

Dries De Crom

LXX Song of Songs and Descriptive Translation Studies



De Septuaginta Investigationes (DSI)

Edited by

Anneli Aejmelaeus, Kristin De Troyer,
Wolfgang Kraus, Emanuel Tov

In Co-operation with

Kai Brodersen (Erfurt, Germany), Cécile Dogniez (Paris, France),
Peter Gentry (Louisville, USA), Anna Kharanauli (Tbilisi, Georgia),
Armin Lange (Wien, Austria), Alison Salvesen (Oxford, UK),
David Andrew Teeter (Cambridge, USA), Julio Trebolle (Madrid, Spain),
Florian Wilk (Göttingen, Germany)

Volume 11

Dries De Crom

LXX Song of Songs and Descriptive Translation Studies

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek:
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.de>.

© 2019, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Theaterstraße 13, D-37073 Göttingen
All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Typesetting: NEUNPLUS1, Berlin
Printed and bound: Hubert & Co. BuchPartner, Göttingen
Printed in the EU

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Verlage | www.vandenhoeck-ruprecht-verlage.com

ISSN 2197-0912
ISBN 978-3-647-57071-6

Table of Contents

Preface.....	7
Abbreviations.....	9
1. Introduction.....	11
1.1 The LXX text of Song of Songs	12
1.1.1 Date and provenance	12
1.1.2 A <i>καίγε</i> subgroup	14
1.1.3 Translation character	15
1.1.4 Textual history	17
1.2 The interaction of LXX Studies and Translation Studies	18
1.3 Scope and method of the present study.....	20
1.4 Textual witnesses.....	25
1.4.1 Papyri and fragmentary parchment manuscripts.....	27
1.4.2 Witnesses to the pre-Hexaplaric text	30
1.4.3 Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran	33
2. LXX Song of Songs.....	37
2.1 LXX Song of Songs 1	37
2.2 LXX Song of Songs 2	67
2.3 LXX Song of Songs 3	91
2.4 LXX Song of Songs 4	111
2.5 LXX Song of Songs 5	145
2.6 LXX Song of Songs 6	173
2.7 LXX Song of Songs 7	187
2.8 LXX Song of Songs 8	209
3. Translational Norms and the <i>καίγε</i> Question	233
3.1 The problem(s) of <i>καίγε</i>	233
3.2 The study of translational norms.....	238
3.2.1 The nature of norms	240
3.2.2 <i>Καίγε</i> as norm-governed translational behaviour	243
3.2.3 <i>Καίγε</i> and translational norms	252
3.3 A question of methodology.....	253
3.3.1 Deficit of the traditional approach.....	253
3.3.2 Comparative study of congeners.....	255
3.4 LXX Song and LXX Psalms	261
3.4.1 Unique agreements	261
3.4.2 Unique disagreements	263
3.4.3 Agreements with or against one other congener	263
3.4.4 Disagreements with or against one other congener	267
3.4.5 Additional agreements.....	271
3.4.6 Additional disagreements	272

3.5 LXX Song and 8ḤevXIIgr	272
3.5.1 Unique agreements	273
3.5.2 Unique disagreements	274
3.5.3 Agreements with or against one of her congener	276
3.5.4 Disagreements with or against one other congener	277
3.5.5 Additional agreements	278
3.5.6 Additional disagreements	278
3.6 LXX Song and LXX Ecclesiastes	278
3.6.1 Unique agreements	279
3.6.2 Unique disagreements	279
3.6.3 Agreements with or against one other congener	281
3.6.4 Disagreements with or against one other congener	281
3.6.5 Additional agreements	284
3.6.6 Additional disagreements	284
3.7 LXX Song of Songs and καίτε: conclusions	285
4. Textual-linguistic profile of LXX Song of Songs	289
4.1 The lexical profile of LXX Song of Songs	289
4.2 Textual-linguistic interference	295
4.3 Interference, interlanguage and literary code	300
5. Conclusions	303
5.1 LXX Song of Songs as a translation	303
5.2 LXX Song of Songs as a textual witness	305
5.3 LXX and DTS	307
 Bibliography	 309
Index	333
Appendix: Lexical chart	341
Nouns	341
Verbs	351

Preface

When first I came to the study of Jewish-Greek literature, I was a young classicist steeped in the idioms of Plato and Sophocles. At that time, the Septuagint was little more than a name to me. Over the course of several years, I acquainted myself with the field of Biblical studies, with the Greek Scriptures, and with the Greek Song of Songs in particular. To some, this new-found interest was peculiar. (I still fondly remember the expression of mild shock on my erstwhile advisor's face when I quoted to him some choice fragments attributed to Aquila.) In some respects, this book represents my own efforts to come to grips with the strange, unruly, even alluring language of the Greek Song of Songs.

It is my firm belief that the field of Septuagint Studies, standing as it does at the crossroads of so many disciplines – among them Greek linguistics, textual criticism, Old Testament exegesis, Biblical philology, Translation Studies, patristics and palaeography – deserves the interdisciplinary attention of scholars from a variety of backgrounds. This volume should be understood in that light: a close reading of LXX Song of Songs, informed primarily by classical philology and Translation Studies, which could and should be supplemented by other readings from other points of view.

*

This book results from the research project *Canticles (Song of Songs) in Hebrew and Greek. A Comparative Analysis of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint and the so-called Pre-Hexaplaric Revisions* (FWO G.0349.06), directed between 2005 and 2009 by prof. dr. Hans Ausloos and prof. dr. Bénédicte Lemmelijn at the Centre for Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism (Faculty of Theology, KU Leuven). During this time, I had the pleasure and the honour of working with prof. dr. Reinhart Ceulemans and dr. Elke Verbeke, excellent scholars both, and the finest partners-in-crime that anyone could wish for. I should not say that, without them, this book would never have existed – but the process certainly would have been a lot less fulfilling.

Many people contributed to the completion of this study, in ways both great and small. I am grateful to each and every one of them. At the risk of forgetting many others, I name only prof. dr. Luc Van der Stockt, prof. dr. Reine Meylaerts, dr. Cameron Boyd-Taylor, dr. Katrin Hauspie, Toon Ternier, prof. dr. Pierre Van Hecke, and dr. Jeroen Lauwers. I would also like to express my thanks to the editorial board of *De Septuaginta Investigationes* and the staff members at Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht – in particular, to prof. dr. Kristin De Troyer, prof. dr. Wolfgang Kraus, and dr. Elisabeth Hernitscheck. And finally, to some people I am indebted in ways that I cannot begin to recount: to the youngsters and students

to whom I have had the privilege of teaching Greek over the years; to my beloved wife, Katleen; and to Floris, Joppe and Timo, our golden boys, who have been a source of pride, joy and distraction in equal measure.

Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used throughout. Abbreviations of parabiblical books and classical authors will be easily identified through either the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* or *The SBL Handbook of Style* (2nd edition).

α'	Aquila
ἄλλος	another, unspecified Minor Version
ε'	Quinta (Minor Version)
ζ'	Sexta (Minor Version)
θ'	Theodotion
οἱ ἄλ'	the others (Minor Versions)
σ'	Symmachus
A	Codex Alexandrinus
CATSS	Computer-Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (database accessed through BibleWorks 7.0 software)
B	Codex Vaticanus
BDAG	F. W. Bauer/W. Danker, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</i>
BHK	H. Kittel, <i>Biblia Hebraica</i> (3 rd edition)
BHQ	Biblia Hebraica Quinta
DDBDP	Duke Database of Documentary Papyri
DTS	Descriptive Translation Studies
FGrHist	F. Jacoby (ed.), <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i>
Jastrow	M. Jastrow, <i>A Dictionary of the Targumim etc.</i>
KB	L. Koehler/W. Baumgartner, <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
Lampe	G. W. H. Lampe, <i>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</i>
LEH	J. Lust/E. Eynikel/K. Hauspie, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i>
LSJ	H. G. Liddell/R. Scott, <i>English-Greek Lexicon</i>
LSJRevSupp	Revised supplement to LSJ
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Massoretic text
NE ²⁸	E. Nestle/K. Aland (ed.), <i>Novum Testamentum graece</i>
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
OG	Old Greek
OT	Old Testament
PCG	R. Kassel/C. Austin (ed.), <i>Poetae comici graeci</i>

PG	J.-P. Migne (ed.), <i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca</i>
PST	Polysystem Theory
RA	A. Rahlfs/D. Fraenkel, <i>Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften</i>
S	Codex Sinaiticus
SC	source culture
Schleusner	J. F. Schleusner, <i>Lexicon in LXX</i>
SIG	W. Dittenberger (ed.), <i>Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum</i>
SL	source language
Sophocles	E. A. Sophocles, <i>Greek Lexicon</i>
ST	source text
TC	target culture
TL	target language
TLG	Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Online Database
TS	Translation Studies
TT	target text
V	Codex Venetus

1. Introduction

According to legend, the history of Bible translation began with seventy-two Jewish elders on the small island of Pharos, who achieved a Greek translation of the Torah of Moses at the behest of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (309–246 BCE). These texts – the Greek Pentateuch – marked the starting point of intense Hebrew-Greek translation activity by the Jews of the Hellenistic age. For centuries, Jewish ancestral and sacred writings were being translated and retranslated into Greek, supplementing and at the same time underpinning no small amount of originally Greek literary compositions. The names of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, translators from the 1st and 2nd century CE, have traditionally been received as the epitome of ancient Jewish Hebrew-Greek translation. When Christianity rose to prominence, the Scriptural legacy it shared with Judaism – the Old Testament (OT) – was articulated entirely in Greek. To this day, this collection of translations and original compositions is commonly known as the Septuagint (LXX), in memory of the seventy-two elders of legend.

Among the texts contained in this corpus, the LXX version of the Song of Songs has received little sustained scholarly attention, a negligence disproportionate to the shelves of books that have been devoted to the Hebrew version(s) of this intriguing little book. The present study aims to redress this oversight by making the translation character of LXX Song of Songs the object of a book-length study for the first time

The necessity of such an undertaking need hardly be defended here. Together with the Biblical manuscripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the ancient versions, foremost among them the Septuagint, constitute sources of primary importance for the textual criticism of the OT, whose main Hebrew tradition is no older than the 9th–10th century CE (the Aleppo codex and codex Leningradensis). Theoretically, therefore, the study of the Septuagint takes us back at least a thousand years in the transmission history of the text of the OT.

Access to this important witness, however, is a privilege dearly bought, for the Hebrew text behind each translation is invariably obscured by the very act of translation, as well as by century upon century of copyists and editors separating the modern-day scholar from the original translator and his work. An analysis of the aims, means and methods behind the LXX translation precedes any evaluation of it as a textual witness. The first aim of this dissertation, then, is to make a contribution to the textual criticism of Song of Songs, by providing just such an analysis of its LXX version.

In addition to this, it is my express intention to study LXX Song of Songs as a specimen of Hebrew-Greek translation, as it thrived during the Hellenistic and Roman periods. This entails a cultural-historical and literary perspective beyond the text-critical concerns described above. The discipline of Translation Studies

(TS), from which this perspective draws, has been coalescing into a full-fledged academic field over the past fifty years or so. It is regrettable that, for a long time, this relatively young discipline and the established field of LXX Studies remained largely oblivious of each other's existence. Only during the past twenty years has mutual interest been growing, particularly among LXX scholars. I consider myself to be a firm supporter of this cause, and should like to dedicate the present research to stimulating the cross-fertilization of LXX Studies and Translation Studies.

1.1 The LXX text of Song of Songs

1.1.1 Date and provenance

Commentaries discussing the LXX text of Song of Songs at any length are few and far between. Those mentioning anything about the date and/or provenance of the translation are even rarer. Marvin H. Pope and Yair Zakovitch cite 100 BCE as a likely date but do not discuss the matter any further.¹ Especially in Pope's case, we may assume this judgment to have been based upon the prologue to Greek Ben Sira, a common interpretation of which holds that most Biblical books had been translated into Greek and were known to Alexandrian Jewry by 132 BCE. The implicit assumption is that whatever books had not been translated at that time would have followed shortly afterwards. Pope tellingly adds that LXX Song of Songs probably was an Alexandrian product, again without further argumentation.

Increasingly meticulous analysis of the Greek text has led to a later date being suggested. The first to do so was Peter Katz (*alias* Walters)², on the basis of adverbial πρὸς (Song 1:16) and ἐκλεκτός ~ בָּר (Song 6:10) which he identified as Aquilanic influences on LXX Song of Songs. Thus, he concluded that the translation “*eher nach als vor Aquila* [i.e. 2nd century CE] *seine jetzige Gestalt gewonnen hat*”.³ This line of reasoning was subsequently disproved by Gillis Gerleman, who

1 M. H. Pope, *Song of Songs. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 7C; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977), 20; Y. Zakovitch, *Das Hohelied* (HTKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2004), 102. Other commentaries forestall any decision on time and place of the translation: P. Joüon, *Le Cantique des Cantiques. Commentaire philologique et exégétique* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1909), 117 (“*impossible de préciser la date*”); G. Gerleman, Ruth. *Das Hohelied* (BKAT 18; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), 81 (“*keine festen Anhaltspunkte*”).

2 P. Katz, “Frühe hebraisierende Rezensionen der Septuaginta und die Hexapla”, *ZAW* 69 (1957) 77–84.

3 Katz, “Frühe hebraisierende Rezensionen”, 84. For a fuller discussion and refutation of Katz's arguments, see R. Ceulemans, “A Critical Edition of the Hexaplaric Fragments of the Book of Canticles, With Emphasis on Their Reception in Greek Christian Exegesis” (PhD diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2009), 7–9.

showed that Katz's presumably Aquilanic elements are not, in fact, typical of the 1st- to 2nd-century Jewish translator Aquila.⁴

Shortly afterwards, the discussion on LXX Song's time and place of origin took an unexpected turn with the publication of Dominique Barthélemy's unparalleled study *Les devanciers d'Aquila*.⁵ Counting LXX Song of Songs among the translations related to the so-called καίτε group and defining the latter as a translational phenomenon situated in 1st-century CE Palestine, he assigned the LXX translation of the Song to the self-same time and place. This conclusion found its way into an important introductory volume to the Septuagint⁶, and as such came to be accepted as a tentative scholarly consensus.⁷

In the first thorough lexical study of LXX Song of Songs, Marguérite Harl implicitly confirmed this consensus by stressing the links between the translation and some of the more idiosyncratic renderings of Theodotion⁸, whom Barthélemy had identified with the shady 1st-century targumist Jonathan ben 'Uziel.⁹ However, she also pointed out a number of lexical correspondences between LXX Song and Egyptian papyrological materials. Refraining from definitely assigning LXX Song to Egypt (which would perhaps be difficult to reconcile with its Theodotonic tendencies), she has nevertheless reopened the discussion on the translation's provenance. Her call for further investigation of this topic is certainly justified.¹⁰

In his 1996 dissertation, Jay C. Treat again corroborated the scholarly consensus by assigning a late date to LXX Song, i.e. 1st century BCE or 1st century CE.¹¹

4 For a brief introduction on the most famous of ancient Jewish translators and his peculiar methods, see N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 109–22.

5 D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécapropheton trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabinat palestinien* (SVT 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

6 M. Harl/G. Dorival/O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante. Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien* (Initiations au christianisme ancien; Paris: Cerf, 1988), 97.

7 E.g. J.-M. Auwers, "Le traducteur grec a-t-il allégorisé ou érotisé le Cantique des Cantiques?," in M. K. H. Peters (ed.), *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Leiden, 2004* (SBL SCS 54; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006) 161–68 (p. 161); N. de Lange, "From Eros to Pneuma: on the Greek translation of the Song of Songs," in M. Loubet/D. Pralon (ed.), *Eukarpa. Εὐκάρπα. Études sur la Bible et ses exégètes en hommage à Gilles Dorival* (Paris: Cerf, 2011) 73–83 (p. 73).

8 See Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context*, 142–54.

9 M. Harl, "La version LXX du Cantique des Cantiques et le groupe Kaige-Théodotion – quelques remarques lexicales," *Textus* 18 (1995) 101–20.

10 See D. De Crom, "The Lexicon of LXX Canticles and Greco-Roman Papyri," *ZAW* 124 (2012) 255–62.

11 J. C. Treat, "Lost Keys. Text and Interpretation in Old Greek Song of Songs and its Earliest Manuscript Witnesses" (PhD diss. University of Pennsylvania, 1996), 384.

Treat cites four indications in favour of this conclusion, the first two of which, being *argumenta e silentio*, are the least cogent by far:

- 1) the absence of Greek fragments of the book among the Dead Sea Scrolls
- 2) the absence of clear quotations in Philo, Flavius Josephus and Church Fathers prior to Theophilus of Antioch (2nd–3rd century CE)¹²
- 3) its perceived link with the *καίγε* group
- 4) certain details of orthography

The last point refers to certain forms which, according to Treat, are indicative of a date after 100 BCE.¹³ Indeed, both *ταμείον* (Song 1:4; 3:4; 8:2) and *λελουσμένοι* (Song 5:12) are later than their classical counterparts *ταμείον* and *λελουμένοι*.¹⁴ However, both the classical and later spellings are found throughout the manuscript tradition. Treat himself admits that it is difficult to determine what the original spelling would have been in each case. His argument regarding *ἐξουδενώσουσιν* (Song 8:7) is more convincing because the manuscript evidence is less divided. An alternative spelling *ἐξουθ-* would point to an earlier date (3rd–2nd century BCE) but the original spelling *ἐξουδ-* re-emerged from the 1st century BCE onwards, as discussed in Thackeray's grammar.¹⁵ Still, Treat remarks that the examination of more recent papyrus finds might lead to a readjustment of this pattern.

1.1.2 A *καίγε* subgroup

In his 1963 publication and study of the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Hever (8HevXIIgr), Barthélemy identified a sub-group related to *καίγε*-Theodotion consisting of LXX Lamentations, LXX Song of Songs and LXX Ruth.¹⁶ The primary criterion for this distinction was the pattern *καίγε* ~ *ⲕⲓ*, typical of the pre-Aquilanic translational tradition identified by Barthélemy. Seeing that LXX Song, like LXX Lamentations and LXX Ruth, applies this pattern inconsistently, Barthélemy grouped these three translated units together but did not fully discuss the subgroup's wider relation to the *καίγε* phenomenon.

12 See Ceulemans, "A Critical Edition", 7 (n. 30).

13 J. C. Treat, "To the Reader of Song of Songs," in A. Pietersma/B. G. Wright (ed.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007) 657–61 (p. 659, n. 15).

14 Treat, "Lost Keys", 384.

15 H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint. Vol. 1. Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 58–62.

16 Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, 33–34, 47, 49, 158–60.

Harl's lexical study picked up on Barthélemy's conclusions concerning LXX Song of Songs and the *καίγε* group.¹⁷ To this end she confronted the θ' variants of this book with its LXX version, noting both the relative scarcity of the former and the prominence of transliterations in the latter. This, in conjunction with a few specific lexical patterns, led her to conclude that either Theodotion authored LXX Song of Songs, or he used it as a basis for his revision activity and did not alter it very much.

The topic of LXX Song's relation to the *καίγε* group was of course further discussed in Treat's dissertation.¹⁸ His collations showed there is no manuscript evidence for a far-reaching *καίγε* recension of LXX Song (not that Barthélemy ever intended something of the sort). Rather he noted that the translation shares some family resemblances with Barthélemy's *καίγε* group, exhibiting some of its characteristics but not all of them. From this evidence, Treat concluded that LXX Song "may represent a transitional stage on the way to consistent *καίγε* practice – or it may simply represent a partial acceptance of some of the principles of the *καίγε* revisers".¹⁹

In the present volume, attention will be given first and foremost to the issues discussed by Treat – that is to say, the precise nature of LXX Song's relationship to *καίγε* and its apparent lacklustre application of *καίγε* renderings. These issues logically precede an evaluation of Barthélemy's *καίγε* subgroup, while Harl's suspicions in the direction of Theodotion should, in the best of cases, be based on a new edition of the fragments preserved under his name.

1.1.3 Translation character

General opinion holds LXX Song of Songs to be a literal translation of a Hebrew *Vorlage* that did not differ much from MT. The characterizations of Gerleman²⁰ ("*Eine fast sklavische Treue gegen den hebräischen Text scheint die griechische Übersetzung durchgehend zu prägen*") and Roland E. Murphy²¹ ("Indeed, the results are sometimes faithful to a fault, sacrificing Greek idiom in favour of a woodenly literal approach to the Hebrew") are illuminating in this respect. For the most part, these judgments are based on superficial readings of the text. Among the commentaries on the Song, only Gerleman devotes several pages to a discussion of the Greek translation and its perceived defects.²²

17 Harl, "La version LXX du Cantique des Cantiques", 101–20.

18 Treat, "Lost Keys", 357–60, 382–83.

19 Treat, "To the Reader of Song of Songs", 659.

20 Gerleman, *Das Hohelied*, 77.

21 R. E. Murphy, *The Song of Songs. A Commentary on the Book of Canticles or the Song of Songs* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 9.

22 Gerleman, *Das Hohelied*, 77–82.

More recently, several authors have reconfirmed the literal translation character of LXX Song of Songs, though in less depreciative terms and usually acknowledging a measure of subtlety and inventiveness within its formal framework.²³

This general consensus has been challenged by Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn who, working on sets of so-called “content-related” indicators of translation technique, aim at a re-evaluation of the translation profile of LXX Song of Songs. Their studies attempt to define the translator’s solutions to various ST problems in terms of the terminological triad literal – free – faithful. One such study discusses LXX’s rendering of Hebrew *hapax legomena*²⁴; another focuses on the plants, herbs and spices in the poem.²⁵

In this context one should also refer to the authors according to whom several subtleties reflect an allegorical reading of the text. This had been posited for εὐθύτης (Song 1:4) by Gianni Barbiero²⁶, for the oath formula ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσιν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἰσχύσεσιν τοῦ ἀγροῦ (Song 2:7; 3:5; 5:8; 8:4) by both Paul Joüon and Wilhelm Wittekindt²⁷, and for ἀποστολαί (Song 4:13) by Leo Prijns.²⁸ Jean-Marie Auwers reviewed and rejected these and other possible indices of allegorization on the part of the translator, retaining only μαστός (Song 1:2 and *passim*) as possibly suggestive of an allegorical reading.²⁹ To this Ausloos and Lemmelijn replied with a discussion of their own, questioning some of Auwers’ assumptions and suggesting that the Greek translation of Song 1:2 is quite neutral with regard to the allegoric and/or erotic content of this verse.³⁰

23 M. Harl, “On the Greek Version of the Song of Songs”, *BJGS* 5 (1989) 11–12; J.-M. Auwers, “Les Septante, lecteurs du *Cantique des Cantiques*”, *Graphè* 8 (1999) 33–47 (pp. 35–37); P. B. Dirksen, “Canticles – שִׁיר הַשִּׁירִים”, in *General Introduction and Megilloth* (Biblia Hebraica quinta editio cum apparato critico novis curis elaborato 18; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004) 10*–11*; Treat, “To the Reader of Song of Songs”, 657–661; de Lange, “From Eros to Pneuma”, 75, 78–79.

24 H. Ausloos/B. Lemmelijn, “Rendering Love. Hapax Legomena and the Characterisation of the Translation Technique of Song of Songs”, in H. Ausloos et al. (ed.), *Translating a Translation. The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (BETL 213; Leuven – Paris – Dudley: Peeters, 2008) 43–61.

25 B. Lemmelijn, “Flora in Cantico Canticorum. Towards a More Precise Characterisation of Translation Technique in the LXX of Song of Songs”, in A. Voitila/J. Jokiranta (ed.), *Scripture in Transition. Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Solamo* (SJSJ 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 27–51.

26 G. Barbiero, *Cantico dei Cantici* (I Libri Biblici 24; Milano: Paoline, 2004), 23.

27 Joüon, *Le Cantique des Cantiques*, 67, 161; W. Wittekindt, *Das Hohe Lied und seine Beziehungen zum Ishtarkult* (Hannover: Lafaire, 1925), 64–5.

28 L. Prijns, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948), 39.

29 Auwers, “Le traducteur grec”, 161–68.

30 H. Ausloos/B. Lemmelijn, “Canticles as Allegory?”, in H. Ausloos/B. Lemmelijn/M. Verenne (ed.), *Florilegium Lovaniense. Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (BETL 224; Leuven: Peeters, 2008) 35–48.

Naturally, the translation character of LXX Song of Songs is a topic of primary importance. The secondary literature is somewhat divided on the matter, because the target text (TT) apparently combines a very formal approach to translation with context-bound, creative solutions to source text (ST) problems. In addition to mapping out the presence of these two tendencies, the present study will put some effort into explaining, relating and evaluating their coexistence on a more theoretical level, so as to avoid judging individual cases on an *ad hoc* basis.

1.1.4 Textual history

Although the textual history of LXX Song of Songs is yet to be written in full, this much may be said about the earliest period of its manuscript transmission. According to scholarly consensus, the original translation was achieved somewhere in the 1st century BCE or CE. The two following centuries yielded at least five re-translations into Greek, viz. those of Aquila (α'), Symmachus (σ'), Theodotion (θ'), the Quinta (ε') and the Sexta (ζ'). The remains of these have recently been collected and edited by Reinhart Ceulemans.³¹ In the early third century CE, Origen of Alexandria produced a multi-columned synoptic edition of the OT, commonly known as the *Hexapla*.³² For this edition Origen collated an unknown Hebrew text, a transliteration thereof (the so-called *Secunda* or second column), the Minor Versions mentioned above, and an LXX text current at his time. In this LXX text he marked with the obelos (÷) those passages that he did not find in his Hebrew text, while those passages that were present in the Hebrew text but not in the LXX were supplied from some other source and marked with the asterisk (*). In the meantime the LXX text itself had begun to be translated into several other languages, among them Latin and Coptic – these “daughter versions” are important witnesses for the early stages of the LXX text. In later centuries further recensions of the Greek Bible were ascribed to Lucian (Antioch) and Hesychius (Egypt). On the basis of the available manuscript evidence, a separate Lucianic or Hesychian recension of LXX Song of Songs does not seem to have existed.³³

31 Ceulemans, “A Critical Edition”, 269–534.

32 See F. Field (ed.), *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* (2 vol.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1875). Field’s extensive introduction has been translated as G. J. Norton, *Frederick Field’s Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta* (Cahiers de la Revue biblique 62; Paris: Gabalda, 2005). See also the essays in A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen’s Hexapla and Fragments. Papers presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th–3rd August 1994* (TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

33 But see Treat, “Lost Keys”, 53 on possible “Lucianic” manuscripts, and S. Euringer, “Une leçon probablement hésychienne”, *Revue biblique* 7 (1898) 183–92 on the variant Ὀδολλαμῆτις in Song 7:1.

Though Origen's *Hexapla* is now lost, his recensional activity on the LXX text of Song of Songs occupies a central position in the textual history of this book. Indeed, the distinction between the pre-Hexaplaric LXX text and its Hexaplaric (or Origenian) recension is a necessary prerequisite for any study of the translator's work. This distinction was not always sufficiently made in earlier editions of the book, but a huge leap forward has been made by Treat's work on the topic.³⁴

1.2 The interaction of LXX Studies and Translation Studies

During the last fifteen years or so, the field of Septuagint Studies has been marked by an increased interest in the various approaches to translation that are collectively known as "Translation Studies". A small but steady flow of contributions and presentations, and at least two important monographs, have engaged with concepts from modern-day Translation Studies and their applicability to the study of the Septuagint. Both Theo van der Louw's *Transformations in the Septuagint* and Cameron Boyd-Taylor's *Reading Between the Lines* call for increased interaction between the fields of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies.

Unfortunately, this interaction has so far been a rather one-sided affair. While there is no shortage of works in the field of Translation Studies that deal with translation in the ancient world, few authors concern themselves with translation in the pre-Ciceronian period or with any other tradition than the Romans'. The Septuagint is absent from many standard works on translation, and those that do mention it are often unaware of current trends in Septuagint scholarship.³⁵

By far the most energetic influx of concepts from TS has occurred through the work of scholars involved in the *New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS). Ever since the classic formulation of the "interlinear paradigm", which underlies much of the NETS principles³⁶, the work of the Israeli translator and scholar Gideon Toury has featured regularly in the publications of authors connected to the NETS project. This formative branch of translation research, commonly known as Descriptive Translation Studies (DTS)³⁷, is among the most in-

³⁴ Especially Treat, "Lost Keys", 376–82.

³⁵ For further examples, see T. A. W. van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint. Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* (CBET 47; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 9–12.

³⁶ See A. Pietersma, "A New Paradigm For Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint", in J. Cook (ed.), *Bible and Computer. The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique "From Alpha to Byte"*. University of Stellenbosch 17–21 July, 2000 (Leiden: Brill, 2002) 337–64 and Pietersma/Wright (ed.), *A New English Translation*, xiii–xx.

³⁷ G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Benjamins Translation Library 4; Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995) and Id., *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond. Revised Edition* (Benjamins Translation Library 100; Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2012). Unless otherwise noted, reference is made automatically to the 2012 edition.

fluent paradigms of TS and has begun to penetrate the field of LXX scholarship as well. A clear sign of this was the invitation extended to Toury to present a lecture on the interaction of LXX Studies and DTS at the international congress of the *International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* in Leiden, 2004.³⁸

Several concepts from Toury's method for translation research have been put to good use in recent publications, e.g. the target-oriented approach to translation³⁹, the distinction of production and reception⁴⁰, the triple distinction of function – product – process⁴¹, the concept of norms⁴², coupled pairs⁴³ and interference and interlanguage.⁴⁴ In this process an important role has been played by Cameron Boyd-Taylor⁴⁵, whose monograph *Reading Between the Lines* is devoted entirely to the development of interlinearity as a DTS-informed paradigm for LXX Studies. Many of the NETS precepts have their theoretical foundation in this work, which remains the most in-depth exploration to date of DTS and what it has to offer to LXX Studies.

It should be stressed that the application of DTS to the study of the Septuagint *does not* automatically imply acceptance of the NETS principles and/or the interlinear paradigm, despite the fact that the two are as yet closely intertwined. Also, it is unfortunate that the integration of DTS into LXX Studies has so far been largely limited to Toury's seminal volume *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* – though perhaps understandable in view of its unique importance. Yet in the rapidly evolving discipline that is Translation Studies, many new insights

38 G. Toury, "A Handful of Methodological Issues in DTS: Are They Applicable to the Study of the Septuagint as an Assumed Translation?", *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 13–25.

39 C. Boyd-Taylor, "The Evidentiary Value of the Septuagint for Lexicography: Alice's Reply to Humpty Dumpty", *BIOSCS* 34 (2001) 47–80.

40 A. Pietersma, "Translating a Translation. With Examples from the Greek Psalter", in *Translating a Translation*, 169–82.

41 A. Pietersma, "LXX and DTS: A New Archimedean Point for Septuagint Studies", *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 1–11; Id., "Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits (The Psalter as a Case in Point)", in W. Kraus/R. G. Wooden (ed.), *Septuagint Research. Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBL SCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006) 33–45; B. G. Wright, "The Letter of Aristeas and the Reception History of the Septuagint", *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 47–67; C. Boyd-Taylor, "An Ear for an Eye – Lay Literacy and the Septuagint", in *Scripture in Transition*, 127–45.

42 C. Boyd-Taylor, "Toward the Analysis of Translational Norms: A Sighting Shot", *BIOSCS* 39 (2006) 27–46.

43 C. Boyd-Taylor, "In A Mirror, Dimly – Reading the Septuagint as a Document of Its Times", in *Septuagint Research*, 15–31.

44 C. Boyd-Taylor, "Lexicography and Interlanguage – Gaining our Bearings", *BIOSCS* 37 (2004) 55–72; Id., "Calque-culations – Loanwords and the Lexicon", *BIOSCS* 38 (2005) 79–99.

45 C. Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines. The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies* (BTS 8; Leuven: Peeters, 2011). See also Id., "A Place in the Sun. The Interpretative Significance of LXX-Psalm 18:5c", *BIOSCS* 31 (1998) 71–105.

and concepts have been introduced since that particular 1995 volume. The DTS paradigm has shaped modern-day TS to a very great extent, but has not itself remained unaffected. A quick scan of the bibliography will reveal a lot of recent work with great potential for LXX Studies.

One very important point remains to be made concerning the interaction of Translation Studies and LXX Studies. The point of integrating one into the other is not to refute or replace the established methodology of LXX Studies, but to complement and enrich it. Acceptance of concepts and methods from Translation Studies should never be uncritical: some concepts may not work for LXX Studies, or may need adjusting. Our primary aim should be to put a stop to naïve and uncritical ways of thinking about translation and translated texts – what Boyd-Taylor aptly calls “the folk-theory of translation”.⁴⁶ We find an admirable example of how this should be done in van der Louw’s study. The categories “literal” and “free” are commonly regarded as too vague to be of any objective value, and yet LXX Studies have gone a long way to operationalize them as useful parameters without recourse to TS (the works of James Barr and Emanuel Tov come to mind in this connection⁴⁷). Instead of casting these established methods aside, van der Louw complements them with their mirror image from linguistic TS, i.e. parameters to categorize and describe instances of freedom. In a way, he sets LXX Studies’ very own “typology of literalism” over against a new “typology of freedom”, thereby enriching the descriptive tools available to LXX scholars.

1.3 Scope and method of the present study

The DTS methodology is based on the threefold distinction of *function*, *product* and *process*, which originated in James S. Holmes’ ground-breaking essay *The Name and Nature of Translation Studies*, widely considered programmatic for Translation Studies as a discipline.⁴⁸ With these concepts, Toury developed not a theory of translation as such, but rather an inductive method, which in its most idealized form consists of three phases. First, an assumed translation is contextualized within the target culture (TC), resulting in a prospective formulation of the translation’s function (position) within the target literary system. Then, a detailed study of the translational product is undertaken: it is mapped onto its assumed source text (ST), the nature and extent of ST-TT relations are determined,

⁴⁶ Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines*, vii.

⁴⁷ J. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (MSU 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979); E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 17–24.

⁴⁸ J. S. Holmes, “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies”, in *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies* (Approaches to Translation Studies 7; Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1988) 67–80 (pp. 71–73).

while the translation's prospective function is continually being checked against the results of textual analysis. Finally, generalizations are made as well as attempts to reconstruct the translation process underlying the finished product. Whatever the scope of any descriptive study, the next logical step would be to enlarge the corpus under investigation and test previous results and hypotheses, arriving at ever higher levels of generalization.

It should be noted that, while the interdependence of function, product and process is central to Toury's methodology⁴⁹, the DTS method actually offers several entry points for studying translation as a textual, literary and social phenomenon. In view of the difficulties surrounding the Septuagint as a historical corpus, we should start our investigation from the most solid data we have and work our way up from there. For this reason, the present study focuses not on the translation's function but on the translational product – that is, on a detailed textual analysis of the LXX text of Song of Songs. At present I will discuss the materials used for this textual analysis, clarify its aims and interests, and discuss a few methodological issues.

When it comes to textual analysis, the field of LXX Studies has long since developed a methodology of its own which, in my opinion, compares favourably to Toury's coupled-pairs approach.⁵⁰ I am of course referring to the study of "translation technique" as it is practiced primarily by the so-called Finnish school. The modalities of translation technique as a method, involving quantitative and qualitative data and aspects of literalness as well as freedom, have been discussed elsewhere⁵¹ and need not be repeated here. For the present purpose it will suffice to define translation technique as a threefold integrated approach to LXX texts, viz. from a text-critical, linguistic and translational perspective.⁵²

Textual study of an LXX text is by definition *text-critical* because, as will be discussed in more detail below, both ST and TT as well as their relationship have to be reconstructed from the available text-critical data. For this reason the textual analysis involves not only LXX and the Massoretic Text (MT) as the closest possible approximations of the original TT and ST, but other textual witnesses as well, as detailed below (pp. 25–35). The present study is text-critical insofar as it is required to be for the study of translation technique. This means that im-

49 Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 6.

50 On which see Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 115–29.

51 Notably B. Lemmelijn, "Two Methodological Trails in Recent Studies on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint", in R. Sollamo/S. Sipilä (ed.), *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint. Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999* (PFES 82; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001) 43–63; A. Aejmelaeus, "What We Talk About When We Talk About Translation Technique", in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators. Collected Essays* (CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007) 205–22.

52 Cf. R. Sollamo, "Translation Technique as a Method", in *Translating A Translation*, 35–41.

portant text-critical issues concerning the LXX text are discussed, but problems specific to the Hebrew witnesses are generally ignored, unless they also bear on LXX or its relation to MT.

Translation technique also explicitly studies a translation as a *linguistic* document. This involves comparing linguistic phenomena to non-translated literature, both synchronically and diachronically, in order to determine how representative the translation is of contemporary language use. In effect, one investigates to what extent one can make sense of the Greek text without recourse to the Hebrew – often a moot point among LXX scholars. For this aspect of translation technique I have made good use of a wide selection of comparative material, viz.

1. Latin and Coptic daughter versions of the book of Canticles (see below)
2. fragments of Canticles in the Minor Versions (α'σ'θ'ε'ς')⁵³
3. the entire LXX corpus⁵⁴
4. the TLG database of Greek literature, especially authors from the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods (ca. 2nd century BCE – 2nd century CE)⁵⁵
5. selected commentaries of Greek Fathers, notably Origen of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa and Nilus of Ancyra⁵⁶
6. the papyrological evidence covered by the Duke Database of Documentary Papyri (DDBDP)⁵⁷

An important theoretical concept in this regard is the notion of interference, i.e. linguistic transfer from the SL (Hebrew) to the TL (Greek). Interference is a central issue in DTS, so much so that Toury made interference the topic of one of his two fundamental laws of translation.⁵⁸ The amount of interference in a transla-

53 Consulted in the edition by Ceulemans, “A Critical Edition”, 269–534.

54 Accessed primarily through E. Hatch/H. A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. Second Edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998) and BibleWorks 7.0 software (BibleWorks. Software for Biblical Exegesis and Research, 2007).

55 *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. A Digital Library of Greek Literature* (University of California) at <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/>.

56 Consulted in the following editions: M. A. Barbàra (ed.), *Origene. Commentario al Canticum dei Cantici* (Biblioteca Patristica 42; Bologna: EDB, 2005); H. Langerbeck (ed.), *Gregorii Nysseni in Canticum Cantorum* (Gregorii Nysseni Opera 6; Leiden: Brill, 1960); H.-U. Rosenbaum (ed.), *Nilus Ancyranus. Kommentar zum Hohelied* (PTS 57; Schriften Nilus von Ancyra 1; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004).

57 *Duke Database of Documentary Papyri* (currently available through <http://papyri.info/>).

58 Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 303–15. In its most basic form, the “law of interference” states that “in translation, phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to force themselves on the translator and be transferred to the target text” (p. 310). See also A. Pym, “On Toury’s laws of how translators translate”, in A. Pym/M. Schlesinger/D. Simeoni (ed.), *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury* (Benjamins Translation Library 75; Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2008) 311–28.

tion obviously is inversely proportional to its representative value as a linguistic document.⁵⁹ However, tracing interference is not just a question of counting awkward phrases and oddly used words. To begin with, one needs to be aware of Toury's fundamental distinction between positive and negative transfer.⁶⁰ Positive transfer applies to those cases where a normal, though perhaps infrequent TL item is used disproportionately often in translated texts, because it happens to closely resemble some SL feature. It is therefore a matter of frequency rather than grammatical correctness (in LXX, see e.g. ὄτι ~ כִּי, καὶ ἐγένετο ~ וַיְהִי). Negative transfer is used when SL interference results in non-normal TL items (e.g. transliterations).

Furthermore, interference is an essentially syntagmatic phenomenon. That is to say, interference does not show so much on the paradigmatic level, in the selection of linguistic items, as on the syntagmatic level, in the combination of linguistic items. A single instance of ὄτι ~ כִּי hardly counts as interference, but standard application of this pattern in a translated unit very likely does. Likewise, the mere fact that ST item X resulted in TT item Y cannot count as interference, unless it be shown that Y is contextually (or stylistically, semantically etc.) out of place in the TT. Interference can of course manifest itself on various levels – the present study takes into account lexico-semantic interference, syntactic interference and interference on the level of text and discourse.

Finally, translation technique studies *ST-TT relations*, through comparative study of LXX and MT. The aim is to discover if and how each element of LXX relates to MT and, if no relation is apparent, to determine the cause of the difference: structural differences between the languages, a reading error on the part of the translator, the translation process itself, some contextual factor, or possibly a different *Vorlage* (ST)?⁶¹ The latter point reveals a fundamental similarity shared by the study of translation technique and DTS, viz. the provisional status of the ST at the outset of textual study. Both DTS and translation technique work with *assumed* source texts, meaning that the nature and extent of ST-TT relations are not given but have to be discovered during textual study. To be sure, DTS formulates this as a theoretical axiom, whereas for LXX Studies it is a practical consequence of the textual uncertainty of both ST and TT. Still, the issue constitutes a strong factor in the basic compatibility of both methods.

An important tool for the study of ST-TT relations is the synoptic comparison of LXX and MT included with the discussion of each verse. These tables record

59 On this topic, see J. N. Adams/S. Swain, "Introduction", in J. N. Adams/M. Janse/S. Swain (ed.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Word* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) 1–19 (pp. 3–7).

60 In addition to what Toury calls 'discourse transfer', i.e. the constant cognitive code-switching required of the translator (see Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies*, 311).

61 See Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 123–72 for likely causes of ST-TT deviation.

quantitative differences (pluses and minuses), preservation of word order and the level of segmentation. Words in MT are divided into morphemes for this purpose.

The ultimate object of textual analysis is to describe, i.e. to observe and explain, textual-linguistic features of the TT in relation to the ST. For this we will muster the entire heuristic and terminological apparatus currently used in LXX Studies, including van der Louw's inventory of transformations. The only concept from LXX scholarship here deemed unfit to be used in descriptive analysis is faithfulness. The notion of "faithful" translation had been mentioned in passing by Anneli Aejmelaeus to counter the idea that free translations do not reliably represent the original, i.e. in an explicitly evaluative context.⁶² The term has since been adopted by certain scholars to form a conceptual triad with "literal" and "free". However, unlike those two terms, "faithfulness" has never received the treatment required to operationalize it for practical use – there are no criteria for faithfulness. Indeed, it is not even clear what the term "faithful" means. Obviously it denotes some kind of relationship with the ST, but it is entirely unclear at what level this relationship obtains: faithful to what? Is the relationship semantic, formal, functional, communicative, hermeneutic? Perhaps faithfulness is closest to the concept of loyalty as it is used in Skopos theory.⁶³ In this German-based model, aimed towards translator training, loyalty denotes an interpersonal relationship of trustworthiness and reliability between translator and client. Faithfulness, it seems, establishes a similar relationship on an intertextual level, i.e. between TT and ST. If this is a correct interpretation of faithfulness, the term is ethical and prescriptive, a value assigned by a certain community or readership rather than an objectively verifiable property of translation. Unless those who would use the term clarify its meaning and prove my interpretation wrong, faithfulness does not belong in a properly descriptive methodology.

The final chapters discuss the processes and procedures behind the translation product. To be sure, in the truest sense of the word "process-oriented study" covers either the (un)conscious psycholinguistic operations performed by the

62 A. Aejmelaeus, "The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint", in C. E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem, 1986* (SBL SCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) 361–80 (p. 378). See also I. Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Auslassung des Possessivpronomens im Griechischen Pentateuch", in A. Aejmelaeus/R. Sollamo (ed.), *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax. Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987* (AASF 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen, 1987) 86–103 (p. 88).

63 C. Nord, *Translation as a Purposeful Activity. Functionalist Approaches Explained* (Translation Theories Explained 1; Manchester: St. Jerome's, 1997), 47–48. See also J. Munday, *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications. Second Edition* (London: Routledge, 2008), 79–81.

translator, or the material production process from client to publisher.⁶⁴ While there is no lack of studies covering such topics with reference to LXX⁶⁵, students of ancient translation will never be able to study “the translator’s black box” to the extent that this is done in TS. The main reason for this is that the translators themselves – its main source of raw materials – have been dead and buried for quite some time.

Therefore, process-oriented research is here viewed as corresponding to the final phases in Toury’s DTS methodology, viz. generalization and extension of the corpus. The label “process-oriented” is perhaps more convenient than accurate. Still, it serves as an umbrella for those sections where the study of the translational product is taken beyond mere observables to trends, tendencies, inconsistencies and, ultimately, norms.

Thus, the penultimate chapter investigates the *καίγε* phenomenon. The aim of this chapter is to evaluate Barthélemy’s thesis that LXX Song of Songs is related to the so-called *καίγε* group. This central problem in scholarship on LXX Song of Songs is tackled with the comprehensive method devised by Peter J. Gentry in his doctoral thesis.⁶⁶ The modalities of this type of research are further explained on pp. 255–260.

The final chapter generalizes the findings of the textual analysis into a textual-linguistic profile of LXX Song of Songs. The central issue in this section is interference, which is why a distinction is made between lexico-semantic, syntactic and text-linguistic features of LXX Song of Songs.

1.4 Textual witnesses

A central issue in the study of the Septuagint is the fact that neither the original translation produced by the translator, nor the original source text from which he worked have been preserved. Our oldest, more or less complete sources are manuscripts from the 4th and 5th century CE onwards for LXX, and the codex Leningradensis (1008 CE) for MT. What we do have is critical editions, which it has become common practice to regard as the closest possible approximations of the TT and ST. Translation technique therefore studies the relations between a hypothetical translated text and an equally hypothetical *Vorlage*. Thus, to study a

64 K. Malmkjaer, “Postscript: Multidisciplinarity in Process Research”, in S. Tirkkonen-Condit/R. Jääskeläinen (ed.), *Tapping and Mapping the Processes of Translation and Interpretation. Outlooks on Empirical Research* (Benjamins Translation Library 37; Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2000) 163–69 (p. 163).

65 I. Soisalon-Soininen, “Beobachtungen zur Arbeitsweise der Septuaginta-Übersetzer”, in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax*, 28–39; Theo A. W. van der Louw, “The Dictation of the Septuagint Version”, *JSJ* 39 (2008) 211–29.

66 P. J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SBL SCS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 419–93.