10. The Study of Translation Technique

Raija Sollamo

Translation technique study has established itself as a significant approach to the study of the Septuagint. This chapter first defines the term and summarizes its development. Second, it describes translation technique as a method of inquiry that opens up the rich world of the Septuagint by considering it as a translation that must be appreciated in its own right. Third, it demonstrates the essential contribution of translation technique studies to such specialized fields as the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, the study of Septuagint syntax, and the theology of the translators. Fourth, it presents a sample of some of the most important results produced by translation technique studies.

1. The Term and Its History

The study of translation technique is one of the main fields of modern Septuagint research. The term translation technique was introduced by Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen in his doctoral thesis, *Die Textformen des Richterbuches* (1951), in which, following the advice of his advisor, Gillis Gerleman of the University of Lund, Sweden,[1] he compared the A- and B-texts of Judges, noting differences in the translations. To describe his approach he not only used such terms as *"übersetzungstechnische Eigenheiten,"*[2] *"die übersetzungstechnische Übereinstimmung der verschiedenen Textformen,"*[3] and *"übersetzungstechnische Untersuchung,"*[4] but also *"Übersetzungstechnik."*[5] In his second book, *Der Charakter der asterisierten Zusätze in der Septuaginta* (1959), Soisalon-Soininen examined the additions that Origen made to the Septuagint column of his Hexapla on the basis of the longer Hebrew *Vorlage* at his disposal.[6] However, it was in his monograph *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (1965)[7] that Soisalon-Soininen de-

1. For more details, see R. Sollamo, "The origins of LXX Studies in Finland" *SJOT* 10 (1996), 159-168.
2. I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Textformen der Septuaginta-Übersetzung des Richterbuches* (AASF Series B 72.1), Helsinki 1951, 14.
3. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Textformen*, 23.
4. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Textformen*, 25. He calls his doctoral thesis "a translation technical study".
5. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Textformen*, 24. This appears to be the first time he used the term "translation technique" in his scholarly production. At least one reviewer saw the main merit of the book as consisting of his materials and observations on translation technique. See S. Segert, "Semitistische Marginalien I" *ArOr* 29 (1961), 87-89.
6. I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Der Charakter der asterisierten Zusätze in der Septuaginta* (AASF Series B 114), Helsinki 1959, 46-160.
7. I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*. (AASF Series B 132.1), Helsinki 1965.

fined, for the first time, the term "translation technique" *("Übersetzungstechnik")* as a new methodological approach to the Septuagint.[8] This seminal volume became the standard international reference work for the study of translation technique. Accordingly, Soisalon-Soininen deserves to be known as the founder of the study of translation technique in modern Septuagint research. Of course, Septuagint Greek and translation have been studied by numerous scholars throughout the centuries, but what Soisalon-Soininen accomplished was a methodological breakthrough.

Translation technique was, for Soisalon-Soininen, both a research object and a research method. For him, the two could not be separated. Soisalon-Soininen's research interest was primarily focused on the study of Septuagint syntax.[9] He soon realized however that the syntax of a translation cannot be properly analyzed without considering the syntax of the source language, the particularities of the target language, and the translator's relation to both. Indeed, how a translator translated seemed to depend on the degree to which he felt obliged to follow the wording of his source text, i.e., the Hebrew *Vorlage* he was using. This appeared to be the main reason for differences between Septuagint syntax and Greek syntax as manifested in contemporary original Greek literature. To be sure, the Greek competence of the translators varied considerably. Soisalon-Soininen emphasized the importance of comparing different translations and different translators, taking the source text as a point of departure; for only those renderings that correspond to the same Hebrew expressions, grammatical forms, or syntactical constructions can shed light on translation technique. Only in this way was it possible to demonstrate true differences in translation technique.

The study of translation technique seeks to describe how translators customarily work when they translate Hebrew into Greek. Soisalon-Soininen was fully aware that translators did not randomly select equivalents, but, on the contrary, instinctively chose identical renderings in similar cases with a high degree of consistency,[10] a phenomenon that had nothing to do with modern computers executing predetermined program codes. On the other hand, Septuagint translators sporadically rendered some Hebrew constructions very freely, using idiomatic Greek expressions in a way that contrasted with their customary literalism. A certain degree of variation was, of course, occasioned by context and particularity. Moreover, the degree of constancy varied to a certain extent from one individual to another. Soisalon-Soininen was convinced that the translator was not aware of using a translation technique. Indeed, the presence of a translation technique can only be shown by examining the final product, the translation.

The translation equivalent pairs that the study of translation technique reveals in a given translation reflect the way the translator's mind worked. Cognitive scientists could perhaps explain these patterns as the result of the architecture of the human

8. The term *"Übersetzungstechnik"* possibly derived from Peter Katz (Walters), whom Soisalon-Soininen had consulted in Britain after the war. Katz's article "Zur Übersetzungstechnik der Septuaginta" appeared in 1956 (*WO* II, 267-273).

9. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive*, 12-15.

10. I. Soisalon-Soininen, "Methodologische Fragen der Erforschung der Septuaginta-Syntax" in: I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (edited by A. Aejmelaeus and R. Sollamo, AASF B, 237), Helsinki 1987, 40-52.

brain. But it is important to note that Soisalon-Soininen only applied his methods to the study of the Septuagint, a corpus translated in Alexandria during the last centuries BCE. Today, translation has been revolutionized by the development of new tools (lexica, concordances, computers, etc.) and contemporary translation studies now shift the focus from the customary study of translation technique to identifying translation universals common to all translations regardless of the source or target languages.[11]

2. The Method

Since the pioneering studies of Soisalon-Soininen, translation technique study has been associated with the Septuagint school at the University of Helsinki, and rightly so, since his disciples (Raija Sollamo and Anneli Aejmelaeus) and their students (Anssi Voitila and Seppo Sipilä) have continued developing this methodological approach. Increasingly however, scholars around the world have adopted the method, applying its procedures to their own work (Jan Joosten, Arie van der Kooij, Takamitsu Muraoka, Staffan Olofsson, Emanuel Tov, to name but a few).[12] Translation technique study presents three principal advantages: it makes it possible to treat the Septuagint as a translation, to evaluate the quality of Septuagint Greek, and to characterize the translations. I will discuss each of these points in turn.

2.1 The Septuagint as Translation

Because translation technique study takes seriously the fact that the Septuagint is a translation, the source text and language form its point of departure. Without this methodological foundation, it would be impossible to correctly understand how the translators worked. Translation technique was originally developed in order to further the study of Septuagint syntax. It is therefore better suited to syntactical analysis than to lexical or phonological studies. It can however be used for lexicographical studies if context and semantics are taken into account in such a way that different fields of meaning are considered. It is important to bear in mind that the purpose of translation

---

11. R. Sollamo, "Translation Technique and Translation Studies: The Problem of Translation Universals" in: M. K. H. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 55), Atlanta, GA 2008, 339-351; A. Chestermann, "Hypotheses about Translation Universals" in: G. Hansen / K. Malmkjaer / D. Gile (eds.), *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies*, Amsterdam 2004, 1-13; and G. Toury, "Probabilistic Explanations in Translation Studies: Welcome as They Are, Would They Qualify as Universals?" in: A. Mauranen / P. Kujanmäki (eds.), *Translation Universals: Do They Exist?*, Amsterdam 2004, 15-32.
12. For the study of translation technique see E. Tov, "The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present" in: C. E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for the Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Atlanta, GA 1987, 337-359; and B. Lemmelijn, "Two Methodological Trails in Recent Studies on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint" in: R. Sollamo / S. Sipilä (eds.), *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, Helsinki/Göttingen 2001, 43-63.

technique study is not to compile statistics on translation equivalents, but to identify variant renderings and propose explanations for these choices. It is akin to being a detective on the trail of the Septuagint translators, discovering how they chose their translation equivalents.[13] The aim is not to criticize them, but to understand the mental processes that generated the renderings.

Knowledge of the target language is indispensable for understanding how the translators interpreted their *Vorlage*. The most promising Hebrew expressions or constructions for translation technical investigation are those that diverge significantly from Greek language and idiom and, in addition, occur with great frequency. In such cases, the translation technical differences between translators come more clearly to the fore. Randomly selected materials do not constitute a sufficiently solid basis for the analysis of translation technique. If one simply examined a chapter or two here and there, the results could be misleading, as the occurrences of given equivalents are not necessarily distributed evenly throughout an entire book. It is therefore necessary to examine all the occurrences of different equivalents for relevant Hebrew constructions and locutions in a given book before proposing explanations for the choices made by the translator.

Translation technical scholars begin by classifying all relevant occurrences into appropriate syntactic or semantic categories. Of course, the translator did not proceed in such a systematic way. Instead, his language competence instinctively instructed him how to translate Hebrew expressions, constructions, or words belonging to these categories. Frequently these categories are not evenly represented. In my study of the renderings of the semiprepositions in the Septuagint, I would not have noticed that, from the point of view of the Greek, the preposition לִפְנֵי constituted a distinct category when used to refer to objects or places had I not examined all the books of the Septuagint.[14] Only in this way was I able to accumulate enough material to detect this special group. Since constant equivalents such as ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον, and ἔναντι were used only to refer to humans and other living beings, in the sense "in the presence of, before," other equivalents were needed when referring to objects and places in front of which something or someone was placed or situated. The instances of לִפְנֵי in a temporal sense also formed a special category in Greek, because most of the locative equivalents could not be used to connate a temporal meaning.

For a translation technical study, לִפְנֵי and its Greek equivalents provided particularly appropriate materials not only because translators had a number of equivalents from which to choose, ranging from slavish to literal to free (e. g., πρὸ προσώπου, κατὰ πρόσωπον, ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον, ἔναντι, κατέναντι, ἀπέναντι, ἔμπροσθεν, πρό, πρότερος, πρίν [ἤ], πρός + accusative or dative, παρά + dative, etc.), but also because the preposition לִפְנֵי was used in a variety of semantic fields and after verbs in such a way that the verbal rection and preverbs in Greek became interesting (e. g., προσκυνοῦσιν τῷ κυρίῳ 1 Sam 1:19, προπορεύεται πρότερος + genitive Deut 1:33). As for etymology and grammar, the preposition alternated between a prepositional

---

13. A. Aejmelaeus, On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays (CBET 50), Leuven 2007.
14. R. Sollamo, *Renderings of the Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF, Diss. Hum. Litt. 19), Helsinki 1979, 13-80.

metaphoric phrase and a new grammaticalized preposition. The most slavish translators preserved the noun πρόσωπον in their equivalents, while the literal translators looked for a more suitable Greek expression, using analogical structures such as ἐνώπιον, which consists of the preposition ἐν and the root -ώπ-, the same root as in the middle of πρόσ-ωπ-ον. The prepositions ἐναντίον, ἔναντι, and ἔμπροσθεν also represent attempts toward an analogical structure. The freest translations, which appeared sporadically, used ordinary Greek prepositions or, more simply, the case taken by the preceding verb. This variation in Greek renderings shows that the translators understood לִפְנֵי differently according to the textual circumstances and context.

Generally speaking, each translator had a favorite equivalent, but to a certain extent his renderings varied from case to case. Translations can be categorized as slavish or literal or free depending on which types of renderings predominate in a given case. Still, even in books where highly slavish equivalents prevail, very free renderings occasionally appear.

2.2 The Quality of Septuagint Greek

Translation technique study makes it possible to evaluate the quality of the Greek language used in the Septuagint. This is particularly important because the translators conceived of their task in different ways. Some strive for as literal a translation as possible; others favor idiomatic language and good Greek style as a means of remaining faithful to the original; still others paraphrase continuously. Often it is not easy to determine if the expressions produced by the translator are good Greek or not. In the case of לִפְנֵי, the equivalent πρὸ προσώπου would seem to be understandable Greek: the preposition πρό takes a genitive and the expression therefore means "before the face of." However, a comparison with contemporary Greek documents showed that this locution was never used in non-translational koine literature or in Ptolemaic papyri or inscriptions. I was therefore able to identify it as a Hebraism invented by the translators. All the other equivalents of לִפְנֵי can be found in Greek sources, although they are infrequent. For instance, before it was raised to a new literary level by the Septuagint translators, ἐνώπιον was only attested in Egyptian papyri. The preposition ἐναντίον, which belongs to a literary register, was attested not only in Ptolemaic papyri and inscriptions but also in Polybius' Histories.[15] In general, the most slavish translations are written in Hebraistic or poor Greek, but this is not automatically the case: κατὰ πρόσωπον was good Greek, even though it was mostly used in Greek sources as an independent adverbial, not as a prepositional construction followed by a genitive.

The use of prepositions and prepositional phrases taken from Greek literature does not, by itself, constitute a criterion of the quality of the Greek in Septuagint books. Rather, their frequency in the translation must be compared with their frequency in original Greek sources. In the case of semiprepositions, frequencies vary significantly. While such prepositions as ἐνώπιον, ἐναντίον, and ἔναντι occur infrequently in Greek sources, they abound in the translated Greek of the Septuagint. This disproportion is due to the practice of imitating Hebrew constructions and locutions

---

15. R. Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 328, 311-317.

that gave the Septuagint Greek a Hebraistic flavor. In addition, the overrepresentation of certain expressions restricts the possibility of genuine Greek idioms gaining ground in the translation. Another enlightening example is the infrequent use of the verb ἔχειν in the Septuagint.[16] This anomaly can be explained by the absence of a corresponding verb in Hebrew. Instead, the Septuagint translators used the verb εἶναι with a dative, imitating the Hebrew construction הָיָה + לְ.

Let us take another example of the difficulty of recognizing what is idiomatic Greek and what is not. It is undeniable that the repetition of pronominal genitives, either before or after the coordinate items, is characteristic of Hebraistic translation Greek. But in order to go beyond this observation it is necessary to know where the pronominal genitive is customarily placed in idiomatic Greek: before the two coordinate items, after the first item, or after the second item. Greek grammars were of no avail for answering this question, for it had received no attention prior to the study of Septuagint translation. My comparative survey of original Greek sources indicated that the three positions occur with almost equal frequency.[17] The survey also confirmed that the repetition of the pronominal genitive in connection with two coordinate items—so frequent in the Septuagint—was unattested in original Greek sources. The syntax of the Septuagint abounds in peculiarities that derive from strict adherence to Hebrew syntax.

2.3 Characterization of Translations

The comparison of different translators is an important aspect of translation technique study. In order to be significant, such comparisons must be based upon a large number of similar cases in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. It is hazardous to compare translation equivalents without classifying them according to uses and meanings. The comparison is meaningful only within similar categories. Temporal cases of לִפְנֵי, for instance, are comparable, but temporal and locative cases of the same preposition are not. Classification requires common sense. If the categories are too restrictive, there will be too few occurrences in each category for comparison. Statistics are only useful if they are correctly compiled.

The consistency of the translators varies considerably. General statistics show that translators have a constant or favorite way of translating a term, which they use automatically in most cases. Here, the preliminary intuitions of Soisalon-Soininen have proved to be true. As almost any instance will show, the most common rendering of a syntactic feature usually accounts for 50 to 90 % of the cases. The coordinator καί is used in 63 % of the instances of ו in Genesis, the ratio is 72 % in Exodus, 90 % in Leviticus, 90 % in Numbers, and 84 % in Deuteronomy.[18] The genitive form of the personal pronouns, used as a possessive pronoun, is repeated with two coordinate nouns in 51 % of the cases in Genesis, the ratio is 40 % in Exodus, 75 % in Leviticus, 86 % in Numbers,

---

16. I. Soisalon-Soininen, "Der Gebrauch des Verbs ἔχειν in der Septuaginta" in: Soisalon-Soininen, *Studien*, 181-188.
17. R. Sollamo, *Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 40), Atlanta, GA 1995, 7-18.
18. A. Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint* (AASF 31), Helsinki 1982, 13.

and 76 % in Deuteronomy.[19] Semiprepositions constitute an exception in that translators did not restrict themselves to a single equivalent, but used different ones from time to time. Thus, the percentage for the most common equivalent of לִפְנֵי, in referring to living beings, varies between 30 % in Joshua and 89 % in Judges (B-text).[20]

Quantitative comparison must however be complemented by qualitative comparison. Indeed, the latter is more important than the former. Labels such as "slavish," "literal," "free," or "paraphrasing" are typically used to characterize translations. They can also refer to the translator's "philosophy of translation."[21] Viewed from the perspective of the translator, the philosophy preceded and determined the general orientation of the work. But when we study translations, we begin by examining the translator's technique, only then can we hope to grasp his philosophy of translation, i. e., what kind of translation (literal, free, paraphrasing, interpretative, etc.) he aimed to produce and for whom it was intended. In the present state of Septuagint studies a more adequate description of the respective natures of literalness and freedom is a desideratum, much in the same way that an understanding of literalness was for James Barr or freedom for Theo van der Louw.[22] It is of vital importance for translation technical studies to learn to recognize differences between translators far better than in the past. Only in this way, can we hope to deal with the thorny issue that arises when two books or two parts of a single book diverge so drastically from one another that they cannot have been produced by the same translator.

3. The Aims of Translation Technique Study

A translation technical approach is essential for the study of Septuagint syntax, the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, the comparison of different books and translators, and for a better understanding of the individual translators, their translations, and the special character of Septuagint Greek. It also provides a point of comparison for the analysis of Hellenistic Greek in general and New Testament Greek in particular. Recently, translation technique study has proved useful in identifying the theologies, ideologies, and philosophies that underlie the work of the translators. I will discuss three of these issues in more detail: the syntax of the Septuagint, the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, and the theologies of the translators.

3.1 Septuagint Syntax

Describing the syntax of the Septuagint can no longer be done in the way that Conybeare and Stock went about it at the beginning of the last century.[23] Their grammar

19. R. Sollamo, *Repetition*, 81-82.
20. R. Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 70-71.
21. S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, Oxford 1968, 314-315.
22. J. Barr, *The Typology of Literalism* (MSU XV), Göttingen 1979. T. van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* (CBET 47), Leuven 2007, 57-92.
23. F. C. Conybeare / St. G. Stock, *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (reprint of *Selections from the Septuagint*, Boston 1905). Grand Rapids, MI 1980.

consists of a collection of special features of Septuagint syntax. But aside from these particularities, it fails to give a general understanding of the syntax. Conybeare and Stock's syntax does not inform the reader how frequently the Septuagint peculiarities appear or how they are distributed in the different books. Any syntax of the Septuagint must take seriously that the Septuagint is not a single entity but a collection of different translations made by different translators over a lengthy period of time (from the middle of the third century to the first century BCE). Hence any attempt to create a syntax of the Septuagint must rely upon detailed translation technical studies.[24] In my opinion, writing a syntax of the Septuagint implies describing the general characteristics and the particularities of the syntax of the different books. Such a syntax should inform the reader of syntactic features in each book or group of books and whether they occur frequently, infrequently, or on a par with normal koine syntax. Until a sufficient number of detailed studies on clause connections, tenses, pronouns, prepositions, word order, etc. are done, a comprehensive syntax of the Septuagint will remain out of reach. Such a project has been delayed from one decade to another. Now is the time to begin.

3.2 Textual Criticism

Translation technique is an invaluable tool for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible. For although there is always a risk factor involved in retro-translation, particularly between dissimilar languages such as Greek and Hebrew, translation technique study provides a reliable means for identifying the Hebrew *Vorlage* used by the Septuagint translators.[25] This *Vorlage* can then be compared with the Masoretic text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Qumran manuscripts. The Septuagint has always played an important role in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible as a representative of the pre-Masoretic texts. This role would be greatly increased if the complete Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint could be reconstructed. To this purpose, the more literal the translation, the greater the degree of reliability of the *Vorlage* reconstructed with the aid of translation technique method.

3.3 Theologies of the Translators

In the present state of Septuagint studies, the ideologies, or theologies, of the translators are fiercely debated between "minimalists" and "maximalists."[26] Minimalists are very cautious in detecting possible traces of the translator's theology in the text;[27] max-

---

24. For principles of Septuagint syntax, see R. Sollamo, "Prolegomena to the Syntax of the Septuagint" in R. Sollamo / S. Sipilä (eds.), *Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, Helsinki/Göttingen 2001, 23-41.
25. A. Aejmelaeus, "What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint" in: Aejmelaeus, *Trail*, 71-106.
26. M. Knibb, "Introduction" in: M. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195), Louvain 2006, xiii-xxxi.
27. A. Aejmelaeus, "Von Sprache zur Theologie: Methodologische Überlegungen zur Theologie der Septuaginta" in: Knibb, *Septuagint and Messianism*, 21-48; A. Pietersma, "Messianism and Greek Psalter: In Search of the Messiah" in: Knibb, *Septuagint and Messianism*, 49-75.

imalists on the other hand see telltale signs of the translator's theology in almost every verse.[28] As a general rule, students of translation technique tend to belong to the minimalist party. They have learned to look at the philological side of the translation first. Only once the translation technique of the translator has been properly analyzed does theology enter into the discussion, if indeed it is still relevant. For often a putative theologically pregnant expression is stripped of its theology by translation technique analysis.

One example will illustrate this point. In an early (1953) article, my friend John William Wevers wrote on the exegetical principles underlying the Greek text of 2 Sam 11:2–1Kings 2:11. Discussing 2 Sam 24:14 ἐμπεσοῦμαι δὴ ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου ὅτι πολλοὶ οἱ οἰκτιρμοὶ αὐτοῦ σφόδρα εἰς δὲ χεῖρας ἀνθρώπου οὐ μὴ ἐμπέσω without knowledge of the translator's translation technique, he quite naturally supposed that the strange phrase ἐν χειρί was due to the translator's exegetical or theological principles, while its parallel, εἰς χεῖρας, in the same verse did not need require comment. Wevers assumed that the use of ἐν χειρί to refer to God "implies a tendency to remove God as far as possible from mankind."[29] In fact, in the βγ' section of the KR recension, ἐν χειρί was consistently (eleven occurrences) used to render the Hebrew בְּיַד, which referred equally to human beings or God. On the other hand, εἰς χεῖρας appears only in our verse. Because εἰς χεῖρας was the usual Old Greek expression, the conclusion can be drawn that the KR recension failed to correct εἰς χεῖρας to ἐν χειρί. There was no theology here at all, only philology, in the form of an attempt at as literal a rendering as possible of the Hebrew בְּיַד.

As a methodology, the study of translation technique is a *sine qua non* for detecting possible traces of the Septuagint translators' theology. Only those elements that do not derive from translation technique or philology can be said to contain theology, in the sense of a theology of the Septuagint distinct from the theology of the source text. Underlining the importance of translation technique does not imply that the translators had no theological motives. It does however warn against drawing hasty conclusions unsupported by solid argumentation. The theology or ideology must be demonstrated, not presupposed.

Much more research still needs to be done into the theology of the Septuagint translators. My conviction is that the ideologies, or theologies, of the translators should be seen against the background of the encounter of a conservative religious tradition with a more modern, Hellenistic, cultural environment. It consisted in the cumulative effect of a number of rather small changes in vocabulary that slightly shifted the meaning of the phrases of the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

---

28. M. Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung. Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta*, Berlin 1994; J. Schaper, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, Tübingen 1995.
29. J. W. Wevers, "A Study in the Exegetical Principles Underlying the Greek Text of 2 Sam 11:2 ▌-1 Kings 2:11" *CBQ* 15 (1953), 30-45.

4. Results

The study of translation technique has produced new knowledge about the Septuagint translators and their characteristic ways of translating. The hypothesis that, as a rule, each book of the Septuagint was the work of a single translator has been strengthened. The book of Twelve Prophets is also now considered to be due to a single translator. Earlier theories that postulated the presence, for certain books, of two translators[30] or one translator and a reviser[31] have not found sufficient evidence in recent research.[32] But there is at least one exception to this: the Books of Kings (1-4Reigns). Henry St. John Thackeray divided the text into five major sections. These were subsequently adopted by Dominique Barthélemy,[33] who was the first to identify the text types as the Old Greek translation and the Kaíge Recension (KR). A subsequent study by James Donald Shenkel then revealed further characteristics of the two translation techniques that he attributed respectively to the OG and KR sections.[34]

Old Greek	KR
1Rg	
2Rg 1:1–11:1	2Rg 11:2–3Rg 2:11
3Rg 2:12–21:43	3Rg 22:1–4Rg 25:30

One of the most significant results of translation technique study is that the books of the Septuagint can be divided into three categories or types of translations: slavish, literal, and free. On a scale ranging from slavish to literal to free, the most slavish translations are those of Ecclesiastes, 2Esdras, Judges A and B, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the KR sections of 1-4Reigns. At the other end of the scale, the freest are Esther o', Proverbs, Job, Isaiah, and Daniel o', followed by the books of the Pentateuch, most notably Exodus and Genesis, and by Joshua. The remaining books could be said to have been translated literally, but not slavishly.[35]

---

30. E.g. H. St. J. THACKERAY, "The Greek Translators of Ezekiel" *JTS* 4 (1903), 387-397; H. St. J. THACKERAY, "The Greek Translators of Jeremiah" *JTS* 4 (1903), 245-266; H. St. J. THACKERAY, "The Greek Translators of the Prophetical Books" *JTS* 4 (1903), 578-585. F. BAUMGÄRTEL / J. HERRMANN, "Die Septuaginta zum Zwölfprophetenbuch das Werk zweier Übersetzer" *BWAT* NF 5 (1923), 32-38. O. J. BAAB, "A Theory of Two Translators for the Greek Genesis" *JBL* 52 (1933), 239-243.

31. E.g. E. Tov, *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29-52 and Baruch 1,1–3,8*, Missoula, MT 1976.

32. T. MURAOKA, "In Defence of the Unity of the Septuagint Minor Prophets" *AJBI* 15 (1989), 25-36; J. ZIEGLER, "Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölfprophetenbuch" in: J. ZIEGLER, *Sylloge: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* (MSU 10), Göttingen 1971, 29-42; A. PIETERSMA, "Of Translation and Revision: From Greek Isaiah to Greek Jeremiah" in: M. N. VAN DER MEER et al. (eds.), *Isaiah in Context. Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Leiden/Boston 2010, 359-387.

33. H. ST. J. THACKERAY, "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings" *JTS* 8 (1907), 262-278; D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Les devanciers d'Aquila. VT Supplement* X, 1963.

34. J. D. SHENKEL, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*, Cambridge, MA 1968

35. R. SOLLAMO, *Semiprepositions*, 280-289; I. SOISALON-SOININEN, *Die Infinitive*, 176-190.

Translation technique study has shown that the translators seem to have read and translated their source text in small units of a few words at a time.[36] Free translation deals with larger units, as the book of Proverbs shows. Wide variations in the length of books can generally be attributed to a different *Vorlage*, the Septuagint version of Jeremiah being a parade example.[37] The existence of Hebrew texts different from the MT has been confirmed by the Qumran manuscripts. Some of these Qumran manuscripts are closely related to the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint.[38] In general, the translator did not shorten or revise the text, but adhered to the Hebrew *Vorlage* at his disposition. At times the text is very different from the MT (Jer, Exod 36-40[39]); at others very close (the books of the Pentateuch, Isaiah). Thus, the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint gives us access to pre-Masoretic textual developments of the Hebrew Scriptures.

36. Soisalon-Soininen, "Beobachtungen zur Arbeitsweise der Septuaginta-Übersetzer" in: Soisalon-Soininen, *Studien*, 28-39.
37. E. Tov, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources" in: Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran. Collected Essays*, Tübingen 2008, 154-170.
38. E. Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert – An Overview and Analysis" in: Tov, *Hebrew Bible*, Tübingen 2008, 128-154, esp. 140-154.
39. A. Aejmelaeus, "Septuagintal Translation Techniques – A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account" in: Aejmelaeus, *Trail*, 116-130.