Renderings of the Hebrew Semipreposition lifne in 1-4 Reigns

Sollamo, Raija

Kristin DE TROYER, T. Michael LAW,
and Marketta LILJESTRÖM (eds)

IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF
SHERLOCK HOLMES

Studies in the Biblical Text
in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION ONE:

THE SEPTUAGINT. ORIGINS AND TRANSLATION

SECTION TWO

THE SEPTUAGINT AND THE VERSIONS.
TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND TEXTUAL HISTORY

SECTION THREE

THE SEPTUAGINT IN NEW TESTAMENT AND
CHRISTIAN USE

SECTION FOUR

THE SEPTUAGINT IN JEWISH TRADITION

SECTION FIVE

HEBREW BIBLE AND DEAD SEA SCROLLS

RENDERINGS OF THE HEBREW SEMIPREPOSITION לִפְנֵי IN 1-4 REIGNS

Raija SOLLAMO

INTRODUCTION

In my doctoral thesis, *Renderings of the Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint,* I already examined the renderings of the Hebrew semiprepo-sitions in 1-4 Reigns.[1] I even provided some statistics showing how the renderings are divided between the Old Greek and Kaige sections. What I now intend to provide is a further and more detailed study also includ-ing the renderings attested in the Lucianic text. It was James Shenkel who had put forward a thesis that there appears to be a dichotomy between the renderings of בְּעֵינֵי in the Old Greek and Kaige sections in 1-4 Reigns.[2] His thesis was further confirmed by my dissertation. Shenkel for the most part adopted Dominique Barthélemy's view on the Kaige recension.[3] They agreed to a certain extent on the idea that the proto-Lucianic recension represents (or is) the Old Greek translation in the Kaige sections. For this reason the Lucianic text will also be examined in this study.[4] Except for בְּעֵינֵי, Shenkel did not include other semiprepositions in his study. My pur-pose is to concentrate on לִפְנֵי here.

According to Barthélemy and Shenkel, 1) the translation technique of the Kaige Recension – from here onwards KR – is more slavish than that followed in the earlier portions (Old Greek sections). It implies that certain

[1] Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF Diss. Hum. Litt. 19; Helsinki, 1979), pp. 271-279.

[2] James Donald Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge MA, 1968), pp. 11-18.

[3] Dominique Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (VT Sup 10; Leiden, 1963).

[4] I use the term Lucianic text or Lucianic recension. In contrast, I do not utilize the term proto-Lucianic at all because the existence of a proto-Lucianic recension is uncertain. Anneli Aejmelaeus, 'The Septuagint of 1 Samuel', in Leonard Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich (eds.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cog-nate Studies. Paris 1992* (SBLSCS 41; Atlanta**,** 1995), pp. 109-129. Tuukka Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel (*De Septuaginta Investigationes 3; Göttingen, 2012).

important Hebrew expressions have consistently been rendered by one
and the same slavish equivalent whether this is good Greek or not. 2) The
KR is a revision towards a Hebrew *Vorlage* of the same type as the MT.[5]
Shenkel and Barthélemy distinguish the following OG and KR sections:[6]

OG	KR
α 1 Reigns	βγ 2 Reigns 11:2 - 3 Reigns 2:11
ββ 2 Reigns 1:1 - 11:1	γδ 3 Reigns 22:1 – 4 Reigns 25:30
γγ 3 Reigns 2:12 - 21:43	

My doctoral thesis concentrated on the most common (stereotyped) ren-
derings and their occurrences in different books, also taking note of a
certain degree of variation and the number of free renderings. But because
the target then was to show the general lines of how the semiprepositi-
ons were rendered in different cases and different books, it was not
possible to pick up the heterogeneous exceptional instances and inves-
tigate possible reasons for their usage. Now, in this Festschrift article I
shall carry out a study of the divergent renderings of לִפְנֵי in 1-4 Reigns
including the Lucianic text.[7] The general lines of translation technique
must necessarily be reproduced from my doctoral thesis as a point of
departure. I hope that my contribution is useful for the jubilar Anneli
Aejmelaeus, my friend and colleague for several decades, and her team in
their editorial work on 1 Reigns and perhaps also on work on 2-4 Reigns
in the future.

THE RENDERINGS OF LOCAL לִפְנֵי REFERRING TO LIVING BEINGS

The renderings of לִפְנֵי referring to living beings are monotonous in all
the sections of 1-4 Reigns. The predominant stereotype is ἐνώπιον, and
it is predominant also in the KR sections. Apparently, ἐνώπιον which
was originally used in the Old Greek (OG) was slavish enough to be

---

[5] Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, pp. 31-80, 102-110. Shenkel, *Chronology and
Recensional Development,* pp. 11-13.

[6] Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development*, pp. 11-18. Barthélemy, *Les devan-
ciers d'Aquila*, p. 36.

[7] For the *L* text I have used Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz, *El
Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega I-II (1-2 Samuel, 1-2 Reyes)* (Textos y Estudios
"Cardenal Cisneros" de la Biblia Políglota Matritense; Madrid, 1989-1992) and Alan
England Brooke, Norman McLean and Henry St John Thackeray, *The Old Testament in
Greek II:I-II* (Cambridge, 1927-1930).

acceptable for the reviser(s) of the KR. This rendition appears altogether in 111 occurrences in 1-4 Reg against 20 divergent cases that contain 8 different equivalents used only 1-3 times each.[8]

Table 1. The renderings of local לִפְנֵי referring to living beings in the OG and KR sections

		ἐνώπιον	other renderings
OG	α	35	6
	ββ	15	2
	γγ	27	2
KR	βγ	16	6
	γδ	18	4
		111	20

In addition to the 20 other renderings of these statistics there appear a few cases where the OG or KR sections of the LXX[B] (Codex Vaticanus and its allies) had a shorter *Vorlage* and therefore contain no rendering for a לִפְנֵי construction or for a whole clause. The first instance is 1 Reg 2:28 לָשֵׂאת אֵפוֹד לְפָנַי – καὶ αἴρειν εφουδ (OG), καὶ αἴρειν εφουδ ἐνώπιόν μου (L). The existence of the shorter *Vorlage* is confirmed by 4QSam[a].[9] The second shorter instance to be discussed is 2 Reg 7:26 where a whole line is lacking apparently because of haplography between יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת in vv. 26 and 27 either in the Hebrew *Vorlage* or in the LXX[B]. Hexaplaric and Lucianic manuscripts correct the text according to the MT.[10] Their shared approximation contains the whole missing line with ἐνώπιον for לִפְנֵי. There appears another instance of a shorter *Vorlage* in 4 Reg 19:15 וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל חִזְקִיָּהוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה where the Lucianic group diverges from the Hexaplaric manuscripts, while this clause was not found in the *Vorlage* of the KR (LXX[B]). The *L* group boc₂e₂ or 19 108 82 93 127 uses a good Greek equivalent πρός in the combination προσηύξατο Εζεκιας πρὸς κύριον, possibly due to a difference in its *Vorlage* (אֶל instead of לִפְנֵי) or it happened by accident because there appear many instances where this good Greek rendering was used for הִתְפַּלֵּל אֶל in 1-4 Reg, such as 1 Reg 1:26,

---

[8] Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, pp. 70-71, 273.

[9] 4Q51, Col. III, Frgs. a-e. *DJD XVII* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 39-47. Andrew Fincke, *The Samuel Scroll from Qumran. 4QSam^a Restored and Compared to the Septuagint and 4QSam^c* (STDJ 43; Leiden 2001), p. 10.

[10] The reconstructed text of 4QSam[a] goes with the MT. *DJD XVII*, pp. 130-132.

3 Reg 8:48, 4 Reg 4:33, 6:18, and 19:20. Also, there appears one instance in the OG sections containing a double reading showing both ἐνώπιον and πρός: 3 Reg 8:28 וְאֶל־הַתְּפִלָּה אֲשֶׁר עַבְדְּךָ מִתְפַּלֵּל לְפָנֶיךָ הַיּוֹם – τῆς τέρψεως ἧς ὁ δοῦλός σου προσεύχεται ἐνώπιόν σου πρὸς σὲ σήμε-ρον. In this verse the same two prepositions appear also in *L*. The stereo-type ἐνώπιον for לְפָנֵי appears in 1 Reg 1:12 לְהִתְפַּלֵּל לִפְנֵי יְהֹוָה – הִתְפַּלֵּל προσευχομένη ἐνώπιον κυρίου (also in *L*). To return to our instance, it remains uncertain whether the OG of 4 Reg 19:15 was similar to *L* or whether this clause was found in the *Vorlage* of the OG at all. The asterisk in 93 attests, however, to the absence of this clause in the OG (and its *Vorlage*). In that case the Lucianic group corrects the OG according to its longer Hebrew *Vorlage* harmonized with the parallel passage of Isa 37:15: וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל חִזְקִיָּהוּ אֶל־יְהוָה לֵאמֹר – καὶ προσεύξατο Εζεκιας πρὸς κύριον λέγων. Note that the Hebrew preposition is אֶל in Isa 37:15 instead of לְפְנֵי. Therefore it seems very plausible that the harmonization occurred already in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of *L* and was not made first in the recension. The witnesses 247 121 (= xy) and Syrohexapla have a very slavish rendition πρὸ προσώπου, while A gives a rarely used literal equivalent εἰς πρόσ-ωπον, typical of Aquila.[11] Both 93 (belonging to the *L* group) and Syrohexapla contain an asterisk referring to the Hexaplaric origin of their additions. Since the rendition of לְפְנֵי varies in these Hexaplaric additions, they must derive from different columns of the Hexapla. The equivalent εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον also appears in 3 Reg 9:25 in one Hexaplaric manu-script 247 (= x).[12] It contains a Greek rendering for וְהִקְטִיר אִתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי יְהֹוָה supported by Arm and Syrohexapla, while OG and *L* have no render-ing because of their shorter *Vorlage*.

   These four cases of a shorter *Vorlage* in LXX[B] were dealt with in order to demonstrate that there appear differences between the Masoretic text and the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint and the *Vorlage* of the *L* group and the *Vorlage* of KR in 1-4 Reigns, but often one or two of them agree against the others in regard to the לְפְנֵי construction and its close context. At any rate, methodically it is sound to assume that when the MT and the LXX

[11] Frederik. Crawford Burkitt (ed.), *Fragments of the books of Kings according to the translation of Aquila* (Cambridge, 1897). The fragments show εἰς πρόσωπον for לְפְנֵי in 4 Reg 23:25. C. Taylor, *Hebrew Greek Cairo Genizah. Palimpsests from the Taylor-Schechter collection including a fragment of the twenty-second Psalm according to Origen's Hexapla* (Cambridge, 1900). The book contains several examples of Aquila's use of εἰς πρόσωπον for לְפְנֵי. Cf. also Joseph Reider - Nigel Turner, *An Index to Aquila* (VTSup 12; Leiden, 1966), p. 206.
[12] Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development,* p. 20.

diverge – if the divergences cannot be explained with the aid of rather literal translation technique followed by the translators of these books – the differences are due to a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the MT.[13] The *Vorlage* of the Lucianic text and that of the KR recension might have been closer to the MT than to the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint, but it must be checked from case to case.

Now it is time to penetrate into the essence of the matter, the renderings of לִפְנֵי diverging from the stereotype ἐνώπιον in 1-4 Reg. One of the 20 divergent renderings for לִפְנֵי in 1-4 Reg is the preposition πρός in a double rendering in 3 Reg 8:28 וְאֶל־הַתְּפִלָּה אֲשֶׁר עַבְדְּךָ מִתְפַּלֵּל לְפָנֶיךָ הַיּוֹם – τῆς τέρψεως ἧς ὁ δοῦλός σου προσεύχεται ἐνώπιόν σου πρὸς σὲ σήμερον. It also contains the stereotype for local לִפְנֵי referring to living beings ἐνώπιον. *L* attests the same two prepositions of the double rendering. Plausibly the *Vorlage* of the OG originally had the preposition אֶל and was translated with πρός, but the stereotype ἐνώπιον was added as an approximation according to another (later) Hebrew *Vorlage,* similar to the MT; and the reviser by an accident or a later copyist deliberately (if the correction was, for instance, written above the line) took both of them into his text.[14] As for details I refer to my discussion above in connection with 4 Reg 19:15, where it was demonstrated that with the Hebrew verb הִתְפַּלֵּל the preposition אֶל was very common in 1-4 Reg, whereas לִפְנֵי very seldom appeared and its use was obviously due to a later development of the pre-Masoretic text. On the basis of my dissertation I am convinced that this is the direction in which the use of prepositions was developing.

We now go ahead to the instances of a dative without any preposition as an equivalent of לִפְנֵי in Greek (only two cases altogether). Our first

---

[13] Timothy M. Law, 'How not to Use 3 Reigns. A Plea to Scholars of the Books of Kings'; *VT* 61 (2011), pp. 280-297. Julio Trebolle Barrera, 'The Text Critical use of the Septuagint in the Books of Kings', in Claude E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Leuven, 1989* (SBLSCS 31; Atlanta, 1991), pp. 285-299.

[14] Here I disagree with Zipora Talshir who when discussing the double renderings expressed as her view that the double renderings could also originate both from the same original translator who was hesitant about which of the two was the more adequate rendering. Zipora Talshir, 'Double Translations in the Septuagint', in Claude E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23; Atlanta, 1987), pp. 21-63. Julio Trebolle Barrera shows instances where the Lucianic double readings generally preserve the OG reading to which the Kaige (B) reading was later added in the Kaíge sections. Our instance is different because it occurs in the B-text of an OG section, certainly also in *L*. Trebolle Barrera, 'The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in the Books of Kings', pp. 285-299, esp. 288-289.

example is 1 Reg 1:19 וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ֙ לִפְנֵ֣י יְהֹוָ֔ה – καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν τῷ κυρίῳ. The use of לִפְנֵי with this Hebrew verb is very rare, appearing only here (4 Reg 18:22 is different because it expresses the place to bow down, not a person whom one respects). The use of the preposition לְ is much more usual (22 occurrences) in these cases in 1-4 Reg; the Greek rendering is always a dative, and additionally even in seven cases where the Hebrew has no preposition. Thus, it seems plausible that the translator had לְ in his *Vorlage*. Otherwise, we should suppose that he exceptionally (by accident?) used the more common and more Greek equivalent (dative) for לִפְנֵי here. The *L* group also attests a dative here instead of its stereotype ἐνώπιον either following the OG or having לְ in its *Vorlage*. The second example is 3 Reg 1:2 וְעָמְדָה לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ – καὶ παραστήσεται τῷ βασιλεῖ, which is a good Greek rendering to be found in the KR.[15] The Lucianic group 19 108 82 93 127 has ἔναντι τοῦ βασιλέως. It is without doubt a literal rendering for לִפְנֵי of its *Vorlage* which here was similar to the MT. Nevertheless, one would expect to find ἐνώπιον τοῦ βασιλέως in the Lucianic text. It is difficult to determine whether the OG was similar to the KR (dative) or *L* (ἔναντι) here. I come to the conclusion that the dative of the KR apparently originates from the OG. In that case the KR reviser preserved the dative without noticing that there was לִפְנֵי in the *Vorlage*. It is very unlikely that this time there had been a different preposition, for instance לְ or אֶל in his Hebrew *Vorlage*, because ᶜmd + לִפְנֵי in Hebrew is an idiomatic expression meaning 'to serve, to stand before as a servant'.[16] That the KR followed the OG in having the dative is more plausible than to assume that the reviser, known for his strict adherence to the Hebrew *Vorlage*, which was very similar to the MT, would deliberately have corrected ἔναντι of the OG to a dative against his *Vorlage*. Instead ἔναντι in the *L* group for the dative of the OG is an approximation / correction according to the *Vorlage*, similar to the MT. On this occasion the reviser of the *L* group was not consistent in his preference for ἐνώπιον. The Hexaplaric text, however, shows ἐνώπιον τοῦ βασιλέως (247 = x), while A attests ἐνώπιον τῷ βασιλεῖ, the dative being very rare after ἐνώπιον. Possibly this Hexaplaric adjustment in A meant to add the preposition according to the MT but forgot to change the dative into the genitive.

---

[15] It must be mentioned that the dative often appears in relative clauses of the type אֲשֶׁר עָמַדְתִּי לְפָנָיו – ᾧ παρέστην ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (3 Reg 17:1, 18:15; 4 Reg 3:14, 5:16; similarly also in *L*). The Hebrew syntax has contaminated the Greek, because ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ is used for לְפָנָיו, even though it is redundant in Greek after the relative pronoun in the dative.

[16] Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, pp. 57-62.

In the following instances the KR section exceptionally attests ἔναντι κυρίου (2 Reg 21:9), ἀπέναντι κυρίου (4 Reg 16:14) or ἐναντίον κυρίου (4 Reg 19:14) instead of the stereotypical ἐνώπιον. These cases are so interesting that we discuss them one by one. In the case of ἐναντίον in the KR, the Lucianic recension = OG? (19 108 82 93 127) has ἐνώπιον (4 Reg 19:14), as could be expected. More surprisingly ἔναντι (ἐναντίον in AMN with a group of minuscules) attested in the KR (2 Reg 21:9) is shared by L (= OG?). In 4 Reg 16:14 L (= OG?) has ἐναντίον, but ἀπέναντι appears in the KR, presumably because of the altar (not a person) that was referred to as standing before Yahweh. Certainly, ἐνώπιον κυρίου was the KR stereotype for לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, but a confusion with purely local cases might have happened here. In contrast, it is very difficult to tell where the few ἔναντι and ἐναντίον cases come from into both the KR and L, where they are very exceptional. One possibility is that they are reminiscences by the translator (or inner Greek harmonizations) from the Pentateuch where they are the most common equivalents, and in particular when referring to Yahweh. The KR and L seem to be dependent on one another in 2 Reg 21:9 in particular, and behind the translation of this verse seems to be Num 25:4, even though ἔναντι does not appear just in this verse.[17] Another alternative might be to assume that ἐναντίον, ἔναντι and ἀπέναντι all represent the lost Old Greek version of these sections, which as a translation would have been rather similar to the books of the Pentateuch. In that case, however, the Old Greek of the Kaíge and of the Non-Kaíge sections would have been different in their translation technique because ἐναντίον, ἔναντι and ἀπέναντι do not appear in the Old Greek sections as renderings of לִפְנֵי at all.[18] For the use of ἐναντίον in 4 Reg 19:14 (KR) there is another more plausible reason, namely the harmonization with the parallel passage in Isa 37:14. It was perhaps a later inner Greek harmonization that did not affect L (and the OG?), for L attests ἐνώπιον.

The examples are as follows:

---

[17] The instance 2 Reg 21:9 is interesting because it contains a rare verb yqꜥ hi. 'to hang' which also occurs in Num 25:4, but ἔναντι κυρίου does not appear in that verse in Numbers, only ἀπέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου does. In any case, ἔναντι κυρίου here could originate from Numbers, where it is the stereotype for לִפְנֵי יְהוָה. Furthermore, the verbs are rendered in different ways: ἐξηλίασαν 'to hang in the sun' (2 Reg 21:9) and παραδειγμάτισον (Num 25:4). The examples are as follows: καὶ παραδειγμάτισον αὐτοὺς κυρίῳ ἀπέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου (Num 25:4) and καὶ ἐξηλίασαν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἔναντι κυρίου (2 Reg 21:9).

[18] Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, pp. 14-15.

2 Reg 21:9 וַיַּקְשִׁיעֵם בָּהָר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה – καὶ ἐξηλίασαν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἔναντι κυρίου (L ἔναντι)

4 Reg 16:14 וְאֵת הַמִּזְבֵּחַ הַנְּחֹשֶׁת אֲשֶׁר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה – καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χαλκοῦν τὸ ἀπέναντι κυρίου (L ἐναντίον)

4 Reg 19:14 וַיִּפְרְשֵׂהוּ חִזְקִיָּהוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה – καὶ ἀνέπτυξεν αὐτὰ Εζεκιας ἐναντίον κυρίου (L ἐνώπιον)

(cf. Isa 37:14 וַיִּפְרְשֵׂהוּ חִזְקִיָּהוּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה – καὶ ἤνοιξεν αὐτὸ ἐναντίον κυρίου.)

Three times a local לִפְנֵי referring to living beings is rendered by ἔμπροσθεν (2 Reg 10:15,19 OG sections and 20:8 KR). All the examples are found in 2 Reg, none in 1 or 3-4 Reg. To give an example: 2 Reg 10:15 וַיַּרְא אֲרָם כִּי נִגַּף לִפְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל – καὶ εἶδεν Συρία ὅτι ἔπταισεν ἔμπροσθεν Ισραηλ. In these cases the *L* group has ἐνώπιον as could be expected, but 2 Reg 20:8 is an exception. It attests κατὰ πρόσωπον which makes the meaning of the rendering crystal clear while ἔμπροσθεν is ambiguous.[19] The usual rendering ἐνώπιον would also have suited well. Why the *L* group chose exactly κατὰ πρόσωπον instead of ἐνώπιον is hard to explain. See also the κατὰ πρόσωπον cases below. This instance is as follows:

2 Reg 20:8 וַעֲמָשָׂא בָא לִפְנֵיהֶם – καὶ Αμεσσαι εἰσῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν (L κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν). In its context it must mean: 'Amasa came to (meet) them', not 'Amasa came before / ahead of them'.

Finally, there appears a small group of instances having not the stereotype ἐνώπιον, but a rendering formed with the aid of the noun πρόσωπον, such as πρὸ προσώπου in 3 Reg 12:8 וַיִּוָּעַץ אֶת־הַיְלָדִים אֲשֶׁר גָּדְלוּ אִתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר הָעֹמְדִים לְפָנָיו: – καὶ συνεβουλεύσατο μετὰ τῶν παιδαρίων τῶν ἐκτραφέντων μετ' αὐτοῦ τῶν παρεστηκότων πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ. The rendering πρὸ προσώπου in metaphorical local usage referring to persons is very rare and strange in 3 Reigns, which should belong to an Old Greek section. The same structure τῶν παρεστηκότων πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ is repeated in 3 Reg 12:10 against the MT. The *L* group has the same barbaric Hebraistic equivalent in these two cases, although the *L* text is presumed to value good Greek style. In addition to these two cases, πρὸ προσώπου occurs in 3 Reg 12:30 and reads as follows: וַיֵּלְכוּ הָעָם לִפְנֵי הָאֶחָד עַד־דָּן – καὶ ἐπορεύετο ὁ λαὸς πρὸ προσώπου τῆς μιᾶς ἕως Δαν. In its context, this should mean something like 'for the people went (to worship) before the one as far as Dan', even though in the other books

---

[19] Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, p. 35.

of the LXX this phrase πορεύεσθαι πρὸ προσώπου c. gen. usually means 'to go ahead of' (e.g. Amos 9:4 and Hab 3:5) as well as προπο-ρεύεσθαι πρὸ προσώπου c. gen. (e.g. Exod 32:34 and Deut 1:30). The *L* group has an addition here correcting the evident mistake of the MT and OG by adding καὶ πρὸ προσώπου τῆς ἄλλης εἰς Βαιθηλ and thus show-ing two parallel πρὸ προσώπου expressions. It is very hard to explain why as Hebraistic a rendering as πρὸ προσώπου could ever be used in the OG sections in the LXX and also in the *L* group.[20] This rendering is not even found in the literally rendered KR sections, but surely a few times also in Exodus and Numbers, while most examples of this rendering are to be found in Deuteronomy, Minor Prophets and Ezekiel.[21] Either both the original translator and the reviser behind the *L* group were not con-sistent in their renditions or we must suppose that these equivalents are due to a later inner Greek revising of the OG sections sporadically here and there in the spirit of the predecessors of Aquila.[22] For this reviser the stereotype ἐνώπιον was not literal enough, and his barbaric and slavish πρὸ προσώπου crept into the *L* text as well.

A literal equivalent that also occurs for לִפְנֵי referring to living beings is κατὰ πρόσωπον, which otherwise is a stereotype for לִפְנֵי referring to objects and things, in 3 Reg in particular.[23] It is good Greek also in refer-ring to living beings. It is used seven times altogether in referring to living beings in 1-4 Reg (three instances in OG and four in KR): 1 Reg 9:12, 14:13, 16:8; 2 Reg 14:33, 19:8(9); 3 Reg 1:23; 4 Reg 10:4. In three cases the *L* group has the same equivalent κατὰ πρόσωπον as the OG and KR (1 Reg 14:13, 16:8 and 4 Reg 10:4), in three instances it is ἐνώπιον in *L* (= OG?), but κατὰ πρόσωπον in KR (2 Reg 14:33, 19:6[9], and 3 Reg 1:23), and once it is πρὸ προσώπου in *L* against κατὰ πρόσ-ωπον in OG (1 Reg 9:12). The variation between κατὰ πρόσωπον and ἐνώπιον demonstrates that neither the OG translator nor the *L* reviser was consistent in using their stereotype ἐνώπιον. As the divergent rendition κατὰ πρόσωπον is more common in the KR than in OG and *L*, it appar-ently suited the KR's recensional principles of literal/slavish translating

---

[20] For πρὸ προσώπου see Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, pp. 30-31, 328.

[21] Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, pp. 74-75.

[22] Joseph Reider and Nigel Turner, *An Index to Aquila* (VTSup 12; Leiden, 1966), p. 203. They give as an example 2 Reg 6:14, where the KR section has ἐνώπιον. However, according to Kyösti Hyvärinen, εἰς πρόσωπον is the most common equivalent of לִפְנֵי used by Aquila. Kyösti Hyvärinen, *Die Übersetzung von Aquila* (ConBot; Lund, 1977), pp. 44-45.

[23] Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, pp. 72-73.

better. The instance 1 Reg 9:12 is illuminative. A semantic correction πρὸ προσώπου for OG's κατὰ πρόσωπον witnesses that the *L* reviser read the context very carefully.[24] Saul and his servant arrived at a village and asked whether the seer (Samuel) was at home. The girls' reply if translated with κατὰ πρόσωπον implies that Samuel is in front of them, so close, that he can be seen. Instead, πρὸ προσώπου means that Samuel is somewhere ahead of them and therefore they must hurry to reach him before the sacrificial feast begins. The idea of hurrying is missing in the OG, but appears in *L* and in the MT: 1 Reg 9:12 יֵשׁ הִנֵּה לְפָנֶיךָ מַהֵר כִּי עַתָּה הַיּוֹם בָּא לָעִיר – ἔστιν, ἰδοὺ κατὰ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν. νῦν διὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἥκει εἰς τὴν πόλιν (OG); ἔστιν, ἰδοὺ πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν. ταχύνον ὅτι νῦν ἥκει εἰς τὴν πόλιν διὰ τὴν ἡμέραν (*L*).

   In two instances local לְפָנֵי referring to living beings is rendered by ἐκ προσώπου or ἀπὸ προσώπου in 1-4 Reg, namely in 1 Reg 4:17 and 4 Reg 14:12. The *Vorlage* had either לְפָנֵי or מִלְּפָנֵי or מִפְּנֵי in these cases.

> 1 Reg 4:17 נָס יִשְׂרָאֵל לִפְנֵי פְלִשְׁתִּים – πέφευγεν ἀνὴρ Ισραηλ ἐκ προσ-ώπου ἀλλοφύλων (*L* ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν ἀλλοφύλων).

The use of the perfect tense is decisive in regard to the preposition in this instance. With the perfect tense only ἐκ προσώπου or ἀπὸ προσώπου is suitable, because the perfect is resultative denoting the final result of the event. The Israelites have run away (and are run-off) from before the Philistines. If the translator had described that the Israelites were fleeing before the Philistines, then ἔμπροσθεν, for instance, would have been a suitable counterpart, being the most common rendering for intermediate לְפָנֵי denoting '(going) ahead of' in 1 Reg.[25] Thus, it seems that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG and of *L* both read לְפָנֵי, even though after the verb *nus* 'to flee' מִפְּנֵי (as some manuscripts read here) and מִלְּפָנֵי would also have been linguistically possible (cf. Jdg 9:40 A and B, Jon 1:10). In the final analysis, the reading of the *Vorlage,* however, remains uncertain.

> 4 Reg 14:12 וַיִּנָּגֶף יְהוּדָה לִפְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל – καὶ ἔπταισεν Ιουδας ἀπὸ προσ-ώπου Ισραηλ (*L* ἐνώπιον).

In the MT nifᶜal *ngp* + לְפָנֵי 'to be smitten in front of, to be smitten by' forms a passive construction with an agent.[26] The translator has attempted

---

[24] A similar example of reading the context carefully by the *L* group was 2 Reg 20:8 above.

[25] Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, pp. 74-76.

[26] Raija Sollamo, 'The Passive with an Agent in Biblical Hebrew and its Rendering in the Septuagint', in Martin F.J. Baasten and Wido Th. van Peursen (eds.), *Hamlet on a Hill*.

to render it with an intransitive verb πταίω 'to stumble', and because of the agent he has chosen ἀπὸ προσώπου for ἐνώπιον, which is used in *L* and several times in 1-3 Reg where, as we have seen, ἔμπροσθεν also appears.[27] In principle the *Vorlage* could have had either לִפְנֵי or מִלִּפְנֵי or מִפְּנֵי but the *L* group confirms that at least its Hebrew *Vorlage* attested לִפְנֵי. Furthermore, this Hebrew idiom nifᶜal *ngp* + לִפְנֵי occurred expressly with לִפְנֵי.

RENDERINGS OF LOCAL לִפְנֵי REFERRING TO SOMETHING OTHER THAN A LIVING BEING

In this category where the referent is not a living being the stereotype rendering is κατὰ πρόσωπον in 3 Reigns in all its seven occurrences (3 Reg 3:15*bis*, 6:17/19, 6:21, 8:22, 8:31, and 8:64).[28] In the other books of Reigns the number of instances is very low, κατὰ πρόσωπον occurring only in 4 Reg 11:18. Once ἀπέναντι, which is one of the usual equivalents for לִפְנֵי in this category, occurs in 4 Reg 19:26. Therefore it is quite understandable that 1 Reigns, for instance, does not distinguish these cases from those referring to living beings and accordingly, it uses the stereotype rendering of those cases (namely ἐνώπιον) in this category as well (1 Reg 5:3 and 5:4). The equivalent ἐνώπιον also occurs once in 4 Reg 18:22.

Table 2. Renderings of local לִפְנֵי referring to something other than a living being in the OG and KR sections

		κατὰ πρόσωπον	other renderings
OG	α	–	2
	ββ	–	–
	γγ	7	–
KR	βγ	–	–
	γδ	1	2
		8	4

Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday (OLA 118; Leuven, 2003), pp. 617-629, esp. 624.

[27] Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, p. 52.
[28] Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, pp. 72-73.

In these instances the *L* group usually follows LXX[B] both in the OG and KR sections, e.g. in 3 Reg 3:15 the *Vorlage* of the LXX has an addition which is shared by *L*:

> 3 Reg 3:15 וַיַּעֲמֹד לִפְנֵי אֲרוֹן בְּרִית־אֲדֹנָי וַיַּעַל עֹלוֹת – καὶ ἔστη κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ κατὰ πρόσωπον κιβωτοῦ δια-θήκης κυρίου ἐν Σιων καὶ ἀνήγαγεν ὁλοκαυτώσεις (*L* otherwise similar, but κιβωτοῦ has the definite article).

There appear, however, a few exceptions. In 3 Reg 6:17-21 the LXX is shorter than the MT and *L*, but the equivalent of לִפְנֵי is κατὰ πρόσωπον in the *L* text as in the corresponding OG section. In the other instances enumerated above, LXX[B] and the *L* group do not differ as far as the equivalent of לִפְנֵי and its near context are concerned, with only one exception, namely

> 4 Reg 11:18 וְאֵת מַתָּן כֹּהֵן הַבַּעַל הָרְגוּ לִפְנֵי הַמִּזְבְּחוֹת – καὶ τὸν Ματθαν τὸν ἱερέα τοῦ Βααλ ἀπέκτειναν κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν θυσιαστηρίων (*L*: πρὸ προσώπου τῶν θυσιαστηρίων).

This is again an example of the unexpected situation that the KR section shows a good Greek rendering κατὰ πρόσωπον referring to the altars (not a living being), whereas the *L* group (19 108 82 93 127) attests a literal and Hebraistic counterpart πρὸ προσώπου.

RENDERINGS OF INTERMEDIATE לִפְנֵי DENOTING '(GOING) AHEAD OF' AND RENDERINGS OF TEMPORAL לִפְנֵי

In these two categories of meaning, namely the intermediate category of לִפְנֵי denoting '(going) ahead of' and the category of temporal לִפְנֵי, the semipreposition לִפְנֵי is mostly translated by ἔμπροσθεν in 1-4 Reg both in the OG and KR sections. There appear only six exceptions, all of them in the OG sections.

Table 3. Renderings of intermediate and temporal לִפְנֵי in the OG and KR sections

		ἔμπροσθεν	other renderings
OG	α	10	3
	ββ	3	2
	γγ	6	1
KR	βγ	4	–
	γδ	6	–
		29	6

In the category of intermediate לִפְנֵי there are only a few exceptions to the dominance of ἔμπροσθεν (20 instances), such as πρὸ προσώπου in 1 Reg 18:16 and ἐνώπιον in 3 Reg 19:11, and a genitive after a verb with prefix προ- in 1 Reg 8:11 and 1 Reg 17:7. For temporal לִפְנֵי two exceptional renderings appear in clauses where לִפְנֵי precedes an *infinitivus constructus* (2 Reg 3:13 and 3:35).

1 Reg 18:16 כִּי־הוּא יֹצֵא וָבָא לִפְנֵיהֶם – ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐξεπορεύετο καὶ εἰσεπορεύετο πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ λαοῦ (L πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ λαοῦ). Our first example, 1 Reg 18:16, is difficult to explain. Again in an OG section we have a Hebraistic πρὸ προσώπου in the style of the predecessors of Aquila.

3 Reg 19:11 וְרוּחַ גְּדוֹלָה וְחָזָק מְפָרֵק הָרִים וּמְשַׁבֵּר סְלָעִים לִפְנֵי יְהוָה – καὶ πνεῦμα μέγα κραταιὸν διαλῦον ὄρη καὶ συντρίβον πέτρας ἐνώπιον κυρίου (L ἐνώπιον κυρίου). This instance is easier to interpret. The translator apparently did not realize that the clause was describing a movement: the Lord should pass by, and there occurred natural phenomena that passed by before the Lord came. The translator imagined that the Lord was standing still and these phenomena were played out in front of him, even though he himself was not to be seen. With such an understanding the stereotype ἐνώπιον was very fitting.

1Reg 8:11 וְרָצוּ לִפְנֵי מֶרְכַּבְתּוֹ – καὶ προτρέχοντας τῶν ἁρμάτων αὐτοῦ (L καὶ προτρέχοντας τῶν ἁρμάτων αὐτοῦ). The example attests the verb προτρέχω with a genitive in keeping with good Greek practice and idiom. Of course, it is a very free and exceptional rendering.

1 Reg 17:7 וְנֹשֵׂא הַצִּנָּה הֹלֵךְ לְפָנָיו – καὶ ὁ αἴρων τὰ ὅπλα αὐτοῦ προεπορεύετο αὐτοῦ (L: προεπορεύετο αὐτοῦ ἔμπροσθεν [108 554 127 93], προεπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν [82], προεπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ [19]). The rendering consisting of the prefix προ- and a genitive is idiomatic Greek. The *L* group corrects the rendering because it does not seem to contain an equivalent for לִפְנֵי.[29] The equivalent ἔμπροσθεν was added after αὐτοῦ and in this way a double reading was created. The added preposition was quite unnecessary in Greek, but it fulfilled the needs of literal rendering of לִפְנֵי. Singular *L* witnesses improved the Greek, one (82) by omitting αὐτοῦ, the other (19) by changing the word order so that ἔμπροσθεν was moved before αὐτοῦ. This variation could also originate from a common Greek parent text where ἔμπροσθεν was corrected above αὐτοῦ between the lines. Then the different copyists understood this correction in different ways. According to 82 ἔμπροσθεν should replace αὐτοῦ, while the other copyists assumed that

---

[29] It is worth noting that the opposite revision occurs at times as well, in that ἔμπροσθεν of the KR (LXX^B) is changed to the prefix προ + a genitive in the *L* group, e.g. 3 Reg 1:5 וַחֲמִשִּׁים אִישׁ רָצִים לְפָנָיו – καὶ πεντήκοντα ἄνδρας παρατρέχειν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ while the *L* group (= OG?) has καὶ πεντήκοντα ἄνδρας προτρέχοντας αὐτοῦ (αὐτω 19).

ἔμπροσθεν should be added before or after αὐτοῦ. In this procedure the double reading was deleted and a stereotyped rendering for intermediate לִפְנֵי was introduced: προεπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ.

There remain two very free renderings or paraphrases for לִפְנֵי and an *infinitivus constructus*:

> 2 Reg 3:13 לֹא־תִרְאֶה אֶת־פָּנַי כִּי| אִם־לִפְנֵי הֱבִיאֲךָ אֵת מִיכַל בַּת־שָׁאוּל בְּבֹאֶךָ
> לִרְאוֹת אֶת־פָּנָ – οὐκ ὄψει τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἐὰν μὴ ἀγάγῃς τὴν
> Μελχολ θυγατέρα Σαουλ παραγινομένου σου ἰδεῖν τὸ πρόσωπόν
> μου (*L*: almost the same).
>
> 2 Reg 3:35 כִּי אִם־לִפְנֵי בוֹא־הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ אֶטְעַם־לֶחֶם – ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ δύῃ ὁ
> ἥλιος οὐ μὴ γεύσωμαι ἄρτου (*L*: almost the same). These two
> examples do not offer any significant changes in *L*. The reason was
> perhaps that the rendering of the sentence was so free throughout that
> it was not possible to affect one detail without destroying the meaning
> of the whole.

CONCLUSIONS

What did we learn from this treatise? First, a number of divergent renderings in 1-4 Reigns have their origin in a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the Masoretic text. The existence of different Hebrew *Vorlagen* is confirmed by the Qumran manuscripts, especially 4QSamᵃ. A splendid example is 1 Reg 2:28 where לִפְנֵי is missing in 4QSamᵃ and in the *Vorlage* of the OG (LXXᴮ), but is found in the MT and *L* text. The Lucianic group agrees at times more with the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint and at times more with the Masoretic text, and *L* often corrects the Septuagint translation according to its different *Vorlage* closer to the MT. This is true in particular in such cases where LXXᴮ attests a shorter text than the MT (e.g. 1 Reg 2:28, 2 Reg 7:26, 3 Reg 6:17-21, 3 Reg 12:30, 4 Reg 19:15). Otherwise (i.e. in instances where the *Vorlage* of *L* did not differ from the MT or from the *Vorlage* of LXXᴮ), the *L* group mostly uses for לִפְנֵי the same stereotype equivalent ἐνώπιον and the main divergent renderings (such as κατὰ πρόσωπον mostly referring to something other than a living being and ἔμπροσθεν mostly for intermediate and temporal לִפְנֵי) as LXXᴮ. Even though these are the general lines, there occur many differences in the equivalents of לִפְנֵי between the *L* text and LXXᴮ both in the OG and KR sections.

   How should we evaluate the differences between the *L* text and LXXᴮ that seem to be changes or corrections? The present treatise and its restricted number of instances do not suffice for creating a trustworthy

analysis of the whole picture. Nevertheless, a few interesting minor observations can be presented. Both LXX^B and the *L* text contain such divergent renderings that do not seem to have any logic. Why is, for instance, local לְפְנֵי referring to living beings also rendered sporadically with other equivalents than the stereotype ἐνώπιον? A few instances are occasional free renderings, so idiomatic in the Greek context that it is a good excuse for not using the stereotype (e.g. dative in 1 Reg 1:19 in the OG and *L*, regardless of whether the *Vorlage* had לְפְנֵי or לְ). Some of the free renderings are shared by *L*. A major part of the renderings where the stereotype is not used are of such a nature that the stereotype could well have been utilized. The appearances of the common Pentateuchal translations ἐναντίον κυρίου (*L* ἐνώπιον), ἔναντι κυρίου (*L* similar) and ἀπέναντι κυρίου (*L* ἔναντι) in the KR in 4 Reg 19:14, 2 Reg 21:9 and 4 Reg 16:14 offer a challenge to the researcher of translation technique. The likely explanation is that neither the translator nor the *L* reviser was consistent in his activity. These are probably not original Old Greek readings in the midst of the KR section, but rather they are harmonizations with the Greek Pentateuch or the LXX of Isaiah, conducted by the translator or a later reviser.

One more dilemma is the mysterious πρὸ προσώπου for local לְפְנֵי referring to living beings and for intermediate and temporal לְפְנֵי. The rendering is a very slavish one and it is not found anywhere in Koiné literature outside translation Greek. Therefore it can be called Hebraistic. The first surprise is that it is never used in the KR sections as an equivalent of לְפְנֵי, even though these sections should represent a more literal translation technique than the OG sections. On the contrary, it actually is used in the OG sections and in the *L* text, which should be freer translations (OG sections) or better Greek (*L*). The simplest explanation is that πρὸ προσώπου is due to a later incomplete and inconsistent revision of the Greek translation in the spirit of the forerunners of Aquila. The results of this revision also affected the *L* text but there the usage of πρὸ προσώπου was somewhat more extensive than in the OG sections. The instance of 4 Reg 11:18 is illuminating: the KR has a good Greek rendering κατὰ πρόσωπον, while the *L* text attests πρὸ προσώπου: ἀπέκτειναν κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν θυσιαστηρίων (*L*: πρὸ προσώπου τῶν θυσιαστηρίων). This revision, which favours the equivalent πρὸ προσώπου, is also found in some other books of the LXX.

The *L* reviser read his Greek text very carefully. Twice he corrected the text in such a way that the semantic meaning of the clause became more clear for the Greek reader (1 Reg 9:12 and 2 Reg 20:8). The *L* text

has a few double renderings; one is 3 Reg 8:28 προσεύχεται ἐνώπιόν
σου πρὸς σὲ (OG and *L*) and another is 1 Reg 17:7 *L*: προεπορεύετο
αὐτοῦ ἔμπροσθεν in 108 554 127 93 (OG: προεπορεύετο αὐτοῦ). Both
cases originally had a free rendering for לִפְנֵי but later it was replaced with
a more literal equivalent, and for some reason (by accident or by copying
error) the original and the corrected equivalent both remained in the text
one after another. Now and then *L* seems to improve the Greek language,
for instance in 3 Reg 1:5 וַחֲמִשִּׁים אִישׁ רָצִים לְפָנָיו – καὶ πεντήκοντα
ἄνδρας παρατρέχειν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ while the *L* group (= OG?) has
καὶ πεντήκοντα ἄνδρας προτρέχοντας αὐτοῦ (αὐτω 19). The question
arises whether *L* here corrects the KR section or represents the lost OG.
The *L* group seems to take its freest renderings from the OG (including
a dative in 1 Reg 1:19). Its corrections usually go in a more literal direc-
tion according to its Hebrew *Vorlage*.