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One of the primary functions of textual criticism is to detect the genesis of errors. The «true» reading can only be discovered when the «false» is unmasked. Similarly, if the Septuagint is to be used critically, it is essential to start by unmasking the corruptions, misreadings or mistranslations that lie within.

The completion of a Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene Text in the Historical Books is an excellent opportunity to go through the whole translation process and detect the most common mistakes, the main difficulties met by the translators and the mechanisms employed to overcome them. It is like looking at the reverse side of the weave, giving an insight into the high degree of literal and formal correspondence between the Greek translation and the Hebrew parent text in most of the historical books. At the same time it offers
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the opportunity to appreciate the limits of the formal equivalence and, in some cases, to get a glimpse into the presumed Vorlage of the translators.

For the Greek, our edition of the Antiochene text has been used as the basis of the analysis, and for the Hebrew the text of the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) 2. We are aware that the Masoretic Text (MT) is not identical to the Hebrew Vorlage of the translators. We use it in the comparison for practical reasons, since it is the only complete Hebrew text available for those books. Moreover, it should be emphasized that the MT agrees to a large degree with the Vorlage of the translators, as can be inferred from a look at the Index in which the formal, extant equivalent, is of first concern. One may wonder why priority is not given to Qumran texts of Samuel. The fact is, that apart from the fragmentary character (ca. 8% of the text of Samuel) and occasional agreements with the Antiochene text, there is hule evidence to define the textual affiliation of the Qumran fragments

Much has been written recently on the use of formal or presumed equivalents in an index or concordance. E. Tov and T. Muraoka have vigorously criticized the Hatch Sz. Redpath’s procedure, because these scholars adhered very closely to the formal, almost mechanical equivalence in their Concordance 4. For the Index of the

---


«However, insufficient evidence was found to affirm any link between L and 4QSam’, except for L’s dependence upon LXX, which ‘vas jo turn dependen’ upon 4QSam’»: cf. E. D. HERBERT, «4QSam” and its Relationship to the LXX: An Exploration in Stemmatological Analysis», in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Cambridge, 1995, SCS 45, ed. B. A. TAYLOR (Atlanta, GA 1997) pp. 37-55: p. 49.


4. We hope that a mine of useful information has been added through the new Greek words and new Hebrew equivalents, preceded by an asterisk in the Index. Likewise we suggest the presumed reading in a number of obvious equivalences signaled with an obelus by Hatch and Redpath: co)xucRim; ‘dry’ in 1 Sam 23:14.15 does not translate 1z-02, but is a doublet of the unknown geographic name foppEz.c; is a stereotype equivalent for vn: hence, it can be presumed that in 2 Chr 14: 9 the translator read mnos instead of nnn; in 1 Sam 13:7 it can be presumed that the translator read cl-13.y1 as participle of iny (oi 3-ta3avni|EJ instead of the substantive ‘the Hebrews’ (13)nyz?’).

mes should be avoided: the inclusion of Hebrew words among the new equivalents whose meaning is well outside the semantic field of the Greek word, and the systematic exclusion of a new Hebrew equivalent because it is not attested in other parts of the Septuagint. The good number of new equivalents marked with an asterisk in our Index attests to the richness and variety of the translation manifested through several new plausible correspondences. These equivalents are lacking in the Hatch & Redpath Concordance, be it because the Antiochene Greek terms are only attested in the deuterocanonical or apocryphal books (some of them without Hebrew Vorlage), or because they appear in the three Jewish translators whose Hebrew equivalents are not recorded in this Concordance. Moreover, Hatch & Redpath follow the Greek text of the codices Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, and Sinaiticus plus the Sixtine edition (1587), but they ignore the Antiochene text which is very different from these manuscripts in the historical books.

A careful use of the Index allows the user to draw certain conclusions in relation to the different problems of textual criticism. The stereotype correspondence between two terms in Hebrew and Greek n’ay lead to the restoring of a different reading from that of the MT for the passage in question. Thus, in 2 Chr 33:7 ctoW has been introduced in the Greek translation for the MT Taking into account that 99% of the occurrences of c519 have been regulated; translated by a id5v, it can be deduced, in all confidence, that the Greek translator of this passage also read id5v, as was the case in the other ancient versions, and, consequently, it can be restored as a genuine reading instead of the dubious and uncertain Q15 y of MT. On the contrary, in 1 Chr 17:16 we come across a different text critical panorama. MT reads ‘and what is my house, that you have brought me thus far’ (c5n 1,11)>. The entite Greek tradition interprets the last part of the sentence as Ion eti.6)voC. But this reading results from a phonetic confusion between the gutturals y and n and, consequently, cannot be invoked as a sound witness to change the reading of the MT that makes sense. The frequent occurrence of the expression toS ai.dvoc in the Greek Bible has contributed to consolidate this reading in the Greek transmission.

This is just a sample of the kind of textual criticism that can be made with the aid of the Index, and which is valid for a high proportion of 0[11]11011, abstract and concrete narratives where an almost stereotype equivalent is recorded. Notwithstanding, the critical judgement is more difficult to exercise in other narratives (for which the translator liked the varietat or the metaphorical or stylistic equivalence), and more especially in the verbs, where the array of equivalents is highly diversified: for instance, 1[80]m2,ov corresponds to no less than ten Hebrew words, and Xap.(3áveiv translates eighteen different Hebrew forms.

I shall now move on and try to identify the incorrect readings of the Greek tradition, especially of the Antiochene text, in order to highlight the genuine reading. I will deal with the translation process and the text transmission in a reverse order, going back from a) the paleographic errors of transmission (inner-Greek corruptions), through b) the different vocalization performed by the translator and c) the interchange or confusion of similar letters in the Hebrew Vorlage, to d) some variant readings supported by a different Vorlage. For the last case, the Qumran fragments of Samuel open a window towards actual readings of the Greek confirmed by an extant Hebrew Vorlage different from

---

1 The translation may be idiomatic or metaphorical, or may correspond to different Vorlage, or may conceal a complex text critical problem.

---

A. INNER-GREEK CORRUPTIONS

Using the parent text as a control, some Greek corruptions can be detected that have contaminated a part of or the entire manuscript tradition. A few examples taken from the Antiochene text, shared occasionally by the whole Greek tradition, will suffice to illustrate this phenomenon:

— A1,-'& the regular equivalent for the Hebrew -c9 'goat'. However, in 2 Chr 31:6 we come across a formal equivalent of cdyciSv for the Hebrew 1:1'fp in the sequence «the title of cattle and sheep, and the "title of the dedicated things" that had been consecrated to the Lord their God» 9. In a high probability the whole Greek tradition has been corrupted from á.7icov to aiyv. However, following the manuscript tradition we have restored aiyo5v as did A. Rahlfis in his manual edition. The reason why this new reading, so alien to the original meaning of the Hebrew, succeeded in the text reception, is that it makes sense also in the Greek chain of words joined to the cattle and sheep: Kai cti poi fivsyKav ItE,tE,Ka-ca úuuzcov Kcd TrooKurov Kai ruiS i-cetroi a iy(Táv, Ka i iyfcrnav Tó Kupirw 0E6? túro5v.

— The Antiochene reading of 2 Chr 16:14 must be characterised as an inner-Greek corruption: Kat 1K.2,uav-av at:yrci) K2,-al5o-tv viEyet7,...riv for the Hebrew n5m n n w Siwi ('and they made a very great fire in his honor'). Kai En, and KailkstÇ correspond better to the meaning of the Hebrew root onw, while ic7af' En/ translates' regularly the root on. However, the paleographic confusion Ita.cioniv / IKauGav and K7a13o-tv / Kat3o-tv, easy to detect in the cursive Greek writing, provoked the new reading in the Antiochene branch of manuscripts w. The fact that the new reading makes sense in the context of the verse lead to its consolidat ion within the Greek tradition. In fact it is a doublet or alternative translation that Antio-


1° Interestingly, the correct alternative reading ieo áicwovi.v ai:Yo'r y

1107, W, riv has been preserved exclusively in the Alcalá polyglot Bible.
The reading of Invi as feminine participio by the translator (joining to the participio the article of the following word) generated an embarrassing interpretation in the target language and probably contributed to the success of the corrupt reading '6o2,6tC instead of o To6lC.

— When the queen of Sheba visits king Solomon, she contemplated and admired all his wisdom and among other things in his palace she was amazed by the clothing of bis servants, and by his cupbearers (1)pv."=, 1 Kings 10:5). The current Septuagint translates this part of the sentence Teiv illaTtup."Ov caSto15 i o i zouc o ivozouC aútoi5, in exact correspondence with the meaning of the root npv.) in hiphil, 'give to drink'. However, in Antiochene we across Tov iliartuuóv cu:)Tot5 Kai cójC Éuvot5xouC atiyroli Chis clothing and his eunuchs'). It is the reading of Antiochene without variants, with a meaning far different from the original. It is not plausible to imagine a paleographic confusion at the leve[ of the Hebrew between npv, »D, the regular equivalent for o ivoxóoÇ and vv sp, the stereotype equivalent for Eúvoi.»xo; However, at the level of the Greek transmission the phonetic corruption by similar pronunciation of both terms due to the phenomenon of itacism provides a reasonable explanation. The reading also makes sense, and is consolidated in the text transmission of the Antiochene family of manuscripts 13.

B. A DIFFERENT READING OF THE CONSONANTAL TEXT

The numerous passages characterised as autor in the Index provide some information on misleading translations caused by a different reading of the Hebrew text and, occasionally, by homophonic translation. I emphasize that it is a typical phenomenon that occurs in the translation process at the first level of encounter of the two languages. Translation is a kind of reading and concretely the Septuagint is the first interpretation of an unvocalised Hebrew text. It is a kind of performance of the consonant text, like a score, to use a musical metaphor. No doubt, in several cases it is clear that the translators were following a different reading tradition or an exegetical device, but in many other cases the end product can be analysed simply as a misreading.

— In 1 Sam 2:31 the Hebrew word 'arco', is read twice as 913, 'seed'. The Hebrew sentence «See... I will cut off your arm and the arm of your ancestor's family» becomes in Greek Ka ¿lo7,o0pst50 co tó (5n¿plia croo Kal T5 cyrt¿ppla To5) olKou rtazpS 0 0l).

— In 1 Sam 15:9, the different vocalization plus the confusion of similar consonante leads to a new diverse sense in the target language quite different from the parent text. Saul and the people spared Agag, and «the best of the sheep... and the lambs (nnzn), and all that was valuable». The plural of lamb' or 'ram' is read and interpreted by the whole Greek tradition as Td.)v exurcaAvcov = tjrDz, the plural of

— In 1 Sam 16:20 the Hebrew prl'7 rm r 0> np ) («And Jesse took a donkey with bread») is translated in Antiochene: KO:i 12,43EN 'Isccsai óvov, Ka,i ¡TE5OTIKEV aílTO yól,6o6op IlpTcovo. In all probability this sentence arose from the double translation of a single word linn with different vocalization as donkey (lino) and as a measure (irp n). Antiochene utilizes this recourse to double interpretation in order to solve the brachiology of the Hebrew; the majority text of the Septuagint understood it as yól.too. But only Antiochene makes a difficult sentence in Hebrew explicit. Interestingly, the Old Latin retains the Antiochene reading: Et accepit Iesse asinum et imposuit super gomal 'lntis 14.

Ms t of Brooke-McLean has still another corruption, "chariot—drivers'. There are no Hexaplaric remains to this hasage. Two late minuscules (243 and 244) solve the problem by creating the doublet; roiF.; oi vóxejouz; Kai TO6; ÉuvotOouo,; cf. F. FIELD, Origenis Hexaplorion. 'ad loc.

The Old Latin can be consulted in the apparaalus of our edition of the Antiochene text quoted in note 2.
— In 2 Sam 14:17 the Hebrew word nnlx, ‘resting-place’ is translated by the entire Septuagint tradition by Goo-ila., reading nnm, ‘offering’, and changing the sense of the Hebrew sentence ‘the word of my lord the king will set me at rest’ into the new ‘I set you at rest’.

— The same source of confusion can be detected in 2 Chi 10:10: w5yn 5pn nnN, where Antiochene reads the preposition 51t as 5.1 ‘yoke’ and translates accordingly: Kai di) vis)v kot5cptcsov Cucó Tot5 Cuyo(T) ijuáv in contrast with the current Septuagint kai (7i.) él(pEÇ

An alternative reading of the consonantal text may produce a double interpretation that Antiochene incorporates willingly into the textual chain, as in 1 Kings 18:44, where the MT ‘out of the sea’, has been translated twice by Antiochene: í55coo ¿erró 0c/Ieto-nrK — The different vocalization of the MT may result in the interpretation of some proper names as common names or verbs, with a sense fas from that of the original. In 1 Kings 6:3 (= MT 5:32a) it is stated that in the building of the temple «Solomon’s builders and Hiram’s builders and the Giblites did the stonecutting» (15vDn lD,52+nl crvm ‘12.11ntD v’ u), translated by Antiochene: irni’fivEy-KCCv Ov uioi 02).0116.MO Kat O1 UtOY Epetpt, tcti; ¿vOf7Lov ctiyro5g («and Solomon’s sons and Hiram’s sons brought the stoneS and fashioned their borders»). The majority text of the LXX reads aeErkicasav (‘did the stonecutting’) instead of ivEykav, and puts the simple verb 1f3aIctv instead of ¿v¿3a2,ov. But, what is more important, the translator read with different vocalization some ‘builders’ (A-2), and interpreted the proper name in the plural ‘Giblites’ 16 as a hiphil of 5n, ‘circumscribe’, probably read-

15 MT: ‘A little cloud [60] bigger than a person’s hand is rising out of the sea’ (n5v n’n). The Old Greek ovctyovn. -Uicop probably read onto n5vn. Antiochene con-Bates both readings and obtains a meaningful sentence.

16 People from Gebal called Byblos by the Greeks.
C. INTERCHANGE OF SIMILAR LETTERS

Another source of misreading translations lies in the confusion of similar letters or groups of letters. The Index provides a mine of information on unusual equivalences going back eventually to a misreading of some consonants in the early square script. It is an accident of reading or copying; in the first case it arises in the course of the translator's deciphering of the Vorlage; in the second, it reflects a Vorlage already at variance with the MT. It is not to be excluded that a germinal textual difference underlies some of these variants, but in general it can be stated that the paleographic confusion at the level of the Hebrew script is the most plausible explanation. The most frequent interchange of similar letters occurs between vř.

— In 1 Sam 23: 15-16.18-19, the city where David remains hidden in the wilderness of Ziph, Horesh is translated systematically in Antiochene by Kaťři, obviously read as ntitrm.

— In 1 Sam 19:13.16 the uncertain Hebrew expression o>ts,n 1-1, translated commonly as 'net of goat's hair' (Vulgate pellenz pilosam caprarunz), is interpreted in the whole Greek tradition as €uca p, reading the first terco as ip .

— In 1 Sam 24:3 Saul went to look for David and his men >)D n05yj7 usually translated as «in the direction of the Rocks of the Wild Goats». The majority text of the Septuagint reads npóceyvreuo E35atëf, that is, a transliteration (cuco variantibus).

But Antiochene interprets Kaťó. itpóowitov rřfo òi pa; rwv ḥxt( pow. This interpretation is confirmed by the reading of the Old Latin transmitted by Lucifer of Cagliari ante faciencia venationis cor1 01 111. No doubt, the translator read 'hunting' instead of the >)7 'rocks' from MT. In this example the two most frequent interchanges of similar letters concur: nři and vi.

— In 2 Sam 22:21b it is stated «according to the cleaness of my hands he [the Lord] recompensed me (>5 2.>O> v r 11D), translated literally by the current Septuagint as xatel. tTjv KaEláptórrta τ6ν τετρανγλικάν τάν Νταλτακάν, but Antiochene does not make this distinction. However, Antiochene gives a different interpretation of the sentence: &gay y,tepC7)N sao &paal10. 5(50 Es reading the first word as tina. A similar graphic confusion underlies the Antiochene term 5olaal,tóÇ in 2 Sam 22:25: Bolaesi.uk soo áruvatt r6n 004+165V CLÚTO5 for the Hebrew 1s>y b)5 12D).

— In 1 Sam 14:40 Saul says to all Israel: «You shall be on one side, and I and my son Jonathan will be on the other side» (13y5 ΙΝΝΜΝΥΣ ... τΝN). The whole Greek tradition transmits in both cases κ 3ou7..E1av, reading 121 instead of nav. Interestingly, the Antiochene text adds, as a doublet, a new sentence with the correct sense according to the MT: Ka1 ErmE. Eao2.. apqC' τεν 7aóv ΓΥτΕиЦ 10 E00 E-r 11CL v IApN, wa yAc,;a) Ka1...zslaus0Δ ει p,
pqpoC. The alternative reading, in agreement with MT, is not supported by any Hexaplaric witness, and we are probably dealing with an early correction, already known to Josephus . The double reading 3ou7E), Efavit4eg-, based on the interchange of 1/1 generated a new sentence. As is well known, a trend of the Antiochene text consists of joining double readings with small redactional retouches to clarify the meaning so that all the informaban of the preserved variants can be explicit for public reading.

The misreading of other graphically letters like vi, nn, n/n, D/D, o/1, v r, 9/1; letters with similar phonetics like the sibilants r, v, V, or the gutturals ṇ, n, n, y, is also reflected in the

2 In the parallel pass. we of I Kings 14:42 (= MT 4:28), the majority text of the Septuagint transliterates e i, and Antiochene 8cio5c.
Index. These phenomena have been recently dealt with by T. Muraoka, E. Tov and A. Gelston. The examples abound, especially in the transmission of the proper names and other transliterated words. Herewith a handful of illustrations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Presumed Reading</th>
<th>Antiochene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kimis 12:16</td>
<td>ını</td>
<td>ɓon</td>
<td>ɓi UKEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 10:11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15ro</td>
<td>ɓayən</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings 16:18</td>
<td>7trila</td>
<td>Osp.k?tov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kingis 21:9</td>
<td>nvarchar</td>
<td>[36Caico civ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 4:10</td>
<td>779-t</td>
<td>yevips-ʨ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chr 12:33</td>
<td>(ciid)</td>
<td>PonoEiv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1 Kings 21:38 (MT 20:38), the prophet waited for the king of Israel along the road, «disguising himself with a bandage over his eyes» (ii))9-59 1DB2. 52.91171)). The entire Greek tradition reads this part of the sentence as: ɓai-caςɛl,ə-aro hv TE7,ctu6Jvt ToiïÇ ɓoP0a2-ptoïÇ atina. Hatch and Redpath give as the Hebrew equivalent of kata&giv the *hithpael* of -yDr) with a question mark. Muraoka put this root between double brackets signifying that the equivalent given by Hatch and Redpath is implausible. He pointed with an arrow to the (*`d of riny as the true equivalent that should replace that of Hatch and Redpath. However, 1 think it is more plausible to replace that the translator read in this passage the *jai* of regularly translated in the Septuagint by 5Eiv, liatet5Eiv. The confusion of in the Hebrew script is frequent and also between the sibilants *taiVo, While 0`)29 in jai is regularly translated by alPEtv, tyqu-

---


CEtv and, in my opinion, its confusion with *x:n* is less probable. In any case, it is just an example of how the presumed equivalents can be seen differently by diverse scholars.

The different reading based on paleographic confusion may affect not only isolated consonants but also a group of letters, the phenomenon of metathesis included:

— In 1 Sam 8:16 the Hebrew reads «He will take your male and female s'aves and the best of your young men (nYvlni-z-n, nin-os optimes in the Vulgate) and donkeys», while the Greek tradition interprets: ¿on1ouÇ Kai -ref.Ç 3o157aÇ iiruó7w Kai 'cric Poux62aa ɓn.6.)v Tâ (XliæCι K-aï T0ïï C OVOUï iii116)v. In view of the regular equivalence between 1171 and 13o0Kóktov, it can reasonably be presumed that the translator read opr ɓro.

— In 1 Chr 22:9 the king Jehu searched for Ahaziah, «who was captured while hiding in Samaria» ep1,302. N2n preparing But the Greek tradition unanimously: iceni xcetaal3ov evir ν iatogueltEvov vlcwapefá. Hatch and Redpath insert an obelus of uncertainty by icumEneTtav as equivalent of N δ. However, given the regular equivalences of kpi5l3Etv, xpi52t-ustv for the *hithpael* of z’un, and, likewise, the regular equivalence of fatpcdctv for the *hithpael* of ND-1, it can be presumed that the translator read Nnrt.

Moreover, the confusion of final 1 and final ci leads to a quite different interpretation in the Greek of 1 Sam 28:14, when the woman medium evokes Samuel’s spirit to Saul. To SauFs question concerning Samuel’s appearance, the woman answers according to the MT: «An old man is coming up; he is wrapped in a robe» (0,N 5)v nOY Nlni n59 However. Antiochene translates with the rest of the Greek witnesses 24: CivSpa ópOtov ával3aífovta &rue) Tīq

---

but paleographic. The verb ἀφετοῦσα is translated by ἀφετοῦσα in the two Justin Martyr and other rabbinic sources...

In this passage of Genesis Symmachus inserts an explanatory note relying probably on an exegetical tradition that emphasizes the most peculiar feature of the human being in contrast with animals, his upright stance, a tradition that can be traced back to Justin Martyr and other rabbinic sources.

Metathesis can be detected in some unusual translations, but it is especially visible in the transliteration of proper names.

In 2 Chr 28:3: Kcci 5tllayE 'Cia, al]1015 ἐν ῥυπι for the MT reflects a different reading from the verb ἄφετοῦσα in hiphil, a stereotype expression for «make pass through fire». In 2 Sam 22:13 it is said that «coals of fire flamed forth» (v.)N ἐν ῥυπὶ, rwn.). The current LXX translates literally: ἐκείταϲ ἐν ῥυπι & ἀνάβαται ΚΕ Τϲυποῦ. However, Antiochene interprets the whole sentence as 81f7L00v.

Some items of metathesis in the transliteration of proper names are the following: Ἀθονοετι for ῥυπι (1 Chr 2:18,19); Ἀταπί for Τίν (2 Sam 23:25); Ἀκάπεπι for ῥυο (2 Sam 23:25); κάπητα for ἔνα (1 Chr 1:6), and Ἑπ.ΤΕΣ for ῥις (2 Kings 19:12).

I believe that most of the commented phenomena can be explained as misreadings during the process of translation due to the incorrect deciphering of the Hebrew Vorlage. Consequently, they are of secondary character arising from an accident of the transmission, be it in the copying of the Hebrew text itself or produced by a misreading of the translator. It cannot be excluded, however, that some of these variants conceal a genuine reading.

D. TRACES OF A DIFFERENT VORLAGE.

It is common knowledge that the Antiochene text is rooted in the Hebrew not only as part of the Septuagint tradition, but also due to the fact that it incorporates a set of Hexaplaric corrections according to the MT. Sometimes it is even closer to the MT that the rest of the Septuagint tradition. Moreover, S. Brock realized that not all the approximations to the Hebrew in Antiochene were of Hexaplaric
provenance 30 Thanks to the discovery of the Qumran documents for Samuel this statement has been confirmed. There are a few Antiochene deviations from the MT that are supported by 4QSauf.

The relationship between the textual witnesses of the book of Samuel is very complex and, therefore, it is dangerous to make any kind of generalization. On the other hand, only with the full publication of the fragments and a thorough comparative study of both texts do not allow such a close relationship to be established. For our purpose it will suffice to point out some agreements of Antiochene with 4QSam1 leaving a full comparison of both witnesses for a further study.

— 1 Sam 5:9: «And it occurred that after they had brought it [the ark of God]» (171N 11V71 nnN n»), in the majority text of the Septuagint the translation is Kfl. ɉyEvOn r. pcw&OsiV cdfriv. However, in Antiochene we come across the following interpretation: cai yɉv-ccO ɉv Tæi) p.ÊTÊHEÎV ɉv ktpurcô TupãÇ to-bq yeeecdouÇ. This version makes explicit the noun of the ark, translated literally by the pronoun in the Septuagint, but, what is more important, it mentions Gath (roi.) Ç yE0eafouÇ) as read in 4QSam as read in 4QSam” (nnr v nra. ‘ro’), but absent in MT 32.

— 2 Sam 12:16: When the Lord struck the child that Uriah’s wife bore to David, the king fasted «and went in and lay all night on the ground» (n u  vn 51 Na.).) The Vaticanus and bis group of manuscripts translate iccd. sio-fj2,0Ev 1a1 112JOi1 rti TTfC. However, Antiochene renders: Kcd ɉKeteEu5Ev CYCkk1f n yfr, a version that corresponds exactly to the reading of 4QSarna to this passage, niN pvn apvi Nin) 33. The Alexandrinus and the group of MN plus S OFTLLTc mesures read ɉxotuilei according to the MT. Only Antiochene uses koBE153Etv the frequent equivalent for ÆO in the Septuagint 34.

— 2 Sam 22:43: «1 heat them fine like the dust of the earth» (npnOti NnN-1Dy.), has been translated in the current Septuagint: Kcd ɉ(laier cdrcoi..) cin xvo13v  But Antiochene translates the sentence differently: Sta0kop7ut63 aüToi.) Ç dç xvoiÇv rci zpœcsmrov & v4tou. The Antiochene version is closer to the Qumran reading (n-IN )J [53 ‘D D ppnwrn) than to the MT 35. Interestingly, the Vorlage of Antiochene was not identical to that of the Qumran fragments; it probably read rîm ’wind’ instead of ry-tn ‘wanderer’, the reading of the parallel passage in Psalm 18 (17):43.

— In 2 Sam 23:1, the majority text of the LXX is close to the MT, while the Antiochene version follows the reading of 4QSarn’; Oracle of David, son of Jesse, «and oracle of the man who was exalted on the anointed of the God of Jacob» ,n5N1-1,0)2 5 rpn -nAn oN(1)), is rendered in the current Septuagint as Kat -rutc:TSÇ &v½ Zîv &vàs-çlçuy Kt5potoÇ 7t xpluTáv eco8 ‘Itexx[5]3. However, the Antiochene family of manuscripts translates rcto-c”Ç avtî p bv ecvo-ricsEv cJE(Ç xputTôv, oE6ç ‘Iccm1S3, a literal rendering of 4QSama: np[ly] ,nn5N) nwn 5N urpn C01NJ 36. It is clear that Antiochene read a Hebrew text similar to the fragment of Qumran, that is, 5N (es6Ç), instead of 51 (= ‘ni.) of the-rest of the Septuagirit tradition.

In two other cases, the reading underlying the whole Greek tradition is witnessed in Qumran, not in the MT: 1 Sam 2:8-9 the use of El:)70ysiv in the Septuagint is transparent of the Qumran reading rari 37, not of a different or corrupted MT. And in 1 Sam 2:20 the current text of the Septuagint with ánotívEtv as well as the Antiochene variant with kvtano3t5óvat are supported by the Qumran reading n5v,» 38 instead of the D'y) of the MT. Aitoríverv and ávtairo8t5óvat are regular equivalents for the piel of ti5Y.) the Septuagint, while these two verbs are never used for cr.v./.

These agreements between the Greek text, especially the Antiochene, and an extant, non-Masoretic, Hebrew, lead us to the conclusion that, in all probability, several other deviations of Antiochene are also rooted in the Hebrew. In this context I would like to point out a series of doublets in the Antiochene text whose origin can only be explained at the level of the Hebrew, a Hebrew text different from the MT. Such cases also confirm, from another perspective, that the Antiochene text is rooted in the Hebrew. A typical example will serve as an illustration:

— In 2 Kings 2:23 while Elisha was going up on the way to Bethel, «some small boys carne out of the city and jeered at him, saying (15 ilnr,o);)v-5pn)1), «Go away, bald-head! Go away, bald-head!». The current Septuagint renders literally: ioi ructt5étput paKpet - 3. TIC imECOC KOLL K0T ETealCOV ccoico3 Kcti EITWV 6-ut(D. Notwithstanding. Antiochene emphasizes that the boys not only mocked him but also threw stones at him: 20enect3ápia PAKpd t k TIC TE621.,ECOC cah 2%, LOCJ.(OV alkOV Kcd Kat2natCov a6-co) icd 2, cyov 0.176? Avd3at. (pa2mKp, &vetPutvE, (paka,Kp, The use of KUT arca i (Elv for the hihtpael of v5p is consolidated in the Septuagint. The use of Xтеа(Etv, 2,04o?...Elv for all the forms of 5pv is also well attested among the Greek-Hebrew equivalences. Consequently, it can be deduced that this curious doublet ultimately relies on a different Vorlage with the reading 5-13s5, or on the extant MT read with metathesis of consonants by the translator. Interestingly, the Old Latin retains only this second interpretation of the Antiochene text: pueri pusilli exierunt de civitate el lapidabant illin dicentes: Ascende calve, Ascende calve.

E. CONCLUSIONS

Through the lens of translation, particularly of the Antiochene text in the historical books, I have tried to point out some of the pitfalls that may have occurred in the process of translation and transmission. An awareness of these mistranslations is the only way of correctly evaluating the Greek variants for the restoration of the genuine text. Some mistakes have been produced, such as inner-Greek corruptions, through the frequent copying of the manuscripts. Severe's mistranslations arose as a result of a different vocalization on the side of the translators. Other variant readings were produced by the confusion of similar consonants or groups of letters; these variants or alternative readings can be explained only at the level of the Hebrew. And finally, in a few cases, an extant, non-Masoretic, Vorlage has been detected in the Hebrew fragments of 4QSain'. These agreements open a window toward a textual stage when different Hebrew texts were in circulation. The Vorlage of the Septuagint (Old Greek) was one of them. MT is the only complete Hebrew text available, but we must be aware that the Greek tradition, when it deviates from the MT, may conceal another [ext. with a striking resemblance, but not identical to the MT. Some scholars maintain that the Vorlage of the Septuagint in the books of Kins is older and probably more genuine than the MT.

There are numerous passages in the Index preceded by the mention of the mark aliter. These draw our attention to the specific texts which should allow a continuous exercise of textual criticism.
with all the evidence at our disposal, and this, in the knowledge that not every scholar will come to the same conclusions in a great many of these text-critical problems.

RESUMEN

En crítica textual es muy importante descubrir la génesis de los errores; a veces la lectura verdadera sólo se descubre desenmascarando la falsa. De igual manera, para usar críticamente la Septuaginta es imprescindible descubrir primero las corrupciones y los errores de traducción. La confección de un índice griego-hebreo del texto antioqueno en los libros históricos es una ocasión excelente para analizar el proceso de traducción y detectar los errores más comunes cometidos por los traductores. En el artículo se estudian algunos ejemplos con relación a los siguientes fenómenos: corrupciones internas al griego y traducciones equivocadas motivadas por la confusión gráfica de letras (paleografía) o sonidos (fonética) semejantes y por una vocalización diferente del texto consonántico. En varios casos este análisis permite vislumbrar un texto base hebreo distinto del masorético.
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SUMMARY

In textual criticism it is important to detect the genesis of mistakes: sometimes the true reading is only reached through the unmasking of the wrong one. Likewise, in order to use critically the Septuagint it is indispensable to find out first its corruptions and mistranslations. The making of a Greek-Hebrew Index of the Antiochene Text in the Historical Books is an excellent occasion to observe the translation process and find out the most common errors 'made by the translators. A few examples will be commented concerning the following issues: inner-Greek corruptions and misleading translations caused by the graphic confusion of similar letters (paleography) or sounds (phonetics), and by a different reading or vocalization of the consonantal text. In several cases this analysis may open a window towards a non-Masoretic Hebrew Vorlage.
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