



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## **The old Greek of Isaiah : an analysis of its pluses and minuses**

Vorm-Croughs, M. van der

### **Citation**

Vorm-Croughs, M. van der. (2010, November 10). *The old Greek of Isaiah : an analysis of its pluses and minuses*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16135>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/16135>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

## Chapter 6.

### THE ADDITION AND OMISSION OF PARTICLES

In their use of particles the MT and LXX of Isaiah display an abundance of differences. Sometimes these may be the outcome of a different Hebrew manuscript underlying the two documents, but in most cases they were probably inserted or left out by the translator himself. The present chapter will present a short overview of these variations in the employment of particles, with the purpose of giving an impression of when and for what reasons the Isaiah translator has added or omitted these words.

#### 6.1 The copulative conjunctions *καί* and *ו*

Especially in the appearance of the copulative conjunctions *καί* and *ו* a large diversity exists between the two versions. As the Hebrew *ו* is a letter that was liable to be skipped over by scribes or translators, or to be confused with the *וּ*, the reason for the occasional absence of an equivalent conjunction in the Greek may regularly have been a different *Vorlage* or a translational mistake. Similarly, the erroneous reading of a conjunctive *ו* may explain a considerable number of the pluses in LXX Isaiah consisting of *καί*, *γάρ* and *δέ*. Nonetheless, differences in the occurrence of *καί/ו* will often be due to the deliberate intervention of the translator as well. Many of the omissions of *ו* can be explained by the choice made by the translator—for stylistic reasons or for the sake of a correct use of the Greek—not to represent this abundantly used Hebrew conjunction.<sup>1</sup>

To these few remarks my discussion of the copulative conjunction in LXX Isaiah has to be restricted, as however much this subject is worth investigating, an extensive analysis would require even more time and room than are available to me.

#### 6.2 Particles forming a plus

##### 6.2.1 *Conjunctive particles*

Conjunctive particles (e.g. *καί*, *γάρ*, *δέ* and *ἀλλά*) fairly often appear as pluses in LXX Isaiah. This can be clarified by the discrepancy that Hebrew and Greek show in their application of conjunctions. Whereas “Hebrew possesses very few clause connectors and is most sparing in the employment of connectives other than *ו* ‘and’ ... Greek, on the other hand, has plenty of connectives and an ideal which is the direct opposite to parataxis, the ideal of composing well-organized periods of subordinate clauses and main clauses.”<sup>2</sup> Consequently, in order to produce a stylistically adequate Greek text, the Isaiah translator may have felt obliged to now and then add conjunctive particles to his text.

---

<sup>1</sup> To achieve a correct use of the Greek the translator may for instance have omitted the *ו* in an apodosis (see e.g. Isa 8:21; 22:20; 23:15; and 65:24); cf. Anneli Aejmelaeus, “The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint,” in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SCS 23; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987), 368–369.

<sup>2</sup> Aejmelaeus, “Significance of Clause Connectors,” 364–365. Cf. also J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1934), xliii.

## a. γάρ

In LXX Isaiah γάρ has been employed very frequently,<sup>3</sup> mostly as a representation of ו and occasionally of ו (see 3:7; 10:1,24; 28:7; 29:2; 30:3; 31:9; 32:7; 34:12; 37:24, etc.). The conjunction appears as a plus approximately eighty times: In 1:12,15,24,27; 2:11,20; 5:9,11,12; 6:10; 7:4<sup>4</sup>,25; 8:1,9,12,20; 9:3(4),5(6),20(21); 10:11,22,28,33; 13:9,15; 15:2,5,6; 16:7,8,10; 17:3; 18:2; 19:14; 20:5; 23:10; 24:20; 26:10; 28:8; 29:1,6; 32:1; 33:2,7,8,24; 34:12; 35:10; 37:18; 38:13,14,16,19; 40:20,24,27; 41:11,12,17,26,29<sup>5</sup>; 42:22; 44:22; 47:10; 49:20; 51:14,17; 54:1,10; 55:12; 59:6,8,21; 60:20; 62:7,11; 64:4(5); and 65:16. In some of those verses the translator (whether or not mistakenly) may have read a ו (or ו) in his Hebrew manuscript; in others he may have added γάρ on purpose. The latter could be true particularly when the Hebrew offers a cause or an explanation of something stated in the preceding text, while this cause has not been introduced by means of a conjunction. By supplying γάρ the translator may have intended to make the causal relationship more explicit. See e.g.:<sup>6</sup>

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1:15 ὅταν τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνητε πρὸς με,<br>ἀποστρέψω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου ἀφ' ὑμῶν,<br>καὶ ἔὰν πληθύνητε τὴν δέησιν,<br>οὐκ εἰσακούσομαι ὑμῶν·<br>αἱ γὰρ χεῖρες ὑμῶν αἵματος πλήρεις. | When you stretch out your hands to me,<br>I will turn away my eyes from you;<br>even if you make many petitions,<br>I will not listen to you,<br><b>for</b> your hands are full of blood. |
| 5:11 οὐαὶ οἱ ἐγειρόμενοι τὸ πρῶτον<br>καὶ τὸ σικερα διώκοντες,<br>οἱ μένοντες τὸ ὄψε·<br>ὁ γὰρ οἶνος αὐτοὺς συγκαύσει.  | Woe to those who rise early<br>and pursue the sikera,<br>who linger till evening<br><b>for</b> wine will inflame them.  |

Le Moigne notes that in LXX Isaiah γάρ is often used after a volitive mood (e.g. an imperative) with the aim of justifying the command, especially after verbs denoting “(not) to fear” or “(not) to rejoice.”<sup>7</sup> Among the *extra* occurrences of γάρ, this is the case in 2:11; 7:4; 8:1,9; 10:11; 15:2; and 26:10, and also in 1:24; 5:11; 18:2; and 29:1 where γάρ comes after οὐαὶ, and in 33:2 where it follows a prayer.<sup>8</sup> Related to this is the addition of γάρ to the interjection ἰδού in 10:33; 13:9; and 32:1. γάρ further regularly appears in the context of predictions, in order to rationalise or explain them (see the pluses in 7:25; 10:22,28; 24:20; and 33:7–8).<sup>9</sup>

<sup>3</sup> The unusually high frequency of the occurrence of γάρ in LXX Isa has been pointed out by Troxel (*LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 92). Only in the Greek Proverbs has the conjunction a relatively higher rate of appearance.

<sup>4</sup> In line with the LXX, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> offers ו as a plus; cf. section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>5</sup> Perhaps γάρ translates ו; see section 9.8.2b.

<sup>6</sup> Apart from a causal or explanatory force, Denniston mentions several other—less common—functions of γάρ, e.g. an anticipatory function (the γάρ clause preceding rather than following the clause which it explains), and γάρ introducing a supporting reply to a statement of another speaker, in the sense of “Yes, for” or “No, for” (see Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 58–95).

<sup>7</sup> Le Moigne, “Livres d’Ésaïe,” 232–268.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. also 10:1,24 and 30:2, where after a volitive mood ו is rendered γάρ.

<sup>9</sup> Other regular usages of γάρ in LXX Isa are according to Le Moigne e.g. γάρ following on a rhetorical question as an explanation of the expected answer (see the pluses in 5:9 and 15:7); γάρ introducing repeated words (see the pluses in 1:27; 9:20[21]; 16:8; 19:14; 26:10; and 28:8); and γάρ preceding an idea that is repeated in a

A large number of the possible insertions of γάρ in LXX Isaiah are connected to variant translations, such as a distinct interpretation of the text, a different sentence division, or a rearrangement of the Hebrew: see 1:12,24; 5:9,12; 6:10; 7:4,25; 8:1,9,12,20; 9:3(4),5(6); 10:22; 15:5; 16:8,10; 17:3; 18:2; 20:5; 23:10; 24:20; 26:10; 28:8; 29:1,6; 33:7,24; 35:10; 38:14,16,19; 41:17; 51:14,17; 54:1,10; 62:7; and 65:16.

In 1:12, for instance, the apparent addition of γάρ is a consequence of the translator's divergent interpretation of the sentence division. Whereas in the MT זאת in v.12 anticipates מי־בקש זאת מידכם רמס חצרי, the LXX translator has understood the demonstrative (rendered by ταῦτα) to refer back to the offerings that are mentioned earlier in the same verse. The words מי־בקש זאת מידכם he has apparently regarded as a complete clause, telling *why* God does not want Israel's offerings (the succeeding phrase רמס חצרי he considered as the object of לא תוסיפו—which in the MT belongs to the next sentence). To expose the relationship that he supposed to exist between these clauses, he supplied the conjunction γάρ:

1:11–13

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>MT:                    שבעתי עלות אילים<br/>                          וחלב מריאים<br/>דם פרים וכבשים ועתודים לא הפצתי<br/>כי תבאו לראות פני<br/>מי־בקש זאת מידכם רמס חצרי<br/>לא תוסיפו הביא מנחת־שוא</p>                                  | <p>I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams<br/>and the fat of fed beasts;<br/>I do not delight in the blood of bulls, lambs, or of he-goats.<br/>When you come to appear before me,<br/>who requires <b>this</b> of you <b>to trample my courts?</b><br/>Bring no more vain offerings;</p> |
| <p>LXX:    πλήρης εἰμι ὀλοκαυτωμάτων κριῶν<br/>καὶ στέαρ ἀρνῶν<br/>καὶ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων οὐ βούλομαι,<br/>οὐδ' ἐὰν ἔρχησθε ὀφθῆναί μοι.<br/>τίς γὰρ ἐξεζήτησε ταῦτα<br/>ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν;<br/>πατεῖν τὴν ἀύλην μου οὐ προσθήσεσθε·</p> | <p>I am full of burnt offerings of rams;<br/>and the fat of lambs,<br/>the blood of bulls and goats I do not want,<br/>not even if you come to appear before me.<br/><b>For</b> who asked <b>these things</b><br/>from your hands?<br/>You shall trample my court no more!</p>                  |

The sentence division of the LXX is supported by compositional observations. If one reads the Hebrew text of 1:12–14 in the manner of the LXX, it comprises a series of four clauses, all in a similar way composed of a subject in *casus pendens*, followed by an estimation of this very subject:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>רמס חצרי<br/>לא תוסיפו<br/>הביא מנחת־שוא<br/>קטרת תועבה היא לי<br/>חדש ושבֿת קרא מקרא<br/>לא־אוכל<br/>און ועצרה חדשיכם ומועדיכם<br/>שנאה נפשי</p> | <p>the trampling of my courts—<br/>you will do no more;<br/>the bringing of vain offerings—<br/>an abominable incense it is to me.<br/>New moon and sabbath, the calling of assemblies—<br/>I cannot endure (them);<br/>iniquity and solemn assembly, your new moons and your feasts—<br/>my soul hates (them).</p> |
|--|---|

---

different wording (see the pluses in 15:6; 16:7,10; and 20:5) (Le Moigne, "Livre d'Ésaïe," 271–272, 289–295, 302–305).

## b. ὅτι

ὅτι is most commonly a rendering of כִּי, but now and again it represents ו (see e.g. 2:2; 9:19[20]; 15:4; 24:6; and 30:8). Almost forty times the conjunction is a plus in LXX Isaiah: In 9:20(21); 10:24; 20:4; 22:9,10, 14; 23:13; 28:11; 30:7,12; 33:14,23; 37:24; 39:7; 41:24(?)<sup>10</sup>,26; 44:12,16,20(2x); 45:5,11,14; 47:14; 48:5(2x),7,8; 50:8; 52:7; 56:3(?)<sup>11</sup>,8,10; 57:10; 59:4; 63:15; and 64:8(9). If it was not because a conjunction was already present in his *Vorlage*, then the translator may have inserted it for several other reasons:

- Like γάρ, ὅτι may have been added so as to make clear that something gives an explanation or motivation for what precedes it, and so is used in the sense of “because.”<sup>12</sup> See 9:20(21); 20:4; 23:13; 37:24; 41:24; 44:12; 45:5,11,14; 50:8; 59:4; and 64:8(9).
- ὅτι can serve to introduce object clauses, following verbs denoting a mental act, such as “to see,” “to know,” “to understand,” or “to say,” or verbs of emotion or fear, initiating the cause of this emotion. In Hebrew the conjunction כִּי is usually applied with such a substantival function. Where כִּי in the sense of “that” is missing, the Greek sometimes fills in ὅτι. See e.g. 33:14; 39:7; 44:16,19,20; 48:8;<sup>13</sup> and 56:10. See also 10:24:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Μὴ φοβοῦ, ὁ λαός μου<br>οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Σιων, ἀπὸ Ἀσσυρίων,<br><u>ὅτι</u> ἐν ῥάβδῳ πατάξει σε· | Do not be afraid, O my people,<br>who live in Sion, for the Assyrians,<br><u>that</u> he will beat you with a rod; |
|---|--|

In 22:9–10 the addition of ὅτι has transformed two independent clauses into subordinate ones, still depending on the verb “to see” earlier in the text:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| καὶ εἶδσαν ὅτι πλείους εἰσὶ<br>καὶ <u>ὅτι</u> ἀπέστρεψαν τὸ ὕδωρ<br>τῆς ἀρχαίας κολυμβήθρας εἰς τὴν πόλιν<br>καὶ <u>ὅτι</u> καθείλοσαν τοὺς οἴκους<br>Ιερουσαλημ εἰς ὀχύρωμα τοῦ τείχους τῆ πόλει. | And they saw that there were rather many,<br>and <u>that</u> they had turned the water<br>of the old pool into the city,<br>and <u>that</u> they had demolished the houses<br>of Ierousalem to fortify the wall for the city. |
|--|---|

The Greek particle has been supplemented to signal the beginning of direct speech in 2:2;<sup>14</sup> 30:7; 41:26(?); 44:20; 48:5(2x),7; and 56:3,8. Operating in such a way it is called ὅτι *recitativum*, which is a genuine Greek phenomenon.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Perhaps ὅτι translates כִּי; see section 9.8.2b.

<sup>11</sup> Perhaps ὅτι translates כִּי; see section 9.8.2b.

<sup>12</sup> As Aejmelaeus remarks, ὅτι and γάρ have different meaning nuances, in that ὅτι is a subordinate conjunction for “directly causal clauses expressing cause or reason,” while γάρ is a coordinative conjunction, used for “expressions of motivation or explanation which are somewhat more independent in relation to the main clause” (“indirectly causal”). Aejmelaeus considers it a peculiarity of Septuagintal texts translated from Hebrew that they comprise a high frequency of causal clauses introduced by ὅτι, also in places where one finds only an *indirectly* causal relation with the preceding sentence, on which grounds in secular Greek γάρ would have been employed. This LXX inclination towards ὅτι probably results from the translator’s preference for that conjunction above γάρ to render the Hebrew כִּי, for the reason that ὅτι can represent כִּי in both substantival and causal instances, and does not change the original word order (which γάρ does). See Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Ὅτι *causale* in Septuagintal Greek,” in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V Congreso de la IOSCS)* (ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos; Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 34; Madrid: Instituto “Arias Montano,” 1985) esp. 122; and idem, “Significance of Clause Connectors,” 371. See also section 6.3.1 below.

<sup>13</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> likewise gives a conjunction here: כִּי אֵין ידעתי כִּי אֵין בְּגֹד תִּבְנֶה; cf. section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>14</sup> וְהִיא becomes “Ὅτι ἔσται in the LXX.

- The addition of ὅτι is connected to a variant translation of the Hebrew in 22:9–10; 28:11; 30:12; 33:14,23; 41:24; 44:16,20; 47:14; 52:7; 56:10; 57:10; and 63:15.

c. δέ

Even though δέ usually corresponds to *et*, it occurs as a plus nearly forty times: In LXX Isa 1:3,18,25; 2:11; 4:2; 8:14; 14:10,11; 16:2; 17:11; 19:16; 23:5,11; 24:14; 26:14; 27:3; 31:9; 35:8; 37:26; 38:1; 39:6; 40:23; 41:25; 42:17; 43:26; 47:6,15; 49:21;<sup>16</sup> 54:17(as part of a larger plus); 55:13; 59:3,7; 64:7(8); 65:23; and 66:3(2x),9.

In most cases—if not the result of a different *Vorlage* or a translational mistake—δέ has been added so as to make explicit the relation of one sentence to the previous one. This relation is often adversative, δέ functioning to signal an opposition.<sup>17</sup> Besides, with regularity it is utilised in a continuative way, in order to express the continuation of a thought.<sup>18</sup> A third function of δέ is to connect two synonymous clauses.<sup>19</sup>

One example of the probable insertion of δέ with the purpose of highlighting a contrast is afforded by 1:3:

|     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 1:3 | ἔγνω βοῦς τὸν κτησάμενον<br>καὶ ὄνος τὴν φάτνην τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ·<br>Ἰσραηλ δέ με οὐκ ἔγνω,<br>καὶ ὁ λαός με οὐ συνῆκεν. | The ox knows its owner<br>and the donkey its master's crib<br><b>but</b> Israel has not known me<br>and the people have not understood me. |
|-----|--|--|

An example of an additional δέ expressing continuation can be found in 39:6–7:

39:6–7

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Ἴδου ἡμέραι ἔρχονται, λέγει κύριος,<br>καὶ λήψονται πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου,<br>καὶ ὅσα συνήγαγον οἱ πατέρες σου<br>ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἤξει,<br>καὶ οὐδὲν οὐ μὴ καταλίπωσιν·<br>εἶπε δέ ὁ θεὸς ὅτι καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων σου,<br>ὧν ἐγέννησας, λήψονται | Look, days are coming, says the Lord,<br>when they will take all the things in your house;<br>and whatever your ancestors have collected—<br>up until this day—shall go to Babylon,<br>and they shall leave nothing behind.<br>God has <b>further</b> said that some of your children,<br>whom you have begotten, they shall take too. |
|---|--|

Instances illustrating the supposed addition of δέ in order to connect two synonymous or parallel clauses can be found in e.g. 14:10; 40:23; 54:17; 59:3,7; and 66:3, as well as in 55:13:

καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς στοιβῆς ἀναβήσεται κυπάρισσος,      And instead of a brier shall come up a cypress;

<sup>15</sup> See Anneli Aejmelaesus, “Ὅτι recitativum in Septuaginta Greek,” in *Studien zur Septuaginta. Robert Hanhart zu Ehren. Aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages.* (ed. Detlef Fraenkel, Udo Quast, and John W. Wevers; AAWG 190, MSU 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 74–82. According to Aejmelaesus the use of ὅτι *recitativum* is not uncommon (albeit relatively infrequent) in the LXX. It relatively more often takes place in the freer translations. Its occurrence reaches the highest frequency in the LXX of Genesis (18 cases, of which 7 concern additions), after which follows LXX Isaiah (8 cases, of which 7 added).

<sup>16</sup> Perhaps δέ translates ἡ: see section 9.8.2b.

<sup>17</sup> Denniston notes that whereas ἀλλά is a strong adversative, eliminating the opposed idea, δέ balances two opposing ideas (Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 165).

<sup>18</sup> Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 162–168; LSJ 371; Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 307.

<sup>19</sup> Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 368–375.

ἀντὶ **δέ** τῆς κονύζης ἀναβήσεται μυρσίνη· **and** instead of the nettle, shall come up a myrtle.

The addition of **δέ** is related to a variant translation in LXX Isa 1:25; 2:11; 8:14; 16:2; 23:11; 24:14; 27:3; 31:9; 35:8; 39:6; 43:26; 54:17; and 65:23.

#### d. ἀλλά

ἀλλά in Greek answers to the purpose of indicating a contrast or limitation, mostly in a strong way, eliminating the opposing idea.<sup>20</sup> In LXX Isaiah ἀλλά is generally the counterpart to ו or כּ, yet appears as a plus in 7:17; 9:9(10) (ἀλλά δεῦτε); 10:16; 30:6 (as part of a larger plus), 10; 37:34; 39:4; 41:18; 42:3; 45:18; 48:6; 53:3; 58:6; and 63:16. These pluses may either go back to a deviating *Vorlage*, or are additions by the translator himself. In the latter case they have been inserted principally after a negation to stress the contrast with what will follow.<sup>21</sup> See e.g. 45:18:

45:18 οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἐποίησεν αὐτήν      he did not make it to be empty  
**ἀλλά** κατοικεῖσθαι      **but** to be inhabited.

In 10:16; 39:4; and 58:6 the presence of ἀλλά is bound to a variant translation of the LXX.<sup>22</sup>

### 6.2.2 Particles of comparison

In several situations particles of comparison have been interpolated:

(a) The Isaiah translator from time to time has turned metaphors into similes by supplying a comparative particle ὡς or ὡσεῖ. In 44:4 and 50:9 he has done this in assimilation to the subsequent, or respectively earlier (part of the) clause, which contains a particle of comparison as well:<sup>23</sup>

|       |  |   |
|-------|--|---|
| 37:27 | היו עשב שדה וירק דשא<br>חציר גגות ושדמה לפני קמה | καὶ ἐγένοντο ὡς χόρτος ξηρὸς ἐπὶ δωμάτων<br>καὶ ὡς ἄγρωστις.                    |
| 44:4  | וצמחו בבין חציר<br>כערבים על-יבלי-מים            | καὶ ἀνατελοῦσιν ὡσεῖ χόρτος ἀνὰ μέσον ὕδατος<br>καὶ ὡς ἰτέα ἐπὶ παραρρέον ὕδωρ. |
| 50:3  | אלביש שמים קדרות<br>ושק אשים כסותם               | καὶ ἐνδύσω τὸν οὐρανὸν σκότος<br>καὶ θήσω ὡς σάκκον τὸ περιβόλαιον αὐτοῦ.       |
| 50:9  | הן כלם כבגד יבלו<br>עש יאכלם                     | ἰδοὺ πάντες ὑμεῖς ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσεσθε,<br>καὶ ὡς σῆς καταφάγεται ὑμᾶς.     |

<sup>20</sup> Denniston, *Greek Particles*, 1.

<sup>21</sup> Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 393–397. Occasionally, the content of the negative sentence which ἀλλά follows is synonymous to that of the succeeding positive sentence (cf. Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 398–420): see the pluses in 30:6 and 53:3. In 9:9(10) ἀλλά accompanies a volitive mood: ἀλλά δεῦτε λαξεύσωμεν λίθους. According to Le Moigne this is a very classical employment of the conjunction (Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 385–386).

<sup>22</sup> Troxel notes that the frequency of ἀλλά in LXX Isa is among the highest in the books of the LXX. Of its 55 occurrences only 13 correspond to כּ in the Hebrew. He infers from this that “the translator was interested in marking strong disjunction for his readers” (Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation*, 92).

<sup>23</sup> For the LXX Isaiah tendency to interpret metaphors, see Arie van der Kooij, “The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language. A Characteristic of LXX-Isaiah,” in: *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome. Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst* (ed. Florentino García Martínez and Gerard P. Luttikhuisen; JSJSup 82; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 179–185.

|        |   |   |
|--------|---|---|
| 52:6–7 | מהנאוו על־ההרים רגלי<br>מבשר משמיע שלום מבשר<br>טוב משמיע ישועה                   | πάρειμι <u>ὡς</u> ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων, <u>ὡς</u> πόδες<br>εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοήν εἰρήνης, <u>ὡς</u> εὐαγγελιζόμενος<br>ἀγαθά, ὅτι ἀκουστήν ποιήσω τὴν σωτηρίαν σου         |
| 66:3   | שוחט השור מכה־איש<br>זובח השה ערף כלב<br>מעלה מנחה דם־חזיר<br>מזכיר לבנה מברך און | ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ὁ θύων μοι μόσχον<br><u>ὡς</u> ὁ ἀποκτένωνων κύνα,<br>ὁ δὲ ἀναφέρων σεμίδαλιν <u>ὡς</u> αἶμα ὕειον,<br>ὁ διδοὺς λίβανον εἰς μνημόσυνον <u>ὡς</u> βλάσφημος· |

Also compare 55:8:

|      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| 55:8 | כי לא מחשבותי מחשבותיכם<br>ולא דרכיכם דרכי | οὐ γάρ εἰσιν αἱ βουλαί μου <u>ὡσπερ</u> αἱ βουλαί ὑμῶν<br>οὐδὲ <u>ὡσπερ</u> αἱ ὁδοὶ ὑμῶν αἱ ὁδοὶ μου |
|------|--|--|

(b) In various places the translator has created a simile where the Hebrew gives neither a simile nor a metaphor (in 5:29; 16:11; 27:10[9]; and 30:22 he has thus harmonised the clause to the previous one):<sup>24</sup>

|          |   |   |
|----------|---|---|
| 4:5      | וברא יהוה על כל־מכון הר־ציון<br>ועל־מקראה ענן יומם<br>ועשן ונגה אש להבה<br>לילה | καὶ ἦξει, καὶ ἔσται πᾶς τόπος τοῦ ὄρους Σιών καὶ<br>πάντα τὰ περικύκλω αὐτῆς σκιάσει νεφέλη ἡμέρας<br>καὶ <u>ὡς</u> καπνοῦ καὶ <u>ὡς</u> φωτὸς πυρὸς καιομένου<br>νυκτός· |
| 5:29     | שאגה לו כלביא ושאג ככפירים<br>וינהם ויאחזו טרף                                  | ὀρμῶσιν <u>ὡς</u> λέοντες καὶ παρέστηκαν <u>ὡς</u> σκύμνος<br>λέοντος· καὶ ἐπιλήμψεται καὶ βοήσει <u>ὡς</u> θηρίου  |
| 10:17    | ואכלה שיתו ושמירו ביום אחד  | καὶ φάγεται <u>ὡσεί</u> χόρτον τὴν ὕλην   |
| 16:1     | שלח־וכר משל־ארץ   | Ἀποστελῶ <u>ὡς</u> ἐρπετὰ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν· <sup>25</sup>  |
| 16:11    | על־כן מעי למואב ככנור יהמו<br>וקרבי לקיר חרש                                    | διὰ τοῦτο ἡ κοιλία μου ἐπὶ Μωαβ <u>ὡς</u> κιθάρα ἠχήσει,<br>καὶ τὰ ἐντός μου <u>ὡσεί</u> τεῖχος, ὃ ἐνεκαίνισας. <sup>26</sup>   |
| 17:11    | וכאב אנוש   | καὶ <u>ὡς</u> πατὴρ ἀνθρώπου κληρώσει τοῖς υἱοῖς σου. <sup>27</sup>   |
| 23:3     | קציר יאור תבואתה<br>ותהי סחר גוים   | <u>ὡς</u> ἀμητοῦ εἰσφερομένου<br>οἱ μεταβόλοι τῶν ἐθνῶν.  |
| 27:10(9) | כי עיר בצורה בدد  | <u>ὡσπερ</u> δρυμὸς μακράν. <sup>28</sup>   |
| 30:22    | תזרם כמו דוה<br>צא תאמר לו  | καὶ λικμήσεις <u>ὡς</u> ὕδωρ ἀποκαθμένης<br>καὶ <u>ὡς</u> κόπρον ὡσεις αὐτά. <sup>29</sup>  |

However, there are also some instances in which a simile has been removed:

|       |                                     |  |
|-------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 13:6  | כשד משדי יבוא                       | καὶ συντριβὴ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἦξει  |
| 33:9  | היה השרון בערבה                     | ἔλη ἐγένετο ὁ Σαρων·   |
| 57:20 | והרשעים בים נגרש<br>כי השקט לא יוכל | οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι οὕτως κλυδωνισθήσονται<br>καὶ ἀναπαύσασθαι οὐ δυνησονται. |

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 100–103.

<sup>25</sup> The translator has read the clause with a different word division: שלחו כרמש לארץ—“Send something like a snake to the country.” Cf. Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*, 30; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 101.

<sup>26</sup> לקיר חרש—“for Kir-heres”—is translated as if it were כקיר חדש—“like a new wall.”

<sup>27</sup> The translator has read וכאב (MT וְכָאֵב—“and pain”) as וְכָאֵב—“and like a father”; cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 95.

<sup>28</sup> כי עיר has been read as if it were כיעיר; cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 101.

<sup>29</sup> The Greek insinuates a Hebrew text כצואה תסיר; cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 102.



(c) Now and then, when in (what was considered) the apodosis of a comparative clause the Hebrew lacks the particle כן, the Greek has complemented it with οὕτως:

|       |   |   |
|-------|---|---|
| 17:12 | כהמות ימים יהמיון                                       | ὡς θάλασσα κυμαίνουσα <u>οὕτως</u> παραχθήσεσθε   |
| 33:1  | כנלתך לבגד יבגדוך                                       | καὶ ὡς σῆς ἐπὶ ἱματίου <u>οὕτως</u> ἠττηθήσονται. <sup>30</sup>   |
| 33:4  | כמשק גבים<br>שוקק בו                                    | ὄν τρόπον ἔάν τις συναγάγη ἀκρίδας,<br><u>οὕτως</u> ἐμπαίξουσιν ὑμῖν.   |
| 38:14 | כסוס עגור כן אצפף<br>אהגה כיונה                         | ὡς χελιδών, <u>οὕτως</u> φωνήσω,<br>καὶ ὡς περιστέρα, <u>οὕτως</u> μελετήσω·  |
| 41:25 | ויבא סגנים כמו־חמר וכמו יוצר<br>ירמס־טיט                | καὶ ὡς πηλὸς κεραμέως καὶ ὡς κεραμεὺς καταπατῶν<br>τὸν πηλόν, <u>οὕτως</u> καταπατηθήσεσθε. <sup>31</sup>                   |
| 53:7  | כשה לטבח יובל<br>וכרחל לפני גזייה נאלמה<br>ולא יפתח פיו | ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἤχθη<br>καὶ ὡς ἄμνός ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος<br><u>οὕτως</u> οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ. |

(d) In 55:9 the MT lacks a particle introducing the comparative clause (maybe due to haplography). Nevertheless, the LXX does use ὡς here:<sup>32</sup>

|      |   |  |
|------|---|--|
| 55:9 | כי־גבהו שמים מארץ<br>כן גבהו דרכי מדרכיכם | ἀλλ' <u>ὡς</u> ἀπέχει ὁ οὐρανὸς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς,<br><u>οὕτως</u> ἀπέχει ἡ ὁδός μου ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν ὑμῶν |
|------|---|--|

In 62:5 the particles introducing the apodosis as well as the protasis seem to be missing in the Hebrew. In the LXX both are present, however:

|      |  |  |
|------|--|--|
| 62:5 | כי־יבעל בחור בתולה<br>יבעלוד בניך<br>ומשוש חתן על־כלה<br>ישיש עליך אלהיך | καὶ <u>ὡς</u> συνοικῶν νεανίσκος παρθένω,<br><u>οὕτως</u> κατοικήσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ σου μετὰ σοῦ·<br>καὶ ἔσται <u>ὄν τρόπον</u> εὐφρανθήσεται νυμφίος ἐπὶ νύμφη,<br><u>οὕτως</u> εὐφρανθήσεται κύριος ἐπὶ σοί. |
|------|--|--|

### 6.2.3 Other particles

#### a. νῦν

In classical and Hellenistic Greek νῦν can besides in its primary temporal sense, also be used as a particle of emphasis. In the latter function it frequently appears in combination with a conjunction, serving as a connective (καὶ νῦν; νῦν οὖν; διότι νῦν) or as an antithetic particle (νῦν δέ; ἀλλὰ νῦν; οὐδὲ νῦν).<sup>33</sup> In the Isaiah translation these compound forms usually render ועתה,<sup>34</sup> an expression which in Hebrew has the purpose of introducing a new thought or a new section of the text. At times it happens that while the MT provides a mere

<sup>30</sup> כנלתך probably ought to be read as ככלתך—“when you have ceased.” The translator seems to have rendered it by ὡς σῆς—“like a moth,” while interpreting the infinitive לבגד (“to destroy”) as a noun phrase בגד על (“on a garment”). In doing this he was probably influenced by 50:9. Cf. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 102–103.

<sup>31</sup> In the MT ירמס־טיט belongs to the protasis of the comparison (“as the potter treads clay”). In the LXX it is used to form both the protasis (ὡς κεραμεὺς καταπατῶν τὸν πηλόν) and the apodosis (οὕτως καταπατηθήσεσθε) (see section 2.6.2).

<sup>32</sup> 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> supports the LXX: כִּי־בַגְוֵה דַרְכֵי מַאֲרָצְךָ כִּן גְּבוּהוּ שָׁמַיִם מֵאֲרָצְךָ; cf. section 12.3.1.1.

<sup>33</sup> LSJ 1185; Timothy Friberg, Barbara Friberg, and Neva F. Miller, eds. *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*, cited from Bibloi 8.00, 2004.

<sup>34</sup> See 1:21; 5:3,5; 16:14; 36:10; 43:1; 44:1; 48:16; 47:8; 49:5; 52:5; and 64:7(8).

conjunction, the translator appears to have attached  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  to it. Also the whole combination of  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  plus a conjunction now and then turns up as a plus in the Greek. Most of these instances probably concern intentional additions on the part of the translator in order to articulate a specific relation towards the preceding part of the text (for instance an antithesis, as in 14:15 and 47:9, or a consequence, as in 3:8), to stress a command (e.g. 2:5,10),<sup>35</sup> or—when preceding questions—to provide these with more force (see 40:25,28; 51:13). In some cases of  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  accompanying a conjunction,  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  may have preserved its temporal meaning, however (see 3:8,13 and 33:4).<sup>36</sup>

καὶ  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  MT = (–) : 2:5,10; 40:28; MT =  $\eta\aleph$ : 26:11; MT =  $\iota$ : 51:13.

$\nu\tilde{\nu}$  δέ MT =  $\eta\aleph$ : 14:15; MT =  $\iota$ : 33:4; 37:28; 47:9.

ἀλλὰ  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  MT = (–) : 3:13.

διότι  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  MT = (–) : 3:8.

$\nu\tilde{\nu}$  οὖν MT =  $\iota$ : 40:25.<sup>37</sup>

οὐδὲ  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  MT = (–) : 48:19.

Also without a conjunction  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  can be found in LXX Isaiah where an equivalent is missing in the MT: see 18:2; 21:2; 33:11(2x); 51:3; and 58:2.<sup>38</sup> In all of these verses the word bears its primary meaning as an adverb of time.

For τοίνυν as a plus, see LXX Isa 33:23.<sup>39</sup>

#### b. ΤΟΤΕ

When τότε in LXX Isaiah occurs as an adverb of time meaning “then, when that time comes,” it mostly reproduces  $\aleph$  (or—in case of 30:23— $\iota$ ). In 8:16; 41:1,<sup>40</sup> and 65:25 τότε with that same connotation can be found as a plus. Also when the adverb appears in apodosis, introducing a conditional clause (“when/if ..., then...”) it occasionally mirrors  $\aleph$  (although the Hebrew mostly gives  $\iota$  or no conjunction at all in such places); in that function τότε has been added in 30:15, where the Hebrew has a different syntax, however.<sup>41</sup> Referring to a point in the past (German “damals”) τότε is a plus in 44:8.

<sup>35</sup> Van der Kooij notes about the plus καὶ  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  in LXX Isa 2:5 and 10 that this expression “evokes the idea that a critical moment of time has arrived.” See Arie van der Kooij, “The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Hebrew Text of Isaiah 2:22 and 36:7,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam; VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 381.

<sup>36</sup> According to Le Moigne  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  has preserved its independent temporal meaning—marking the transition of past to present—in all of the occurrences of  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  δέ in LXX Isa. Hence, he thinks  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  δέ in LXX Isa not to be a combination, but a *collocation* of words (Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 315–316; 328).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. 30:8 where the MT offers  $\eta\eta\epsilon$ , while the LXX has  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  οὖν. For an inquiry into  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  οὖν in LXX Isa, see Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 221–228. Le Moigne points out that the function of  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  οὖν is to mark the continuation of an account, which is influenced by what has been said earlier in the text.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. also 43:22 οὐ  $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  ἐκάλεσά σε,  $\iota\alpha\kappa\omega\beta$  /  $\eta\eta\epsilon$   $\eta\aleph$   $\eta\aleph$   $\eta\aleph$   $\eta\aleph$   $\eta\aleph$  ( $\nu\tilde{\nu}$  probably comes from  $\eta\eta\epsilon < \eta\eta\epsilon$ ).

<sup>39</sup> For a discussion on this plus, see Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 203–206.

<sup>40</sup> It may be that in this verse τότε represents  $\aleph$ , which appears in the preceding clause. Yet, there the Hebrew adverb seems already to have been translated as καί.

<sup>41</sup> For examples of  $\iota$  in apodosis becoming τότε, see 28:25 and 58:10.

c. *δή*

The LXX of Isaiah comprises six occurrences of the intensive particle *δή*, of which two are a plus. Both pluses—in 22:17 and 33:7—form part of the expression *ἰδοὺ δή* (the MT offers *הנה* and *הנה*, respectively). Elsewhere in the Greek Isaiah *ἰδοὺ δή* is attested only in 3:1, translating *הנה*.<sup>42</sup> The addition of *δή* in 22:17 may have been performed in analogy to that verse, as it has a somewhat similar wording:<sup>43</sup>

3:1 Ἰδοὺ δή ὁ δεσπότης κύριος σαβαωθ ἀφελεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς Ιουδαίας  
καὶ ἀπὸ Ιερουσαλημ ἰσχύοντα καὶ ἰσχύουσιν  
22:17 ἰδοὺ δή κύριος σαβαωθ ἐκβαλεῖ καὶ ἐκτρίψει ἄνδρα

## 6.3 Particles forming a minus

6.3.1 *כי*

Apart from *ו*, the only Hebrew conjunction for which a counterpart frequently is missing in LXX Isaiah is *כי*. This pertains to approximately forty cases: 7:22; 15:1,5,6; 16:8; 18:5; 21:15; 24:13; 28:10,11,19,21; 29:20; 30:15,16 (*לֹא-כִי*); 31:1; 32:10,14; 33:5,22; 34:5; 36:16; 47:5; 48:2; 49:19,25; 52:1,4; 54:6(2x),9,10; 56:4; 57:15,16; 60:2,9(2x); 62:4;<sup>44</sup> and 65:16.

*כי* has a large range of usage in Hebrew. If used as a conjunction, it can denote “because,” “for,” “that,” and “when,” or—after a negative statement—“but rather.” Besides, the lexeme occurs as a demonstrative or emphatic particle in the sense of “indeed,” “surely,” opening a statement with emphasis. Finally, *כי* sometimes introduces the direct narration, turning into a “*כי* recitativum.”<sup>45</sup> There are also cases in which it is unclear which of these various connotations *כי* conveys. The multi-functionality and resulting ambiguity of *כי* may partly explain its many omissions in the translation of Isaiah. Maybe the translator was not always sure about the specific meaning of *כי* in a certain context, and hence tended to discard it altogether. Especially when *כי* is employed in the sense of “indeed,” he often seems to have left it out, perhaps because that connotation was difficult to reflect in Greek. Also *כי* following a negative statement (“but rather”; see 30:16) may have caused him trouble. In places where the conjunction is applied in such a way many errors appear throughout the entire LXX.<sup>46</sup>

Among the instances of *כי* being a minus eight occur in expressions starting with *כִּי כֹה אָמַר* (see 8:11; 30:15; 36:16; 45:18; 49:25; 52:4; 56:4; and 57:15).<sup>47</sup> Starting with *כי* this formula is found fourteen times in MT Isaiah, in addition to almost thirty times without *כי* and six times where it begins with *לִכֵּן*.<sup>48</sup> LXX Isaiah’s frequent lack of representation of *כי* in the translation of this expression might be a matter of assimilation. The translator may have wanted to adjust

<sup>42</sup> For a more extensive analysis of the use of *δή* in LXX Isa, see Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 207–219.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 217.

<sup>44</sup> In 62:4 the entire sentence that starts with *כי* is absent in the Greek.

<sup>45</sup> BDB 471–472; Aejmelaeus, “Ὅτι recitativum,” 74–78; HALOT 1:470–471. Two possible cases of *כי* recitativum in MT Isa which Aejmelaeus mentions can be found in 14:32 and 39:8 (cf. “Ὅτι recitativum,” 78).

<sup>46</sup> Aejmelaeus, “Significance of Clause Connectors,” 373.

<sup>47</sup> In 4QIsa<sup>f</sup> 8:11 *כי* is a minus as well. See section 12.3.2.2.

<sup>48</sup> Starting with *כי*: 8:11; 18:4; 21:6,16; 30:15; 31:4; 36:16; 45:18; 49:25; 52:3,4; 56:4; 57:15; 66:12. Without *כי*: 7:7; 22:15; 36:4,14; 37:3,6,21; 38:1,5; 42:5; 43:1,14,16; 44:2,6,24; 45:1,11,14; 48:17; 49:7,8,22; 50:1; 51:22; 56:1; 65:8; 66:1. Starting with *לִכֵּן*: 10:24; 28:16; 29:22; 30:12; 37:33; 65:13.

the formula to its most common appearance, which is without **כִּי**. But usually the explanation can also be found in contextual harmonisation, in that the text contains a similar formula close at hand that is not introduced by **כִּי** either.<sup>49</sup>

Despite the many cases in which **כִּי** is not represented, in the majority of its occurrences it does however have a Greek parallel. This generally consists of ὅτι—nearly always when **כִּי** introduces a subordinate object clause (“that”), but also often when it has a causal meaning.<sup>50</sup> Twice **כִּי** matches δὴ in the Greek (3:1 and 39:8), where the translator probably intended to reflect the emphatic function of the Hebrew word. Additionally, **כִּי** has been rendered a few times by e.g. ἐάν (1:15; 8:19; 10:8,22; 28:15,18; 43:2; 58:7); γάρ (10:25; 37:19; 57:16), καί (14:1; 32:13; 54:14), ἀλλά (10:7; 49:10), διότι (7:16; 30:19), ἕως (55:10), and μὴ (36:19).

### 6.3.2 **אֲנִי**

For the non-translation of **אֲנִי** in LXX Isaiah, see section 9.8.3.

### 6.3.3 **וְ**

Like **כִּי**, **וְ** also may have confused the translator on account of the multiple purposes that this particle has: **וְ** can serve as an emphasising “surely,” but it can also be utilised in a restrictive sense as “only,” as well as antithetically in the meaning of “however,” “but.”<sup>51</sup> This complexity may have triggered the omission of the word in three places: Isa 34:14,15; and 45:24. In its other occurrences, **וְ** is represented by νῦν δέ (14:15); καί (19:11); ἀλλά (43:24); and ὅτι (45:14), and also twice by means of a rhetorical question introduced by μὴ (36:5) or οὐχ (63:8), and once by a negation οὐκ (16:7).

### 6.3.4 **וְגַם**

**וְגַם** (“also”) in among half of its 31 attestations in Isaiah is rendered by καί or οὐδέ/οὔτε in the LXX. In the nine cases where the Hebrew gives **וְגַם**, the LXX generally offers a mere καί (see 5:2; 7:20; 21:12; 30:5; 31:2; 45:16; and 66:21). Probably this was because the translator could not think of a synonym that he could add to καί. In 28:7 **וְגַם** is rendered by γάρ, and in 40:24 an equivalent is entirely absent in the translation. **וְגַם** is left out in another four instances where it is not preceded by **וְ**: see 7:13; 26:12; 47:3; and 49:25.

## 6.4 Conclusion

Although the present chapter could not go into great detail in discussing LXX Isaiah’s pluses and minuses consisting of particles, still, it has however attempted to shed some light upon the way in which the translator has dealt with these small words. One impression given, is that he has much more often *inserted* particles than omitted them. This has probably to do with the fact that the Hebrew language displays a smaller variety and a lower frequency in its use of

<sup>49</sup> In 36:16 the omission of **כִּי** has most likely been carried out in assimilation to v.14; in 49:25 to 49:5,7,8,22; in 52:4 to 52:5; in 56:4 to 56:1,8; and in 57:15 to 57:19,21.

<sup>50</sup> On the rendering of **כִּי** by ὅτι, see section 6.2.1b above.

<sup>51</sup> HALOT 1:45.

particles—especially connective ones—than the Greek does.<sup>52</sup> As a consequence, the translator may, for the sake of a proper and clear use of the Greek language, from time to time have felt himself called upon to add particles, thus clarifying or creating relationships between different parts of the text. In doing so, he has at the same time demonstrated that he was not just concerned to render his text in a mechanical way, but that he also aimed at employing the Greek language in a correct manner. In this respect, as Le Moigne has pointed out, the addition of particles illustrates the *autonomy* of the Greek Isaiah. By ameliorating the discourse through the insertion of particles the translator exhibits “une lecture qui ‘corrige’ le texte grec à partir du texte grec lui-même, qui révèle un souci d’offrir un texte trouvant sa cohérence en soi et non par rapport au modèle hébreu.”<sup>53</sup> This subject of the translator’s aspiration to use Greek style and language properly, for which he was occasionally prepared to deviate from his Hebrew source, will be further investigated later in this study.

As for minuses consisting of particles in LXX Isaiah, this concerns in particular the Hebrew conjunction וְ. Perhaps the translator omitted this multi-functional lexeme for the reason that it caused him some trouble.

Except by the addition or omission of these words by the translator, the presence or absence of particles in LXX Isaiah will occasionally have been caused by a Hebrew ancestor text in which these words were extra or lacking as compared to the MT. This can be expected especially as it concerns minuses consisting of the Hebrew *copula* וְ, as well as pluses formed by the conjunctions καί, γάρ and δέ which may render וְ, because the וְ was a letter which was easily skipped over or added by copyists.

---

<sup>52</sup> Except for the conjunction וְ—“and.”

<sup>53</sup> Le Moigne, “Livre d’Ésaïe,” 578–579.