¹²⁴ Deut 2.25; 2 Sam 19.1; Ps 18.8; 77.17; Isa 64.1; Amos 8.8; Hab 3.16.

¹²⁵ Gen 45.24; Exod 15.14; 2 Kgs 19.28; Ps 4.5; 99.1; Prov 29.9.

רָגַז “to tremble” to συγχέω “to confuse” in the same stich. Gelston (2010, 109*) suggests the translator misread the preposition *mem* as *bet*.

- e) **יִרְאָה / ἐκστήσονται]** יִרְאָה “to fear, dread” is usually rendered with φόβος “fear”¹²⁶ or φοβέω “to fear” but is also rendered ἐξίστημι “to be amazed” in Hos 3.5. This is likely an instance of maintaining variation in vocabulary—other examples of this variation are Ps 27.1 [Gk 26.1] (יִרְאָה “to fear” > φοβέω “to fear”; יִרְאָה “to fear, dread” > δειλιάω “to be timid”); Prov 3.25 (יִרְאָה “to fear” > φοβέω “to fear”; יִרְאָה “dread” > πτόσησις “terror”).

4.8.18 Micah 7.18

MT מי־אֵל כְּמוֹתָיִךְ נִשְׂאָה עֵינֶיךָ וְעָבַר עַל־פְּשָׁע לֹא־הִחֲזִיק לְעַד אָפּוֹ
בִּי־חַפְּזָה הוּא

Who is God like you,
Pardoning iniquity and passing over transgression
For the remnant of his inheritance?
He does not retain his anger forever
Because he delights in steadfast love.

LXX τίς θεὸς ὡσπερ σύ ἐξαίρων ἀδικίας καὶ ὑπερβαίνων ἀσεβείας τοῖς καταλοιποῖσι τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐ συνέσχεν εἰς μαρτύριον ὀργὴν αὐτοῦ ὅτι θελητῆς ἐλέους ἐστίν
Who is God like you,
Removing unrighteousness and passing over ungodliness
For the remnant of his possession?
And he did not retain his anger for a witness,
Because he is one who desires mercy.

- a) **יָוֶן / ἀδικίας]** Singular to plural shift. (See explanation in §5.5.2.3 for more details.)

- b) **פְּשָׁע / ἀσεβείας]** Singular to plural shift. (See explanation in §5.5.2.3 for more details.)

¹²⁶ Gen 31.42, 53; Deut 28.67; 1 Chr 14.17; 2 Chr 19.7; Esth 8.17; Job 3.25; 13.11; 15.21; 21.9; 25.2; 31.23; 39.16; Ps 14.5; 31.12; 36.2; 53.6 (2x); 64.2; 91.5; 105.38; 119.120; Isa 2.10, 19, 21; 24.17, 18; Jer 30.5; 48.44; Lam 3.47.

- c) **קִּיָּיִק / συνέσχευ]** This is a unique rendering but still captures the sense of the Hebrew (God does not / did not remain angry).
- d) **לְעַד / εις μαρτύριον]** The translator read **עַד** “witness” for **עַד** “forever.” This section (vv. 18-20) describe the general character of God. There has been question in the OT about whether or not God will remain angry forever (e.g., Ps 85.6 [Gk 84.6]) and the question has been answered elsewhere (e.g., Psa 103.9 [Gk 102.9] and Jer 3.12). Here, the MT affirms that the answer is “no,” he will not retain his anger forever but will show compassion, faithfulness and steadfast love. The translator likely does not disagree with the idea of God not retaining his anger forever; however, he understood **לֹא־הִקְיָיִק** “he does not retain” with a past time reference and that does not fit with the future oriented time reference of **לְעַד** “forever.”

4.8.19 Micah 7.19

MT **יָשׁוּב יְרַחֵמֵנוּ יְכַבֵּשׁ עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ וְיִשְׁלֵךְ בְּמַצְלוֹת יָם כָּל־אֲשׁוּטָנֵינוּ**
 He will again have compassion on us;
 He will tread down our iniquity.
 You will cast into the depths of the sea all their sins.

LXX **ἐπιστρέψει¹²⁷ καὶ οἰκτιρήσει ἡμᾶς καταδύσει τὰς ἀδικίας ἡμῶν καὶ ἀπορρίψει¹²⁸ εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θαλάσσης πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν**
 He will turn and have compassion on us;
 He will cause our unrighteousness to sink
 And he will cast all our sins into the depths of the sea.

¹²⁷ Preceded by *αὐτὸς* in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

¹²⁸ *ἀπορριφήσονται* in Rahlfs-Hanhart.

- a) **יָשׁוּב** / **ἐπιστρέψει καὶ**] The LXX (like S) treats this verb as a separate action instead of an auxiliary verb (in other words, the LXX translator did not understand the Hebrew idiom). This understanding necessitated the addition of the καὶ “and” conjunction.
- b) **יִכְבֹּשׁ** / **καταδύσει**] This is a unique rendering. καταδύω “cause to sink” occurs in the LXX only four times and each time it renders a different Hebrew word (occurrences outside Micah: Exod 15.5 – **יָרַד** “to go down”; Jer 51.64 – **שָׁקַע** “to sink”; Amos 9.3 – **סָתַר** “to hide”). It is likely that the translator did not know the meaning of **כָּבַשׁ** “to tread underfoot” and relies on the context of the next line “casting sins into the depths of the sea” (slot translation).
- c) **וְתִשָּׁלֵךְ** / **καὶ ἀπορρίψει**] This is a shift from second to third person singular. The translator harmonised with the third person in first two stichoi.
- d) **חַטָּאוֹתֵם** / **τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν**] This is a shift from a 3mp suffix pronoun to 1p pronoun. Just as the translator harmonised the verb in this stich, he harmonised this pronoun with the pronouns in the first two stichoi.

4.8.20 Micah 7.20

MT תִּתֵּן אֱמֶת לְיַעֲקֹב חֶסֶד לְאַבְרָהָם אֲשֶׁר־נִשְׁבַּעְתָּ לְאַבְתְּיָנוּ מִיְמֵי קֶדֶם
 You will show faithfulness to Jacob,
 Steadfast love to Abraham,
 Which you swore to our fathers from days of old.

LXX δώσεις ἀλήθειαν τῷ Ιακωβ ἔλεον τῷ Αβρααμ καθότι ὄμοσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἔμπροσθεν
 You will give truth to Jacob,
 Mercy to Abraham,
 Just as you swore to our fathers in former days.

a) תְּמַנֶּה / ἀλήθειαν] This is the common rendering.

b) דַּקָּה יְמֵי / κατὰ ἡμέρας τὰς ἔμπροσθεν] Schwantes (1962, 207) suggests the rendering resulted from a *kaf/mem* confusion. A better solution comes from Magary (1995, 462) who argues that the translator is “harmonizing with two previous יְמֵי time references in close proximity: דַּקָּה יְמֵי = καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος (7.14), and דַּקָּה יְמֵי = κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐξοδίας σου (7.15).” Gelston (2010, 109*) allows for the possibility of a different *Vorlage* but claims “the rendering may be simply free or assimilation to v. 14.” The other versions support MT.

4.9 Conclusions

Through the detailed comparison of coupled-pairs in MT/LXX-Micah some interesting and profitable data have emerged. I have found differences due to translator (or scribal) errors (e.g., 1.10, 4.9, and 5.5) as well as instances potentially reflecting a different Hebrew *Vorlage* (2.1, 5.6 [Gk 5.7] and 7.15). The more intriguing differences involved apparently purposeful translation shifts. Among these shifts I found several additions (e.g., τῆς θυγατρὸς “of the daughter” [1.15], ἐξάπινα “suddenly” [2.3], ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος “from Babylon” [4.8], and κυρίου “Lord” [6.8]) and, less frequently, deletions (e.g., כֹּל “all” [1.2], -הַ “the” [1.4], -וַ “and” [2.2], מִן “from” [2.8], בַּיִת “house of” [4.1], and יַיִן “wine” [6.15]).

The most valuable discoveries were those shifts that exhibited patterns. For instance, I noticed that the translator did not always render verbal conjugations according to what I expected. And, it seemed that these unexpected conjugation renderings occurred in close proximity with one other. When I organised the data in chapter 5, I realised that this pattern communicated important information. There are shifts from *w^eqatal* to imperfect indicative (2.2 [4x]) or aorist indicative (3.5), and *yiqtol* to imperfect indicative (2.1; 3.11 [4x]) or aorist indicative (2.4 [2x]; 2.8 [2x]; 2.10; 3.5; 4.9). These were historicising shifts that altered the vantage point of the text from that of the author of the Hebrew text to that of the translator who was communicating to 3rd or 2nd century B.C.E. diaspora Jews.

Another historicising pattern emerged with certain Hebrew vocatives. Of the 14 Hebrew vocatives, the translator renders 5 of them as the subject of the main verb (1.2, 13; 2.7, 12; 4.14 [Gk 5.1]). In 2.7 and 2.12, the shifts likely represent historicising shifts (in congruence with other historicising shifts in this chapter [esp. in 2.1-4]). The translator viewed the addresses to the house of Jacob (2.7) and Jacob (2.12) to be contemporary with the original prophecies, not with his own historical context.

I also noticed that certain types of singular nouns were rendered in the plural. After categorising the shifts, I realised that these nouns often referred to sin and punishment. For instance, in Mic 1.12, 2.1, 2.3 and 4.9, the translator rendered עָרָא “evil” as κακά “evil deeds” (singular to plural). In Mic 2.1 רָשָׁע “wickedness” was rendered κόπους “troubles.” And in 3.8, there are shifts from יְעוֹשֵׂהוּ “his transgression” to ἀσεβείας αὐτοῦ “his impious acts” and יְחַטְּאוּ “his sin” to ἀμαρτίας αὐτοῦ “his sins.” It seems that these shifts were made because the translator understood that the sins of Jacob must have been numerous and great in order to warrant the punishment they endured. Further, it seems that the translator may be

harmonising with the plural iniquities and sins of Jacob in 7.19, where God's lovingkindness, faithfulness and compassion to forgive are described.

The shifts described in this section are only a selection of the kinds of shifts that emerged from the detailed analysis in this chapter. In chapter 5, I will categorise the verbal correspondences, the errors and all of the translation shifts discerned in chapter 4. Then I will explain the stylistic, functionalist, theological and ideological translation patterns that emerge. In this way, the ideological and theological stance of the translator and of his translated text can be discerned.

Chapter 5: Categorisation of Translation Shifts

5.1 Introduction

Translation technique is often a complicated mixture of conscious and subconscious translation decisions based on linguistic constraints of the target language, the translator's style and desire to clarify, and the translator's idiosyncratic ideology and theology. In this chapter, I will categorise the shifts noted and partially explained in chapter 4 and draw out the tendencies of the translator as discerned by the translation patterns. The first section of this chapter details the correlation of each Hebrew conjugation with its respective mood and tense in Greek. Percentages as they relate to Greek mood are also provided. In the second section, I categorise translation shifts according to morphology, semantics and syntax. Morphological shifts involve person, number, and voice. Semantic shifts involve primarily shifts in meaning. Syntactic shifts include differences in word order, class shifts as well as plusses and minuses.

5.2 Verbal correlations

MT	LXX	Occurrences	#	% of total
Perfect (<i>Qatal</i>)	Indicative	<p>Aorist:</p> <p>1.1 – הִיָּה > ἐγένετο;</p> <p>1.1 – הִזָּה > εἶδεν;</p> <p>1.7 – הִצָּבִק > συνήγαγεν;</p> <p>1.9 – הִסָּבִב > ἦλθεν;</p> <p>1.9 – הִשָּׂבִיב > ἦψατο;</p>	49	94%

		<p>1.11 – הִצִּיט > ἐξήλθε;</p> <p>1.12 – הִלִּיף > ἤρξατο;</p> <p>1.12 – דָּרַי > κατέβη;</p> <p>1.16 – וָלָג > ἠχμαλωτεύθησαν;</p> <p>2.4 – וְנִשְׁדָּנוּ > ἐταλαιπωρήσαμεν;</p> <p>2.7 – הִקְצִיר > παρώργισε;</p> <p>2.11 – כִּיָּב > ἔστησε;</p> <p>2.13 – וַפְּרָצוּ > διέκοψαν;</p> <p>3.3 – וְכָלוּ > κατέφαγον;</p> <p>3.3 – וַיִּטְשֵׁיהֶם > ἐξέδειραν;</p> <p>3.3 – וַיִּפְצְחוּ > συνέθλασαν;</p> <p>3.3 – וַיִּשְׁוּ > ἐμέλισαν;</p> <p>3.4 – וַיִּרְעוּ > ἐπονηρεύσαντο;</p> <p>4.4 – דָּבַר > ἐλάλησεν;</p> <p>4.6 – וַיִּרְעֲתֵיהֶם > ἀπώσαμην;</p> <p>4.9 – דָּבַח > ἀπόλετο;</p> <p>4.9 – וַיִּקְרָא > κατεκράτησάν;</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>4.11 – פּוֹסְפוֹ > ἐπισυνήχθη;</p> <p>4.12 – יָדְעוּ > ἔγνωσαν;</p> <p>4.12 – הִבִּינוּ > συνήκαν;</p> <p>4.12 – קִבְּצוּ > συνήγαγεν (αὐτούς);</p> <p>4.14 [Gk 5.1] – שָׁטַח > ἔταξεν;</p> <p>5.14 [Gk 5.15] – שָׁמְעוּ > εἰσήκουσαν;</p> <p>6.3 – עָשִׂיתִי > ἐποίησά;</p> <p>6.3 – הִלֵּאתִי > ἐλύπησά (σε) and παρηνώχλησά (σοι) (double rendering of one verb)</p> <p>6.4 – הִטְלֵתִי > ἀνήγαγόν (σε);</p> <p>6.4 – פְּדִיתִי > ἐλυτρώσάμην (σε);</p> <p>6.5 – עָצַו > ἐβουλεύσατο;</p> <p>6.5 – אָנַח > ἀπεκρίθη;</p> <p>6.8 – הִגִּיד > ἀνηγγέλη;</p> <p>6.12 – מָלְאוּ > ἔπλησαν;</p> <p>7.1 – הֵיטִיב > ἐγενόμην;</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>7.9 – חַטָּאתִי > ἥμαρτον;</p> <p>7.18 – קָהַלְתִּי > συνέσχεν;</p> <p>7.20 – נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי > ὄμοσας.</p> <p>Present:</p> <p>2.3 – אָמַר > λέγει;</p> <p>3.5 – אָמַר > λέγει.</p> <p>Future:</p> <p>5.2 [Gk 5.3] – יִלְדָּה > τέξεται;</p> <p>6.13 – יִחַלְתִּי > ἄρξομαι;</p> <p>7.8 – קָמַתִּי > ἀναστήσομαι.</p> <p>Imperfect:</p> <p>6.12 – יִבְרַח > ἐλάλουν.</p> <p>Perfect:</p> <p>7.2 – אָבַד > ἀπόλωλεν;</p> <p>7.4 – אָבַד > ἤκασιν;</p> <p>7.8 – נִפְלֵתִי > πέπτωκα.</p>		
Subjunctive	<p>Aorist:</p> <p>3.8 – מָלֵאתִי > ἐμπλήσω;</p>	2	4%

		5.7 [Gk 5.8] – עָבַר > διέλθη.		
	Participle	Present: 2.4 – אָמַר > λέγων.	1	2%
Consecutive perfect (<i>w^eqatal</i>)	Indicative	Future: 1.3 – יָרַד > καταβήσεται; 1.3 – יָרַד > ἐπιβήσεται; 1.4 – וְנָמְסוּ > σαλευθήσεται; 1.6 – וְשָׁמְתִי > θήσομαι; 1.6 – וְהִגַּדְתִּי > κατασπάσω; 2.4 – הִקָּה > θρηνηθήσεται; 2.11 – הִיָּה > ἔσται; 3.6 – וְחָשְׁכָה > σκοτία...ἔσται; 3.6 – וּבָאָה > δύσεται; 3.6 – וְקָדַר > συσκοτάσει; 3.7 – וּבִשּׁוּ > καταισχυνηθήσονται (passive); 3.7 – וְעָטוּ > καταλαλήσουσιν; 4.1 – וְנִשְׁפָּה > μετεωρισθήσεται (passive);	55	95%

		<p>4.1 – וְנָהָרוּ > σπεύσουσιν;</p> <p>4.2 – וְהָלְכוּ > πορεύονται;</p> <p>4.2 – וְאָמְרוּ > ἐροῦσιν;</p> <p>4.3 – וְשָׁפַט > κρινεῖ;</p> <p>4.3 – וְהוֹכִיחַ > ἐξελέγξει;</p> <p>4.3 – וְכָתְתוּ > κατακόψουσιν;</p> <p>4.4 – וְיָשְׁבוּ > ἀναπαύσεται;</p> <p>4.7 – וְשָׁמְתִי > θήσομαι;</p> <p>4.7 – וּמָלַךְ > βασιλεύσει;</p> <p>4.8 – וּבָאָה > εἰσελεύσεται;</p> <p>4.10 – וְשָׁכַנְתָּ > κατασκηνώσεις;</p> <p>4.10 – וּבָאת > ἦξεις;</p> <p>4.13 – וְהִדְקוּתָּ > κατατήξεις;</p> <p>4.13 – וְהִתְרַמְתִּי > ἀναθήσεις;</p> <p>5.3 [Gk 5.4] – וְעָמַד > στήσεται;</p> <p>5.3 [Gk 5.4] – (וְרָעָה) > ὄψεται; either a plus or one of the double renderings; see</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>explanation in §4.6.3</p> <p>5.3 [Gk 5.4] – וַיִּשְׁבוּ > ὑπάρξουσι;</p> <p>5.4 [Gk 5.5] – וְהָיָה > ἔσται;</p> <p>5.4 [Gk 5.5] – וַהֲקִמְנוּ > ἐπεγερθήσονται;</p> <p>5.5 [Gk 5.6] – וְרָעוּ > ποιμανοῦσι;</p> <p>5.5 [Gk 5.6] – וְהִצִּיל > ῥύσεται;</p> <p>5.6 [Gk 5.7] – וְהָיָה > ἔσται;</p> <p>5.7 [Gk 5.8] – וְהָיָה > ἔσται;</p> <p>5.9 [Gk 5.10] – וְהָיָה > ἔσται;</p> <p>5.9 [Gk 5.10] – וְהִכְרַתִּי > ἐξολεθρεύσω;</p> <p>5.9 [Gk 5.10] – וְהִאַבְדֹתִי > ἀπολῶ;</p> <p>5.10 [Gk 5.11] – וְהִכְרַתִּי > ἐξολεθρεύσω;</p> <p>5.10 [Gk 5.11] – וְהִרְסֹתִי > ἐξαρῶ;</p> <p>5.11 [Gk 5.12] – וְהִכְרַתִּי > ἐξαρῶ;</p> <p>5.12 [Gk 5.13] – וְהִכְרַתִּי > ἐξολεθρεύσω;</p> <p>5.13 [Gk 5.14] – וְנִתְשָׁתִּי > ἐκκόψω;</p> <p>5.13 [Gk 5.14] – וְהִשְׁמַדְתִּי > ἀφανιῶ;</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>5.14 [Gk 5.15] – הַשִּׁעֵי > ποιήσω;</p> <p>7.9 – הַשִּׁעֵי > ποιήσει;</p> <p>7.13 – הַתְּהִי > ἔσται.</p> <p>Imperfect:</p> <p>2.2 – וְהָמָּה > ἐπεθύμουν;</p> <p>2.2 – וְהָלַךְ > διήραζον;</p> <p>2.2 – וְהָשִׁיב > κατεδυνάστευον;</p> <p>2.2 – וְהָשִׁיב > διήραζον.</p> <p>Aorist:</p> <p>3.5 – וְהָשִׁיב > ἤγειραν.</p>		
	Subjunctive	<p>Aorist:</p> <p>5.7 [Gk 5.8] – הָרַץ > ἀρπάση.</p>	1	2%
	Participle	<p>Present:</p> <p>3.5 – וְהָרַץ > κηρύσσοντας.</p> <p>Aorist:</p> <p>5.7 [Gk 5.8] – הָרַץ > διαστείλας.</p>	2	3%
Imperfect (<i>yiqtol</i>)	Indicative	<p>Future:</p> <p>1.2 – וְהָיָה > ἔσται;</p> <p>1.4 – וְהָבִיחַ > τακήσοντα;</p>	108	79%

		<p>1.6 – אֲגַלֶּה > ἀποκαλύψω;</p> <p>1.7 – יִכְתּוּ > κατακόψουσιν;</p> <p>1.7 – יִשְׂרְפוּ > ἐμπρήσουσιν;</p> <p>1.7 – אִשָּׁם > θήσομαι;</p> <p>1.8 – הִפְסֹדָה > κόψεται;</p> <p>1.8 – אִלְלֵה > θρηνήσει;</p> <p>1.8 – אִלְכָה > πορεύσεται;</p> <p>1.8 – הִשְׁעֵה > ποιήσεται;</p> <p>1.11 – חָקַע > λήμψεται;</p> <p>1.14 – תִּתְּנֵה > δώσεις;</p> <p>1.15 – אִבֹּא > ἴξει;</p> <p>2.4 – אִשָּׁה > λημφθήσεται;</p> <p>2.5 – הִיָּה > ἔσται;</p> <p>2.6 – יִסָּג > ἀπώσεται;</p> <p>2.7 – יִיטְבוּ > εἰσιν;</p> <p>2.9 – תִּגְרָשׁוּן > ἀπορριφήσονται (passive);</p> <p>2.12 – אִסָּחַת > συναχθήσεται (passive);</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>2.12 – אָשׁוּבִי > θήσομαι (τὴν ἀποστροφὴν αὐτῶν);</p> <p>3.4 – יִזְעָקוּ > κεκράζονται;</p> <p>3.4 – יֵעָנֶה > εἰσακούσεται;</p> <p>3.4 – וַיִּסְתָּר > ἀποστρέψει;</p> <p>3.12 – שִׁתְּרָהּ > ἀροτριαθήσεται (passive);</p> <p>3.12 – תִּהְיֶה > ἔσται;</p> <p>4.1 – יִהְיֶה > ἔσται;</p> <p>4.2 – וַיֹּרְנוּ > δείξουσιν (ἡμῖν);</p> <p>4.2 – וַנִּלְכֶּה > πορευσόμεθα;</p> <p>4.2 – תִּצָּא > ἐξελεύσεται;</p> <p>4.5 – יֵלְכוּ > πορεύσονται;</p> <p>4.5 – נִלְךְ > πορευσόμεθα;</p> <p>4.6 – אֶסְפָּא > συνάξω</p> <p>4.6 – אֶקְבָּצָא > εἰσδέξομαι;</p> <p>4.8 – תִּתְּאֵר > ἥξει;</p> <p>4.10 – תִּצָּא > ἐξελεύσεται;</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>4.10 – תִּנְצָלִי > ρύσεταιί;</p> <p>4.10 – יִלְאָלֶיךָ > λυτρώσεταιί (σε);</p> <p>4.11 – תִּחַרְתֵּנוּ > ἐπιχαρούμεθα;</p> <p>4.11 – יִתְחַפְּזוּ > ἐπόψονται;</p> <p>4.13 – אֲשַׁאֲ (2x) > θήσομαι (2x);</p> <p>4.14 [Gk 5.1] – תִּדְרָגְתֵּךְ > ἐμφραχθήσεται;</p> <p>4.14 [Gk 5.1] – יִבְּזוּ > πατάξουσιν;</p> <p>5.1 [Gk 5.2] – יִצָּלֶיךָ > ἐξελεύσεται;</p> <p>5.2 [Gk 5.3] – תִּדְּנֶם > δώσει (αὐτοῦς);</p> <p>5.2 [Gk 5.3] – יִשְׁבֹּבוּ > ἐπιστρέψουσιν;</p> <p>5.3 [Gk 5.4] – יִגְדָּל > μεγαλυνθήσεται;</p> <p>5.8 [Gk 5.9] – תִּרְשָׁו > ὑψωθήσεται;</p> <p>5.8 [Gk 5.9] – יִקְרְתוּ > ἐξολεθρευθήσονται;</p> <p>5.11 [Gk 5.12] – יִהְיוּ > ἔσονται;</p> <p>6.2 – תִּבְחָרְתֵּךְ > διελεγθήσεται;</p> <p>6.6 – אֲבִיבֶיךָ > ἀντιλήμψομαι;</p> <p>6.6 – הִקְדִּמְנוּ > καταλήμψομαι;</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

		<p>6.7 – הִרְצָה > προσδέξεται;</p> <p>6.9 – אִקְרָא > ἐπικληθήσεται (passive);</p> <p>6.11 – הִאָזְנָה > δικαιωθήσεται (passive);</p> <p>6.14 – לֶאֱכַל > φάγεσαι;</p> <p>6.14 – גִּשְׁתִּי > ἐκνεύσει;</p> <p>6.14 – אֶתַּן > παραδοθήσονται (passive);</p> <p>6.15 – עָרַרְתִּי > σπερείς;</p> <p>6.15 – דָּרַרְתִּי > πιέσεις;</p> <p>6.16 [Gk from 6.15] – וַיִּשְׁתַּמְרֵם > ἀφανισθήσεται (passive);</p> <p>6.16 – וַיִּשְׁאָל > λήμψεσθε;</p> <p>7.4 – תִּהְיֶה > ἔσονται;</p> <p>7.7 – אֶפְצֹא > ἐπιβλέψομαι;</p> <p>7.7 – אֶלְהִיָּא > ὑπομενῶ;</p> <p>7.7 – וַיִּשְׁמְעֵנִי > εἰσακούσεταιί (μου);</p> <p>7.8 – אֶשָּׂב > καθίσω;</p> <p>7.9 – אֶשָּׂא > ὑποίσω;</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>7.9 – יוֹצִיאֲנִי > ἐξάξει (με);</p> <p>7.9 – אֶרְאֶה > ὄψομαι;</p> <p>7.10 – וְתָרָא > ὄψεται;</p> <p>7.10 – וְתִכְסְּהָ > περιβαλεῖται;</p> <p>7.10 – תִּרְאֲיֶנָּה > ἐπόψονται;</p> <p>7.10 – תִּהְיֶה > ἔσται;</p> <p>7.11 – קָרַקְרַק > ἀποτρίγεται;</p> <p>7.12 – יִבֹּאוּ > ἤξουσιν;</p> <p>7.14 – יִרְעוּ > νεμήσονται;</p> <p>7.15 – אֶרְאֲנֹנוּ > ὄψεσθε;</p> <p>7.16 – יִרְאוּ > ὄψονται;</p> <p>7.16 – וַיִּבְשּׁוּ > καταισχυνθήσονται;</p> <p>7.16 – יִשְׂימוּ > ἐπιθήσουσιν;</p> <p>7.16 – תִּקְרַחְרַחֲנָהּ > ἀποκωφωθήσονται;</p> <p>7.17 – יִלְחֲכוּ > λείξουσιν;</p> <p>7.17 – יִרְגְּזוּ > συγχυθήσονται;</p> <p>7.17 – יִפְתְּדוּ > ἐκστήσονται;</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>7.17 – יִרְאוּ > φοβηθήσονται;</p> <p>7.19 – יָשׁוּב > ἐπιστρέψει;</p> <p>7.19 – יִרְחֹמֵנוּ > οἰκτιρήσει;</p> <p>7.19 – יִכְבֹּשׁ > καταδύσει;</p> <p>7.19 – יִתְשַׁלֵּךְ > ἀπορρίψει;</p> <p>7.20 – תִּתֶּן > δώσεις.</p> <p>Imperfect:</p> <p>2.1 – יַעֲשׂוּהָ > συνετέλουν (αὐτά);</p> <p>3.11 – יִשְׁפֹּטוּ > ἔκρινον;</p> <p>3.11 – יִירוּ > ἀπεκρίνοντο;</p> <p>3.11 – יִקְסְמוּ > ἐμαντεύοντο;</p> <p>3.11 – יִשְׁעֲנוּ > ἐπανεπαύοντο.</p> <p>Aorist:</p> <p>1.7 – יָשׁוּבוּ > συνέστρεψεν;</p> <p>2.4 – יִמֵּר > κατεμετρήθη;</p> <p>2.4 – יִחַלֵּק > διεμερίσθησαν;</p> <p>2.8 – יִקְוֶם > ἀντέστη;</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>2.8 – תִּשְׁפֹּטוּן > ἐξέδειραν;</p> <p>2.10 – לִתְחַבֵּל > διεφθάρητε (passive);</p> <p>2.11 – הִטֵּא > ἐστάλαξέν;</p> <p>3.5 – יִתֵּן > ἐδόθη (passive);</p> <p>4.9 – תִּרְיַעֵי > ἔγνωσ.</p> <p>Present:</p> <p>7.2 – יִאָּרְבוּ > δικάζονται;</p> <p>7.2 – יִצְוּ > ἐκθλίβουσιν.</p>		
Subjunctive	<p>Aorist:</p> <p>1.15 – אָּבִי > ἀγάγω;</p> <p>2.3 – תִּמְיִשׁוּ > ἄρητε;</p> <p>2.3 – תִּלְכוּ > πορευθήτε;</p> <p>3.11 – אָּבוּא > ἐπέλθη;</p> <p>4.2 – וְנִעְלֶה > ἀναβῶμεν;</p> <p>4.3 – אָּשֶׁא > ἀντάρη;</p> <p>4.3 – יִלְמְדוּן > μάθωσι;</p> <p>5.4 [Gk 5.5] – יָּבוּא > ἐπέλθη;</p>	22	16%

	<p>5.4 [Gk 5.5] – ףר׳ > ἐπιβῆ;</p> <p>5.5 [Gk 5.6] – אבו > ἐπέλθη;</p> <p>5.5 [Gk 5.6] – ףר׳ > ἐπιβῆ;</p> <p>5.6 [Gk 5.7] – הנה > συναχθῆ;</p> <p>5.6 [Gk 5.7] – לח׳ > ὑποστῆ;</p> <p>5.12 [Gk 5.13] – תתקנה > προσκυνήσης;</p> <p>6.6 – מקדא > καταλάβω;</p> <p>6.7 – נתן > (εἰ) δῶ;</p> <p>6.14 – עבד > ἐμπλησθῆς (passive);</p> <p>6.14 – תליט > διασωθῆς (passive);</p> <p>6.14 – תליט > διασωθῶσιν (passive);</p> <p>6.15 – רצור > ἀμήσης;</p> <p>6.15 – סת > ἀλείψη;</p> <p>6.15 – תשת > πίητε.</p>		
Imperative	<p>Present:</p> <p>2.6 – ופ > δακρυέτωσαν.</p> <p>Aorist:</p> <p>2.9 – ∅ > ἐγγίσατε;</p>	3	2%

		6.1 – וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ > ἀκουσάτωσαν.		
	Participle	<p>Present:</p> <p>3.9 – וְשֹׁרְפֵי > διαστρέφοντες;</p> <p>6.9 – הַרְאֵי > φοβουμένους.</p> <p>Future:</p> <p>2.4 – שִׁמְיָ > ὁ κωλύσων (past time determined by imperfect הָיָה “there was”)</p>	3	2%
	Infinitive	<p>Aorist:</p> <p>7.9 – דַּיְרֵי > δικαιῶσαι.</p>	1	1%
Past narrative (<i>Wayyiqtol</i>)	Indicative	<p>Aorist:</p> <p>2.13 – וַיִּעְבֹּר > διῆλθον;</p> <p>2.13 – וַיִּצְאֵי > ἐξῆλθον;</p> <p>2.13 – וַיִּעְבְּרֵי > ἐξῆλθεν;</p> <p>6.4 – וַיִּשְׁלֵחַ > ἐξάπεσταιλα;</p> <p>6.16 – וַיִּתְּכֹוּ > ἐπορεύθητε (passive).</p> <p>Future:</p> <p>3.1 – וַיִּמְרֵי > ἐρεῖ;</p> <p>7.3 – וַיִּעְבְּדֵי > ἐξελοῦμαι.</p>	7	100%
Negated imperfect	Indicative	Negated Present:	2	33%

(לֹא + impf)		<p>7.5 – אֲלֵתֶּאֱמִינוּ > μὴ καταπιστεύετε;</p> <p>7.5 – אֲלֵתֶּחֹחַ > μὴ ἐλπίζετε.</p>		
	Imperative	<p>Present:</p> <p>1.10 – אֲלֵתֶּגִּידוּ > μὴ μεγαλύνεσθε;</p> <p>1.10 – אֲלֵתֶּבְכוּ > μὴ ἀνοικοδομεῖτε;</p> <p>2.6 – אֲלֵתֶּטְפוּ > μὴ κλαίετε;</p> <p>7.8 – אֲלֵתֶּשְׂמְחִי > μὴ ἐπίχαιρέ.</p>	4	66%
Imperative	Imperative	<p>Aorist:</p> <p>1.2 – שְׁמַעוּ > ἀκούσατε;</p> <p>1.10 – הִתְפַּלְשְׁתִּי > καταπάσασθε;</p> <p>1.16 – קָרָחִי > ξύρησαι;</p> <p>1.16 – וָגַיִי > κείρῃαι;</p> <p>2.10 – קוּמוּ > ἀνάστηθι;</p> <p>3.1 – שְׁמַעוּ־נָא > ἀκούσατε;</p> <p>3.9 – שְׁמַעוּ־נָא > ἀκούσατε;</p> <p>4.13 – וְהִרְמַתִּי > ἀνάστηθι;</p> <p>6.1 – שְׁמַעוּ־נָא > ἀκούσατε;</p>	23	100%

		<p>6.1 – קום > ἀνάστηθι;</p> <p>6.1 – ריב > κρίθητι;</p> <p>6.2 – שמעו > ἀκούσατε;</p> <p>6.3 – ענה > ἀποκρίθητί;</p> <p>6.5 – זכר־נא > μνήσθητι δὴ;</p> <p>7.5 – שמר > φύλαξαι.</p> <p>Present:</p> <p>1.2 – הקשיבי > προσεχέτω;</p> <p>2.10 – ולכו > πορεύου;</p> <p>4.10 – חולי > ὄδινε;</p> <p>4.10 – הגי > ἀνδρίζου;</p> <p>4.13 – ודושי > ἀλόα;</p> <p>6.9 – שמעו > ἄκουε;</p> <p>7.14 – העה > ποιίμαινε.</p>		
Participle	Indicative	<p>Present:</p> <p>1.3 – נצ' > ἐκπορεύεται;</p> <p>2.3 – שבח > λογίζομα;</p>	10	22%

	<p>6.8 – דִּוְרֵשׁ > ἐκζητεῖ;</p> <p>7.3 – שֹׁאֵל > αἰτεῖ;</p> <p>7.3 – דִּבֵּר > ἐλάλησε;</p> <p>7.6 – מַנְבִּיל > ἀτιμάζει.</p> <p>Perfect:</p> <p>2.7 – הִוְלִיחַ > πεπόρευνται.</p> <p>Aorist:</p> <p>2.10 [Gk 2.11] – נִמְרָץ > κατεδιώχθητε (passive);</p> <p>6.1 – אָמַר > εἶπεν.</p> <p>Future:</p> <p>7.6 – קָמָה > ἐπαναστήσεται.</p>		
Participle	<p>Present:</p> <p>1.4 – מְנָרִים > καταφερόμενον;</p> <p>1.11 – יוֹשְׁבֵת (2x) > κατοικοῦσα (2x);</p> <p>2.1 – חֹשְׁבֵי > λογιζόμενοι;</p> <p>2.1 – וּפְעִילֵי > ἐργαζόμενοι;</p> <p>2.5 – מְשִׁלֵּיךָ > βάλλον;</p>	34	76%

		<p>2.7 – הָאָמַר (Qal passive) > ό λέγων (act);</p> <p>2.11 – הָלַךְ > διώκοντας;</p> <p>3.2 – שָׂנְאִי > οί μισοῦντες;</p> <p>3.2 – וְאֶהְבֵּי > ζητοῦντες;</p> <p>3.2 – גָּזְלִי > ἀρπάζοντες;</p> <p>3.5 – הַמְתַּעֲבִים > τοὺς πλανῶντας;</p> <p>3.5 – הַנִּשְׁכָּחִים > τοὺς δάκνοντας;</p> <p>3.9 – הַמְתַּעֲבִים > οί βδελυσσόμενοι;</p> <p>3.10 – בָּנָה > οί οικοδομοῦντες;</p> <p>4.4 – מְחַרֵּד > ό ἐκφοβῶν;</p> <p>4.9 – בִּיּוֹלָדָה > (ώς) τικτούσης;</p> <p>4.10 – בִּיּוֹלָדָה > (ώς) τίκτουσα;</p> <p>4.11 – הָאֹמְרִים > οί λέγοντες;</p> <p>5.2 [Gk 5.3] – יוֹלָדָה > τικτούσης;</p> <p>5.7 [Gk 5.8] – מַצִּיל > ό ἐξαιρούμενος;</p> <p>5.11 [Gk 5.12] – וּמְעוֹנְנִים ></p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>ἀποφθεγγόμενοι;</p> <p>6.12 – וְיֹשְׁבֵיהֶּ > οἱ κατοικοῦντες (αὐτήν);</p> <p>7.10 – הָאֵמְרָהּ > ἡ λέγουσα;</p> <p>7.13 – וְיֹשְׁבֵיהֶּ > τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν (αὐτήν);</p> <p>7.14 – שְׁכָנֵי > κατασκηνοῦντας;</p> <p>7.17 – בְּזִחְלֵי > σύροντες;</p> <p>7.18 – נִשְׂאֵ > ἐξάιρων;</p> <p>7.18 – וְעָבַר > ὑπερβαίνων.</p> <p>Perfect:</p> <p>4.6 – הַצְּלֵמָהּ > τὴν συντετριμμένην (passive);</p> <p>4.6 – הַנְּדָדְתָהּ > τὴν ἐξωσμένην (passive);</p> <p>4.7 – הַצְּלֵמָהּ > τὴν συντετριμμένην (passive);</p> <p>4.7 – הַנְּהַלְתָּהּ > τὴν ἀπωσμένην (passive).</p>		
	Infinitive	<p>Aorist:</p> <p>2.8 – מְעַבְרִים > ἀφελέσθαι.</p>	1	2%
Infinitive construct	Indicative	<p>Present:</p>	1	8%

		7.3 – לְהִיטִיב > ἐτοιμάζουσιν.		
	Subjunctive	Aorist: 6.5 – תֵּדַע > γνωσθῆ; 6.16 – תִּתֵּן > παραδῶ.	2	15%
	Participle	Present: 3.11 – לֹאמְרֵי > λέγοντες.	1	8%
	Infinitive	Aorist: 3.1 – לְדַעַן > γινῶναι; 3.8 – לְהַגִּיד > ἀπαγγεῖλαι; 6.13 – הַכּוֹרֵץ > πατάξει (σε); 7.1 – לֶאֱכֹל > φαγεῖν. Present: 5.1 [Gk 5.2] – לְהִיוֹת (2x) > εἶναι (2x); 6.8 – תִּשְׁעַן > ποιεῖν; 6.8 – וְאֶהְבֵּת > ἀγαπᾶν; 6.8 – לְכַתֵּב > πορεύεσθαι.	9	69%
Infinitive absolute	Indicative	Future: 6.13 – מִשְׁמַח > ἀφανιῶ.	1	16.5%
	Participle	Present:	2	33.5%

		2.12 – הִסָּח > συναγόμενος (passive); 2.12 – קָבַץ > ἐκδεχόμενος (middle).		
	Infinitive	Present: 6.8 – \emptyset > εἶναι (+ adjective).	1	16.5%
	Other	Dative of cognate noun: 2.4 – דָּוָה > ταλαιπωρία. Mistake: 1.10 – בָּבֶל > οἱ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι.	2	33.5%

The correlation between Hebrew conjugations and Greek moods and tenses demonstrates certain important translation tendencies. First, in the vast majority of instances, the translator renders the Hebrew verbs in the expected way. For instance, *qatal*s and *wayyiqtol*s are usually rendered with aorists, *yiqtol*s and *w^eqatal*s are usually rendered with futures and infinitives construct are usually rendered with Greek infinitives. We can conclude, therefore, that the translator had a good grasp of Hebrew and Greek grammar and he sought fidelity to his Hebrew *Vorlage*. Where he encountered a Hebrew form that has no exact equivalent in Greek (i.e., infinitive absolute), he chose a Greek verbal or nominative form that would convey a similar meaning.

There are, however, instances where the translator deviates from a direct verbal correspondence. In those instances, a historicising pattern emerges which reflects intentional changes to the time reference of the verbs. There are shifts from *w^eqatal* to imperfect indicative (2.2 [4x]) or aorist indicative (3.5), and *yiqtol* to imperfect indicative (2.1; 3.11

[4x]) or aorist indicative (2.4 [2x]; 2.8 [2x]; 2.10; 3.5; 4.9).¹ These two important grammatical changes clarify that, from the vantage point of 3rd or 2nd century B.C.E. diaspora Jews, the sins leading to exile (and exile itself) occurred in the past. For instance, in Mic 2.2, there are four Hebrew verbs in the consecutive perfect conjugation (וּדְמָתוּ, וְלָגְגוּ, וְשָׂפוּ, וְקָשְׁעוּ) that are rendered as Greek imperfects (ἐπεθύμουν, διήραζον, κατεδυνάστευον, διήραζον). These shifts change the timing of the sins from the present (covet, steal, take, oppress) to the past (desired, were plundering, were oppressing, would plunder). Furthermore, the choice of Greek imperfect (instead of aorist) reflects the view of the translator that the Israelites were regularly sinning and this is what invited their exile. What follows in 2.3 in the MT and LXX is a declaration by the LORD about the future judgment that will result from the wickedness. The accumulation of shifts in Mic 2.1-4 suggests that the translator intended to update the message to reflect his post-exilic context rather than the pre-exilic context of his *Vorlage*.

5.3 Morphological, lexical and syntactic shifts

Type	Shift
Morphological	<p><i>Voice</i></p> <p>Active > Passive:</p> <p>2.4 – שָׂפוּ “he will lift up” > λημφθήσεται “it will be taken up”;</p> <p>2.4 – הִלְלֵנוּ “and he will sing (a lament)” > θρηνηθήσεται “(a dirge) will be sung”;</p>

¹ Intentionality is more conspicuous in rare conjugation shifts. Following are the percentages represented by these rare shifts: *w^eqatal* to imperfect indicative (7.3%) or aorist indicative (1.8%), and *yiqtol* to imperfect indicative (4.6%) or aorist indicative (8%).

	<p>2.4 – יָמַר “he changes” > κατεμετρήθη “it was measured out”;</p> <p>2.4 – חָלַק “he alots” > διεμερίσθησαν “they have been divided”;</p> <p>2.10 – חָבַל “it destroys” > διεφθάρητε “you were corrupted”;</p> <p>2.12 – אָסַף “gathering” > συναγόμενος “being gathered”;</p> <p>2.12 – אֲסַף “I will assemble” > συναχθήσεται “he/it will be gathered”;</p> <p>3.5 – יָתַן “he puts” > ἐδόθη “it was put”;</p> <p>6.8 – הִגִּיד “he has told” > εἰ ἀνηγγέλη “has it been told”;</p> <p>6.9 – יִקְרָא “he will cry out” > ἐπικληθήσεται “it will be proclaimed”;</p> <p>6.11 – הֲאִזְכֶּה “shall I acquit” > εἰ δικαιωθήσεται “shall it be justified”;</p> <p>6.14 – אֲתֵּן “I will give” > παραδοθήσονται “he will be handed over”;</p> <p>7.10 – וְחִבְּטָהּ “and it will cover her” > καὶ περιβαλεῖται “she will be covered”.</p> <p>Passive > Active:</p> <p>1.7 – יִכְרְטוּ “they will be crushed” > κατακόψουσιν “they will cut”;</p>
--	---

	<p>1.7 – יִשְׂרְפוּ “they will be burned” > ἐμπρήσουσιν “they will burn”;</p> <p>2.6 – יִסָּג “it will be turned away” > ἀπόσεται “he will remove”;</p> <p>2.7 – הֵאָמַר “is it being said” > ὁ λέγων “one says”;</p> <p>4.10 – תִּנְצָלְיָ “you will be rescued” > ῥύσεταιί σε “he will rescue you”;</p> <p>4.11 – תִּחַנְּךָ “let her be defiled” > ἐπιχαρούμεθα “we will rejoice”;</p> <p>6.12 – מָלְאוּ “they are full” > ἔπλησαν “they filled” (shift is from a stative intransitive to a transitive).</p>
	<p>Conjugation (verb): see §5.2.1 above.</p>
	<p><i>Person (verb, pronoun, suffix)</i></p> <p>First singular > Second singular:</p> <p>4.13 – הִתְרַמַּתִּי “I will devote” or “you (fs) will devote” (if read as archaic 2fs ending) > ἀναθήσεις “you (s) will devote”.</p> <p>First singular > Second plural:</p> <p>7.15 – אֶרְאֶנּוּ “I will show him” > ὄψεσθε “you (p) will see”.</p> <p>First singular > Third singular:</p> <p>1.8 – אֶסְפְּדָה “I will wail” > κόψεται “she will lament”;</p> <p>1.8 – אֶלִּילָה “I will howl” > θρηγήσει “she will wail”;</p>

	<p>1.8 – אֵילְכָה “I will go” > πορεύσεται “she will go”;</p> <p>1.8 – אֶעֱשֶׂה “I will make” > ποιήσεται “she will make”;</p> <p>2.4 – לִי “from me” > αὐτὸν “him”;</p> <p>2.7 – דְּבָרַי “my words” > οἱ λόγῳι αὐτοῦ “his words”;</p> <p>2.11 – הִטָּא “I will prophecy (drip [foam])” > ἐστάλαξέν “it has dropped”;</p> <p>6.11 – הֲאֶזְכָּה “shall I acquit” > εἰ δικαιωθήσεται “shall it be justified”;</p> <p>6.14 – אֶתֶּן “I will give” > παραδοθήσονται “he will be handed over”.</p> <p>First plural > Third plural:</p> <p>5.4 [Gk 5.5] – נִקְמְנוּ “then we will raise” > καὶ ἐπεγερθήσονται “then they will be stirred up”.</p> <p>Second singular > Third singular:</p> <p>1.2 – הִקְשִׁיבִי “pay attention ” > προσεχέτω “let it [the earth] give heed”;</p> <p>4.10 – תִּנְצָלִי “you will be rescued” > ῥύσεται σε “he will rescue you”;</p> <p>4.14 [Gk 5.1] – תִּתְגַּדְּדִי “gather (2fs) in the troops” > ἐμφραχθήσεται “she will be walled in”;</p>
--	--

6.9 – אָמְךָ “your name” > τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ “his name”;

6.14 – וְתִשְׁגֹּךְ “and you will capture (prey)” > καὶ ἐκνεύσει “and he will turn aside”;

7.19 – וְתִשְׁלֹךְ “and you will cast” > καὶ ἀπορρίψει “and he will cast” (7.19).

Second singular > Third plural:

2.12 – כָּלְכֶם “all of you” > πᾶσιν “everyone”;

6.14 – וְאֵשְׁרָרְתֶּם “and what you carry off” > καὶ ὅσοι ἐὰν διασωθῶσιν “and all who might escape”.

Second singular > Second plural:

1.10 – הִתְפַּלְשִׁי “roll yourself” (fs imperative) (*Qere*) or

הִתְפַּלְשְׁתִּי “I roll myself” (*Kethib*) > καταπάσασθε “strew” (plural imperative).

Second plural > Third plural:

2.8 – תִּפְשְׁטוּן “you (mp) strip off” > ἐξέδειραν “they stripped off”;

2.9 – וְתִקְחוּ “you (mp) take” > ἐξώσθησαν “they have been expelled”.

Third singular > First plural:

4.11 – תִּהְיֶה “let her be defiled” > ἐπιχαρούμεθα “we will

	<p>rejoice”.</p> <p>Third singular > Second plural:</p> <p>2.10 – נִמְרָץ “(it is) grievous” > κατεδιώχθητε “you (p) were pursued”.</p> <p>Third singular > Third plural:</p> <p>2.9 – תַּעֲנִיגָהּ “her delightful” > τρυφῆς αὐτῶν “their luxurious”;</p> <p>עֲלֵילָהּ “her children” > πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν “their evil practices”;</p> <p>2.12 – הַדְּבָרָהּ “its pasture” > κοίτης αὐτῶν “their fold”;</p> <p>5.2 [Gk 5.3] – אָחָיו “his brothers” > τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν “their brothers”.</p> <p>Third masculine > Third feminine:</p> <p>1.11 – תִּקַּח “he will take” > λήμψεται “she will receive” (shift not marked grammatically but clear from context);</p> <p>5.4 [Gk 5.5] – הֵן “he” > αὕτη “this” (f.).</p> <p>Third plural > First plural:</p> <p>7.19 – חַטָּאוֹתָם “their sins” > τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν “our sins”.</p> <p>Third plural > Third singular:</p> <p>1.7 – יָשׁוּבוּ “they will return” > συνέστρεψεν “she brought together”.</p>
--	---

	<p><i>Number (verb, noun)</i></p> <p>Singular > Plural:</p> <p>1.5 – תֹּאֵז “this” > ταῦτα “these”;</p> <p>1.7 (2x) – מִאֲתָנִן “wage” > μισθωμάτων “wages”;</p> <p>1.12 – רָע “disaster” > κακὰ “calamities”;</p> <p>1.12 – שַׁעַר “gate of” > πύλας “gates”;</p> <p>1.13 – הַמְרֻכָּבָה “chariot” > ἄρμάτων “chariots”;</p> <p>1.13 – לְרֻכָּז “steed” > ἵππευόντων “horsemen”;</p> <p>1.15 – הַיֹּרֵשׁ “a conqueror” > τοὺς κληρονόμους “the heirs”;</p> <p>2.1 – אֲוֵן “wickedness” > κόπους “troubles”;</p> <p>2.1 – רָע “evil” > κακὰ “evil deeds”;</p> <p>2.1 – יַעֲשׂוּהָ “they do <i>it</i>” > συνετέλουν αὐτά “they accomplished <i>these things</i>” (direct object pronouns);</p> <p>2.3 – רָעָה “calamity” > κακὰ “evils”;</p> <p>2.9 – בַּיִת “house” > τῶν οἰκιῶν “houses”;</p> <p>2.10 – נִמְרָץ “(it is) grievous” > κατεδιώχθητε “you (p) were pursued”;</p> <p>3.8 – פְּשָׁעוֹ “his transgression” > ἀσεβείας αὐτοῦ “his impious</p>
--	---

	<p>acts”;</p> <p>3.8 – חַטָּאתוֹ “his sin” > ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ “his sins”;</p> <p>3.9 – זאת “this” > ταῦτα “these”;</p> <p>3.10 – בְּנֵיהֶם “who (s) build” > οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες “who (p) build”;</p> <p>3.12 – עֵיִן “heaps of ruins” > ὄπωροφυλάκιον “a hut for a garden-watcher”;</p> <p>4.2 – וְיִרְנֶנּוּ “and he will teach us” > καὶ δεῖξουσιν ἡμῖν “and they will show us”;</p> <p>4.9 – רַעַע “a shout” > κακά “calamities”;</p> <p>4.9 – חֵיל “pain” > ὠδῖνες “birth pains”;</p> <p>4.11 – תִּתְחַנְּנָהּ “let her be defiled” > ἐπιχαρούμεθα “we will rejoice”;</p> <p>4.13 – קַרְנֶיךָ “your horn” > τὰ κέρατά σου “your horns”;</p> <p>4.14 [Gk 5.1] – שֹׁפֵט “judge” > τὰς φυλὰς “the tribes”;</p> <p>5.5 [Gk 5.6] – בְּגִבּוֹלֵנוּ “our border” > τὰ ὄρια ὑμῶν “our borders”;</p> <p>5.11 [Gk 5.12] – מִיָּדְךָ “from your hand” > ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου “from your hands”;</p> <p>6.7 – בְּכוֹרִי “my firstborn” > πρωτότοκά μου “my firstborns”;</p>
--	---

	<p>6.14 – תִּפְּלוּ “you will carry off” > διασωθῶσιν “they might escape”;</p> <p>6.16 – וְתִרְפֹּת “and the reproach of” > καὶ ὀνειδή “and the reproaches”;</p> <p>7.4 [Gk 7.3] – טוֹבָם “their good” > τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν “their good things”;</p> <p>7.4 – פְּקֻדֹתֶיךָ “your visitation” > αἱ ἐκδικήσεις σου “your punishments”;</p> <p>7.4 – מְבוֹכָתָם “their confusion” > κλαυθμοὶ αὐτῶν “their weeping”;</p> <p>7.5 – בְּרֵעַ “in a friend” > ἐν φίλοις “in friends”;</p> <p>7.5 – בְּאַלְוֵי “in a friend” > ἐπὶ ἡγουμένους “in leaders”;</p> <p>7.11 – קֵחַ “boundary” > νόμιμά σου “your ordinances”;</p> <p>7.14 – צֹאן “flock” > πρόβατα “sheep”;</p> <p>7.14 – שְׂכְנֵי “who (ms) dwell” > κατασκηνοῦντας “who inhabit (mp)”;</p> <p>7.15 – אֶרְאֶנּוּ “I will show him” > ὄψεσθε “you (p) will see”;</p> <p>7.16 – יָדַי “hand” > χεῖρας “hands”;</p> <p>7.18 – עֲוֹן “iniquity” > ἀδικίας “unrighteousness”;</p>
--	---

	<p>7.18 – פֶּשַׁע “transgression” > ἀσεβείας “ungodliness”.</p> <p>Plural > Singular:</p> <p>1.5 – חַטָּאוֹת “sins” > ἁμαρτίαν “sin”;</p> <p>1.5 – בְּמוֹת “high places” > ἁμαρτία “sin”;</p> <p>1.6 – לְמַטְעֵי “for places to plant” > εἰς φυτεῖαν “a planting”;</p> <p>1.7 – יָשׁוּבוּ “they will return” > συνέστρεψεν “she brought together”;</p> <p>2.8 – מֵעֲבָרִים “from those crossing” > ἀφελέσθαι “to remove”;</p> <p>4.2 – מִדְרָכָיו “from his ways” > τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ “his way”;</p> <p>4.4 – יִשְׁבוּ “they will sit” > ἀναπαύσεται “he will rest”;</p> <p>4.4 – צְבָאוֹת “hosts” > παντοκράτορος “almighty”;</p> <p>4.12 – מַחְשְׁבוֹת “the thoughts of” > τὸν λογισμὸν “the thought”;</p> <p>6.5 – צְדָקוֹת “righteous acts” > ἡ δικαιοσύνη “justice”;</p> <p>7.1 – כְּאַסְפֵי “like the gatherings of” > ὡς συνάγων “like one gathering”;</p> <p>7.4 – מְצַפֵּי “your watchmen” > σκοπιᾶς “watching”;</p> <p>7.11 – גְּדָרֶיךָ “your walls” > ἐξάλειψίς σου “your obliteration”;</p> <p>7.17 – מִמְּסַגְרֹתֵיהֶם “from their strongholds” > ἐν συγκλισμῶ</p>
--	--

	αὐτῶν “in their enclosure”.
Lexical	<p>Lexeme/root (verb, noun):</p> <p>1.2 – מְהִיכַל “from temple” > ἐξ οἴκου “from house”;</p> <p>1.3 – וְנִמְסוּ “and they will melt” > καὶ σαλευθήσεται “and they will be shaken”;</p> <p>1.4 – מְגָרִים “being poured” > καταφερόμενον “being carried”;</p> <p>1.5 – בְּמוֹת “high places” > ἡ ἁμαρτία “the sin”;</p> <p>1.6 – לְעֵי “a heap” > εἰς ὄπωροφυλάκιον “a hut for a garden-watcher”;</p> <p>1.6 – וְהִגְרַתִּי “and I will hurl down” > καὶ κατασπάσω “and I will pull down”;</p> <p>1.6 – לְגֵי “into the valley” > εἰς χάος “into an abyss”;</p> <p>1.7 – וְעַד “and unto” > καὶ ἐκ “and from”;</p> <p>1.7 – יָשׁוּבוּ “they will return” > συνέστρεψεν “she brought together”;</p> <p>1.8 – כְּתַנִּים “like jackals” > ὡς δρακόντων “like dragons”;</p> <p>1.8 – כְּבָנוֹת יַעֲנָה “like ostriches” > ὡς θυγατέρων σειρήνων “like daughters of sirens”;</p> <p>1.9 – אֲנוּשָׁה “incurable” > κατεκράτησεν “it has prevailed”;</p>

	<p>1.10 – אַל־תִּגְדּוּ “do not tell (it) > μὴ μεγαλύνεσθε “do not exalt yourselves”;</p> <p>1.10 – בָּכוּ “weep” (infinitive absolute) > ἐν Ακιμ “in Akim”;</p> <p>1.10 – אַל־תִּבְנוּ “do not weep” > μὴ ἀνοικοδομεῖτε “do not rebuild”;</p> <p>1.10 – לְעִפְרָה “Leaphrah” > κατὰγέλωτα “an object of derision”;</p> <p>1.10/11 – עֲבְרֵי לְכֶם “pass on your way” > κατὰγέλωτα ὑμῶν “your object of derision”;</p> <p>1.11 – שָׁפִיר “Shaphir” > καλῶς “well”;</p> <p>1.11 – עֲרִיָה “nakedness” > τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς “her cities”;</p> <p>1.11 – הָאֶצֶל “Ezel” > ἐχόμενον αὐτῆς “next to her”;</p> <p>1.11 – עֲמֻדָתוֹ “its support” > πληγὴν ὀδύνης “a painful blow”;</p> <p>1.12 – כִּי “for” > τίς “who”;</p> <p>1.12 – הִלָּה “she waits” > ἤρξατο “he began”;</p> <p>1.12 – מְרוֹת “Maroth” > ὀδύνας “sorrow”;</p> <p>1.13 – רְתֵם “harness” [imperative] > ψόφος “noise”;</p> <p>1.13 – לְרֶכֶשׁ “steed” > ἵππευόντων “horsemen”;</p> <p>1.13 – רֵאשִׁית “beginning” > ἀρχηγός “founder”;</p>
--	--

	<p>1.14 – מוֹרְשֶׁת “Moresbeth” > κληρονομίας “inheritance”;</p> <p>1.14 – אַחְזִיב “Achzib” > ματαίους “worthless”;</p> <p>1.15 – דַּע “again” > ἕως “until”;</p> <p>1.15 – מַרְשָׁה “Mareshah” > κληρονομία “inheritance”;</p> <p>1.16 – קְרָחְתָּךְ “your baldness” > τὴν χηρείαν σου “your widowhood”;</p> <p>2.1 – הִוִּי “woe” > ἐγένοντο “they were”;</p> <p>2.1 – יֵשׁ “there is” > οὐκ ἤρασαν “they did not lift up”;</p> <p>2.1 – לְאֵל “in the power” > τὸν θεὸν “to God”;</p> <p>2.4 – נִהְיָה “it will be” > ἐν μέλει “with mourning”²;</p> <p>2.4 – יִמַּר “he changes” > κατεμετρήθη “it was measured out”;</p> <p>2.4 – אֵיךְ “how” > οὐκ ἦν “there was (no one)”;</p> <p>2.6 – אַל־תִּטְפוּ “do not drip [foam]” > μὴ κλαίετε “do not weep”;</p> <p>2.6 – יִטְיִפוּן “they drip [foam]” > δάκρυσιν “with tears”;</p> <p>2.6 – לֹא־יִטְפוּ “they should not drip [foam]” > μηδὲ δακρυέτωσαν “neither let them weep”;</p>
--	---

² Translation based on rendering in Ezek 2.10 (הִגְהָה “moaning” > μέλος “member”).

	<p>2.7 – הַקָּצֵר “is he impatient” > παρώργισεν “it provoked”;</p> <p>2.8 – מִמּוֹל “from the front of” > κατέναντι “in opposition to”;</p> <p>2.8 – שְׁלֵמָה “outer garment” > τῆς εἰρήνης “welfare”;</p> <p>2.8 – אֶדְרָא “cloak” > τὴν δορὰν “skin”;</p> <p>2.8 – בְּטָח “securely” > ἐλπίδα “hope”;</p> <p>2.8 – שׁוֹבֵי “returnees” > συντριμμὸν “ruin”;</p> <p>2.9 – נְשֵׁי “women of” > ἡγούμενοι “rulers”;</p> <p>2.9 – מֵעַל עֲלֵלֶיהָ “from her children” > διὰ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτῶν “because of their evil practices”;</p> <p>2.9 – הַדְרִי “my splendor” > ὄρεσιν “mountains of”;</p> <p>2.10 – נִמְרָץ “(it is) grievous” > κατεδιώχθητε “you (p) were pursued”;</p> <p>2.11 – לֹא-אִישׁ “if a man” > οὐδενός “no one”;</p> <p>2.12 – בְּצָרָה “enclosure” > ἐν θλίψει “in affliction”;</p> <p>2.12 – תְּהִימְנָה “they will bleat” > ἐξאלοῦνται “they will leap forth”;</p> <p>2.13 – וַיַּעֲבֹר “and he passes over” > καὶ ἐξῆλθεν “and he has gone out”;</p>
--	---

	<p>2.13 – יהוה “<i>and the LORD</i>” > ὁ δὲ κύριος “<i>but the Lord</i>”;</p> <p>2.13 – בראשם “<i>at their head</i>” > ἡγήσεται αὐτῶν “<i>he will lead them</i>”;</p> <p>3.1 – קציני “<i>rulers of</i>” > οἱ κατάλοιποι “<i>those who are left of</i>”;</p> <p>3.3 – כאשר “<i>like that which</i>” > ὡς σάρκας “<i>like flesh</i>”;</p> <p>3.4 – אז “<i>then</i>” > οὕτως “<i>thus</i>”;</p> <p>3.7 – וְעָטוּ “<i>and they will cover</i>” > καὶ καταλαλήσουσιν “<i>and they will speak evil</i>”;</p> <p>3.7 – עַל-שִׁפְּמֵם “<i>over (their) mouth</i>” > κατ’ αὐτῶν “<i>against them</i>”;</p> <p>3.7 – מַעֲנֶה “<i>answer</i>” > ὁ εἰσακούων “<i>one listening</i>”;</p> <p>3.7 – אֱלֹהִים “<i>God</i>” > αὐτῶν “<i>to them</i>”;</p> <p>3.8 – וְאִלֵּם “<i>but</i>” > ἐὰν μὴ “<i>if not</i>”;</p> <p>3.9 – ראשי “<i>heads of</i>” > οἱ ἡγούμενοι “<i>ones leading</i>”;</p> <p>3.9 – קציני “<i>rulers of</i>” > οἱ κατάλοιποι “<i>those who are left</i>”;</p> <p>3.11 – ראשיה “<i>its/her heads</i>” > οἱ ἡγούμενοι αὐτῆς “<i>her leaders</i>”;</p> <p>3.11 – יורו “<i>they teach</i>” > ἀπεκρίνοντο “<i>they were giving answer</i>”;</p> <p>3.12 – עֵיִן “<i>heaps of ruins</i>” > ὀπωροφυλάκιον “<i>a hut for a</i></p>
--	---

	<p>garden-watcher”;</p> <p>3.12 – לְבִמְזוֹת “as high places” > ὡς ἄλσος “like a grove”;</p> <p>4.1 – יִהְיֶה “it will be” > ἐμφανὲς “manifest”;</p> <p>4.1 – וַיִּנְהָרוּ “they will flow” > σπεύσουσιν “they will hasten”;</p> <p>4.2 – וַיִּוְרְנוּ “and he will teach us” > καὶ δείξουσιν ἡμῖν “and they will show us”;</p> <p>4.4 – יִשְׁבוּ “they will sit” > ἀναπαύσεται “he will rest”;</p> <p>4.4 – צְבָאוֹת “hosts” > παντοκράτορας “almighty”;</p> <p>4.5 – בְּשֵׁם אֱלֹהָיו “in the name of his god” > τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ “in his way”;</p> <p>4.6 – הַצְּלֵעָה “the lame female” > τὴν συντετριμμένην “her who is crushed”;</p> <p>4.6 – אֶקְבְּצָה “I will gather” > εἰσδέξομαι “I will welcome”;</p> <p>4.6 – הִרְעַתִּי “I injured” > ἀπωσάμην “I rejected”;</p> <p>4.7 – וְהִנְהָלְאָה “and her who is removed” > καὶ τὴν ἀπωσμένην “and her who is rejected”;</p> <p>4.8 – עֲפָל “hill” > ἀχμώδης “dusty”;</p> <p>4.9 – תִּרְיַעֲי “you (fs) will raise a shout” > ἔγνωσ “you (s) knew”;</p>
--	---

	<p>4.9 – שָׁרַח “a shout” > κακά “calamities”;</p> <p>4.9 – יוֹעֵצְךָ “your counselor” > ἡ βουλή σου “your counsel”;</p> <p>4.10 – גָּחַי “push forth” > ἔγγιζε “draw near”;</p> <p>4.11 – תִּתְחַנֵּף “let her be defiled” > ἐπιχαρούμεθα “we will rejoice”;</p> <p>4.13 – תִּדְקֶנָּה “you will beat to pieces” > κατατίξεις “you will liquidate”;</p> <p>4.14 [Gk 5.1] – תִּתְגַּדְּדֵי “gather (fs) in the troops” > ἐμφοραθήσεται “she will be walled in”;</p> <p>4.14 [Gk 5.1] – דָּוָה “troop” > ἐμφοραγμῶ “with a wall”;</p> <p>4.14 [Gk 5.1] – שֹׁפֵט “judge” > τὰς φυλὰς “the tribes”;</p> <p>5.4 [Gk 5.5] – בְּאַרְמְנֵינוּ “in our palaces” > ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ὑμῶν “upon our country”;</p> <p>5.4 [Gk 5.5] – נְסִיכֵי “princes of” > δήγματα “stings”;</p> <p>5.5 [Gk 5.6] – בְּפִתְחֶיהָ “at its entrances” > ἐν τῇ τάφρῳ αὐτῆς “with her ditch”;</p> <p>5.5 [Gk 5.6] – כְּרִבִּיבִים “like showers” > ὡς ἄρνες “like lambs”;</p> <p>5.6 [Gk 5.6] – קָנָה “it waits” > συναχθῆ “that he might assemble”;</p>
--	--

	<p>5.6 [Gk 5.7] – יַחַל “it will delay” > ὑποστῆ “he might resist”;</p> <p>5.7 [Gk 5.8] – וְרָמַס “he tramples down” > καὶ διαστείλας “after making a selection”;</p> <p>5.10 [Gk 5.11] – וְהִרְסֹתִי “and I will throw down” > καὶ ἐξαρῶ “and I will remove”;</p> <p>5.11 [Gk 5.12] – וְהִכְרַתִּי “and I will cut off” > καὶ ἐξαρῶ “and I will remove”;</p> <p>5.13 [Gk 5.14] – וְנִתְשָׁתִי “and I will uproot” > καὶ ἐκκόψω “and I will cut off”;</p> <p>5.14 [Gk 5.15] – אֲשֶׁר “that” > ἀνθ’ ὧν “because”;</p> <p>6.1 – אֵת אֲשֶׁר “that which” > λόγον κυρίου “a word of the Lord”;</p> <p>6.2 – הַרִים “mountains” > λαοὶ “people”;</p> <p>6.2 – וְהִאֲתַנְיָם “and you enduring streams” > καὶ αἱ φάραγγες “and you chasms”;</p> <p>6.3 – וְכַהֵן הִלֵּאתִיךָ “And how have I wearied you?” > ἢ τί ἐλύπησά σε ἢ τί παρηνώχλησά σοι “Or how did I grieve you? Or how did I annoy you?”;</p> <p>6.6 – אֶקְדָּם “I will approach” > καταλάβω “I will lay hold of”;</p>
--	---

	<p>6.6 – אָבַךְ “I will bow down” > ἀντιλήμψομαι “I will secure”;</p> <p>6.6 – הֲאֵךְ דָּמְנֹו “how should I approach him” > εἰ καταλήμψομαι αὐτὸν “should I lay hold of him”;</p> <p>6.7 – שֶׁמֶן “oil” (based on the context of rivers) > πiónων “fat”;</p> <p>6.8 – וְהִצַּנֵּעַ “and humbly” > καὶ ἔτοιμον “and to be ready”;</p> <p>6.9 – וְתוֹשִׁיָהּ “and sound wisdom” > καὶ σώσει “and he will save”;</p> <p>6.9 – יִרְאֶה “he will see (acknowledge)” > φοβουμένους “those who fear”;</p> <p>6.9 – וּמוֹעֵד הָעִיר “and assembly of the city” > καὶ τίς κοσμήσει πόλιν “and who will adorn a city”;</p> <p>6.10 – הֲאֵשָׁה “can I forget” > μὴ πῦρ “not fire”;</p> <p>6.10 – רִזּוֹן “scant” > ὕβρεως “pride”;</p> <p>6.10 – זָעַמָּה “hated” > ἀδικία “unrighteousness”;</p> <p>6.12 – אֲשֶׁר “because” > ἐξ ὧν “from these”;</p> <p>6.12 – רַמְיָהּ “deceit” > ὑψώθη “it was lifted up”;</p> <p>6.13 – הִחֲלִיתִי “I will make sick” > ἄρξομαι “I will begin”;</p> <p>6.14 – וַיִּשְׁחָךְ “and your emptiness” > καὶ σκοτάσει “and it shall</p>
--	---

	<p>grow dark”;</p> <p>6.14 – וְלֹא תִפְלֹט “but you will not carry (it) off” > και οὐ μὴ διασωθῆς “and you will not escape”;</p> <p>6.14 – וְאֲשֶׁר תִּפְלֹט “and what you carry off” > και ὅσοι ἐὰν διασωθῶσιν “and all who might escape”;</p> <p>6.15 – תִּדְרֹךְ “you will tread” > πιέσεις “you will press”;</p> <p>6.16 – וַיִּשְׁתַּמֵּר “and he keeps” > και ἀφανισθήσεται “and it will vanish”;</p> <p>6.16 – עַמִּי “Omri” > λαοῦ μου “my people”;</p> <p>7.1 – אֶחְתָּה “I desire” > οἴμμοι “woe is me”;</p> <p>7.2 – יֵאָרְבוּ “they lie in wait” > δικάζονται “they give judgment”;</p> <p>7.2 – יִצְוּדוּ “they hunt” > ἐκθλιβουσιν “they afflict”;</p> <p>7.2 – חֶרֶם “net” > ἐκθλιβῆ “with affliction”;</p> <p>7.3 – לְהֵיטִיב “to do well” > ἐτοιμάζουσιν “they prepare”;</p> <p>7.3 – בְּשִׁלּוּם “for a bribe” > εἰρηνικούς λόγους “peaceful”;</p> <p>7.4 – כְּחֹדֶק “like a briar” > ὡς σῆς ἐκτρόγων “like a consuming moth”;</p> <p>7.4 – יֶשֶׁר “upright person” > βαδίζων “walking”;</p>
--	---

	<p>7.4 – מְסוּכָה “from a hedge” > ἐπὶ κανόνος “upon a rod”;</p> <p>7.4 – מְבוּכָתָם “their confusion” > κλαυθμοὶ αὐτῶν “their weeping”;</p> <p>7.5 – בְּאַלְרוּף “in a friend” > ἐπὶ ἡγουμένους “in leaders”;</p> <p>7.5 – מִשְׁכַּבַּת חֵיקָה “from her who lies (in) your bosom” > ἀπὸ τῆς συγκοίτου σου “from your bedmate”;</p> <p>7.5 – שָׁמַר פִּתְחֵי־פִי “guard the openings of your mouth” > φύλαξαι τοῦ ἀναθέσθαι “guard against declaring”;</p> <p>7.11 – לְבָנוֹת “to build” > ἀλοιφῆς πλίνθου “forming brick”;</p> <p>7.11 – גְּדָרֶיךָ “your walls” > ἐξάλειψίς σου “your obliteration”;</p> <p>7.11 – חֶק “boundary” > νόμισμά σου “your ordinances”;</p> <p>7.11 – יִרְחַק “it will extend” > ἀποτριψεται “it will rub out”;</p> <p>7.12 – וְעַדְיָךָ “even to you” > καὶ αἱ πόλεις σου “and your cities”;</p> <p>7.12 – אַשּׁוּר “Assyria” > ὀμαλισμὸν “a leveling”;</p> <p>7.12 (2x) – לְמַנִּי “from” > εἰς διαμερισμὸν “to a dividing”;</p> <p>7.12 – מִצְרַיִם “Egypt” > αἱ ὀχυραὶ “strong”;</p> <p>7.12 – מִצְרַיִם “Egypt” > ἀπὸ Τύρου “from Tyre”;</p> <p>7.12 – וְיָם “and sea” > ἡμέρα “a day”;</p>
--	---

	<p>7.12 – מַיִם “to sea” > ὕδατος “of water”;</p> <p>7.12 – וְהָרַר הָהָר “and from mountain to mountain” > καὶ θορύβου “and uproar”;</p> <p>7.14 – יִרְעוּ “let them graze” > νεμήσονται “they will feed”;</p> <p>7.17 – יִרְגְּזוּ “they will tremble” > συγχυθήσονται “they will be confounded”;</p> <p>7.17 – יִפְחָדוּ “they will (come) in dread” > ἐκστήσονται “they will be amazed”;</p> <p>7.18 – לְעַד “forever” > εἰς μαρτύριον “for a witness”;</p> <p>7.19 – יִכְבֹּשׁ “he will tread” > καταδύσει “he will cause to sink”.</p>
Syntactic	<p>Minus element (conjunction, pronoun, article, preposition, noun, verb, adverb):</p> <p>1.2 – כָּל “all”;</p> <p>1.2 – יְהוָה “the LORD”;</p> <p>1.4 – הַ “the” (also 1.6; 1.13; 6.1);</p> <p>1.10 – לְ (also 1.13; 2.4);</p> <p>1.11 – בְּשֵׁת “shame”;</p> <p>2.2 – וְ “and” (also 2.10; 5.7 [Gk 5.8]; 5.9 [Gk 5.10]);</p>

	<p>2.7 (2x) – - הַ (interrogative);</p> <p>2.8 – מִן “from”;</p> <p>4.1 – בַּיִת “house of”;</p> <p>4.1 – הוּא “it”;</p> <p>5.5 [Gk 5.6] – אֶת־אֶרֶץ “land of”;</p> <p>5.6 [Gk 5.7] – לְאִישׁ “for a man”;</p> <p>6.7 – 1cs suffix (also 6.16; 7.1, 4);</p> <p>6.11 – אֶת־הָאִישׁ “the man” (elided);</p> <p>6.13 – גַּם “also”;</p> <p>6.15 – יַיִן “wine”;</p> <p>7.3 – וְהַגָּדוֹל “the great man”;</p> <p>7.15 – מֵאֶרֶץ “from the land of”;</p> <p>7.15 – אֶרְאֶנּוּ “I will show him” (3ms suffix);</p> <p>7.18 – כִּי “like”.</p>
	<p>Plus element: (conjunction, pronoun, article; particle preposition, noun, verb, adverb, adjective):</p> <p>1.1 (2x) – καὶ “and” (also 1.2; 1.4;1.6; 1.9; 2.4; 2.7; 4.9; 5.6 [Gk 5.7]; 5.7 [Gk 5.8]; 6.4; 7.4; 7.5; 7.8; 7.11; 7.12; 7.19);</p> <p>1.1 – περὶ “concerning/about/around”;</p>

	<p>1.2 – πάντες “all”;</p> <p>1.3 – τῆς “the”;</p> <p>1.5 – οἶκος “house” (also 3.1; 5.1 [Gk 5.2]);</p> <p>1.15 – Λαχίς “Lachis”;</p> <p>1.15 – τῆς θυγατρὸς “of the daughter”;</p> <p>2.1 – οὐκ “not”;</p> <p>2.1 – ὀρφανούς “orphans”;</p> <p>2.13 – ἐξάπινα “suddenly”;</p> <p>2.14 – ἐν σχοινίῳ “with a line”;</p> <p>2.7 – αὐτός “him” (also 2.8 [2x]);</p> <p>2.9 – διὰ τοῦτο “therefore”;</p> <p>2.9 – ἐγγίζω “to draw near”;</p> <p>2.10 – σοι “for you”;</p> <p>2.12 – σὺν “with”;</p> <p>3.1 – ταῦτα “these” (also 4.4);</p> <p>3.4 – ἐπ’ αὐτούς/αὐτὸν “against/to them” (also 3.5);</p> <p>3.7 – τὰ ἐνύπνια “dreams”;</p> <p>3.12 – ὡς “as”;</p> <p>4.3 – οὐκέτι “no longer”;</p> <p>4.4 – ἕκαστος “each”;</p> <p>4.8 – ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος “from Babylon”;</p> <p>4.10 – ὁ θεός σου “your God”;</p> <p>4.13 – αὐτούς “them”;</p> <p>5.3 [Gk 5.4] – καὶ ὄψεται “and he will see”;</p> <p>5.3 [Gk 5.4] – τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ “his flock”;</p>
--	--

	<p>5.6 [Gk 5.7] – ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν “among the nations”;</p> <p>5.6 [Gk 5.7] – πίπτουσα “falling”;</p> <p>5.11 [Gk 5.12] – σου “your”;</p> <p>6.5 – κατὰ σοῦ “against you”;</p> <p>6.8 – κυρίου “Lord”;</p> <p>6.10 – μὴ “not”;</p> <p>6.10 – [θησαυρίζων] “storing up”;</p> <p>6.13 – σε “you”;</p> <p>7.1 – καλάμην “stubble”;</p> <p>7.2 – ὅτι “because”;</p> <p>7.3 – αὐτῶν “their”;</p> <p>7.3 – λόγους “words”;</p> <p>7.4 – οὐαὶ οὐαὶ “woe, woe”;</p> <p>7.5 – τι αὐτῇ “anything to her”;</p> <p>7.12 – σου “your”;</p> <p>7.12 – εἰς “to”;</p> <p>7.16 – αὐτῶν “their”.</p>
	<p>Preposition:</p> <p>1.10 – בְּבֵית “in Beth-” > ἐξ οἴκου “from a house”;</p> <p>1.12 – לְ “to” > ἐπὶ “upon”;</p> <p>7.4 – מִן “from” > ἐπὶ “upon”;</p> <p>7.17 – מִמְּחֻצוֹתֵיהֶם “from their strongholds” > ἐν συγκλεισμῷ αὐτῶν “in their enclosure”;</p>

	<p>7.20 – מִיָּמֵי קִדְמָה “from days of old” > κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς ἔμπροσθεν “in former days”.</p>
	<p>Word order (elements are there but have been adjusted/switched/moved):</p> <p>2.1 – וְנָשְׂאוּ וְנָשְׂקוּ “so they take (them) and they oppress” > καὶ...κατεδυνάστευον καὶ διήρπαζον “and they were oppressing and they would plunder”;</p> <p>4.10 – חוּלִי “writhe” > ὄδινε καὶ ἀνδρίζου “suffer birth pangs and be courageous” (double rendering);</p> <p>6.3 – וְמַה הֵלֵאֲתִיךָ “And how have I wearied you?” > ἢ τί ἐλύπησά σε ἢ τί παρηνώχλησά σοι “Or how did I grieve you? Or how did I annoy you?”;</p> <p>7.3 – הַשֵּׁר שְׂאֵל וְהַשֹּׁפֵט בְּשֵׁלֹם וְהַגָּדוֹל דָּבַר “The prince and the judge ask for a bribe, the great man speaks” > ὁ ἄρχων αἰτεῖ καὶ ὁ κριτὴς εἰρηνικοὺς λόγους ἐλάλησεν “The ruler asks and the judge has spoken peaceful words”;</p> <p>7.3-4 – טוֹבָם “their good” (subject in MT 7.4) > τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν “their good things” (object in Gk 7.3);</p> <p>7.11-12 – יוֹם הוּא “that day” (part of 7.12) > ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη “that day” (read with 7.11);</p> <p>7.12 – לְמִנִּי אַשּׁוּר “from Assyria” > εἰς ὀμαλισμὸν καὶ εἰς</p>

	<p>διαμερισμὸν “to a leveling and to a dividing”;</p> <p>7.17 – אֶרֶץ “earth” (in construct relationship) > γῆν “earth” (accusative).</p>
	<p><i>Class shift</i></p> <p>verb→noun:</p> <p>1.13 – רָתַם “harness” [imperative] > ψόφος “noise”;</p> <p>2.4 – שָׁדוּד “ruined” > ταλαιπωρία “in misery”;</p> <p>2.11 – מְטִיף “prophet (dripper [of foam])” > τῆς σταγόνας “the dropping”;</p> <p>3.6 – וְחָשְׁכָה “and it will grow dark” > καὶ σκοτία “and darkness”;</p> <p>7.11 – לְבָנֹת “to build” > ἀλοιφῆς πλίνθου “forming brick”.</p> <p>verb→adjective:</p> <p>4.1 – הָיָה “it will be” > ἐμφανὲς “manifest”;</p> <p>4.1 – נִבְּוֶן “established” (Niphal participle) > ἔτοιμον “prepared”;</p> <p>7.1 – אֶחְתָּה “I desire” > οἴμμοι “woe is me”.</p> <p>noun→verb:</p> <p>1.11 – מִסְפָּד “wailing” > κόψασθαι “to mourn”;</p> <p>1.13 – לְרֹכֵשׁ “steed” > ἵππευόντων “those riding horses (horsemen)”;</p>

	<p>2.4 – לְשׁוֹבֵב “to the apostate” > τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι “to turn away”;</p> <p>2.13 – בְּרֹאשָׁם “at their head” > ἡγήσεται αὐτῶν “he will lead them”;</p> <p>7.8 – יְהוָה אֹר לִי “the LORD will be light to me” > κύριος φωτιᾶ μοι “The Lord will give me light”.</p> <p>noun → participle:</p> <p>1.14 – שְׁלוּחִים “parting gifts” > ἐξαποστελλομένους “ones being sent”;</p> <p>3.7 – מַעֲנֶה “answer” > ὁ εἰσακούων “one listening”;</p> <p>3.9 – רֹאשֵׁי “heads of” > οἱ ἡγούμενοι “ones leading”;</p> <p>3.11 – רֹאשֶׁיהָ “its/her heads” > οἱ ἡγούμενοι αὐτῆς “her leaders”;</p> <p>5.8 [Gk 5.9] – צָרִיךָ “your adversaries” > τοὺς θλίβοντάς σε “those oppressing you”;</p> <p>7.1 – כְּאֶסְפֵי “like the gatherings of” > ὡς συνάγων “like one gathering”.</p> <p>noun → adjective:</p> <p>1.14 – אַחְזִיב “Achzib” > ματαίους “worthless”;</p> <p>3.1 – קְצִינֵי “rulers of” > οἱ κατάλοιποι “those who are left of”;</p> <p>3.9 – קְצִינֵי “rulers of” > οἱ κατάλοιποι “those who are left”;</p>
--	--

	<p>6.11 – רָשָׁע “wickedness” > ἄνομος “a lawless (act)”.</p> <p>adjective→participle:</p> <p>7.4 – יָשָׁר “upright person” > βαδίζων “walking”.</p> <p>participle→noun:</p> <p>2.13 – הַפְּרִץ “he who breaks out” > τῆς διακοπῆς “the breach”.</p> <p>object suffix→noun+pronoun:</p> <p>2.12 – אֲשִׁימֵנָם “I will set them” > θήσομαι τὴν ἀποστροφήν αὐτῶν “I will establish their return”.</p> <p>vocative→subject:</p> <p>1.2 – אֶרֶץ “O earth” > ἡ γῆ “the earth”;</p> <p>1.13 – יוֹשֶׁבֶת “O inhabitant” > κατοικοῦσα “she who dwells”;</p> <p>2.7 – בֵּית־יַעֲקֹב “O house of Jacob” > οἶκος Ἰακωβ “house of Jacob”;</p> <p>2.12 – יַעֲקֹב “O Jacob” > Ἰακωβ “Jacob”;</p> <p>4.14 [Gk 5.1] – בַּת־גְּדֹד “O daughter of troops” > θυγάτηρ ἐμφοραγμῶ “the daughter with a wall”.</p>
Different Hebrew <i>Vorlage</i>	<p>2.1 – יֵשׁ-לְאֵל יָדָם “it is in their power” > οὐκ ἦραν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν “they did not lift their hands to God”;</p> <p>5.6 [Gk 5.7] – plus ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν “among the nations”;</p> <p>7.15 – מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם “from the land of Egypt” > ἐξ Αἰγύπτου</p>

	“from Egypt”.
--	---------------

The table above details all the shifts in LXX-Micah apart from shifts in verbal conjugation. LXX-Micah exhibits shifts in voice (active to passive and passive to active), shifts in person (both perspective and number), shifts in number (singular to plural and plural to singular), shifts in meaning (lexical), shifts in class and word order, as well as differences reflected by pluses, minuses and errors.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will explain those data according to the causes for the translation differences. In §5.4, I will describe the differences due either to translator error or to a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. In §5.5, I will discuss the operational norms that emerge from both obligatory and non-obligatory shifts in LXX-Micah. In §5.5.1, I will explain and illustrate obligatory shifts due to linguistic constraint. In the last two sections (§5.5.2 and §5.5.3), I will address the non-obligatory shifts when the translator understood his Hebrew text and when he apparently did not. In addition to the examples I use to illustrate the translation differences, I have provided references to other clear examples of the phenomenon from Micah in footnotes.

5.4 Differences due to translation, transcription and transmission errors or a different Hebrew *Vorlage*

5.4.1 Translation, transcription and transmission errors

This section highlights errors that occurred in the process of translation, transcription or transmission (though it is often difficult to pinpoint the precise stage during which the

error was introduced).³ One such error may reflect the translator’s attempt to adequately render the Hebrew through etymologisation.⁴ For example in 2.8, שְׁלֹמָה “outer garment” is rendered τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ “his welfare.” The translator etymologised some form of שְׁלֹמָה “wholeness, peace” or שְׁלֵמָה “complete, at peace” to render the Hebrew. The 3ms pronoun can be explained in two ways—either he read the *heh* as an archaic 3ms *heh* pronoun or he added the pronoun to explicitise whose welfare was being threatened.

Another example of an etymologising error occurs at Micah 6.6 (אֶרְבֹּא “I will bow down” > ἀντιλήμφομαι “I will secure”). This is a unique rendering. כָּפַף “to bow down” occurs only four other times in the MT (Psa 57.7 [Gk 56.7] – κατακάμπτω “to bow down”; 145.14 [Gk 144.14] and 146.8 [Gk 145.8] – κατερραγμένους “broken down”; and Isa 58.5 – κάμπτω “to bow”). ἀντιλαμβάνομαι “to secure” typically renders קָחַ “to seize” (10x). Here, the translator seems to understand כָּפַף “to bow oneself” as a denominative from כָּף “palm” or a form of כָּפַף “to subdue,” which occurs once in Prov 21.14.

Another type of translation (or transmission) error involves visual mistakes (in textual criticism these include scribal errors such as mistaken letters, metathesis, haplography, and dittography).⁵ The following verses reflect orthographic errors (see chapter 4 for explanations): 1.10 (בָּכוּ “weep” [infinitive absolute] > ἐν Ακιμ “in Akim” [§4.2.10b]); 2.9 (נָשִׁים “the women” > ἡγούμενοι “the leaders”) [§4.3.9b]; 4.9 (תְּרִיעִי “you [fs] will raise a

³ The verses with differences due to translation, transcription or transmission errors in Micah are 1.2, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14; 2.4, 8, 9; 4.2, 9, 10, 14 [Gk 5.1]; 5.3 [Gk 5.4], 5.5 [Gk 5.6], 5.6 [Gk 5.7]; 6.6, 9, 13, 16; 7.1, 2, 3, 11, 12.

⁴ Cf. Tov (1997, 172).

⁵ Cf. Tov (1997, 123ff).

shout” > ἔγνωσ “you [s] knew”) [§4.5.9b]; 7.1 (הַתִּיִּס “I desire” > οἴμμοι “woe is me”) [§4.8.1d]. A few errors due to metathesis occur in 4.2 (וְיִלְמַד “and he will teach us” > καὶ δείξουσιν ἡμῖν “and they will show us”) [§4.5.2a] and 5.5 [Gk 5.6] (בְּפִתְחוֹתָיָהּ “at its entrances” > ἐν τῇ τάφρω αὐτῆς “with her ditch”) [§4.6.5b].

5.4.2 Different Hebrew *Vorlage*

Since we do not have access to original manuscripts, it is impossible to confirm conclusions that a particular apparent shift reflects a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.⁶ Therefore, we should be conservative with this explanation, using it only when there is internal evidence or there are evidences from other manuscripts or versions.⁷ Further, we must evaluate each shift on a case-by-case basis and, when there is no evidence for a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, consider the operational norms that may explain the shift. Wevers (1985, 38) offers the following warning: “It is imperative that one have some clear understanding of the mind of the translator and how he operated before drawing textual conclusions which presuppose a different parent text.”⁸ Sailhamer (1981, 7), similarly, offers an approach that gives priority to translation technique but necessitates a “hermeneutical circle” between analysis of translation technique and Hebrew *Vorlage*: “neither the translation technique nor the Source text of the LXX can be determined in isolation. There is a hermeneutical circle that must be embraced if advancement is to be made in either area.”

⁶ The differences due to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* in Micah are 2.1; 5.6 [Gk 5.7]; 7.15.

⁷ Tov (2012, 117) concludes that “although there are thousands of differences between MT and the translations, only a fraction of them was created by a divergence between MT and the *Vorlage* of the translation.” Cf. Jan de Waard (1978, 339); Olofsson (1990, 67); Bertram (1936, 109).

⁸ Würthwein (1994, 70), similarly, emphasised this priority: “[The LXX] can be useful for textual criticism only after a careful appreciation of its nature, its various translation techniques, and its history. We must beware of attempting to reach the underlying Hebrew text through a simple and direct back-translation of the Greek text into Hebrew.”

Let us consider how another LXX scholar discerns the Hebrew *Vorlage* and then we will evaluate the evidence for two apparent shifts in Micah that reflect a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Phelan (1982, 164) says the following: “The most effective method by which to compare the Septuagint text to the Massoretic Text involves the process of retroversion, the retranslation of the Greek text back to its *Vorlage*, the postulated Hebrew original. This process first necessitates a reliable Greek text and secondly an understanding of the Septuagint translator’s technique.” Unfortunately, Phelan’s approach to assessing the LXX translators’ techniques is faulty. One faulty presupposition is that the LXX translators adopt a philosophy of translation as either literal or free (1982, 165 n. 25) and “only those verses in the Septuagint which display literal technique are useful in retroversion” (1982, 165-6). Translators alternate between literal and free approaches to the text they are translating. A methodology that relies upon the labels literal or free is much too simplistic.

Phelan suggests two lexemes in Micah 4.13 that reflect a different Hebrew *Vorlage* (underlined in the Greek text and translation below).

4.13 MT קומי וְדוּשִׁי בַת־צִיּוֹן בִּי־קַרְנֶיךָ אֲשֵׁים בְּרִזְלֶךָ וּפְרִסְתִּיךָ אֲשֵׁים נְחוּשָׁה וְהִדְקוֹת עַמִּים
רַבִּים וְהִחַרְמֹתִי לִיהוָה בְּצַעַם וְחִילָם לְאֲדוֹן כָּל־הָאָרֶץ

Arise and thresh, O daughter of Zion
For I will make your horn iron
And I will make your hoofs bronze
And you will beat to pieces many peoples
And I will devote their gain to the LORD
And (and I will devote) their wealth to the lord of all the earth.

LXX ἀνάστηθι καὶ ἀλόα αὐτούς θύγατερ Σιων ὅτι τὰ κέρατά σου θήσομαι σιδηρᾶ καὶ τὰς ὀπλάς σου θήσομαι χαλκᾶς καὶ κατατήξεις λαοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ ἀναθήσεις τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἰσχὺν αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ πάσης τῆς γῆς

Arise and thresh them, O daughter of Zion,
For I will make your horns iron
And your hoofs I will make bronze
And you will liquidate many peoples
And you will devote their multitude to the Lord
And (you will devote) their strength to the Lord of the whole earth.

He provides the following explanation: “The Greek reading suggests ליהוה וְהִתְרַמְּתָּ לִיהוָה (second person singular) as its original Hebrew reading. Perhaps the additional αὐτοῦς in the Septuagint version represents a *Vorlage* reading of וְדוּשִׁי with an additional final *mem*” (1982, 168). Phelan’s (lack of) explanation for his conclusion that the Greek text reflects a different Hebrew *Vorlage* is the very type of analysis we want to avoid. Phelan failed to adequately consider the translation technique in LXX-Micah. If he had considered the operational norms of the translator, he might have suggested that the translator consciously or subconsciously supplied the expected object of דוּשִׁי “to thresh.” Further, recognising the translator’s tendency to clarify the text for his target audience might have led Phelan to conclude something different about וְהִתְרַמְּתָּ “and you will devote.”⁹ In the context of the verse, the LORD has commanded daughter Zion to arise and thresh that he might strengthen her and that she might defeat her enemies and devote their wealth to the LORD. A switch to the prophet speaking in the last two stichoi would not have made sense to the translator, leading him to render וְהִתְרַמְּתָּ as a second person singular. Given the translator’s tendency to clarify the text for his target audience (e.g., supplying the object αὐτούς “them” earlier in the same verse), we should resist the temptation to explain these differences as reflecting a different Hebrew *Vorlage* (unless, of course, something in the context points to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* [cf. 2.1 and 5.6 (Gk 5.7)]). Interestingly, Phelan does not comment on another shift in the verse (קַרְנֶיךָ “your horn” > τὰ κέρατά σου “your horns”). For some reason, this shift does not meet the criteria he uses for suggesting a different Hebrew *Vorlage*.

⁹ Archaic form of the 2fs (GKC, §44h).

Phelan points to two other shifts in Mic 1.12 that reflect a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. He claims that *בִּי-חָלָה* “for she writhes” (which he translates “because he waits”) was *מִי חָלָה* “who waits” and *לְשַׁעַר* “to the gate of” was *לְשַׁעְרֵי* “to the gates of” (1982, 170). However, the translator’s operational norms reveal a common tendency to render singulars in the plural. At times, the shift is theologically motivated, especially when it involves the sins of Jacob (e.g., 2.1; 3.8; 7.18). At other times, the shift seems to reflect a collective singular understanding (e.g., 5.11 [Gk 5.12]; 7.14, 16). The first shift in 1.12 is partially explained as an orthographic error (*מִי* “who” for *בִּי* “because”). The rest of the explanation involves the translator reading *חָלָה* “she began” (from *חָלַל* “to begin”) for *חָלָה* “she writhes” (from *חָלַל* “to writhe”). The same consonantal text was vocalised differently.¹⁰

Now let us consider an apparent shift in 2.1. The difference between the Hebrew in 2.1 *יְשׁוּ-לְאֵל יָדָם* “it is in the power of their hand” and the Greek translation *οὐκ ἤρασαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν* “they did not lift their hands to God” has multiple possible explanations. The other occurrences of the idiom *יְשׁוּ-לְאֵל יָד* “there is power in the hand” are Gen 31.29, Proverbs 3.27 (with *בְּהִיּוֹת* “when there is” rather than *יֵשׁ* “there is”), and Deut 28.32 and Neh 5.5 (with negative particle *אֵין* “there is not” rather than *יֵשׁ* “there is”). In each of these occurrences, the LXX captures the sense of the Hebrew, which leads us to believe that the Micah translator understood the Hebrew idiom.¹¹ Several possible explanations present themselves: 1) the translator confused *יֵשׁ* “there is” for a form of the verb *נָשָׂא* (*נָשָׂא* or *נָשָׂו*)

¹⁰ Strangely enough, Phelan (1982, 165 n. 25) acknowledges that the unvocalised Hebrew text was a source of difficulty for the translators.

¹¹ Cf. Cécile Dogniez (2002) for a discussion of LXX translators’ treatment of Hebrew idioms.

[Eze 39.26]) “they lift up” and the added the negative particle οὐκ “not” (cf. Deut 32.40 for use of lifting hands to heaven and swearing; 2 Sam 18.28 for use of lifting hands against the king; Ps 28.2 for David lifting his hands toward the sanctuary as he cries for help); 2) the translator intentionally changed the sense of this verse in order to attribute the cause of their misdeeds to their failure to pray to God (i.e., not aligning themselves with God in order to do what is right in his eyes); 3) the LXX rendering reflects a different Hebrew *Vorlage* (at least in the positive sense of praying to God, which is how the Peshitta renders the Hebrew).¹² The LXX and Peshitta both reflect readings having to do with prayer (not power to carry out wrongdoing) yet the Greek claims that the people did not pray and the Syriac that the people do pray. It seems that this does not reflect polygenesis¹³ but a different Hebrew *Vorlage* that reflected the idea of prayer. Then, based on different understandings of the context, the translators of the LXX and Peshitta rendered their texts differently.

The plus in 5.6 [Gk 5.7] (ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν “among the nations”) likely reflects that the translator was reading a different Hebrew text than the MT. The absence of this phrase in the MT disrupts the parallel structure both in v.6 (Gk v.7) and between v.6 and v.7 [Gk v.7 and v.8]. The Hebrew *Vorlage* of v.6 contained בְּגוֹיִם “among the nations” and was lost through *homoioarchon* (*bet* at beginning of בְּגוֹיִם “among the nations” and בְּקִרְבֵּי “in the midst of”).

Similarly, מֵאֶרֶץ “from the land of” in 7.15 may have been lost during the transmission process through *homoioarchon*.¹⁴

¹² Given that S renders this idiom in Mic 2.1 similarly to the LXX (though it does not render the idiom negatively), S may have relied on the LXX, where the LXX translator made a mistake, intentionally shifted the translation, or S was reading a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. If the Hebrew *Vorlage* contained the idea of praying (or not praying) to God, the translators may have arrived at their translations independently.

¹³ “Translational polygenesis occurs when two versions coincidentally have the same reading due to similar translation behavior or error” (Tully 2012, 311).

¹⁴ Alternatively, מֵאֶרֶץ “the land of” could have been dropped through parablepsis during the translation process.

5.5 Operational norms

We know that translators have a certain amount of freedom in their activity. Though they are guided by preliminary norms, they negotiate difficult grammar and syntax, unknown vocabulary, and the presence of their own ideology and theology in different ways at different times. Therefore, it is prudent to resist analysing a text based on a general reputation of “literal” or “free.” Barr (1979, 7) was correct in noting that translators in antiquity would tend to “combine the two approaches in a quite inconsequential way.”

In the following discussion, I provide the obligatory and non-obligatory shifts in LXX-Micah according to their various categories. These categories reveal the operational norms used by the translator.

5.5.1 Obligatory shifts

The obligatory translation shifts in Micah are those that were linguistically constrained.¹⁵ These shifts are required by the linguistic system (Toury 1995, 59); non-obligatory shifts are those decided upon by the translator based on factors of culture, ideology or style (Bakker *et al* 1998, 228). Micah 7.14 reflects a linguistically constrained shift based on different semantic boundaries for particular words in biblical Hebrew and septuagintal Greek. רָעָה “to shepherd, graze” appears twice in 7.14, first as a command to the leaders to shepherd their people and second as a charge to the leaders to allow their people to graze. The translator renders the command with the expected ποιμαίνω “to shepherd” but since the semantic range of ποιμαίνω “to shepherd” does not include “grazing,” the translator was linguistically constrained by the target language to render it νέμω “to feed.”¹⁶

¹⁵ The obligatory shifts in Micah are 1.10; 2.4, 12 (2x); 5.7 [Gk 5.8], 5.9 [Gk 5.10]; 6.8, 13, 16; 7.14.

¹⁶ Cf. Olofsson’s discussion of Hebrew semantic range (2009, 54ff).

There are six infinitives absolute in Micah. Since no grammatical form that is comparable to the infinitive absolute exists in Greek, the translator was constrained to shift the translation. In Mic 2.4 the Hebrew infinitive absolute plus *yiqtol* construction וְנִשְׁדָּדְנוּ “we are utterly ruined” is rendered as a participle and cognate noun in the dative case ταλαιπωρία ἐταλαιπωρήσαμεν “we suffered intense misery.”¹⁷ In 2.12 both infinitives absolute are followed by *yiqtol* conjugations of the same verbal root. These Hebrew constructions are rendered as participles with the same finite verbs (or verbs with similar semantics) (הִסְבֵּי) “I will surely assemble” > συναγόμενος συναχθήσεται “[Jacob] will surely be gathered together”; קָבַץ אֶקְבֹּץ “I will surely gather” > ἐκδεχόμενος ἐκδέξομαι “I will surely receive”). In Mic 6.8, the translator rendered the Hebrew infinitive absolute followed by an infinitive construct with an adjective plus two present infinitives (וְהִצַּגְנוּ לְקָטָן “and to walk humbly” > καὶ ἔτοιμον εἶναι τοῦ πορεύεσθαι “and to be ready to walk”). It is likely that the translator did not understand the *hapax legomenon* infinitive absolute and rendered it to the best of his ability. In 6.13, the infinitive absolute is rendered with a future indicative (הַשְׁמַם) “making [you] desolate” > ἀφανιῶ “I will cause [you] to vanish”).

Finally, there are two instances in LXX-Micah where the *vav* “and” conjunction is not rendered (5.7 [Gk 5.8] and 5.9 [Gk 5.10]). Both minuses occur in temporal clauses where a καὶ “and” in the second clause of the temporal sentences would be grammatically incorrect in Greek syntax. Therefore, in order to render acceptable Greek syntax, the translator was linguistically constrained to delete the conjunctions.

¹⁷ Thackeray (1909, 48) notes the use of a participle and the dative of the cognate noun as one of the two most common renderings for the Hebrew infinitive absolute plus *yiqtol*.

5.5.2 Non-obligatory shifts (when text understood)

The following operational norms were used when the translator apparently understood the source text: style (lexical variation and syntactic smoothing), clarity (explicitisation, concretisation, harmonisation and interpretation), theological and ideological.

5.5.2.1 Style

The two primary stylistic non-obligatory operational norms¹⁸ involve lexical variation¹⁹ and the smoothing of syntax. Lexical variation is reflected in two ways in LXX-Micah. The first occurs when a repeated Hebrew word is translated with different Greek words. In Micah 2.6, we see the sequence $\text{לֹא־תִטֹּפוּ...לֹא־יִטְפוּ}$ “do not drip (foam)...they should not drip (foam)” rendered with two different Greek verbs ($\mu\eta\ \kappa\lambda\alpha\iota\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ “do not weep” and $\mu\eta\delta\epsilon\ \delta\alpha\kappa\rho\upsilon\epsilon\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$ “neither let them weep” for). This is a clear example of the translator’s desire to vary the lexicon in the translation.²⁰

Another type of lexical variation occurs when there is a limitation in the Greek lexicon. In 2.12, the infinitive absolute + *yiqtol* sequence אֲסַבֵּר אֲסַבֵּר “I will surely assemble” is rendered $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\chi\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ “he will surely be gathered together” (the infinitive absolute is rendered as a participle because of the linguistic constraint whereby Greek lacks a form comparable to the infinitive absolute). Then when the infinitive absolute + *yiqtol* occurs in the next stich $\text{קָבַרְתִּי קָבַרְתִּי}$ “I will surely gather,” the translator has already used the most common rendering for קָבַר “to gather” in the first stich so he provides variety with $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\delta\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$

¹⁸ The non-obligatory shifts (when the text was understood) due to style preference in Micah are 1.3, 9, 14; 2.6, 12; 6.15 (minus motivated by *inability* to provide lexical variation); 7.12, 17.

¹⁹ Toury (1991, 188) identifies this translation tendency as “one of the most persistent, unbending norms in translation in all languages studied so far.” Cf. Joosten (2005) regarding the tendency in the Minor Prophets to eliminate verbal repetitions.

²⁰ Van der Kooij (2014) provides an interesting analysis of the translator employing lexical variation ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ and $\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$) in LXX-Isaiah not for style but to distinguish two different groups of inhabitants.

“to wait for / receive.” Later in the book, Mic 4.6, when the translator again encounters קָבַץ “to gather” he chooses a verb different than the ones used in 2.12 (εἰσδέχομαι “to receive/welcome”). In 6.15, a word is deleted because the translator did not have another Greek word to convey a meaning comparable to the meaning in the Hebrew. There וְלֹא תִשְׁתֶּה־יַיִן “but you will not drink wine” is rendered καὶ οὐ μὴ πίητε “and you will not drink” because οἶνος “wine” was already used earlier in the same stich to render תִּירוֹשׁ “new wine” (οἶνος “wine” is used in the LXX for both יַיִן “wine” and תִּירוֹשׁ “new wine.”)

Another type of translation style involves the smoothing of syntax. In 1.3, the translator added an article (אֶרֶץ “land” > τῆς γῆς “the land”) to improve the syntax. This is supported by the fact that 1QpMic (הָאָרֶץ “the land”; Horgan 2002, 134), V, S, and T all contain the article, which likely reflects the tendency for translators in general to smooth out syntax. Similarly, the following shift occurs in 7.12: וְעָדִידָ יָבוֹא לְמִנֵּי אַשּׁוּר “even to you they will come from Assyria” > καὶ αἱ πόλεις σου ἥξουσιν εἰς ὀμαλισμὸν καὶ εἰς διαμερισμὸν “and your cities will come to a leveling and (come) to a dividing.” Here the translator has made some interesting adjustments (see §4.8.12 for explanation). The stylistic change, though, is reflected in the addition of καὶ “and” to make the Greek syntax smoother than the Hebrew syntax which lacks the expected (according to the translator) *vav* “and.”

5.5.2.2 Clarity

Clarification is a norm related to the translator’s *skopos*. It is high priority for the translator of LXX-Micah to clarify the message for his target audience. There are four

primary ways that he clarifies the text: explicitisation, concretisation, harmonisation and interpretation.

5.5.2.2.1 Explicitisation

Explicitisation is a common operational norm in LXX-Micah and throughout the LXX.²¹ Vinay and Darbelnet (1995, 342) define this norm as “a stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source text because it is apparent from either the context or the situation.” It is, therefore, distinct from a theological (§5.5.2.3) or ideological shift (§5.5.2.4) that is not necessarily motivated by the context or situation but by the translator’s / target culture’s ideological/theological agenda. Pal Heltai (2005, 46) distinguishes between explicitisation that involves the use of words with increased meaning²² and explicitisation to improve comprehension.²³ Here I will not distinguish between the two types of explicitisation; rather, I will discuss the different manifestations of explicitisation in LXX-Micah. I will begin with some of the less intrusive shifts such as the supplying of a pronoun or prepositional phrase and end with the more intrusive shifts involving explicitising time reference or clause connection.²⁴

In 4.10, we have an example of the translator explicitising through supplying the unspecified subject. The shift from לְיָצִיִּךָ “you will be rescued” to ῥύσεται σε “he will rescue you” exhibits a shift from Niphal *yiqtol* 2fs to future 3s with 2s direct object plus. The

²¹ The non-obligatory shifts (when the text was understood) due to explicitisation in Micah are 1.6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15; 2.8, 9, 12, 13; 3.2, 5, 7; 4.4, 6, 9 (2x); 10; 5.3 [Gk 5.4], 5.6 [Gk 5.7], 5.14 [Gk 5.15]; 6.1, 5, 13; 7.2, 3, 5, 11 (2x), 12.

²² Tully (2012, 262) calls this “Syntactical Explicitation” because “the translator operates at the syntactical level, filling in perceived gaps and clarifying the relationship between words.”

²³ Tully (2012, 262) refers to this explicitisation as “Exegetical Explicitation” because “it specifically communicates [the translator’s] understanding of the text and is farther reaching.” Anthony Pym (2008, 325) suggests that translators tend to reduce the risk of a translation or the translator being rejected by reducing the opportunity for misinterpretation.

²⁴ Note that the intrusiveness of a particular shift is ultimately context specific; the supplying of a pronoun (e.g., 2.8) can sometimes be more intrusive than explicitising a time reference (e.g., 1.11).

translator supplied the implicit subject (in congruence with the 3ms *yiqtol* + 2ms suffix in last stich יהוה יגאלך “the LORD will redeem you”) to explicitise the rescuer as the LORD.

The following two shifts explicitise the relationship between clauses. In 2.9, the translator supplies διὰ τοῦτο “therefore” to clarify (explicitise) the relationship between 2.8 and 2.9 as cause and effect. As a result of God’s people resisting in hostility, the leaders will be cast out of their luxurious houses. 2.9b provides additional reason for the judgment. Then, the plus ἐγγίσατε “draw near” informs the audience of their expected action in response to the promised judgment. Similarly, the plus in 7.2 (ὅτι “because”) was inserted to explain the prophet’s feelings in 7.1 and explicitise the causes (7.2-7.4b) for the judgment (7.4c).

In 4.13, the translator supplied the object pronoun αὐτούς “him” following ἀλόα “thresh.” Phelan (1982, 168) suggests it is perhaps based on a Hebrew *Vorlage* that contained ודושים “and thresh them.” Before positing a different *Vorlage*, we should consider the possibility of an intentional, if not subconscious, explicitising shift. Since שׁוּב “to thresh” is usually followed by the object that is threshed (Judg 8.7; 1 Chr 21.20; Isa 25.10; 28.27; 28.28; 41.15; Amos 1.3; Hab 3.12), the translator likely supplied the implicit object.

In 2.4 and 4.10 we see examples of the translator explicitising through supplying prepositional phrases. In 2.4, the plus is ἐν σχοινίῳ “with a line.” This plus was influenced either by the idea of casting the line by lot in Micah 2.5 or by the appearance of καταμετρέω “to measure out” and ἐν σχοινίῳ “with a line” together in Amos 7.17 (the latter is especially likely if there was indeed a single person or single group responsible for translating the Twelve Prophets). Micah 4.8 also contains an explicitising plus. The phrase ἐκ Βαβυλῶνος “from Babylon” was added to identify the attacker unveiled in 4.10. Instead of understanding the verse as part of the future restoration of the exiles, the translator read it in connection with the verses of judgment to follow (4.9ff).

The following two examples exhibit explicitisation through the addition of possessive pronouns. The shift from שְׁלֵמָה “outer garment” to τῆς εἰρήνης αὐτοῦ “his peace” clearly involved the translator reading some form of שְׁלֹמָה “wholeness, peace” or שְׁלֵמָה “complete, at peace.” However, the plus αὐτοῦ “his” can be explained two ways (besides a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, which is always possible). The translator may have read the *heh* ending as an archaic 3ms *heh* pronoun and rendered it accordingly. Alternatively, the translator added the pronoun to explicitise whose welfare was being threatened. Similarly, in 5.11 [Gk 5.12] we see the shift from כְּשִׁפְיִים “sorceries” to τὰ φάρμακά σου “your sorceries.” This 2s pronoun plus was likely motivated by the other 2s suffixes in 5.9-14 [Gk 5.10-15].²⁵

In an unusual instance, the translator explicitised through adding the participle πίπτουσα “falling” (5.6 [Gk 5.7]). It seems that it was supplied to explicitise how the dew comes from the Lord (cf. 2Sam 17.12, which states that δρόσος “dew” πίπτει “falls” on the ground). The plus θησαυρίζων “storing up” in 6.10 is tentative (it is omitted by ms 106 and, hence, bracketed by Ziegler). Hillers (1984, 81 n. h) considers it to be an interpretive expansion in which case it would be an explicitising addition.²⁶

Another type of explicitisation occurs when the translator shifts from an apparent collective singular to a plural. One common example in Micah is the repeated shift from עָרָה “bad thing” to κακὰ “evil things/calamities” (1.12, 2.1, 2.3 and 4.9). Another example occurs in 1.12 where we see a shift from singular שַׁעַר “gate” to plural πύλας “gates.” Singular שַׁעַר עַמִּי “gate of my people” in 1.9 was rendered with singular πύλης λαοῦ μου “gate of my

²⁵ Cf. Schwantes (1962, 140); Wolff (1990, 151).

²⁶ Alternatively, it resulted from a dittographical error in the Hebrew text (e.g., אָצַר “storing up”), then after being translated, it was lost in the proto-MT.

people” but Mic 1.12 is the only occurrence in the MT of singular שַׁעַר “gate” in construct with יְרוּשָׁלַם “Jerusalem” (the phrase שַׁעַרֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם “gates of Jerusalem” occurs eight times in MT – Jer 1.15; 17.19, 21, 27; 22.19; Lam 4.12; Neh 7.3; 13.19). The rendering in the LXX may have been motivated by the unexpected singular form.

This type of shift occurs also with pronouns as in 1.5 (זֹאת “this” > ταῦτα “these”). The plural pronoun likely refers to the multiple punishments to follow in 1.6-7. However, in 1.8 the translator maintains the singular (עַל-זֹאת אֶסְפְּדָה וְאֵלֵלֶּה “because of this I will wail and howl” > ἔνεκεν τούτου κόψεται καὶ θρηνηήσει “on account of this she will lament and wail”) apparently referring to the punishment to come upon Israel. It is possible that the neuter singular τούτου “this” in 1.8 points to neuter singular κρίμα “judgment” (despite not being explicit in the context).

Explicitisation sometimes involves shifts which utilise more specific lexemes. In 6.1, the translator rendered אֵת אֲשֶׁר “that which” as λόγον κυρίου “a word of the Lord.” Most commentators suggest inserting הַדְּבָר “the word” or דְּבַר-יְהוָה “the word of the LORD” to reconstruct the Hebrew *Vorlage*. While it is certainly possible that a word or phrase was lost from the Hebrew text, this more likely reflects the translator’s expectation for a form of דְּבָר “word” to follow the command to listen (cf. similar circumstances in the Twelve Prophets: Hos 4.1; Amos 3.1; 4.1; 5.1; 7.16; 8.11; Zech 7.12; and 8.9; also, see the explanation in §4.2.2 for Mic 1.2). In line with his expectation, he explicitised for his target audience the direct object.

In 7.5, the translator renders the ambiguous מִשְׁכַּבַּת חֵיקֶךָ “from her who lies (in) your bosom” more specifically with ἀπὸ τῆς συγκαίτου σου “from your bedmate.” “Bedmate”

(σύγκοιτος) is a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX so we are not aided by other occurrences. The translator maintains the same feminine gender but renders it directly rather than with a circumlocution as in the Hebrew.

A final set of explicitising shifts occur in LXX-Micah 1.10-15. Here we see several instances where the translator chose not to transliterate place names exhibiting wordplay in the Hebrew text.²⁷ Rather, he rendered them according to their semantic significance. If the target audience was not fluent in Hebrew, then the significance of these placenames would be lost. These shifts represent the translator's priority to retain the sense of his *Vorlage* for his target audience.²⁸

5.5.2.2.2 Concretisation

Concretisation involves shifting a metaphorical image into a concrete idea. This translation technique serves to clarify for the target reader the meaning behind the metaphor.²⁹ The transfer of meaning through metaphor and imagery is especially difficult when crossing cultural boundaries. Antje Labahn's explanation of metaphors being bound to a particular language elucidates the challenge of translating metaphors.

Language denotes a metaphor in a certain way; however, language is bound to a specific sociological and cultural framework. Hence, the language of a particular metaphor has to be common to the sociological framework of its hearers and readers. Their environment enables them to decode a possible meaning of a metaphor and to adapt it to their specific situation. The language of a metaphor therefore has to fit the sociological code of an individual or that of the group, to which the individual belongs. The mode whereby a metaphor establishes an extension of meaning is due to the communicative process provided by a coherent social group sharing the same cultural framework (Labahn 2005, 70).

²⁷ Ausloos *et al* (2010, 373) claim, "Indeed, although the LXX Song of Songs was in the past characterised as slavish—though without a thorough analysis of the translation technique—this research has clearly shown that the Greek translator couches the majority of the Greek equivalents for the fifteen *hapax legomena* in the Song of Songs in a way that is indeed faithful with respect to the content and meaning of the Hebrew *Vorlage*, but that, at the same time, appears to be a 'free' Greek rendering."

²⁸ Similarly, Ausloos (2012, 63-64) examines the possibility of the LXX translator of Judges attempting to replicate the intended *double entendre* of his Hebrew *Vorlage*.

²⁹ The non-obligatory shifts (when the text was understood) due to concretisation in Micah are 1.5, 16; 2.13; 3.7, 9, 11; 5.10 [Gk 5.11]; 5.11 [Gk 5.12]; 6.15; 7.5, 16.

The following examples illustrate this operational norm. In 1.5, there is a shift from the use of *בְּמִנְיֹת* “high places” as a metonym for many types of sins to the concrete and literal *ἁμαρτία* “sin.” In 2.13, the metaphor of being at the head (*בְּרֹאשָׁם* “at their head”) is concretised to leading (*ἡγήσεται αὐτῶν* “he will lead them”). In 5.11 [Gk 5.12], the Hebrew uses “hand” metaphorically to refer to possession. However, the Greek rendering concretises “hand” to the literal hands that hold the implements of sorcery (*מִיָּדְךָ* “from your hand” > *ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν σου* “from your hands”).

One more example will suffice to illustrate the norm of concretisation. In Mic 7.5, we see the shift from *שָׂמַר פִּתְחֵי־פִי* “guard the openings of your mouth” to *φύλαξαι τοῦ ἀναθέσθαι* “guard against declaring.” In rendering it this way, the translator shifts the metaphor to the concrete idea of being careful with what one says.

5.5.2.2.3 Harmonisation

Aejmelaeus (1993d, 91-2) claims,

“Harmonization is a practice that far better suits the working habits of a copyist than of a translator. The copyists often knew their text by heart, and for this reason parallels to the passage they were copying could easily occur to them...it could be argued that the translators also knew the text by heart. Nevertheless, the attention of a translator, while working, was directed to quite different things from that of the copyist. The copyist could advance fairly quickly, working mechanically most of the time, with his thoughts free to discover connections with parallel passages, discrepant statements etc. The translator, on the other hand, had to concentrate on the few words he was translating.”

The harmonisation we see in LXX-Micah involves connecting referents in ambiguous contexts with referents in explicit contexts.³⁰ Additionally, the translator harmonises (or levels) ambiguous grammatical categories. The harmonisation in 2.7 represents grammatical

³⁰ The non-obligatory shifts (when the text was understood) due to harmonisation in Micah are 1.5, 7, 10; 2.4, 7, 9 (3x); 3.1 (2x), 10; 4.1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 5.2 [Gk 5.3], 5.3 [Gk 5.4], 5.5 [Gk 5.6]; 5.13 [Gk 5.14]; 6.6, 8, 9; 7.7, 12, 19 (2x), 20.

leveling. The Qal passive participle **הֵאָמַר** “is it being said” occurs nowhere else in the MT.

The translator used a rendering that harmonises with the attested forms (ὁ λέγων “one says”).

In Micah 1.7, several shifts occur, none of which demonstrate a deficiency in grammatical, lexical or syntactic understanding on the part of the translator. The first two stichoi exhibit shifts in agent from the LORD as the passive subject to the strong nations (from Mic 4.3) as the active subject (carved images passively crushed > they will cut the carved images; her wages passively burned > they will burn her wages). In the last stich there are shifts in meaning and tense of the verb as well as a shift in subject (**יָשׁוּבוּ** “they will return” > **συνέστρεψεν** “she brought together”). The MT claims that by the wage of a prostitute she gathered (1.7bα), and unto the wage of a prostitute they will return (1.7bβ). The LXX renders the Hebrew in a parallel sense—from the wages of whoredom she gathered *and* she brought together. Wolff (1990, 58) is correct in understanding Micah’s message as addressing the “commercial goods and tribute” Samaria gave to Assyria in return for the “wages” used to build the royal residences that will be returned (“stones hurled down” and “foundations uncovered” in v.6). The LXX renders **זֹנָה** “whore” as an abstract noun **πορνείας** “whoredom” and likely understands Samaria to be the subject of **συνήγαγεν** “she gathered” and **συνέστρεψεν** “she brought together” while her idols are the objects. The translator’s understanding of the last two stichoi as parallel lines motivated the present shifts. The translator did not read a Hiphil 3fs **הֵשִׁיבָהּ** (“she brought back”) for **יָשׁוּבוּ** “they will return” but shifted the meaning to fit the understood context.

Translators are often faced with having to render words whose meanings they do not know and the context helps them with the translation. Two different Hebrew words in 4.6 (**רָעַע** “to injure”) and 4.7 (**הִלָּא** “to remove”) are rendered with the same Greek word **ἀπωθέω**

“to reject.” The verb in 4.7 is a *hapax legomenon* in the MT but ἀπωθέω “to reject” typically renders דָּאַף “to reject,” חָנַף “to reject” or שָׁטַף “to forsake.” This is a slot translation based upon its usage in 4.6 to render עָרַע “to do harm.” It harmonises the reference to οὓς ἀπωσάμην “those whom the Lord rejected” in 4.6 with τὴν ἀπωσμένην “her who is rejected” in 4.7.

5.5.2.2.4 Interpretation

Johann Cook (2009, 18) posits the following: “Since all translation is in essence interpretation, one should accept that each translator is at pains to make evident what he perceives to be the intention of his parent text.” Interpretive shifts occur when the translator possesses a certain understanding of a passage and adjusts elements in the passage to reflect his interpretation.³¹ This operational norm is distinct from explicitising and ideological/theological shifts. It does not involve the supplying of lexemes in order to clarify ideas in the passage. Nor does it involve the translator infusing his ideology or theology into the passage.

Micah 4.9 is a good example of a chain reaction of translation decisions.³² The translator read תִּדְעִי “you will know” or תוֹדִיעִי “you will make known” for תִּרְעִי “raise a shout” (common *resh/dalet* confusion in the Assyrian square script [𐤒/𐤃] or paleo-Hebrew script [𐤒/𐤃] and missed *yod* or added *waw*). This mistake was likely influenced by reading רַע “evil, bad” for רַע “a shout.” The two *qatal*s אָבַד “he perished” and הִחְזִיקָךְ “it has seized you” influenced how the translator rendered tense in ἔγνως “you knew” and μὴ βασιλεὺς οὐκ

³¹ The non-obligatory shifts (when the text was understood) due to interpretation in Micah are 1.10; 2.8; 3.7; 4.1, 8, 10, 11; 5.2 [Gk 5.3], 5.4 [Gk 5.5]; 6.3, 7, 6.9, 10, 14 (2x); 7.8, 11, 12.

³² C.f. Tov (1984, 61-64).

הֵינְךָ שׁוֹי “was there no king for you?” Though the adverb of negation לֹא “there is/was not” can be used for past time, in the context the Hebrew would be most naturally understood in present time. However, the translator took advantage of the grammatical ambiguity to clarify the time reference for the target audience.

Later in the same chapter (4.13), the translator renders וְהִתְרַמְתִּי “and I will devote” as καὶ ἀναθήσεις “and you will devote.” This is an example of the translator intervening to reflect his interpretation of the context. The LORD has commanded daughter Zion to arise and thresh that he might strengthen her and that she might defeat her enemies and devote their wealth to the LORD. The switch to the prophet speaking in the last two stichoi did not make sense to the translator so he rendered the main verb in the fifth stich as second person singular (which dictated the gapped verb in the last stich). And given the translator’s tendency to clarify the text for his target audience (e.g., supplying the object αὐτούς “them” earlier in the same verse), we should resist the temptation to explain these sorts of translation shifts as reflecting a different Hebrew *Vorlage* (unless, of course, something in the context suggests that a different Hebrew *Vorlage* lies behind the translation [cf. 2.1 and 5.6 (Gk 5.7)]). Another possible explanation for the shift from 1cs to 2fs is that the Hebrew form represents an archaic form of the 2fs that was not corrected by the Massoretes nor marked by the *Qere* reading (cf. Jer 2.33; 3.4, 5; 31.21; 46.11).

Another type of interpretive shift is reflected by double renderings. These occur when the translator is either unsure of the precise meaning of the Hebrew term or concludes that more than one Greek word is necessary to communicate the source text. An example of this solution to a difficult reading occurs in 4.10. There the translator renders חוּלִי “writhe” as ὄδινε καὶ ἀνδρίζου “suffer birth pangs and be courageous.” The verb ὄδινε “suffer birth pangs” is a common rendering for חוּלִי “to writhe,” while ἀνδρίζου “to be courageous”

usually renders קָזַח “to be strong.” The double rendering may have come about through a confusion of חִוּלִי “writhe” with some form of חִיִּל “to be strong.” The Syrohexapla reflects διατεινους “exert yourself” instead of ἀνδρίζου “be courageous,” which may represent another attempt to translate חִוּלִי “writhe.”

Another example of double rendering is 6.3 where the translator renders וּמָה הִלְאִיתִיךָ “And how have I wearied you?” as ἢ τί ἐλύπησά σε ἢ τί παρηνώχλησά σοι “Or how did I grieve you? Or how did I annoy you?” Since הִלְאִיתִי “to be weary” occurs only here in the Twelve Prophets, the translator likely did not know the meaning of the term and rendered it two different ways to increase the likelihood that he would be correct on one of the renderings.³³

5.5.2.3 Theology

Septuagint theology is a debated topic within Translation Studies and Septuagint Studies. Cook and Rösel argue that a theology of the Septuagint should be written as long as the theological nuances of individual books are maintained. Cook (2010a, 605) says one should expect “many theologies, or exegetical perspectives” to emerge from the various LXX books. Similarly, Rösel (2006, 240) provides the following premise: “a ‘Theology of the Septuagint’ cannot be based on the leveling of differences among the individual books or the specific profiles of the translators for the sake of a common edifice of ideas.” However, he proceeds to explain the value in identifying unifying themes among the individual books.

Douglas (2012) and McLay (2010) are more skeptical about the feasibility of writing a theology of the Septuagint. Douglas’ main concerns involve our ability to determine which books make up the LXX and our ability to discern the original intent of the translators (2012,

³³ Cf. Wolff (1990, 165); Schwantes (1962, 147); Hillers (1984, 76 n. e).

104). Connected to his second concern is the challenge of parsing out translator initiated differences from those that arose because of a divergent Hebrew *Vorlage* (Douglas 2012, 112). I agree with Rösel (2006, 251) who argues, “Even if we cannot be sure in every instance whether the translator, the *Vorlage* used, or a later redactor is responsible for these theological characteristics, it has to be stated that they are in the Greek text and therefore belong to the history of reception of the Septuagint.”

McLay (2010) exhibits reluctance about writing a theology of the Septuagint because of the traditionally narrow scope of the pursuit along with an insufficient definition of the field of theology. Regarding the former concern, he argues, “theology of/in the Septuagint is not limited to or controlled by the intentions of the translator” (2010, 608). He believes the theology must also be informed by the translator’s religious and cultural context. Our goal, however, is explicitly limited to the (perhaps incomplete) theology reflected by the patterned shifts in the translated text.

While there are questions about the scope, methodology and definition of Septuagint theology, most agree it would be beneficial to attempt to describe the theologies of individual books within the Septuagint. It seems to me that there are three levels of investigation into Septuagint theology: 1) the individual books, which represent unique themes and historical contexts; 2) the individual translator or group of translators, who may possess unique linguistic capacities, translation techniques and theological perspectives; 3) the entire Septuagint collection which may exhibit common themes already present in its *Vorlage* or resulting from translational interdependence. The third level of investigation lies outside the scope of this thesis. However, if LXX-Micah is in fact part of the larger LXX-Twelve Prophets corpus, the present conclusions could be improved with research in other books of the Twelve Prophets.

It is important to note that the theological shifts in LXX-Micah do not reflect a polished, or even consistent, system.³⁴ Yet, through patterned theological shifts, the translator of Micah reveals his idiosyncratic perspective (though likely not much different than that of his historical milieu). Joosten (2000, 46) offers an appropriate caution: “les auteurs de la Septante visent le plus souvent à transmettre le sens de l’hébreu tel qu’ils le perçoivent, et non à corriger la teneur théologique de leur textesource d’après leur propre agenda.” While this is true of LXX-Micah, where the translator does adjust the content of his source text, he usually does this where the syntax is difficult, where the vocabulary is rare, or where letters can be interchanged with orthographically similar consonants. In other words, the translator often capitalised on ambiguous contexts to infuse his ideas.³⁵ Whether or not the translator actually understood the Hebrew text, we should, nevertheless, classify these as free renderings. And free renderings, as Aejmelaeus (1993c, 50) says, “are like fingerprints that the translators have left behind them.”

Among the more visible translator intrusions involve words for sin and punishment.³⁶ In Mic 1.12, 2.1, 2.3 and 4.9, the translator renders עָרָב “evil” as κακά “evil deeds” (singular to plural). Similarly, in Mic 2.1 the נְאֻץ “wickedness” is rendered κόπους “troubles.”³⁷ In 3.8, we see shifts from יַעֲשֶׂה “his transgression” to ἀσεβείας αὐτοῦ “his impious acts” and יַחַתְחֶה “his sin” to ἀμαρτίας αὐτοῦ “his sins.”³⁸ In 1.5, the shift from הִנֵּה “this” to ταῦτα “these” probably

³⁴ Cf. Tov (2012, 120-121); Sysling (2007, 291). The non-obligatory shifts (when the text was understood) due to differences in theology in Micah are 1.5, 8, 12; 2.1, 3, 8, 9; 3.1, 4, 8 (2x); 4.5, 6, 9; 6.2, 6 (2x), 8, 9, 14; 7.3, 4, 7, 13, 15, 18 (3x).

³⁵ Palmer (2006, 319) noticed the same pattern in LXX-Zechariah.

³⁶ Cook (2005, 73) detects a similar emphasis on evil in LXX-Proverbs.

³⁷ The same shifts occur in Hab 1.3; 3.7; Zech 10.2.

³⁸ See הַיָּדָיִם לַמַּעֲשֵׂה “to the work of your hand” > τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν σου “to the works of your hands” (5.12 [Gk 5.13]) referring to the idols and sacred pillars they constructed, and יָעוּץ “iniquity” > ἀδικίας “unrighteousness” / יַעֲשֶׂה “transgression” > ἀσεβείας “ungodliness” (7.18).

serves to illuminate the extensive future judgment described in 1.6ff.³⁹ This pluralising shift does not occur, however, in 6.7 because it is the sin of the female speaker that is described. These shifts were made because the translator understood that the sins of Jacob must have been numerous and great to warrant the punishment they endured. Further, it seems that the translator may be harmonising with the plural iniquities and sins of Jacob in 7.19, where God's lovingkindness, faithfulness and compassion to forgive are described.

The four shifts in 1.8 from first person to third person are also theologically motivated. The context describes the punishment the LORD will bring upon Samaria for her misdeeds. In 1.8, the prophet describes his own mourning as a result of the punishment Samaria will endure. The translator either himself read the mourning as a description of how the LORD would lament or worried that his target audience would read it this way. The LORD lamenting in nakedness was likely too scandalous for the translator. Therefore, he rendered the verse in such a way (four shifts in person) that the audience would understand the acts of mourning as those that Samaria would carry out.⁴⁰ Gelston (2010, 96*) suggests that the shifts were “perhaps caused by doubt as to the identity of the subj.” It seems more likely that the translator understood the subject to be the prophet but did not want to risk his audience reading the Lord as the subject of the present context.⁴¹

In 2.1, we see the following shift: **יְדֵי לֹא־שִׁי** “it is in their power” > οὐκ ἤραν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν “they did not lift their hands to God.” Though it is possible that the LXX translator was reading a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, other translations (α', σ', θ' and T) reflect the MT. It is also possible that the translator did not understand the Hebrew idiom and was doing the best he could to render it adequately. Evidence against this explanation

³⁹ There is also a shift in the opposite direction (from plural to singular) in 1.5 but this can be explained by the singular entities equated with impiety and sin—Samaria and Jerusalem.

⁴⁰ S shifted to 2fs imperatives and T shifted to 3p *yiqtol*s presumably for the same reason.

⁴¹ Palmer (2006, 319) finds in LXX-Zechariah an emerging “exegetical tradition which softened down anthropomorphisms and other ‘inappropriate’ expressions.”

involves the other occurrences of this idiom which the LXX renders in the same sense.⁴² Instead, the translation reflects an intentional theological shift. He intentionally changed the sense of this verse in order to attribute the cause of their misdeeds to their failure to pray to God (i.e., not aligning themselves with God in order to do what is right in his eyes).

The shifts in 6.9 seem to imply that they could have been rescued if they had feared God. There are three shifts in a single clause (וְתוֹשִׁיחַ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמַרְתְּ אֶת־שֵׁם־יְיָ “and it is sound wisdom to acknowledge your name” > καὶ σώσει φοβουμένους τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ “and he will save those who fear his name”).⁴³ As discussed in §§4.7.9b-d, the first two shifts may have resulted from orthographic/phonological errors. Yet, it is likely that the translator took the opportunity to infuse his salvation theology into the context of judgment (6.9c-16).

In 2.8, we can discern a subtle theological shift through the translator’s rendering of אֹיֵב “enemy.” In the vast majority of occurrences, it is rendered with ἐχθρός “enemy,” an adjective functioning as a noun (250x, includes Mic 4.10; 5.8; 7.6). Four times in the LXX (including Mic 2.8, 7.8 and 7.10; also Isa 63.10) it is rendered with the noun ἔχθρα “hostility.” ἔχθρα “hostility” normally renders שִׂנְאָה “hatred” but also אִיבָה “enmity.” So, given the great frequency that אֹיֵב “enemy” is rendered with ἐχθρός “enemy” in the LXX (including three times in Micah), the present rendering is a shift away from calling God’s people “enemies of God” to people who merely acted in hostility against God. It is a subtle shift away from a focus upon the character of the Israelites to a focus upon their actions. In sum, it serves to highlight the temporary, reformable rebellious posture of the people.⁴⁴

⁴² The other occurrences of the idiom וְשִׁלְיָאֵל “there is power in the hand” are Gen 31.29, Prov 3.27 (with בְּהִיּוֹת “when there is” rather than שֵׁנִי “there is”), and Deut 28.32 and Neh 5.5 (with negative particle אֵין “there is not” rather than שֵׁנִי “there is”).

⁴³ Hillers (1984, 80 n. a) understands these shifts as interpretive.

⁴⁴ Palmer (2006, 319) notes a similar shift in Zech 11.8 where the posture of the shepherds is softened from loathing God (לְהַלֵּל) to crying out to him (ἐπρωύω).

In 3.12, תִּמְנֵל “as high places” is rendered ὡς ἄλσος “like a grove.” The typical renderings are ὑψηλός “high” and Βαμα “Bama” (transliterated proper place name). The same rendering occurs in Jer 26.18 [Gk 33.18]. The shift was likely motivated by the association of high places with sin (cf. Mic 1.5; 1 Kgs 13.33).

In 4.6, עָרַךְ “to injure” is rendered ἀπωσάμην “I have rejected.” Typically it is rendered κακόω “to harm,” πονηρέυομαι “to act wickedly,” or κακοποιέω “to do wrong.” This shift is likely an example of the translator mitigating the implications of God injuring his people. Instead, LXX softens God’s actions to merely rejecting his people for their sin. This is supported by the translator choosing one of the common Greek verbs πονηρέυομαι “to act wickedly” to render עָרַךְ “to injure” in 3.4 because the action is carried out by unjust rulers in Jacob.

A similar shift occurs in 6.14, where יִתְּנֵם “I will give” is rendered παραδοθήσονται “they will be handed over,” which is a shift from *yiqtol* 1cs to future passive indicative 3p. The Greek rendering reflects יִתְּנֵם “they will be given” which has too little orthographic similarity with the Hebrew to suggest a visual error. Instead, this reflects a theological shift intended to distance the Lord from actively handing over his people to the sword.

In 4.10, the translator combines the actions of rescuing and redeeming to have one subject, namely the LORD. In the Hebrew of 4.10d, the LORD is the subject who redeems Daughter Zion; in 4.10c, the subject of the rescue is ambiguous. The translator removed the ambiguity by shifting from the Niphal *yiqtol* 2fs to a future middle (deponent) 3s with a (plus) 2s direct object.

One final example will suffice to illustrate this prominent operational norm in LXX-Micah. In 7.7, the translator intentionally rendered the *bet* and *lamed* prepositions with ἐπι

“on, above,” which is very unusual. He also chose an unusual rendering for צפה “to watch closely” (ἐπιβλέπω “to anticipate”). Together these shifts served to highlight the positive responses of the prophet to anticipate the judgment, salvation and sustenance of the Lord (see §4.8.7b-c for further explanation).

5.5.2.4 Ideology

Crisafulli (2002, 34-35) suggests that the main problem of translation analysis is striking the correct balance between “norm-governed (the trans-individual or collective dimension, which verges on the sociological) and the idiosyncratic behavior (the individual dimension, which foregrounds the human agent)...translators are not simply in the grip of powerful translation and poetic norms; they may have their own ideological agendas.” In the case of LXX-Micah, the translator’s ideology emerges in both overt and covert ways.⁴⁵

The primary means by which the translator infused his ideology was adjusting the historical perspective of the text—historicising.⁴⁶ These shifts became apparent when I classified the verbal correspondences. Because the translator typically rendered Hebrew verbal constructions in expected ways, his deviations often revealed historicising motivations. These shifts provide a separation or distance between Micah’s original audience and the translator’s target audience.⁴⁷ There are two instances where the historicising shifts occur through lexical changes (3.1, 9).⁴⁸

⁴⁵ The non-obligatory shifts (when the text was understood) due to differences in ideology in Micah are 2.1, 2 (4x), 4 (2x), 7, 8 (2x), 9, 10; 3.1 (3x), 5 (2x), 9 (2x), 11 (4x); 4.8, 9 (2x), 11; 6.7, 9; 7.4, 8, 11.

⁴⁶ The subset of non-obligatory ideological shifts occur in the following verses: 2.1, 2 [4x], 4 [2x], 7, 8 [2x], 10; 3.1, 5 [2x], 9, 11 [4x]; 4.8, 9 [2x]. These references are included in the list of ideological shifts.

⁴⁷ Dines (1991, 314) notes similar historicising shifts in Amos 2.14f and 4.4; Ausloos (2014, 487-488) notes shifts in Malachi (3.23 [Gk 3.22]) and Joel (2.11 and 3.4) regarding the Day of the LORD which may reflect historicising or may have been the result of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* or a translation mistake.

⁴⁸ Dines (1991) recognise a similar type of historicising in LXX-Amos. She claims with regard to the prophetic utterances that the translator of Amos understands them to be “speaking to and about contemporary (or at least recent) events.” With regard to salvation prophecies, though he believed they were not yet fully realised, they would soon be completely fulfilled (Dines 1991, 314). Similarly, the historicising approach of 4th-5th century C.E. commentators Dines studied—Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrrhus, Cyril of

Micah 2.1-4 illustrate well this type of shift. In Mic 2.1, the MT explains employs two participles and a *yiqtol* to describe the *current* actions of the wicked. However, the LXX shifts the timing of these actions to the past by rendering יהׁי “woe” with γίνομαι “to be” before the two participles. Additionally, he renders the *yiqtol* with a Greek imperfect, effectively shifting the timing to the past and emphasising the ongoing nature of the wicked actions. In 2.2, there are four Hebrew verbs in the consecutive perfect conjugation (יִדְמֶה, יִגְלוּ, יִשְׁאוּ, וְיִשְׁקוּ) that are rendered as Greek imperfects (ἐπεθύμουν, διήραζον, κατεδυνάστευον, διήραζον). The intentionality of these shifts is further substantiated by the fact that there are 55 occurrences of consecutive perfect in MT-Micah and only five are rendered other than future (four are rendered as imperfects in 2.2; one is rendered as an aorist in 3.5). What follows in 2.3 in the MT and LXX is a declaration by the LORD about the future judgment that will result from the wickedness. Mic 2.4 then describes a taunt song and lament that will be sung on that judgment day (parable and dirge in LXX). Though the content of the lament is clearly present time in the MT, the LXX reflects several shifts that set the timing of the dirge in the past. The accumulation of shifts in Mic 2.1-4 suggests that the translator intended to update the message to reflect his post-exilic context rather than the pre-exilic context of his *Vorlage*.

Similarly, in 3.11, there are four Hebrew imperfects that are translated with Greek imperfects. Typically, Hebrew imperfects have a future or present time reference and Greek imperfects have a past time reference. The translator has clarified for the target audience that these negative actions already occurred and judgment will follow.

Alexandria and Jerome—emphasises the major conquests (Assyrian and Babylonian), Babylonian exile and the return of the Judean remnant as it affects the *parousia* of Christ.

In 3.1 and 3.9 the translator rendered וְקַצְיֵי בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל “and rulers of the house of Israel” as καὶ οἱ κατὰλοιποι οἴκου Ἰσραηλ “and you who are left of the house of Israel.” Many commentators suggest that the shifts reflect a mistaken reading of קַצְיֵן “chief, ruler” as some form of קָצַף “to cut off,” קָץ “end,” קָצָה “to cut off,” or קָצָה “end.”⁴⁹ A better explanation is that it was a historicising shift motivated by an ideological agenda. Aaron Schart (2011, 2285) argues that the shift here reflects the translator’s intention to include the diaspora in the threats to follow. The diaspora has already been mentioned in 2.12 in the context of future gathering and restoration. In LXX 3.1 and 3.9, the diaspora Israelites are chastened along with the rulers in Jacob. This argument is strengthened by the shift in 3.1 from a 1cs *wayyiqtol* to a third person future indicative (וַאֲמַרְתִּי “and I said” > καὶ ἐρεῖ “and he will say”). It was necessary for there to be a *future* command if the translator’s contemporary audience were to also receive the warning. These shifts expand the warnings from only the pre-exilic Israelite rulers to the post-exilic diaspora living in Alexandria in the 3rd or 2nd B.C.E.⁵⁰

Other historicising shifts are reflected through shifts from vocatives to subjects of main verbs. According to Miller (2010a, 48), the definite article *is not* usually present with vocative common nouns. We should not assume, then, that the LXX translator would have looked for a definite article to mark the vocative noun. Therefore, the shifts in LXX-Micah from vocative to the subject of the main verb cannot be explained by means of the absence of the definite article. Instead, we must posit other explanations for these shifts. In 2.7 and 2.12, the shifts likely represent historicising shifts (in congruence with other historicising shifts in

⁴⁹ See also Gelston (2010, 71); Magary (1995, 377); Taylor (1890, 76); Wolff (1990, 90n.1d); Schwantes (1962, 84). Hillers (1984, 41n.d) suggests that this explanation is *ad hoc* but does not offer any other explanation.

⁵⁰ A similar translation technique is noted by Wagner (2013, 148) with regard to OG Isa 1.21-31. He claims, “By adhering closely to his *Vorlage* at pivotal points (vv. 21, 23, 26, 28), the Greek translator faithfully preserves the overall shape of the source text. At the same time, the translator consistently modifies Isaiah’s judgment oracles so that they more specifically target the leaders of Jerusalem.”

this chapter [esp. in 2.1-4]). The translator viewed the addresses to the house of Jacob (2.7) and Jacob (2.12) to be contemporary with the original prophecies, not with his own historical context. The latter shift (2.12) may have also been motivated by a desire to harmonise with the parallel second stich in which “remnant of Israel” is not a vocative.

5.5.3 Non-obligatory shifts (when text apparently *not* understood)

There are also non-obligatory shifts which seem to reflect that the translator did not understand the text he was translating. In some of these cases he will do the best he can to translate the text utilising the context (a common situation resulting in slot translations). At other times, he will simply omit what does not fit the context or shift (e.g., person) to make sense of the context.

5.5.3.1 Slot translations

At times, the translator does not know the meaning of a Hebrew word and utilises the context to help him with its rendering. I refer to these as slot translations.⁵¹ For example, הָלָא “to be removed,” which occurs in 4.7 is a *hapax legomenon* and the translator likely did not know its meaning. The translator rendered it ἀπωθέω “to reject” yet this word typically renders סָמַח “to reject,” נָזַח “to reject” or שָׁטַח “to forsake.” This shift likely represents a slot translation based upon the use of ἀπωθέω “to reject” in 4.6.

Another example occurs in 2.10 (Greek rendering in 2.11), where מָרַץ “to be grievous” is rendered κατεδιώχθητε “you were pursued” likely based on the translator’s understanding of the following verb הָלַךְ “to go,” which was rendered διώκω “to pursue.”

⁵¹ The non-obligatory shifts (when the text was apparently *not* understood) reflected by slot translations in Micah are 1.4, 9, 11, 13; 2.6 (3x), 8, 10, 12 (2x); 3.12; 4.6, 7 (2x), 10; 5.6 [Gk 5.7]; 6.2, 8, 10; 7.19.

This is supported by the rare occurrence of מְרִיץ “to be grievous” in the MT and the fact that each of the four times it occurs, it is rendered differently (1 Kgs 2.8 – ὀδυνηρός “with grief”; Job 6.25 – φαῦλος “worthless”; Job 16.3 – παρενοχλέω “cause difficulty [for]”).

One more example will suffice. In 7.19, יִכְבֹּשׁ “he will tread” is rendered καταδύσει “he will cause to sink.” This situation is the reverse of that in 2.10. In 2.10, the Hebrew word is rare and is rendered differently in each context; in 7.19, the Greek word καταδύω “cause to sink” is rare⁵² and renders a different Hebrew word each time it is used. Still the translator uses context (the following line “casting sins into the depths of the sea”) to render it.

5.5.3.2 Omissions

At times, the translator will omit what he does not understand.⁵³ For example, in 2.7, the interrogative pronoun on הֲקֶצֶר “is it short” does not fit his understanding of the verse. Instead of the second stich involving a question about the spirit of the LORD growing impatient, the translator understood it as a statement that the house of Jacob has provoked the spirit of the Lord to anger (see further explanation in §4.3.7c).

Another example occurs at 1.11. There the translator has rendered יוֹשֶׁבֶת שַׁפִּיר “inhabitant of Shaphir, in nakedness and shame” as κατοικοῦσα καλῶς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῆς “she inhabits her cities well.” As a result of the mistakes in this rendering (as explained in §§4.2.11b-d), בְּשֹׁמֶל “shame” does not fit and is, therefore, omitted.⁵⁴

⁵² It occurs in the LXX only four times and each time it renders a different Hebrew word (occurrences outside Micah: Exod 15.5 – יָרַד “to go down”; Jer 51.64 – שָׁקַע “to sink”; Amos 9.3 – סָתַר “to hide”).

⁵³ The non-obligatory shifts (when the text was apparently *not* understood) resulting in omissions in Micah are 1.11; 2.7; 5.3 [Gk 5.4].

⁵⁴ Other reasons for omitting content are unintentional mistakes and intentional omissions for interpretive, ideological or theological reasons.

5.6 Summary

It is not enough simply to identify translation shifts; they must be organised and categorised in order to discern translation patterns (operational norms). Patterns discerned throughout a corpus are extremely valuable for explaining individual translation shifts. Discovering the translation patterns in LXX-Micah was the primary purpose of this chapter.

These patterns emerged through the categorisation of the data from chapter 4. The first table (§5.2) details the verbal correspondences between the Hebrew and Greek verbs. The second table (§5.3) presents the morphological, lexical and syntactical shifts throughout LXX-Micah. In addition to findings related to traditional textual criticism (i.e., scribal errors and differences due to a variant Hebrew *Vorlage*) (§5.4), I note the obligatory shifts motivated by target language linguistic constraints (§5.5.1). I also describe two types of non-obligatory shifts introduced when the translator apparently did not understand the Hebrew text (§5.5.3).

In §5.5.2, I present the non-obligatory shifts influenced by the translator's style, desire for clarity, theology and ideology. In terms of style, I found that the translator preferred to vary his lexical choices and smooth the syntax. In order to present a clear and unambiguous text, he utilised explicitisation, concretisation, harmonisation and interpretation. He also introduced changes that reflected his own theology. Through several shifts from singular "evil" to plural "evil deeds" the translator suggests that the sins of the Israelites were numerous and great to have warranted the punishment they endured. Similarly, they alone were culpable for their sins and God was justified in punishing them. Other shifts seem to indicate that God did not save them because they did not turn to him in prayer and they did not fear him. Ideologically, shifts occurred primarily through the technique of historicising. The translator effectively distinguished the Israelites of the past that had brought upon themselves the exile from the diaspora Jews living in the 3rd or 2nd century B.C.E. Alexandria.

However, through two other shifts the translator included the post-exilic Jewish diaspora in God's threats of future judgment.

In chapter 6, I will summarise the preceding chapters and provide concluding remarks on the character of LXX-Micah as unique work of literature in the target culture. I will also discuss the ways the translator has intervened in the text to communicate with his target audience.

Chapter 6: Summary and Conclusions

6.1 Introduction

“The fundamental requisite of an ideal translation is complete independence of expression coupled with absolute dependence of idea” (Rife 1933, 245). The reality is that an ideal translation does not exist. “Translations are never perfect; something is always left out, hidden, covered up” (Gentzler 2008, 2). This is what makes their analyses interesting and complex.

The complexity of LXX-Micah is addressed in this study as it employs proven text critical approaches as well as the most recent advances in translation theory. The goal was to describe LXX-Micah through understanding the purposeful, idiosyncratic shifts introduced by the translator. The theoretical framework for this study is the recognition that translations exist within a cultural and literary polysystem where the translator affects change in the polysystem and the polysystem exerts some control over translation norms. This study utilises Chesterman’s causal model (2000) because it incorporates the strengths of both the comparative and process models of translation. The causal model accounts for three important aspects of the translation: the preliminary norms (causal conditions), translated text and translation effects (target culture reception).

6.2 Summary

6.2.1 Chapter 1

In chapter 1, I discuss the difficulty with assigning labels to works of translation. The problem lies in determining what constitutes translation equivalence. Much progress has been made to understand translation in terms of a particular *skopos*, or the communicative function

of the translation. Additionally, if we understand the translator as an agent of change, then we will expect to see idiosyncratic thought reflected in his/her work.

I then describe the fields of Translation Studies and Septuagint Studies and explain how merging the two disciplines can yield better results in the analysis of the LXX. I discuss the importance of understanding general scribal technique/error but also acknowledge the potential for translators to make adjustments based on their unique perspectives or purposes in producing the translations.

Next I discuss the methodology I employed to analyse LXX-Micah. I used the causal model within DTS, which incorporates both the comparative and process models. The causal model accounts for three important aspects of the translation: the preliminary norms (causal conditions), translated text and translation effects (target culture receptance).

Finally, I explain why I chose to analyse LXX-Micah instead of perhaps the entire Twelve Prophets or another book in the LXX corpus. I ended the chapter with a description of the organisation of my study.

6.2.2 Chapter 2

In chapter 2, I survey three scholars that specifically focus on LXX-Micah—Taylor (1890), Schwantes (1965) and Magary (1995). While they are valuable from a text-critical perspective, they do not describe the character of LXX-Micah nor the ideology of its translator. I then provide a chronological overview of the studies which address translation technique in the Latter Prophets. Some of these have methodological problems; others, are too selective with either data or the scope of their investigations. Many of these studies, including those by and Dines (1991), Palmer (2006), Van der Louw (2007), Glenny (2009), O'Hare (2010) and Tully (2012) help advance our understanding of the *Tendenz* of LXX translators.

6.2.3 Chapter 3

Chapter 3 provides the theoretical and methodological framework for my description of LXX-Micah. The theoretical framework for this study is the recognition that translations exist within a cultural and literary polysystem where the translator affects change in the polysystem and the polysystem exerts some control over translation norms. Based on this theoretical framework, Descriptive Translation Studies scholars have developed three primary translation models—comparative, process and causal. Of these, Chesterman's causal model (2000) was chosen for this study because it incorporates the strengths of both comparative and process models. The causal model addresses three critical aspects of translation: preliminary norms (causal conditions), translated text and translation effects (target culture reception).

I considered the preliminary norm that emerged from the influence of the *Book of Aristeas*, which served to infuse the LXX with authority and validity. As a result, the LXX-Micah possessed these qualities simply because it was a part of the LXX corpus. Additionally, the *Book of Aristeas* functioned as a metatext for the translations subsequent to LXX-Torah. This metatext, on some level, guided the translation process of LXX-Micah. Also in chapter 3, I described the high level of acceptance of the LXX within Judaism in the 2nd-1st centuries B.C.E. and early Christianity in the 1st-2nd centuries C.E.

6.2.4 Chapter 4

Chapter 4 presents the raw data for this study. It involves a verse-by-verse comparison of MT and LXX-Micah. Each translation shift is documented as a coupled-pair and explained. Septuagint Studies and textual criticism provided the tools necessary to explain differences due to orthographic errors or the linguistic incompetency of the translator as well as differences due to a Hebrew *Vorlage* which was different than the MT. The other

differences described in this chapter involve apparently purposeful translation shifts. There are shifts in verbal conjugation, morphological shifts (in person, number, and voice), semantic shifts, and syntactic shifts (in word order, class shifts, pluses and minuses).

6.2.5 Chapter 5

In chapter 5, I categorised the data from chapter 4 to draw out the tendencies of the translator as discerned by the translation patterns. There are two tables presented at the beginning of this chapter. The first table (§5.2) details the correlation of each Hebrew conjugation with its respective mood and tense in Greek. The second table (§5.3) presents the morphological, lexical and syntactical shifts throughout LXX-Micah.

In addition to findings related to traditional textual criticism (i.e., scribal errors and differences due to a variant Hebrew *Vorlage*), I note the obligatory shifts motivated by target language linguistic constraints (§5.5.1). I also describe two types of non-obligatory shifts introduced when the translator apparently did not understand the Hebrew text (§5.5.3).

In §5.5.2, I present the non-obligatory shifts (when the translator apparently understood the Hebrew text) influenced by the translator's style, concern for message clarity, theology and ideology. In terms of style, I found that the translator preferred to vary his lexical choices and smooth the syntax. In order to present a clear and unambiguous text, he utilised explicitisation, concretisation, harmonisation and interpretation. He also took advantage of opportunities to infuse into the translated text his own theology and ideology. In §6.3 below I will highlight the more significant findings regarding the style, concern for message clarity, theology and ideology of LXX-Micah's translator.

6.3 Conclusions

6.3.1 Style

Though good style was not the most important operational norm for the translator, lexical variation demonstrates this norm. Lexical variation is illustrated in instances both where the translator renders the same Hebrew word differently (e.g., 1.14; 2.6, 12) and where the translator deletes a word because his Greek lexicon does contain another option (6.15). The other stylistic shift was motivated by the goal of creating a target Greek text that was easy to read. In three instances, the translator has adjusted the syntax (smoothed it), not because there was no corresponding Greek syntax, but in order to make the Greek more readable (1.3, 1.9; 7.12).

6.3.2 Clarity

A high priority for the translator was to make the message of Micah clear for his target audience. This was especially true in instances where the text is ambiguous (explicitisation – e.g., 2.4, 9; 4.10; 6.1) or metaphorical (concretisation – e.g., 1.5; 2.13; 5.11 [Gk 5.12]; 7.15). It was also true when the Hebrew text was clear but the translator wanted to harmonise his present context with something similar in that verse or elsewhere in Micah (e.g., 1.7; 4.6). When the message of the Hebrew text differed from the translator's understanding, he often made adjustments. When these adjustments were not motivated by a theological or ideological agenda, they are interpretive shifts (e.g., 4.8, 11, 13).

6.3.3 Theology

A picture of the translator's idiosyncratic theology (though not completely developed or consistent) emerges from the shifts he introduced in the translated text. These are instances where he intervenes to infuse a theology that is unique but that likely reflects his historical

milieu. Most of the translator's theological interventions occurred where the syntax is difficult, where the vocabulary is rare, or where letters can be interchanged with orthographically similar consonants. In other words, the translator often capitalised on ambiguous contexts to infuse his ideas.

The translator's theology reflects a high view of God and a critical perspective toward those Israelites who caused the exile. His high view of God can be seen in how he protected his target audience from misinterpreting certain aspects of God. For instance, in 1.8, he made sure they will not think God is going about naked and barefoot mourning. In 6.14, he also attempted to shield them from viewing God as one who inflicts harsh punishment on his people like handing them over to the sword. In 4.6, it seems that the translator wanted his audience to believe that God did not directly injure his people; he merely rejected them. In 4.10, the translator sought to build up his audience's view of God by making it clear that it was the Lord who rescued his people from exile and that that Lord was their God.

The translator also infused the translation with his critique of the Israelites whose sin resulted in exile. Through shifting words about sin from singular to plural (e.g., 1.12; 2.1; 4.9), he highlighted the grievous nature and abundance of their sins, making it clear that they alone were culpable and God was justified in punishing them. Similarly, he shifted words of judgment from singular to plural to illuminate the extent of their punishment (e.g., 6.16; 7.4). Other shifts seem to indicate that God did not save them because of their failure to turn to him in prayer (e.g., 2.1) or fear him (e.g., 6.9).

6.3.4 Ideology

Ideologically, shifts occurred primarily through the technique of historicising. The translator demonstrated a clear desire to update the text to reflect his contemporary historical setting of the 3rd or 2nd century B.C.E. Alexandria. He intended to place a separaton between

the sins of Micah's original audience that led to their exile and the historical context of the post-exilic diaspora Jews (e.g., 2.1, 2, 4, 7, 8; 3.5, 11; 4.9). He also wanted to make it clear that the judgment incurred by the pre-exilic Israelites had already taken place (e.g., 2.1, 2, 4, 10; 4.9). Yet, he made sure to warn his target audience that they should heed their own actions lest they receive the same judgment (3.1, 9).

6.4 Future perspectives

This study makes unique contributions to Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies. For Septuagint Studies, my results demonstrate the value of considering preliminary norms and translation effects for the overall assessment of any work of translation. Additionally, I show why it is critical to utilise translation patterns (operational norms) for the evaluation of each and every translation shift. Discerning these operational norms involves first evaluating the shifts and categorising them but then re-evaluating the shifts based on the operational norms (feedback process). My analysis also illustrates viable alternatives to explaining differences through positing a divergent Hebrew *Vorlage*.

For the field of Translation Studies, this study attempts to demonstrate the fruitful tools of textual criticism and Septuagint Studies. It illustrates how important it is to consider scribal tendencies when analysing ancient translations that have a long history of transcription and transmission. Orthographical and phonological factors led to the confusion of letters as well as the omission or duplication of letters, words and phrases. Also, because the translators, transcribers and transmitters were human, they made other mistakes due to their lexical and grammatical deficiencies.

The intent of this study was to contribute to our understanding of the tendencies of LXX-Micah's translator. However, it was a study in only a portion of LXX-Twelve Prophets, which is only a portion of the entire LXX corpus. Research on Greek Hosea, Habakkuk and

Haggai, for instance, will likely produce valuable data. Behind each of these books stands a different historical milieu for the original prophecies in the Hebrew text. Perhaps the different historical settings in the Hebrew motivated different translation approaches. Hopefully Translation Studies scholars will analyse other books in the LXX with respect to their translational patterns in order to add to the overall picture of this rich and diverse work of translation.

Works cited

- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. 1993a. *Participium coniunctum* as a criterion of translation technique. In *On the trail of the Septuagint translators*, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus, 7-16. Kampen, the Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House.
- . 1993b. Septuagint translation techniques – a solution to the problem of the Tabernacle Account. In *On the trail of the Septuagint translators*, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus, 116-130. Kampen, the Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House.
- . 1993c. The significance of clause connectors in the syntactical and translation-technical study of the Septuagint. In *On the trail of the Septuagint translators*, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus, 49-64. Kampen, the Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House.
- . 1993d. What can we know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint? In *On the trail of the Septuagint translators*, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus, 77-115. Kampen, the Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House.
- Albright, William F. 1957. The high place in ancient Palestine. In *Volume du Congrès, Strasbourg, 1956*. *VTSup* 4:242-58.
- . 1993c. What can we know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint? In *On the trail of the Septuagint translators*, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus, 77-115. Kampen, the Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House.
- Alter, Robert. 1996. *The pleasures of reading in an ideological age*. New York: Norton.
- Andersen, Francis I. and David Noel Freedman. 2000. *Micah: A new translation with introduction and commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible 24. New York: Doubleday.
- Arietti, James A. 1972. *A study in the Septuagint of the book of Amos*. Ph.D. diss., Stanford University.
- Ausloos, Hans. 2012. Judges 3:12-30: An analysis of the Greek rendering of

- Hebrew wordplay. In *Text-critical and hermeneutical studies in the Septuagint*, eds. Johann Cook and Hermann-Josef Stipp, 53-68. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2014. Mal 3:22-24 (4:1-6) in the Hebrew and Greek: Some remarks concerning its function in the canon. In *In the footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the biblical text in honour of Anneli Aejmelaesus* eds. Kristin de Troyer, T. Michael Law and Marketta Liljeström, 479-491. Leuven: Peeters.
- Ausloos, Hans and Benedicte Lemmelijn. 2010. Content-related criteria in characterising the LXX translation technique. In *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Karrer and Martin Meiser, 357-376. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Baker, Mona. 1998a. Norms. In *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*, ed. Mona Baker, 163-70. London: Routledge.
- . 1998b. Translation studies. In *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*, ed. Mona Baker, 277-86. London: Routledge.
- . 2006. *Translation and conflict: a narrative account*. London: Routledge.
- Bakker, Matthijs, Cees Koster, and Kitty van Leuven-Zwart. 1998. Shifts of translation. In *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*, ed. Mona Baker, 231-38. London: Routledge.
- Barnstone, Willis. 1993. *The poetics of translation: History, theory, practice*. New Haven: London.
- Barr, James. 1979. *The typology of literalism in ancient biblical translations*. Mitteilungen Des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere. 1990. Translation: Its geneology in the west. In *Translation, history, and culture*, eds. Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, 14-28. London: Pinter Publishers.

- Beck, John A. 2000. *Translators as storytellers: A study in Septuagint translation technique*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Bertram, Georg. 1936. Das Problem der Umschrift und die religionsgeschichtliche Erforschung der Septuaginta. *BZAW* 66: 97-109.
- Bock, Darrell L. 1999. Use of the Old Testament in the New. In *Foundations for biblical interpretation*, ed. David S. Dockery, Kenneth A. Mathews, and Robert Sloan, 97-114. Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman Publishers.
- Brotzman, Ellis R. 1994. *Old Testament textual criticism: A practical introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Catford, J. C. 1965. *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 1998. Causes, Translations, Effects. *Target* 10(2): 201-230.
- . 2000. A causal model for Translation Studies. In *Intercultural faultlines: Research models in Translation Studies 1 – Textual and cognitive aspects*, ed. Maeve Olohan, 15-27. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome.
- Cook, Johann. 2005. “Theological/ideological” *Tendenz* in the Septuagint – LXX Proverbs: A case study. In *Interpreting translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in honour of Johan Lust*, eds. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne, 65-79. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2009. On the role of external traditions in the Septuagint. In *Septuagint and reception: Essays prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, ed. Johann Cook, 17-36. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2010a. Interpreting the Septuagint—exegesis, theology and/or Religionsgeschichte? In *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Karrer and Martin Meiser, 590-606. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2010b. Towards the formulation of a theology of the Septuagint. In *Congress*

- Volume Ljubljana 2007*, ed. André Lemaire, 621-640. Leiden: Brill.
- Crisafulli, Edoardo. 2002. The quest for an eclectic methodology of translation description. In *Crosscultural transgressions: Research models in Translation Studies II*, ed. Theo Hermans, 26-43. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Day, John. 1992a. Asherah. In *The Anchor Bible dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman, 1. 483-487. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- . 1992b. Ashtoreth. In *The Anchor Bible dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman, 1. 491-494. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- de Saussure, F. 1966. *Course in general linguistics*. Translated by W. Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- de Waard, Jan. 1978. Translation techniques used by the Greek translators of Amos. *Bib* 59: 339-350.
- Delisle, Jean and Judith Woodsworth. 1995. *Translators through history*. Benjamins translation library, 13. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Dines, Jennifer M. 1991. *The Septuagint of Amos: A study in interpretation*. Ph.D. diss., University of London-Heythrop College.
- Dogniez, Cécile. 2002. The Greek renderings of Hebrew idiomatic expressions and their treatment in the Septuagint lexica. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 28/1: 1-17.
- Douglas, Alex. 2012. Limitations to writing a theology of the Septuagint, *The Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 45: 104-117.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 2010. Polysystem Theory (Revised). In *Papers in culture research*, 40-50. Tel Aviv: Unit of Culture Research.
- Fishbane, Michael. 1985. Lexical and explicative comments. In *Biblical interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 44-65. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Fox, Michael V. 2009. *Proverbs 10-31: A new translation with introduction and commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible 18b. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds. 1997. *The dead sea scrolls study edition*. 1, 1Q1 – 4Q273. Leiden: Brill.
- Gelston, Anthony, ed. 2010. *The Twelve Minor Prophets*. Biblia Hebraica Quinta 13. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Gentzler, Edwin. 1993. *Contemporary translation theories*. London: Routledge.
- . 2008. *Translation and identity in the Americas: New directions in translation theory*. London: Routledge.
- Glenny, W. Edward. 2007. Hebrew misreadings or free translation in the Septuagint of Amos? In *Vetus Testamentum* 57(4): 524-547.
- . 2009. *Finding meaning in the text: Translation technique and theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2015. *Micah: A commentary based on Micah in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint commentary. Leiden: Brill.
- Gruen, Erich S. 2008. The *Letter of Aristeas* and the cultural context of the Septuagint. In *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten, wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 219*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 134-156. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hadas, Moses. 1973. *Aristeas to Philocrates*. New York: KTAV.
- Hatim, Basil, and Jeremy Munday. 2004. *Translation: An advanced resource book*. Routledge Applied Linguistics. London: Routledge.
- Heltai, Pal. 2005. Explication, redundancy, ellipsis and translation. In *New Trends in Translation Studies. In Honour of Kinga Klaudy*, ed. Krisztina Karoly and Agata Foris, 45-73. Budapest: Akademia Kiado.

- Hengel, Martin. 2002. *LXX as Christian Scripture: Its prehistory and the problem of its canon*. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Hermans, Theo. 1985. Translation studies and a new paradigm. In *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation*, ed. Theo Hermans, 7-15. London: Croom Helm.
- Hillers, Delbert R. 1984. *Micah: A commentary on the book of the prophet Micah*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Holmes, James S. 1988. *Translated! Papers on literary translation and translation studies, approaches to translation studies*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Holmstedt, Robert D. 2002. *The relative clause in biblical Hebrew: A linguistic analysis*. Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Horgan, Maurya P. 2002. Micah Peshet 1. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek texts with English translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth et al. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Howard, George E. 2007. "The Twelve Prophets: To the reader." In *A new English translation of the Septuagint*, eds. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, 777-781. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jakobson, Roman. 2004. On linguistic aspects of translation. In *The translation studies reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 138-43. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge. Originally published in R. A. Brower, ed., *On translation*, 232-239 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1959).
- Joosten, Jan. 2000. Une théologie de la Septante?: Réflexions méthodologiques sur l'interprétation de la version grecque, *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 132: 31-46.
- . 2005. A septuagintal translation technique in the minor prophets. In *Interpreting*

- translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in honour of Johan Lust*, 217-223. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2012. On Aramaizing renderings in the Septuagint. In *Collected essays on the Septuagint: From language to interpretation and beyond*, 53-66. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Gesenius, Friedrich Wilhelm. 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar*, ed. Emil Kautzsch. Tran. Arthur Ernest Cowley. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Kittel, Rudolf, Karl Elliger, and Wilhelm Rudolph. 1967. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Koller, W. 1989. Equivalence in translation theory. In *Readings in translation theory*. Translated by Andrew Chesterman, 99-104. Helsinki: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.
- Kraus, Wolfgang and Martin Karrer. 2009. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Labahn, Antje. 2005. Wild animals and chasing shadows: Animal metaphors in lamentations as indications for individual threat. In *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. P. van Hecke, 67-97. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame*. London: Routledge.
- Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel and Katrin Hauspie, eds. 2003. *Greek-English lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Magary, Dennis R. 1995. *Translation technique in the Peshitta of the book of Micah*. Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Marcos, Natalio Fernández. 2000. *The Septuagint in context: Introduction to the Greek version of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill.
- McLay, R. Timothy. 2003. *The use of the Septuagint in New Testament research*. Grand

- Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 2010. Why not a theology of the Septuagint? In *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Karrer and Martin Meiser, 607-620. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Milik, Jozef T. 1961. Rouleau des Douze Prophetes (Pl. LVI-LXXIII), In *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert II: Les grottes de Murabba'ât*, eds. Pierre Benoit, Jozef T. Milik and Roland de Vaux, 181-205. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Miller, Cynthia. 2005. Ellipsis involving negation in biblical poetry. In *Seeking out the wisdom of the ancients: Essays offered to honor Michael V. Fox on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*, eds. Ronald Troxel, Kevin Friebel and Dennis Magary, 37-52. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- . 2010a. Definiteness and the vocative in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of North-west Semitic Languages* 36/1: 43-64.
- . 2010b. Vocative syntax in Biblical Hebrew prose and poetry: A preliminary analysis. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 55: 347-364.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2008. *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. 2nd ed. New York, NY: Routledge.
- . 2012a. *Evaluation in translation: Critical points of translator decision-making*. London: Routledge.
- . 2012b. *Introducing translation studies: Theories and applications*. London: Routledge.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1973. Literary device in the Septuagint. *Textus* 8: 20-30.
- . 1989. In defence of the unity of the Septuagint Minor Prophets. In *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 15: 25-36.

- . 2003. *A Greek-English lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets*. Louvain: Peeters Publishers.
- Naudé, J. A. 1999. A descriptive translation analysis of the Schocken Bible. *Old Testament Essays* 12/1: 73-93.
- . 2009. The role of metatexts in the translation of sacred texts: The case of the book of Aristeas and the Septuagint. In *Septuagint and reception: Essays prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, ed. Johann Cook, 281-97. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2011. From submissiveness to agency: An overview of developments in translation studies and some implications for language practice in Africa. In *Southern African linguistics and applied language studies* 29(3): 223-241.
- Nida, Eugene. 1969. Science of Translation. *Language* 45(3): 483-498
- . 2003. *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a purposeful activity: Functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester, UK: St Jerome Publishing.
- O'Hare, Daniel M. 2010. "Have you seen, son of man?" A study in the translation and Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40-48. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Oloffson, Staffan. 1990. *The LXX version: A guide to the translation technique of the Septuagint*. Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 30. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- . 2009. *Translation technique and theological exegesis: Collected essays on the Septuagint version*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Palmer, James K. 2006. 'Not made with tracing paper': Studies in the Septuagint of Zechariah. Abstract of Ph.D. diss. *Tyndale Bulletin*. 57.2: 317-320.

- Peters, Melvin K. H. 1992. Septuagint. In *The Anchor Bible dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. 5, 1093-1104. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Phelan, Thomas W. 1982. *Translation techniques of the Greek Minor Prophets*. Ph.D. diss., Bob Jones University.
- Pietersma, Albert. 2006. LXX and DTS: A new Archimedean point for Septuagint Studies? *BIOSCS* 39: 1-11.
- Pym, Anthony. 2008. On Toury's laws of how translators translate. In *Beyond descriptive translation studies: Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*, ed. Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, and Daniel Simeoni, 311-28. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Rabin, Chaim. 1968. The translation process and the character of the Septuagint. *Textus* 6: 1-26.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. 2006. *Septuaginta*. Revised by Robert Hanhart. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Reiss, Katharina and Hans Vermeer. 1984. *Grundlegung einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Renaud, B. 1977. *La formation du livre de Michée: Tradition et actualization*. Paris: Gabalda.
- Rife, Merle J. 1933. The mechanics of translation Greek. *JBL* 52 (4): 244-252.
- Robinson, Theodore H. 1964. *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. Hosea bis Micha*. Handbuch zum Alten Testament, 14. Tübingen: J. C. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Rösel, Martin. 2006. Towards a "Theology of the Septuagint." In *Septuagint research: Issues and challenges in the study of the Greek Jewish scriptures*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, 239-252. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Ryssel, Victor. 1887. *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches Micha: Ein kritischer Commentar zu Micha*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
- Sailhamer, John H. 1981. *The translational technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew*

- verbs and participles in Psalms 3-41*. Ph.D. diss., University of California-Los Angeles.
- Schart, Aaron. 2011. Dodekapropheten das zwölfprophetenbuch. In *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*. Eds. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Schwantes, Siegfried J. 1962. *A critical study of the text of Micah*. Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, Boston.
- Silva, Moisés. 1993. The OT in Paul. In *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin, 630-642. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Smith, Ralph L. 1984. *Micah-Malachi*. Word Biblical Commentary. 32. Waco, Texas: Word Books.
- Sommer, Benjamin D. 1998. *A prophet reads scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40-66*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Steyn, Gert. 2009. Quotations from the minor prophets in Hebrews. In *Septuagint and reception: Essays prepared for the Association for the study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, ed. Johann Cook, 119-140. Leiden: Brill.
- Sysling, Harry. 2007. Translation techniques in the ancient Bible translations: Septuagint and Targum. In *A history of Bible translation*, ed. Philip Noss, 279-305. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Taylor, John. 1890. *The Massoretic text and the ancient versions of the book of Micah*. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. 1903a. The Greek translators of Jeremiah. *Journal of Theological Studies IV*: 245-266.
- . 1903b. The Greek translators of Ezekiel. *Journal of Theological Studies IV*: 398-411.

- . 1903c. The Greek translators of the prophetic books. *Journal of Theological Studies IV*: 578-585.
- . 1909. *A grammar of the Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Theocharous, Myrto. 2012. *Lexical dependence and intertextual allusion in the Septuagint of the Twelve Prophets: Studies in Hosea, Amos and Micah*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Toury, Gideon. 1980. *In search of a theory of translation*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute.
- . 1991. What are descriptive studies into translation likely to yield apart from isolated descriptions? *In translation studies: The state of the art*, ed. Kitty M. van Leuven-Zwart, Antonius Bernardus, and Maria Naaijken, 179-192. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- . 1995. *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Benjamins translation library. 4. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1984. Did the Septuagint translators always understand their Hebrew text? In *De Septuaginta: Studies in honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox, 53-70. Ontario: Benben Publications.
- . 1986. Background of the Greek-Hebrew alignment. In *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS)*. 1: *Ruth*, ed. J. R. Abercrombie, W. Adler, R. A. Kraft, and Emanuel Tov. 37-51. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- . 1997. *The text-critical use of the Septuagint in biblical research*. 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Simor Ltd.
- . 2003 (reprint). *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VIII: The Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXIIgr)*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2012. *Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Troxel, Ronald. 2008. *LXX-Isaiah as translation and interpretation: The strategies of the*

- translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. Leiden: Brill.
- Tully, Eric J. 2012. *The translation and the translator of the Peshitta of Hosea*. Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Tymoczko, Maria. 2007. *Enlarging translation, empowering translators*. Manchester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Ulrich, Eugene, ed. 2013. *The biblical Qumran scrolls*. 2: Isaiah-Twelve Minor Prophets. Leiden: Brill.
- Van der Kooij, A. 1986. Accident or method? On “analogical” interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in 1QIs^a, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* XLIII 3/4: 368-370.
- . 2012. The Septuagint of Isaiah. In *Law, prophets, and wisdom: On the provenance of translators and their books in the Septuagint version*, eds. Johann Cook and Arie van der Kooij, 63-85. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2014. To settle and to dwell: On lexical variation in the Old Greek of Isaiah. In *In the footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the biblical text in honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*, eds. Kristin de Troyer, T. Michael Law and Marketta Liljeström, 217-228. Leuven: Peeters.
- Van der Louw, Theo A. W. 2007. *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2000. Translation, community, utopia. In *The Translation studies reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 468-88. 1st ed. London: Routledge.
- Vermeer, Hans J. 1992. *Skizzen zu einer Geschichte der Translation, Bd. 1. Anfänge – Von Mesopotamien bis Griechenland, Rom und das frühe Christentum bis Hieronymus*. Frankfurt: Verlag für Interkulturelle Kommunikation.
- Vinay, Jean-Paul, and Jean Darbelnet. 1995. *Comparative stylistics of French and English: A*

- methodology for translation*. Translated by Juan C. Sager and M.-J. Hamel. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wade, Martha Lynn. 2003. *Consistency of translation techniques in the tabernacle accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wagner, J. Ross. 2014. *Reading the sealed book: Old Greek Isaiah and the problem of Septuagint hermeneutics*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Waltke, Bruce K. 1999. Old Testament textual criticism. In *Foundations for biblical interpretation*, eds. David S. Dockery, Kenneth A. Mathews, and Robert B. Sloan, 156-186. Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and Michael Patrick O'Connor 1990. *An introduction to Biblical Hebrew syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Wasserstein, Abraham and David Wasserstein. 2006. *The legend of the Septuagint: From classical antiquity to today*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Wellhausen, J. 1963 (reprint). *Die kleinen Propheten. Übersetzt und Erklärt*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Wendland, Ernst. 2008. *Contextual frames of reference in translation: A coursebook for Bible translators and teachers*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Wevers, John W. 1985. An apologia for Septuagint studies. *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 18: 16-38.
- . 1996. The interpretive character and significance of the Septuagint version. In *Hebrew Bible. Old Testament: The history of its interpretation*, ed. Magne Sæbø, 84-107. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wilt, Timothy. 2003. Translation and communication. In *Bible translation: Frames of reference*, ed. Timothy Wilt, 27-80. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. 1990. *Micah: A commentary*. Translated by Gary Stansell. Continental

Commentaries. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Wright III, Benjamin G. 2008. Transcribing, translating, and interpreting in the *Letter of Aristeas*: On the nature of the Septuagint. *Scripture in transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, eds. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 147-161. Brill: Leiden.

Würthwein, Ernst. 1994. *The text of the Old Testament*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes.

Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.

Ziegler, Joseph. ed. 1984. *Duodecim Prophetarum*. 3d rev. ed. Septuaginta XIII. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Abstract

This study combines the strengths of both Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies to describe Septuagint Micah. It employs rigorous text critical tools and methods to assess translation errors that resulted from the translator's insufficient grammatical/lexical knowledge or from orthographical/phonological mistakes. At times, it concludes that the translator's Hebrew *Vorlage* differed from the MT.

An important advance in this study involves the use of the most recent advances in translation theory to determine purposeful, idiosyncratic shifts introduced by the translator. The theoretical framework for this study is the recognition that translations exist within a cultural and literary polysystem where the translator affects change in the polysystem and the polysystem exerts some control over translation norms. Based on this theoretical framework, Descriptive Translation Studies scholars have developed three primary translation models—comparative, process and causal. Of these, Chesterman's causal model was chosen for this study because it incorporates the strengths of both comparative and process models. The causal model accounts for three important aspects of the translation: the preliminary norms (causal conditions), translated text and translation effects (target culture reception).

The translated text provides the core material of investigation, in which every coupled-pair (i.e., the source text phrase and the translation of it) is analysed thoroughly to discern and describe translation shifts. Through categorising these shifts, translation tendencies and patterns emerged. These reflect the translator's operational norms, which are either obligatory (linguistically constrained) or non-obligatory (translation choices).

Among the most important non-obligatory operational norms involve the translator's style, concern for message clarity, theology and ideology. His preferred style led him to provide lexical variation and smooth syntax. Because he valued clarity in the translated text, he employed techniques of explicitisation, concretisation (rarely metaphorisation), harmonisation and interpretation. He introduced changes that reflected his own theology. For instance, through several shifts from singular "evil" to plural "evil deeds" the translator suggests that the sins of the Israelites were numerous and great to have warranted the punishment they endured. Similarly, they alone were culpable for their sins and God was justified in punishing them. Other shifts seem to indicate that God did not save them because they did not turn to him in prayer and they did not fear him. Ideologically, shifts occurred primarily through the technique of historicising. The translator effectively distinguished the Israelites of the past (who had brought upon themselves the exile) from the diaspora Jews living in the 3rd or 2nd century B.C.E. Alexandria who were contemporaneous with the translator. However, through two other shifts the translator included the post-exilic Jewish diaspora in God's threats of future judgment. The intent of this study was to describe LXX-Micah and reveal how its translator intervened in the text to infuse his own idiosyncratic theological perspective. The results seem to indicate that he truly was an agent of change.

Abstrak

Hierdie studie kombineer die sterkpunte van beide die studie van die Septuaginta en Vertaalkunde met die doel om die Septuaginta van Miga te beskryf. Dit maak van streng tekskritiese gereedskap en metodes gebruik om die vertaalfoute te evalueer wat ontstaan het vanuit die vertaler se gebrekkige grammatikale en leksikale kennis as gevolg van ortografiese en fonologiese foute in die bronteks. Daar is gevalle waar dit blyk dat die vertaler se Hebreuse *Vorlage* verskil het van die Masoretiese Teks.

Die belangrike bydrae in hierdie studie sluit die gebruik van resente ontwikkelinge in vertaalteorie in met die doel om die doelgerigte idiosinkratiese strategieë van die vertaler te bepaal. Hierdie studie opereer met die aanname dat vertalers binne 'n kulturele en literêre polisistiem werk. Binne hierdie raamwerk affekteer vertalers verandering in die polisistiem terwyl die polisistiem tot 'n mate beheer uitoefen oor vertaalnorme. Binne hierdie teoretiese raamwerk het Deskriptiewe Vertaalkundiges drie primêre vertaalmetodes ontwikkel-- vergelykend, prosesmatig en oorsaaklik. Hieruit is Chesterman se oorsaaklike model gekies omdat dit die sterk punte van beide die prosesmatige en oorsaaklike modelle inkorporeer. Die oorsaaklike metode verantwoord drie belangrike aspekte van 'n vertaling: die inleidende norme (oorsaaklike voorwaardes), vertaalde teks en die effek van die vertaling (ontvangs deur die teikengehoor).

Die vertaalde teks voorsien die kern van die materiaal vir die ondersoek, waarin elke gekoppelde paar (met ander woorde 'n frase in die bronteks en die vertaling daarvan) deeglik geanaliseer is om vertaalskuiwe te onderskei en te beskryf. Deur hierdie vertaalskuiwe te kategoriseer kom tendense en patrone te voorskyn. Hulle reflekteer die vertaler se operasionele norme, wat of verpligtend (linguisties afgedwing) of nie-verpligtend (vertaalkeuses) kan wees.

Die mees belangrike nie-bindende operasionele norme sluit die vertaler se styl, besorgdheid met die duidelikheid van die boodskap, teologie en ideologie in. Omdat hy waarde heg aan duidelikheid in die teks, maak hy gebruik van die volgende tegnieke: eksplisitering, konkretisering (selde word metafore gebruik), harmonisering en interpretasie. Hy stel veranderinge voor wat sy eie teologie reflekteer. Byvoorbeeld, deur die vertaalskuif tussen die enkelvoud "boos" en die meervoud "bose dade" stel die vertaler die sondes van die Israëliete as talryk en groot voor om daardeur die straf wat hulle verduur het te regverdig. Terselfdertyd was hulle ook verantwoordelik vir hulle sondes en God was geregtig om hulle te straf. Ander vertaalskuiwe wil dit laat voorkom of God hulle nie gered het nie omdat hulle nie na Hom teruggekeer het in gebed en Hom nie gevrees het nie. Ideologies kom vertaalskuiwe primêr voor deur die tegniek van verhistorisering. Die vertaler onderskei effektiewelik tussen die Israëliete van die verlede (wie die ballingskap oor hulle self gebring het) en die Jode van die diaspora wat in die 3de of 2de eeu v.C. in Aleksandrië gewoon het en kontemporêr met die vertaler was. Die vertaler sluit egter deur twee ander vertaalskuiwe die na-eksiliese Joodse diaspora in God se dreigemente van toekomstige oordeel in. Die doel van hierdie studie is om die Septuaginta van Miga te beskryf en aan te toon hoe die vertaler ingemeng het in die teks om sy eie idiosinkratiese teologiese perspektiewe daarin te laat voorkom. Die gevolgtrekkings toon aan dat die vertaler werklik 'n agent van verandering was.