



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of its Translation of Plant Metaphors

Austin, B.M.

Citation

Austin, B. M. (2014, May 28). *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of its Translation of Plant Metaphors*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/25844>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/25844>

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

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/25844> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Austin, B.M.

Title: The old Greek of Isaiah : analysis of its translation of plant metaphors

Issue Date: 2014-05-28

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

In this study, the plant metaphors of the Septuagint of Isaiah will be analyzed in order to gain further insight into the translation technique of this unique book. This introductory chapter begins with a survey of previous scholarship on the metaphors in the LXX. Then a brief introduction to modern views of metaphor is given, followed by a description of the views of metaphor and the rhetorical training that belong to the context in which the LXX-Isa translator worked. Finally, the method this study will follow is described, along with its outline.

1.1. Metaphors in the Septuagint

1.1.1. Metaphors in the Septuagint in General

Scholarship on metaphors in the Septuagint is surprisingly scant. In 1889, Edwin Hatch commented on how differences between Biblical and Classical Greek were in part due to their differences in time, location, and the people using them.¹ These differences among other things, account for the differences in metaphors used.² Regarding special differences between the Greek and the Hebrew of the Old Testament, Hatch noted that the LXX sometimes changes the metaphors, sometimes adds metaphors, and sometimes subtracts them.³

Most scholarship on the rendering of metaphors in the LXX has been centered around the discussion about the translation of anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms. C. T. Fritsch made the argument in 1943 that many anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms were taken into the Greek with few cases of alteration, yet certain expressions were systematically avoided.⁴ Some scholars objected to the idea that the LXX had anti-anthropomorphic tendencies, most notably H. M. Orlinsky.⁵ His studies focus on body parts ascribed to God; he

¹ Edwin Hatch, "On the Value and Use of the Septuagint," in *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1889), 3-4.

² Hatch, "On the Value and Use of the Septuagint," 9.

³ Hatch, "On the Value and Use of the Septuagint," 17-18.

⁴ C. T. Fritsch, *The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943), 62. He even points out exceptions to both the anthropomorphisms that are retained and to those that are usually removed.

⁵ See for example: H. M. Orlinsky, "The Treatment of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the LXX of Isaiah," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 27 (1956): 193-200; and H. M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the LXX of the

concludes: "whether he [the translator] did or did not find anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms offensive, he reproduced the Hebrew terms literally and correctly;"⁶ and that what are called anti-anthropomorphisms "are the result of nothing more tendentious than mere stylism, with theology and philosophy playing no direct role whatever in the matter."⁷ Several of his students conducted further studies, such as Bernard Zlotowitz, who concluded regarding the translations that were not literal: "the sole motive was to make the Hebrew phrase intelligible, but not to avoid any anthropomorphism."⁸

In a study along similar lines, Staffan Olofsson researched metaphors and epithets used of God to investigate the theological exegesis of the LXX (mostly focused on the Psalms).⁹ He concludes that most purported examples of anti-anthropomorphisms and "theological toning down" can be otherwise explained.¹⁰ He admits that the LXX seems reluctant to see God literally, but avoiding anthropomorphic metaphors has more to do with the translator's linguistic understanding of the expression than with conscious exegesis.¹¹ His analysis of terms used both metaphorically and non-metaphorically shows that the metaphorical passages were "in most passages not creative, living images, but more or less stereotypes for the protection and help of God. This is further emphasized through the interchangeability of some of the terms."¹² The theological factors he found that influenced changing metaphors include a reluctance to use terms similar to those used of pagan gods and also a desire to emphasize God's transcendence over creation.¹³

Since Olofsson's book, there have been a few studies on metaphors in the LXX without reference to anthropomorphisms or divine language. David A. Baer studied the ideology and theology of LXX-Isa 56-66 and noted an unsystematic tendency to creatively deflect anthropomorphic language about God.¹⁴ Johann Cook has addressed the issue of LXX Proverbs' translations of the strange woman metaphor.¹⁵ He examined the LXX rendering of Proverbs 1-9 and argues that while the Greek in places retains the metaphor of the strange woman, it nuances the translation as a whole to point to the metaphor's interpretation as being

Book of Job. III, On the Matter of Anthropomorphisms, Anthropopathisms, and Euphemisms," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 30 (1959): 153-67; 32 (1961): 239-68.

⁶ Orlinsky, "The Treatment of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the LXX of Isaiah," 200.

⁷ Orlinsky, "The Treatment of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the LXX of Isaiah," 194.

⁸ Bernard M. Zlotowitz, *The Septuagint Translation of the Hebrew Terms in Relation to God in the Book of Jeremiah* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1981), 183.

⁹ Staffan Olofsson, *God Is My Rock: A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (ConBOT 31; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990).

¹⁰ Olofsson, *God Is My Rock*, 149.

¹¹ Olofsson, *God Is My Rock*, 149.

¹² Olofsson, *God Is My Rock*, 151.

¹³ Olofsson, *God Is My Rock*, 151.

¹⁴ David A. Baer, *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56-66* (JSOTSup 318; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 159. He also notes some translations he classifies as "demetaphorization," 66, 110, 222.

¹⁵ Johann Cook, "אִשָּׁה זָרָה (Proverbs 1-9 Septuagint): A Metaphor for Foreign Wisdom?" *ZAW* 106:3 (1994): 458-76.

foreign wisdom, specifically Greek philosophy.¹⁶ M. V. Fox took up this same issue and argued that the metaphorical or symbolic meanings of the strange woman vary: in chapter two she is demetaphorized simply into bad counsel, in chapter five she is primarily a trollop but also a symbol for folly, in chapter six and seven she again is an adulteress but with no explicit symbolic interpretation, and in chapter nine she can represent not foreign philosophy but foreign thought, religion and ways in general that should be avoided by Jews living in diaspora.¹⁷ Matthew Goff also addressed this issue with his own study of the woman of folly in LXX Proverbs and 4Q184. He believes neither text consistently tries to turn the woman into an abstract symbol, but both do move toward abstraction.¹⁸

Jan Joosten investigated how similes are translated in the Septuagint, focusing on translation technique mostly at the syntactical level.¹⁹ He classifies four types of similes used in Hebrew and adds a catch-all category for other constructions which occur infrequently.²⁰ He concludes that the LXX disregards representing the various types of Hebrew constructions, and opts instead for rendering “accurately the sense of the source text,” largely due to differences in the grammars and syntaxes of the two languages.²¹ He proceeds to show the variety of ways Greek can construct similes (which are not used to correspond to the Hebrew constructions, though some are similar) and gives statistics for which constructions various LXX books prefer.²²

More recently, Antje Labahn researched how the LXX of Lamentations translates and presents the metaphors of 3:1-21.²³ She argues that there is a great variety of how metaphors are translated and that how the translator treats them is integrated into his understanding of the concepts that extend throughout the chapter.²⁴ The main concept is that the LXX understands the song explicitly as that of Jeremiah (LXX-Lam 1:1) and so interprets (including the metaphors) to reflect the experience of Jeremiah, particularly his increasing suffering.²⁵ She makes the observation that the translator both receives the Hebrew metaphors and produces new metaphors in Greek, though it is unclear whether the change in the metaphors he produces are due to his understanding of the Hebrew or his effort to produce a sound Greek

¹⁶ Cook, “הַיָּהוּדָה (Proverbs 1-9 Septuagint),” 474.

¹⁷ M. V. Fox, “The Strange Woman in Septuagint Proverbs,” *JNSL* 22 (1996), 42-43.

¹⁸ Matthew Goff, “Hellish Females: The Strange Woman of Septuagint Proverbs and 4QWiles of the Wicked Woman (4Q184),” *JSJ* 39 (2008), 44.

¹⁹ Jan Joosten, “Elaborate Similes--Hebrew and Greek: A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique,” *Biblica* 77 (1996): 227-236.

²⁰ Joosten, “Elaborate Similes,” 227-29.

²¹ Joosten, “Elaborate Similes,” 230.

²² Joosten, “Elaborate Similes,” 230-36. He distinguishes based on verbal form, since the various comparative particles seem to be nearly synonymous.

²³ Antje Labahn, “Bitterkeit und Asche als Speise – das Leiden Jeremias am Schicksal Jerusalems: Metaphern und Metapher-variationen in Thr 3,1-21 LXX,” in *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (ed. Pierre van Hecke; BETL CLXXXVII; Leuven: University Press, 2005): 147-83.

²⁴ Labahn, “Bitterkeit und Asche als Speise,” 147.

²⁵ Labahn, “Bitterkeit und Asche als Speise,” 147-49.

text, and so we must be content with observing the shifts in meaning.²⁶ Also, she points out that the reception process of a metaphor extends its versatility, but once a rendering is given a limited number of meanings (overlapping, no doubt the original meanings to some extent) are carried through to the new text.²⁷

1.1.2. Metaphors in Septuagint Isaiah

Besides Orlinsky's article on the anthropomorphisms of LXX-Isa,²⁸ there are very few works that specifically treat the metaphors of LXX-Isa. G. B. Caird in his book on the imagery of the Bible notes that the LXX occasionally avoids anthropomorphisms that seem irreverent to the translator, such as in Exod 15, 24, and Psa 17.²⁹ He comments specifically about LXX-Isa, saying: "On occasion he will take Isaiah's vigorous metaphors with flat-footed literalness. He turns 'Your silver has become dross, your wine mixed with water' into 'Your money is counterfeit, and the merchants are diluting the wine with water' (1:22)."³⁰ Later he explains that while the Hebrew metaphor is about the general moral state of the nation, the LXX understands them to literally refer to coinage and wine.³¹ Various other scholars have commented on the translation of metaphors in passing,³² but their studies did not set out to investigate them.

Joosten's work on similes in the LXX concludes regarding LXX-Isa, that unlike most LXX translators (which use two or three), LXX-Isa used all four types of syntax to render similes.³³ He says this is yet more evidence for the well-known independence and freedom of the LXX-Isa translator.³⁴

The most extensive work treating metaphors in LXX-Isa is chapter five of Joseph Ziegler's book *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*.³⁵ In this chapter, Ziegler argues that the translator considered himself authorized to render the text freely: the Greek of Isaiah removes Hebraisms, is often very literal, and is usually in some way related to the *Vorlage*, but at the same time it is both a translation and an interpretation.³⁶ Ziegler believes

²⁶ Labahn, "Bitterkeit und Asche als Speise," 153.

²⁷ Labahn, "Bitterkeit und Asche als Speise," 153.

²⁸ Orlinsky, "The Treatment of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the LXX of Isaiah," 193-200.

²⁹ G. B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 127.

³⁰ Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, 126.

³¹ Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, 185.

³² For example, Isaac Leo Seeligmann, "Problems and Perspectives in Modern Septuagint Research," pages 21-80 in *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (eds. Robert Hanhard and Hermann Spieckermann; Judith H. Seeligmann trans.; Forschungen zum Alten Testament 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004). Ronald L. Troxel, "Economic Plunder as a Leitmotif in LXX-Isaiah," *Biblica* 83 (2002), 381; and Baer occasionally points out instances of demetaphorization in his book *When We All Go Home*, 66, 110, 222.

³³ Joosten, "Elaborate Similes," 236.

³⁴ Joosten, "Elaborate Similes," 236.

³⁵ Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias* (Munster: Aschendorff, 1934): 80-103.

³⁶ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 80.

interpretation occurs most strongly in figurative expressions, allegories, and the like.³⁷ He explains numerous examples to support his argument that metaphors are rendered freely because the translator was interpreting them based on his conception of the passages' meaning and on the context or parallel passages of Isaiah.³⁸ Ziegler does not claim to offer a complete catalogue of the types of metaphor renderings, nor does he treat all of the metaphors in LXX-Isa, he simply offers a few examples of ways metaphors are rendered to support his thesis.

Ziegler points out three specific reasons for metaphors not being rendered literally:

- 1) When the image is too tangible or coarse and so is ameliorated;
- 2) When unknown references or vocabulary are interpreted by the translator;
- 3) When impersonal expressions are rendered personally by the translator.³⁹

He gives several examples for each of these reasons and gives some examples that can be described by multiple of these reasons and others that do not clearly fit into any of these categories.

He also shows that the translator did not feel obligated to render a word or image literally. For example, the translator knew the definition of כָּלִי, translating it literally with σκεῦος on numerous occasions (10:29(28); 39:2; 52:11; 54:16-17; 65:4).⁴⁰ But in nearly as many places he also translated it freely to fit the (perceived) context: for example, in 13:5, וְכָלִי וְזַמְוִי becomes καὶ οἱ ὀπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ;⁴¹ in 18:2 וְכָלִי-גִמְאָ becomes καὶ ἐπιστολὰς βυβλίνας; and in 61:10 תְּעֹדָה כָּלִיָּהּ becomes καὶ ὡς νύμφην κατεκόσμησέν με κόσμῳ.⁴²

Ziegler finishes the section by discussing Isa 22:15-25 and 27:2-5, passages he describes as characteristic for the translation technique of the LXX-Isa.⁴³ Both of these passages are quite different from the Hebrew, though can be in large part traced back to the Hebrew. Ziegler argues that the metaphors in these two passages are rendered freely because the translator was interpreting in each case based on his conception of the passage's meaning and on the context or parallel passages of Isaiah.⁴⁴

The second part of Ziegler's chapter is on comparisons (*Vergleiche*).⁴⁵ He notes that LXX-Isa usually translates the Hebrew כ with ὡς, ὡσεὶ, or ὥσπερ.⁴⁶ When a whole sentence is used as a comparison, ὃν τρόπον stands for בְּאִשֶּׁר, and also for the Hebrew construction כ

³⁷ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 81.

³⁸ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 80-81, 91.

³⁹ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 81.

⁴⁰ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 83-84.

⁴¹ Ziegler points out the same phrase in Jer 27(50):25 is rendered τὰ σκεύη ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 83.

⁴² Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 83-84. He also discusses the other occurrences (32:7; 66:20; and the most interesting: 22:24).

⁴³ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 85-91.

⁴⁴ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 85, 87, 91.

⁴⁵ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 92-103.

⁴⁶ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 92.

with the infinitive of a verb.⁴⁷ Sometimes כ is read as כ and in one place כִּי is read as כִּי. Also, כ is read for the preposition ל, especially in the construction: לִּיהֵי "to become something."⁴⁸ Often, Ziegler notes, the comparative particle ὥς is interjected where something like the Hebrew כ is absent.⁴⁹

Ziegler treats a plethora of comparisons, each in great detail. He argues that sometimes free translations are the result of a misunderstanding of vocabulary (or due to the difficulty of the Hebrew),⁵⁰ or of a harmonization (or influence of a parallel text),⁵¹ or are expanded based on context,⁵² or to better emphasize a theological point,⁵³ or even to fit the cultural context of the translator's own time.⁵⁴ He argues that the translator at times extended similes or added elements, even adding comparisons,⁵⁵ including negations,⁵⁶ to create a sensible meaning in Greek.⁵⁷

In the other work that specifically addresses the rendering of metaphors in LXX-Isa, Arie van der Kooij shows that the interpretation of metaphors is a characteristic of LXX Isaiah which it shares with Targum Jonathan of the Prophets.⁵⁸ The LXX in general tends to render metaphors literally, but he mentions a few examples of interpretive renderings; LXX-Isa, though, has far more.⁵⁹ He gives various examples of different ways metaphors are interpreted. First, he shows how in Isa 1:25 the LXX interprets the refining metaphor as God removing the wicked.⁶⁰ He shows how in 5:14b the LXX interprets the metaphors personally, as representing specific groups of people, so "dignity" is rendered as "glorious ones," "multitude" is rendered "great ones," and "uproar" is rendered "rich ones;" he points out that this is also how the Targum interprets the passage.⁶¹ Similarly, he shows how Isa 10:33-34 is rendered by the LXX so that the tree metaphors are interpreted as referring to specific people: "the glorious" and "the proud;" similarly, the Targum renders the metaphors personally.⁶² In 1:10, he shows how the LXX has interpreted the metaphor "a signal," a term the translator knows, by substituting the word "to rule."⁶³ The LXX interprets many of the metaphors in Isa

⁴⁷ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 92.

⁴⁸ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 92.

⁴⁹ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 92.

⁵⁰ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 92, 96.

⁵¹ e.g. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 92-93.

⁵² e.g. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 93-95.

⁵³ e.g. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 96.

⁵⁴ e.g. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 93, 97. cf. "Kapital 8. Der alexandrinisch-ägyptische Hintergrund der Js-LXX."

⁵⁵ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 100-103.

⁵⁶ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 95-96.

⁵⁷ e.g. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 95.

⁵⁸ 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* (eds. F. Garcia Martinez and G. P. Luttikhuis; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 185.

⁵⁹ van der Kooij, "The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language," 179-180.

⁶⁰ van der Kooij, "The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language," 180-81.

⁶¹ van der Kooij, "The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language," 181-82.

⁶² van der Kooij, "The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language," 182.

⁶³ van der Kooij, "The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language," 182-83.

22:22-24, as van der Kooij describes, often by substituting individual words. In 22:22 the translator connects the idea of a “shoulder” to “leading” (as in 9:6) and so interprets the metaphor as “to rule.”⁶⁴ Similarly, in 22:23, “peg” is interpreted as “a ruler,” and in 22:24 “to hang” on the peg is interpreted as “to trust” in the ruler.⁶⁵ He shows a similar interpretation in 23:17, where “play the harlot” (וִזְנֶתָהּ) is interpreted in the sense of “to trade” (זָנָה) and is rendered that Tyre will be a port of merchandise; this is similar to the Targum’s rendering.⁶⁶ Finally, he gives an example of interpretation, based on similar metaphors in the Hebrew Bible and Mesopotamian literature, where, in 31:9b, “fire” and “furnace” are interpreted by the LXX as “seed” and “kinsmen.”⁶⁷ This tendency to interpret metaphors is typical of the Targum, so it is interesting to see it at work already in LXX-Isa; also of interest are the specific interpretations of metaphors in LXX-Isa that are similar to those of the Targum.

1.1.3. Metaphor Translation Strategies

While Ziegler has offered a few reasons for *why* a metaphor was translated in a special way, in this section we will look at *how* metaphors can be translated. A few studies have pointed out the various metaphor translation strategies used by LXX translators. In the concluding chapter (4.1.) we too will catalogue how LXX-Isa renders metaphors according to various available translation strategies.

Metaphors often depend on cultural perceptions, and different cultures organize concepts differently.⁶⁸ So metaphors can not always be translated literally but require the translator to overcome difficulties both in their source text and also with difficulties in the target text (or culture).⁶⁹

Edwin Hatch noted, in his own words, how differences in culture had an effect on how metaphors were translated in the LXX.⁷⁰ Hatch pointed out three different ways in which the translators modified metaphors in their translations:

- 1) Sometimes metaphors are changed (Micah 3:2: אָהַב “he loved” rendered ζητεῖν “to seek”);
- 2) Sometimes metaphors are “dropped” (Isa 6:6: וַיָּעָז “then flew” becomes ἀπεστάλη “was sent”);
- 3) Sometimes metaphors appear to be added (Jer 5:17: שָׁרַף “he destroyed” becomes ἀλοᾶν “to thresh”).⁷¹

⁶⁴ van der Kooij, “The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language,” 183.

⁶⁵ van der Kooij, “The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language,” 183.

⁶⁶ van der Kooij, “The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language,” 184.

⁶⁷ van der Kooij, “The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language,” 184-85.

⁶⁸ David Punter, *Metaphor* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 104.

⁶⁹ Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995), 84.

⁷⁰ Hatch, “On the Value and Use of the Septuagint,” 9-10.

⁷¹ Hatch, “On the Value and Use of the Septuagint,” 17-18.

It is noteworthy that his examples are all of substitutions of one word.

More recently, Antje Labahn, in her study of the LXX-Lam 3:1-21, finds six categories into which LXX-Lam's renderings of metaphors fit:

- 1) Retained metaphors;
- 2) Removed metaphors;
- 3) Metaphors changed into similes;
- 4) Interpreted metaphors;
- 5) New metaphors due to intratextual references;
- 6) New original metaphors.⁷²

That such a short passage has so many different strategies for rendering metaphors shows the versatility and skill of the translator, and shows he is willing to reshape the metaphors to serve particular functions in the translated text.⁷³ Ziegler has made nearly the same observation regarding the LXX-Isa translator,⁷⁴ and so we should not be surprised to see a varied and versatile treatment of metaphors in LXX-Isa.

Theo van der Louw has a short excursus on the translation of metaphors in his book that bridges translation studies with Septuagint studies.⁷⁵ He points out that metaphors are often divided into lexicalized metaphors, conventional metaphors, and original metaphors.⁷⁶ He says that original metaphors are often the easiest to translate, since conventional and lexicalized metaphors are often language or culture specific.⁷⁷ He claims that metaphors should not be counted as a separate kind of transformation, but merely a problem area that can be solved in different ways.⁷⁸ Van der Louw shows how the various strategies for translating metaphors are essentially the same transformations that are used to translate any kind of text. The strategies he lists are:

- 1) Reproduction of the same image;
- 2) Reproduction of the same image plus its sense;
- 3) Replacement of a stock metaphor with an established metaphor in the same sphere;
- 4) Translation of a metaphor with a simile;
- 5) Translation of a metaphor with a simile plus its sense;
- 6) Translation of a metaphor's sense;
- 7) Deletion of the metaphor if it is redundant;

⁷² Labahn, "Bitterkeit und Asche als Speise," 147-83. She considers this only five categories, but I have divided "new metaphors due to intratextual references" and "new original metaphors."

⁷³ Labahn, "Bitterkeit und Asche als Speise," 181.

⁷⁴ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 80-81, 91.

⁷⁵ Theo A. W. van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint: Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies* (CBET 47; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 85-86.

⁷⁶ van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 86.

⁷⁷ van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 86.

⁷⁸ van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 85.

8) Rendering non-figurative language by a metaphor.⁷⁹

From the perspective of descriptive translation theory, Gideon Toury has proposed six ways metaphors could be translated:

- 1) Translating the metaphor into the “same” metaphor;
- 2) Translating the metaphor into a “different” metaphor;
- 3) Translating the metaphor into a non-metaphor;
- 4) Not translating the metaphor but omitting the line;
- 5) Translating a non-metaphor into a metaphor;
- 6) Adding a metaphor where there is no equivalent in the source text.⁸⁰

These six categories seem complete, but each taken individually is somewhat broad. The second category, for example, includes two widely different translation strategies. Using a “different” metaphor could mean using a simile instead of a metaphor (or vice versa) as well as using a completely different metaphor (either a newly invented one for the text or one taken from the common usage of the target language). Likewise the third category includes simple substitutions (“power” for “hand”) or more extended exegetical explanations. In our conclusions (4.1.) we will catalogue the translation strategies used in LXX-Isa along similar lines, though with narrower categories.

1.1.4. Summary

As this survey has shown, the question of the translation of metaphors in the Septuagint as a whole arose as vague observations and was developed primarily in regard to language for God and as an example of theological exegesis. More recently, along with the general interest in metaphors in Biblical scholarship, the translation of metaphors has been considered worthy of study apart from questions of divine language. The situation in the Septuagint of Isaiah is similar, except that Ziegler and van der Kooij were interested in the metaphors as opportunities for the unique qualities of the translator’s ideas and methods to manifest themselves. Recently, van der Louw and Labahn have categorized some translation strategies used in the LXX for rendering metaphors. While much good work has been done on the rendering of metaphors in the Septuagint, there is still room to expand and elaborate, particularly in the case of the unique work LXX-Isa.

⁷⁹ van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 86.

⁸⁰ Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, 82-83.

1.2. Modern Views of Metaphor

Metaphor scholarship is a rapidly growing field of study, expanding from literary studies into linguistics, philosophy, psychology, neuro-science and many other areas. While many issues are still being explored and discussed, it is worthwhile to briefly survey the major trends in order to better frame how we will approach thinking and talking about metaphors. This section consists of a brief survey of the history of modern metaphor scholarship as well as a survey of how this scholarship has been adopted in Old Testament studies.

1.2.1. A Brief Survey of Modern Metaphor Scholarship

As we will see, modern metaphor theories claim to describe universally how humans use metaphors, and so some features of these theories should be useful in our analysis of LXX-Isa. Also, these theories provide terminology that will be useful in describing metaphors. Here we will survey the relevant scholarship, and we will outline our own approach to metaphors below (1.4.1.).

Starting with I. A. Richards' lecture series in 1936,⁸¹ metaphor has been widely recognized as an integral part of how we communicate and how we understand the world around us. In his lectures, Richards challenged many of the dominant theories and practices concerning metaphors. He argued that Aristotle is mistaken in his *Poetics* in his assertions that: 1) Having an "eye for resemblances" is a special gift some people have, while in fact this is vital for learning and speaking; 2) Good use of metaphor cannot be taught, but we must somehow learn this; 3) Metaphor is something special and exceptional in the use of language, instead of an "omnipresent principle of language."⁸² To Richards, metaphors are not simply the replacement of one word with another, they are "two thoughts of different things active together and supported by a single word, or phrase, whose meaning is a resultant of their interaction."⁸³ Metaphors are not a verbal matter, but are an interaction of thoughts; and thought itself is metaphoric.⁸⁴ A further contribution is his attempt to offer vocabulary for analyzing metaphors. He calls the meaning or topic of the metaphor its *tenor* and the image that is used its *vehicle*.⁸⁵ Also, he warns that not being able to describe why or how a metaphor works, does not mean that the metaphor does not work.⁸⁶

Max Black was also an important early contributor to the development of modern metaphor scholarship. He offers terminology for describing metaphors as well, calling the

⁸¹ I. A. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979).

⁸² Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 89-90.

⁸³ Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 93.

⁸⁴ Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 94.

⁸⁵ Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 101-103.

⁸⁶ Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 118.

image the *focus* and the rest of the statement the *frame*.⁸⁷ He describes two common views of metaphor, and offers his own third view. He calls the first the substitution view, where a metaphor is simply a different way of saying something, so that a metaphor could be paraphrased in literal language.⁸⁸ The second view is a variation of the first; he calls it the comparison view. The comparison view is that metaphor is really just a special kind of simile.⁸⁹ Black calls his own view the interaction view of metaphor. He describes metaphors as highlighting certain commonplaces of the focus and the frame in order to organize our view of the subject of the metaphor; metaphors filter certain aspects, selecting the ones to be emphasized.⁹⁰ A metaphor for Black, then, is more than the transfer of meaning between words, it is a way of filtering an interaction between ideas. In Black's other work on metaphors, he continues to fight the idea that metaphors are a matter of saying one thing and meaning another, as well as the opposite tendency of some to turn everything into metaphor.⁹¹ He also offers further vocabulary for describing metaphors,⁹² though it does not seem to have been adopted by many. He recognizes that metaphors can be restated as similes, but emphasizes that much is lost in this restatement.⁹³ Black critiques attempts to objectively test for the presence of a metaphor, since no test will work all the time, and other rhetorical figures may also be identified by a given test.⁹⁴ He also argues that metaphors can be creative in how they can offer us a new perspective of something that was not previously available, in the same way that cinema could offer a view of a horse running in slow motion, which no one had seen before.⁹⁵

Another important moment in the development of metaphor theory was the work resulting from a 1978 symposium which would become the book "On Metaphor," edited by Sheldon Sacks.⁹⁶ Scholars from a variety of disciplines contributed to the study of metaphors, discussing various aspects of how they are formed and function. For example, Ted Cohen shows how metaphors can create intimacy by using knowledge or experiences common to the speaker and audience.⁹⁷ Wayne C. Booth suggest the evaluation of a metaphor needs to take into account its context, which is not only a literary matter but also cultural.⁹⁸ Paul Ricoeur

⁸⁷ Max Black, *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1962), 21.

⁸⁸ Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 33-34.

⁸⁹ Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 35.

⁹⁰ Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 38.

⁹¹ Max Black, "More about Metaphor," in *Metaphor and Thought* (ed. Andrew Ortony; 2nd ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 1993), 19-22.

⁹² Black, "More about Metaphor," 23-30.

⁹³ Black, "More about Metaphor," 30-31.

⁹⁴ Black, "More about Metaphor," 33-35.

⁹⁵ Black, "More about Metaphor," 35-38.

⁹⁶ Sheldon Sacks, ed., *On Metaphor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979).

⁹⁷ Ted Cohen, "Metaphor and the Cultivation of Intimacy," in *Metaphor and Thought* (ed. Andrew Ortony; 2nd ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 1993): 1-10.

⁹⁸ Wayne C. Booth, "Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation," in *Metaphor and Thought* (ed. Andrew Ortony; 2nd ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 1993): 47-70.

argues that metaphors convey information in part by stimulating our imaginations and feelings in such a way as to “elicit feelings that we mistakenly hold for genuine information and for fresh insight into reality.”⁹⁹ Many of the articles in this book contributed to the ever growing and ever better stated cognitive view of metaphors.

The most detailed and systematic argument for the cognitive (sometimes called conceptual) view of metaphor is George Lakoff and Mark Johnson’s book *Metaphors We Live By*. The idea behind cognitive metaphors is that they are not just a feature of our language, metaphors are how we actually conceive of abstract concepts.¹⁰⁰ For example, Lakoff and Johnson show that we typically conceptualize arguments in terms of war. This is why we use metaphors that say: I won that argument; we got in a fight; she shot down my argument; his claims were indefensible, etc.¹⁰¹ The type of metaphors we use reflect how we conceptualize an idea. They go into great detail showing different types of metaphors (such as orientational, ontological, personification, etc.) and how metaphors find coherence, are structured, and are grounded. They show that many conceptual metaphors are common to many cultures, such as orientational metaphors.¹⁰² Also of note is their assertion that conceptual systems are grounded in our experiences, including physical and cultural experiences.¹⁰³ This last point helps explain why we can understand new metaphors, based on our experiences, and why metaphors from other cultures can be difficult to understand.

The conceptual view of metaphor has become the dominant perspective, though it has been challenged. For example, Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson have tried to put metaphor on a continuum of language somewhere between literal language and hyperbolic language.¹⁰⁴ Also, Donald Davidson has argued that metaphors mean nothing more than what they say literally.¹⁰⁵ The conceptual view has also been expanded in various ways. For example Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner have elaborated the theory by saying cognitive metaphors involved complex integration networks involving more conceptual spaces than the simple pairs (source and target spaces) often given.¹⁰⁶ This theory is often called conceptual blending or mapping, and attempts to describe not only metaphor, but how we think and speak.¹⁰⁷

In the past twenty years another major shift has taken place in the study of metaphors. This shift is well illustrated by comparing the table of contents of the second and third edition

⁹⁹ Paul Ricoeur, “The Metaphorical Process as Cognition, Imagination, and Feeling,” in *On Metaphor* (ed. Sheldon Sacks; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979), 141-42.

¹⁰⁰ George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 5-6.

¹⁰¹ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 4-6.

¹⁰² Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 24.

¹⁰³ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 56-60.

¹⁰⁴ Dan Sperber and Deirdre Wilson, “A Deflationary Account of Metaphors,” in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (ed. Raymond Gibbs Jr.; 3rd ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 2008), 84.

¹⁰⁵ Donald Davidson, “What Metaphors Mean,” in *On Metaphor* (ed. Sheldon Sacks; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979): 29-46.

¹⁰⁶ See Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, “Rethinking Metaphor,” in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (ed. Raymond Gibbs Jr.; 3rd ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 2008), 53-66.

¹⁰⁷ Gilles Fauconnier, *Mappings in Thought and Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 1.

of the *Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought*. In the second edition, articles are mostly theoretical, written by literary critics, linguists, philosophers, with a few contributions from psychologists and scientists. The third edition, however, only has a few contributions from the traditional fields from the humanities, and is dominated by psychologists, neuroscientists, biologists, and even has many contributions from those studying artificial intelligence, music, art, and dance. The study of metaphor is now inextricably bound to the study of linguistics and cognition, and is benefiting from studies both from the hard sciences and the arts.

It is worth mentioning a few insights metaphor theorists have made regarding the translation of metaphors. Raymond Gibbs Jr. talks about the paradox of metaphor: metaphors can be creative, novel, and culturally sensitive and still be rooted in experiences common to many people.¹⁰⁸ Indeed, certain conceptual metaphors do exist across temporal and cultural boundaries,¹⁰⁹ but this does not mean that conceptual metaphors can always explain how a given specific metaphor is used or understood, particularly when dealing with metaphors from another culture. David Punter goes so far as to say “Metaphors are not universals. They depend upon cultural and social perceptions, but we can also go one stage further than this and say that metaphors *ground* our perceptions.”¹¹⁰ When examining how a metaphor is translated it often becomes clear that different cultures organize concepts differently, as Fauconnier says:

different cultures organize their background knowledge differently. Good translation, then, requires a quasi-total reconstruction of the cognitive configurations prompted by one language and a determination of how another language would set up a similar configuration with a radically different prompting system and prestructured background.¹¹¹

But of course not all translators bother to do this. Translators who lack a theoretical framework have to deal with difficulties of metaphors both in their source text and also have to deal with difficulties in the target text (or culture).¹¹² This is an important point for our study in that the translator had to bring metaphors not only into a new language but into a new culture; to effectively do so, it at times required him to depart from a literal translation technique.

1.2.2. Metaphor Scholarship in Old Testament Studies

Old Testament scholarship has long been enriched by a wide variety of methods taken from other fields. Studies in the rhetorical features of the Old Testament have benefited from

¹⁰⁸ Raymond Gibbs Jr., “Metaphor and Thought: the State of the Art,” in *The Cambridge Handbook of Metaphor and Thought* (ed. Raymond Gibbs Jr.; 3rd ed.; Cambridge: University Press, 2008), 5.

¹⁰⁹ Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 24.

¹¹⁰ Punter, *Metaphor*, 104.

¹¹¹ Fauconnier, *Mappings in Thought and Language*, 188-89.

¹¹² Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, 84.

the on-going discussion of conceptual metaphors, but as Pierre van Hecke notes, studies of biblical metaphor have a large variety of approaches.¹¹³ In this section, we will survey how Old Testament scholars have adopted modern theories of metaphor in order to better contextualize the current study and to introduce some works that will be useful for its analysis of Hebrew Metaphors.

In approaching the metaphors of the Old Testament, one must be aware both of the benefits metaphor scholarship has for our understanding of metaphors, and that the ancient writers of the Old Testament had very different ideas (ideas probably not explicitly developed or articulated) about metaphors. Biblical scholarship tends to take one of two approaches: from the text toward the ancient theory and usage, or from modern scholarship to better understand the ancient text.¹¹⁴

Luis Alonso Schökel in his manual of Hebrew poetics describes imagery in terms that seem to combine traditional views of metaphor with modern theories.¹¹⁵ His approach is mostly from the biblical text itself, and so his categorization is very helpful for Biblical studies. He defines separately metaphor,¹¹⁶ symbol,¹¹⁷ allegory,¹¹⁸ parable,¹¹⁹ and visions.¹²⁰ Of particular interest are his comments describing premetaphor as an opposite extreme of lexicalized images. Schökel notes that what may appear to moderns as a metaphor may have been the way ancients actually thought of things. He gives as examples, that the sun moves across the sky, or that various organs are the seat of corresponding emotions.¹²¹

Another approach to metaphors in the Old Testament is to draw from New Testament scholarship, particularly from discussions of parables. In Kristen Nielsen's book *There Is Hope for a Tree: The Tree as Metaphor in Isaiah*, she profits greatly from scholarship on parables, though she also uses some theory from Max Black.¹²² A benefit to this approach is that it reminds us that so called metaphors in a prophetic book were probably conceived of

¹¹³ Pierre van Hecke, "Introduction," in *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (ed. Pierre van Hecke; BETL CLXXXVII; Leuven: University Press, 2005), 1-2.

¹¹⁴ David Aaron describes two main ways Old Testament scholars approach metaphors as being either subject based, or based on Lakoff's theories. David Aaron, *Biblical Ambiguities: Metaphor, Semantics, and Divine Imagery* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 9-11. Another description of OT scholarship's approach to metaphors can be found in Marc Zvi Brettler, "The Metaphorical Mapping of God in the Hebrew Bible," in *Metaphor, Canon and Community: Jewish, Christian and Islamic Approaches* (eds. Ralph Birschops and James Francis; Oxford: Peter Lang, 1999), 219-22.

¹¹⁵ Luis Alonso Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics* (trans. and revs. Luis Alonso Schökel and Adrian Graffy; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988), 95-141.

¹¹⁶ Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 108.

¹¹⁷ Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 110-12. We will discuss these other terms below.

¹¹⁸ Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 109.

¹¹⁹ Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 113-14.

¹²⁰ Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 118-20.

¹²¹ Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 101-2. Cf. Aaron, *Biblical Ambiguities*, 11, who says many OT metaphors are "a modern-made smoke screen to obfuscate truths interpreters would rather not confront when it comes to the religion(s) of biblical literature."

¹²² Kirsten Nielsen, *There Is Hope for a Tree: The Tree as Metaphor in Isaiah* (JSOTSup 65; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 26-68.

quite differently than a modern would conceive of a metaphor. While most metaphors used in a prophetic book are not parables either, they do share in common that they were probably considered to be a *mashal*. A drawback to this approach is that some NT parable discussion seems in a large part concerned with departing from medieval detailed allegorical readings of the parables; this sort of discussion follows a different line than is immediately useful to understanding the nature of metaphors in prophetic discourse.¹²³ However, much discussion of NT parables centers around their nature and that of OT *meshalim*. For example, Stephen Curkpatrick shows how the translation of מִשְׁלָּה with παραβολή is inadequate,¹²⁴ since Aristotle understood παραβολή to have a more specific meaning than the biblical understanding of מִשְׁלָּה.¹²⁵

Some Old Testament scholars have adopted cognitive metaphor theory and integrated it into their work, such as Peter W. Macky who developed a method for interpreting the metaphors in the Bible.¹²⁶ Marjo C. A. Korpel compiled many examples of parallel metaphors for the divine in Biblical and Ugaritic literature.¹²⁷ While she uses cognitive metaphor theory, her work is more of a compilation than a deep analysis, though she offers remarks for further study.¹²⁸ More recently Alec Basson demonstrated how the Old Testament uses the cognitive metaphor “people are plants.”¹²⁹ Eric A. Hermanson offers a summary and critique of other scholars’ approaches to biblical metaphor.¹³⁰ He offers tests to see when metaphors are present and he praises work that not only looks at the metaphors of a given biblical book, but that contribute to our understanding of the conceptual frameworks of the authors of the book.¹³¹ Olaf Jäkel summarizes the main tenants of cognitive metaphor theory and then shows how it can be applied to the OT by analyzing journey and path metaphors.¹³² Similarly, M.

¹²³ Indeed, as Marjo Korpel has shown, the ancients did use “large-scale metaphors approaching purely allegorical composition” as can be seen by early exegesis. Marjo C.A. Korpel, “Metaphors in Isaiah LV,” *VT* 46 (1996), 54.

¹²⁴ Robert Lowth long ago commented on this equivalence, “which in some respects is not improper, though it scarcely comprehends the full compass of the Hebrew expression.” Robert Lowth, *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews* (trans. G. Gregory; London: J. Johnson, no. 72, St. Paul’s Church-Yard, 1787), 78.

¹²⁵ Stephen Curkpatrick, “Between Mashal and Parable: “Likeness” as a Metonymic Enigma,” *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 24.1 (2002 Je): 58-71. We discuss this further below.

¹²⁶ Peter W. Macky, *Centrality of Metaphors to Biblical Thought: A Method for Interpreting the Bible* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1990). For another method for metaphor criticism, see Göran Eidevall, *Grapes in the Desert: Metaphors, Models, and Themes in Hosea 4-14* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1996).

¹²⁷ Marjo Christina Annette Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds: Ugaritic and Hebrew Descriptions of the Divine* (UBL 8; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1990).

¹²⁸ Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds*, 614-37.

¹²⁹ Alex Basson, ““People are Plants’: A Conceptual Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible,” *Old Testament Essays* 19 (2006): 573-83. Another recent work dealing with plant metaphors in the Hebrew Bible is Claudia Sticher, “Die Gottlosen gedeihen wie Gras: Zu einigen Pflanzenmetaphern in den Psalmen: eine kanonische Lektüre,” in *Metaphors in the Psalms* (eds. P. van Hecke and A. Labban; BETL 231; Leuven: Peeters, 2010): 251-68.

¹³⁰ Eric A. Hermanson, “Recognizing Hebrew Metaphors: Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Bible Translation,” *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 22.2 (1996): 67-78.

¹³¹ Hermanson, “Recognizing Hebrew Metaphors,” 75-77.

¹³² Olaf Jäkel, “How Can Mortal Man Understand the Road He Travels? Prospects and Problems of the Cognitive Approach to Religious Metaphor,” in *The Bible through Metaphor and Translation: A Cognitive Semantic Perspective* (ed. Kurk Feytaerts; Religions and Discourse 15; Oxford: Peter Lang, 2003): 55-86. For a

Beth Szlos has shown how cognitive metaphor theory: “offers the philosophical underpinnings that explain where meaning comes from, how meaning develops and is expressed. This approach treats conventional metaphors as powerful tools of expression of thought, whereas other approaches treat the conventional as dead.”¹³³ P. van Hecke has shown how integration networks (conceptual blending) can help us better understand complicated metaphors.¹³⁴ By carefully analyzing a metaphor in terms of its source domain, target domain, the generic domain where certain common elements are focused, and the blended domain where the implications of the metaphor interact, van Hecke shows how biblical metaphors can affect how we think about both the source and target domain.¹³⁵ Andrea L. Weiss has developed a means for identifying metaphor and set to work on studying how metaphors function in the Bible.¹³⁶ Isaak de Hulster has proposed an iconographic approach to biblical metaphors for understanding how the ancients understood imagery and to better understand their mental maps.¹³⁷

There are numerous more studies bringing the treasure of metaphorical theorists into the realm of Old Testament studies,¹³⁸ this brief set of examples has shown the sorts of studies that are being done. It is impossible to evenly adopt a set of theories that are still in development, but OT scholars have been able to profit from these theories none the less.

1.3. Ancient Views of Metaphor

While cognitive metaphor theory undoubtedly describes how ancient people used metaphors unconsciously, to properly study how the LXX translators dealt with metaphors we must also look at what conscious ideas they may have had about metaphors. In this section,

more recent application of cognitive metaphor theory to “way” metaphors in Deuteroisaiah, see Øystein Lund, *Way Metaphors and Way Topics in Isaiah 40-55* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007). It is also notable in that he investigates tests for identifying imagery, 45-50.

¹³³ M. Beth Szlos “Body Parts as Metaphor and the value of a Cognitive Approach: A Study of the Female Figures in Proverbs via metaphor,” in *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (ed. Pierre van Hecke; BETL 187; Leuven: University Press, 2005), 195.

¹³⁴ Pierre van Hecke “Conceptual Blending: A Recent Approach to Metaphor: Illustrated with the Pastoral Metaphor in Hos 4:16,” in *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (ed. Pierre van Hecke; BETL 187; Leuven: University Press, 2005), 215-31. Similarly, Brettler has called for a metaphorical mapping of metaphors for God in the Hebrew Bible, Brettler, “The Metaphorical Mapping of God,” 219-32.

¹³⁵ van Hecke, “Conceptual Blending,” 220-22.

¹³⁶ Andrea L. Weiss, *Figurative Language in Biblical Prose Narrative: Metaphor in the Book of Samuel* (VTSup 107; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 32.

¹³⁷ Izaak J. de Hulster, “Illuminating Images: An iconographic method of Old Testament exegesis with three case studies from third Isaiah” (PhD Diss., Universiteit Utrecht, 2008).

¹³⁸ See especially the scholarship of the European Association of Biblical Studies research group “Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible;” their publications so far are: P. Van Hecke, ed., *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (BETL 187; Leuven: Peeters, 2005); P. van Hecke, and A. Labban, eds. *Metaphors in the Psalms* (BETL 231; Leuven: Peeters, 2010); and A. Labahn, ed., *Conceptual Metaphors in Poetic Texts: Proceedings of the Metaphor Research Group of the European Association of Biblical Studies in Lincoln 2009* (Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts 18; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2013).

we will first look at what Greek writers had to say about metaphor (and that it is likely that the LXX translators had some exposure to these ideas), then we will look at what can be said about Jewish views of metaphor at the time of the translator, followed by a summary and conclusions.

1.3.1. Greek Views of Metaphor

In this section, we will first look at what Greek philosophers were saying about rhetoric and metaphor. Second, we will describe Hellenistic education, particularly the place of rhetoric in learning to write and read. Third, we will look at the highest level of education available, the scholarship in Alexandria, to see what the highest levels of education looked like. Fourth, we will show examples of Jews who were highly educated in classical literature and were doing work like that of the scholars in Alexandria, and who were more or less contemporary to the LXX translators. Finally, we will look at internal evidence within the LXX to show how some translators used what they learned from the Greeks in their own work.

1.3.1.1. Greek Rhetoric and Metaphors

In ancient Greece, rhetoric was an important part of education. Without knowledge of rhetoric, effective participation in the democratic process was much more difficult. As a result, there arose many teachers of rhetoric, and eventually books describing it. In this section we will describe what was said concerning metaphor.

The earliest known work on rhetoric, written by Protagoras, no longer exists.¹³⁹ Likewise Antiphon's *The Art of Speaking* is only a short fragment.¹⁴⁰ Part of Isocrates work *Against the Sophists* exists, as does his *Antidosis*, though neither discusses rhetoric and oratory in a technical way that describes tropes and figures of speech. In his *Evagoras*, though, he does list metaphor as one of the devices that poets may use that distinguish poetry from prose.¹⁴¹ The treatise written by Alcidas, *On Those who Write Written Speeches/On Sophists* likewise is not a technical rhetorical handbook, but an essay about the superiority of being able to speak extemporaneously to the ability to write good speeches. Several of Plato's dialogues touch on issues of oratory, rhetoric, and sophistry, such as *Gorgias*, *Phaedrus*, and *Protagoras*. Plato often uses analogies and models to explain difficult concepts, though is suspicious of imagery and its ability to deceive.¹⁴²

The earliest surviving works that describe metaphor are Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and *Poetics*. These works are to some extent based on the teachings of Gorgias, Antiphon,

¹³⁹ See Cicero, *Brutus* 47, for the claim that Aristotle mentions this book on rhetoric.

¹⁴⁰ It can be found in Ammonius, *περι διαφ. λεξ.* 127.

¹⁴¹ Isocrates, *Evagoras*, 190.

¹⁴² For a systematic analysis of Plato's view of imagery, see E. E. Pender, "Plato on Metaphors and Models," in *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition: Ancient Thought and Modern Revisions* (ed. G. R. Boys-Stones; Oxford: University Press, 2003): 55-81.

Licymnius, Theodorus, Isocrates, and others, and of course include Aristotle's own views.¹⁴³ In *Poetics*, he defines metaphor as "the application of a word that belongs to another thing: either from genus to species, species to genus, species to species, or by analogy."¹⁴⁴ The first three types of metaphor in this definition are more proper to metonymy or synecdoche.¹⁴⁵ Aristotle goes on to talk about good diction; he says that good diction should be clear, but impressive diction should use exotic language, such as loan words and metaphor. If one uses too many metaphors, though, one ends up writing a riddle, and if one uses too many loan words one writes a barbarism.¹⁴⁶ He says riddles "attach impossibilities to a description of real things," in his discussion at achieving clarity and exoticness.¹⁴⁷

In *Rhetoric*, Aristotle adds little to his definition of metaphor, but does define simile and describes how to use each. He says that simile is also a metaphor which has an explanatory word (some form of comparative particle), though is more poetic and should be used sparingly in oratory.¹⁴⁸ The main distinction for Aristotle, apart from the comparative marker, seems to be that metaphors are limited to the exchange of words, while similes are more descriptive, and hence poetic.¹⁴⁹ This may be because by metaphor he has mostly what we would call metonymy and synecdoche in mind, while by simile he has in mind the long descriptive similes of Homer. Later he also calls proverbs (*παροιμίας*) metaphors from species to species,¹⁵⁰ and "approved hyperboles" (*εὐδοκιμοῦσαι ὑπερβολαί*) he also calls metaphors.¹⁵¹

Aristotle is often quoted (and criticized) by modern scholars for his statements that the good use of metaphors can not be taught but requires a natural ability.¹⁵² He does, however, describe how to create good metaphors and how to use them effectively as they are important

¹⁴³ William Bedell Stanford, *Greek Metaphor: Studies in Theory and Practice* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1936), 5.

¹⁴⁴ Aristotle, *Poetics*, XXI.7-9 [Halliwell, LCL]. Μεταφορὰ δὲ ἐστὶν ὀνόματος ἀλλοτρίου ἐπιφορά etc. It may be worth modern metaphor theorists giving Aristotle a second look. It seems to me he is not just substituting words like he is often accused of doing, but brings together names for things, which implies a mixing and association of the things or concepts to which the names normally belong. Also of note in this area are his comments that contemplating images help us gain understanding, *Poetics* IV. Janet Martin Soskice also doubts the typical descriptions of Aristotle's theories. Janet Martin Soskice, *Metaphors and Religious Language* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 8-10. Eva Feder Kittay likewise says: "The argument can be made that Aristotle pointed out the cognitive importance of metaphor." Eva Feder Kittay, *Metaphor: Its Cognitive Function and Linguistic Structure* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 2-3. G. Gregory, in an explanatory footnote to his translation of Lowth, seems to approach cognitive metaphor theory in his description of catachresis: "When a savage experienced a sensation, for which he had as yet no name, he applied that of the idea which most resembled it, in order to explain himself. Thus the words expressing the faculties of the mind are taken from sensible images, as fancy from phantasma; idea in the original language means image or picture; and a way has always been used to express the mode of attaining our end or desire...The principle advantage which the Metaphor possesses over the Simile or Comparison, seems to consist in the former transporting the mind, and carrying it nearer to the reality than the latter..." Lowth, *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews* (G. Gregory, trans.), 106 nt. 3.

¹⁴⁵ See section I.D.1 below for definitions of terms.

¹⁴⁶ Aristotle, *Poetics*, XXII.1-25.

¹⁴⁷ Aristotle, *Poetics*, XXII.

¹⁴⁸ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.4.

¹⁴⁹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.4.3.

¹⁵⁰ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.11.14.

¹⁵¹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.11.15-16, [Freese, LCL].

¹⁵² Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.2.8. *Poetics* XXII.17. See for example Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 89-90.

to good style. For Aristotle, the virtue of style is clarity. Using words in their proper sense makes for clarity, but using tropes makes the discourse elevated, exotic, and charming.¹⁵³ Metaphors are important to good style because they help people understand things clearly and because they are charming and give discourse a sense of exoticness.¹⁵⁴ He says metaphors need to be appropriate; if you wish to honor something use metaphors that come from something higher (like saying a beggar prays instead of begs), and to insult you use something worse.¹⁵⁵ They should take their language from things proper to the object but not be too obvious, either.¹⁵⁶ Metaphors should not be too farfetched, but the meaning should be recognizable almost immediately. To illustrate this he gives the example of “gluing bronze to bronze with fire.”¹⁵⁷ He also says metaphors should be reciprocal, so that the elements can be interchangeable. For this he gives the example of saying Dionysus’ shield to mean his goblet, or saying Ares’ goblet to refer to his shield.¹⁵⁸ Metaphors should come from things that are beautiful, either in sound, meaning, or to one of the other senses.¹⁵⁹ Using metaphors and epithets to describe things rather than giving their name creates a lofty style, but if used too much the discourse becomes too poetical which sort of breaks the illusion and distracts one’s audience.¹⁶⁰

For Aristotle, bad style is characterized by frigidity (*ψύχρα*). This sort of style uses too many compound words, bad epithets (ones that are too long, unseasonable, or too crowded), as well as inappropriate metaphors.¹⁶¹ Metaphors are inappropriate if they are ridiculous or overly dignified, and so they fail to persuade.¹⁶²

Another function of metaphors, besides aiding in clarity, is that they help learning things easily, which is a pleasant quality of smart and popular sayings.¹⁶³ While similes have the same effect, they are less pleasant for Aristotle because they are longer; also since they do not assert that one thing *is* another, the mind does not examine a simile in the same way.¹⁶⁴ Metaphors must avoid the extremes of being too superficial and so unimpressive or being too strange and so too difficult to understand at once.¹⁶⁵ The best sort of metaphors of the four

¹⁵³ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.2.

¹⁵⁴ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.2.8.

¹⁵⁵ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.2.10. The same is true for epithets.

¹⁵⁶ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.11.5.

¹⁵⁷ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.2.12. This is more an example of catachresis, giving a name by metaphor to something that is without a name of its own.

¹⁵⁸ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.4.4. This is really an example of what would today be called metonymy.

¹⁵⁹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.2.13.

¹⁶⁰ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.6.

¹⁶¹ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.3. An excess of epithets turn the oratory into poetry, which makes the speaker seem ridiculous or else he may just lose his audience as he lacks perspicuity.

¹⁶² Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.3.4.

¹⁶³ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.10. Other qualities of these sayings are antithesis and actuality.

¹⁶⁴ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.10.3. This is a point often omitted by modern scholars who criticize the ancient view that metaphors can be restated as similes. Aristotle does believe something is lost cognitively by using a simile in place of a metaphor! Cf. Max Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 35-37.

¹⁶⁵ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.10.6.

kinds described in *Poetics* for helping in learning things are the proportional (that is, what we would call metaphor, as opposed to metonymy or synecdoche).¹⁶⁶ This sort of metaphor sets things vividly in the imagination, particularly metaphors that describe inanimate things in animate terms, such as Homer often does both with his metaphors and similes.¹⁶⁷

Aristotle's student Theophrastus also wrote about rhetoric. His work (or works) survives only in fragments in other writers.¹⁶⁸ Also, a papyrus fragment of Theophrastus has been found that appears related to Aristotle's *Poetics*.¹⁶⁹ From what can be gathered in these fragments, Theophrastus appears to describe rhetoric in much the same way as Aristotle. According to Pseudo-Longinus, Theophrastus, like Aristotle, says bold metaphors can be softened by adding "like" and similar phrases.¹⁷⁰ One improvement from Aristotle (that has been transmitted to us) is that he gives the name *μετουσία* to metaphors that involve transfers from genus to species or from species to genus.¹⁷¹ Since this work is based largely on Aristotle, and is in turn with Aristotle influential on Demetrius, we will move on to Demetrius' work.

The work *On Style* by Demetrius is now largely recognized as not being composed by Demetrius of Phaleron, Theophrastus' student, but by another Demetrius.¹⁷² Nevertheless, the author of this work appears to have known the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus, though perhaps only through intermediaries.¹⁷³ The work, as the title suggests, is about how to achieve different styles, namely, the Grand, Elegant, Plain, and Forceful styles. In the Grand style, metaphor should be used because it makes the prose attractive and impressive and since they can express some things more clearly.¹⁷⁴ Metaphors that are too bold can be made safe by turning them into a simile, or by adding epithets.¹⁷⁵ Some metaphors, though, can create triviality rather than grandeur.¹⁷⁶ Also, common usage of a metaphor can make it a dead metaphor.¹⁷⁷ Demetrius says that in the Elegant style, metaphors in single words can create charm, and allegories can be used to give a colloquial turn of wit.¹⁷⁸ He also talks about similes, saying they are extended metaphors,¹⁷⁹ but adding more than a comparative marker

¹⁶⁶ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.10.7.

¹⁶⁷ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, III.11.

¹⁶⁸ William W. Fortenbaugh, Dimitri Gutas, and Andrew Barker eds. and transls., *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought and Influence: Pt. 2: Psychology, Human Physiology, Living Creatures, Botany, Ethics, Religion, Politics, Rhetoric and Poetics, Music, Miscellanea* (Philosophia Antiqua vol. 54,2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 508-58.

¹⁶⁹ Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastus* pt. 2, 258-64. For the text and translation, see Appendix 9 in vol 2.

¹⁷⁰ Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastus* pt. 2, 537.

¹⁷¹ Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastus* pt. 2, 615. Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastus* vol 8, 261.

¹⁷² Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastus* vol 8, 6.

¹⁷³ Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastus* vol 8, 6.

¹⁷⁴ Demetrius, *On Style*, 77-79, 82.

¹⁷⁵ Demetrius, *On Style*, 80, 85.

¹⁷⁶ Demetrius, *On Style*, 84.

¹⁷⁷ Demetrius, *On Style*, 87-88.

¹⁷⁸ Demetrius, *On Style*, 142, 151.

¹⁷⁹ Demetrius, *On Style*, 80.

turns the simile into a poetic comparison,¹⁸⁰ which also can add charm in the Elegant style.¹⁸¹ In the Forceful style, varying figures of speech (and presumably tropes) creates forcefulness, as do metaphors and similes, but not detailed poetic comparisons.¹⁸² Demetrius is interesting in that he has clear and prescriptive statements about the use of metaphors to achieve different effects in different styles, yet the selection and use of metaphors is still left to the subjective judgment of the orator.

The discipline of Rhetoric continued to develop, taking its most sophisticated and systematic form in the work of Quintilian. Two additional Greek philosophers are worthy of mention in this development. Philodemus was an epicurean (born around 110 BC) who wrote about the place of rhetoric in *paideia*. He claims to be in line with the founders of his philosophical school, but is himself too late for our interests. He is worth mentioning to show that discussion of rhetoric was not limited to peripatetic circles. Unfortunately his discussion of tropes is too fragmentary to say much about. He does, though, say metaphor is described (by some uncited rhetoricians) by four types: those that compare animate with inanimate, animate with animate, inanimate with inanimate, and inanimate with animate.¹⁸³ While Aristotle makes this distinction, it is not the four types he describes. Philodemus is rather critical of the work of rhetoricians on metaphor; he thinks they fail to describe why the metaphors they ridicule are faulty, and that they do not say how to create a good metaphor or even when exactly to use one.¹⁸⁴ An even later source is Longinus, who mentions not only that you should only use two or three metaphors for emotional effect to achieve the sublime in style; he also mentions Genesis 1 in his work *On the Sublime*.

We can conclude from this survey that in the Hellenistic era there were multiple rhetorical handbooks in circulation that discussed metaphor. Among the Peripatetics, there were at least three authors that dealt with metaphor: Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Demetrius. Perhaps also some of the works or at least the teachings of the Sophists were still in circulation. Philodemus seems to suggest that even the Epicurians were still discussing rhetoric (or perhaps again discussing rhetoric), even if in a mostly critical way.

While terminology for tropes was still developing, we can clearly see distinguished and described in Aristotle what today we would call metaphor, simile, catachresis, metonymy, synecdoche, and hyperbole. Discussion of tropes seems to be concerned mostly with their use in poetry and oratory, though there is acknowledgement of their use in daily life, and their usefulness in teaching. In any case, a person educated in rhetoric in this period should have

¹⁸⁰ Demetrius, *On Style*, 89-90.

¹⁸¹ Demetrius, *On Style*, 160.

¹⁸² Demetrius, *On Style*, 267-71, 272, 272-74.

¹⁸³ Philodemus, *The Rhetoric of Philodemus* (trans. Harry M. Hubbell; Transactions of The Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 23, Sept 1920; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920), 298. This corresponds to Sudhaus' edition vol 1, 171,2 col XII.

¹⁸⁴ Philodemus, *The Rhetoric of Philodemus*, 298. This corresponds to Sudhaus 1. 173 Col XV-1.174 col XV.

had some knowledge of the various types of metaphor and had some instruction in their proper and improper use.

1.3.1.2. Hellenistic Education

As we have seen, the ancient Greek world had many philosophers thinking about metaphors and more generally about rhetoric and its proper use. James K. Aitken has asserted that the LXX translators, along with any literate writer of Greek, would have been exposed to Greek ideas about rhetoric while learning to write.¹⁸⁵ To evaluate this, in this section we will look at what students would have been taught when they learned to write and read Greek.

There were of course various forms of education in the Hellenistic age (including technical and professional training), but our interest is in the *ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία*, or well-rounded education.¹⁸⁶ The main task of this education in the east seems to be about preserving Greek identity, values, language, and literature in the various Greek cities surrounded by barbarian peoples.¹⁸⁷ As Raffaella Cribiore explains it:

Education was based on the transmission of an established body of knowledge, about which there was wide consensus. Teachers were considered the custodians and interpreters of a tradition and were concerned with protecting its integrity. Education was supposed to lead to a growing understanding of an inherited doctrine.¹⁸⁸

So education was not just about preparing a student vocationally but was about preserving a certain kind of culture and identity.

Education was by no means standardized, but it was quite regular in the things that were taught (particularly by the grammarian due to the content of the work studied) and the sort of exercises used.¹⁸⁹ Generally, education was based around individual teachers, who collected students either at his (or occasionally her)¹⁹⁰ house or in the corner of some public building such as the gymnasium or palaistra.¹⁹¹ For the wealthy it was also possible to hire

¹⁸⁵ James K. Aitken, "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch," in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies* (eds. James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin; Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 20; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 508-509.

¹⁸⁶ Mark Joyal, Ian McDougall, and J.C. Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook* (New York: Routledge, 2009), 123-24.

¹⁸⁷ Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 9. This goal corresponds to Jason's goal in building a gymnasium in Jerusalem in 2 Macc 4:7-15; 1 Macc 1:11-15.

¹⁸⁸ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 8. The same could undoubtedly apply to priestly training among the Jews.

¹⁸⁹ See Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education*, 124. And Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 2-3, 37.

¹⁹⁰ For women learning to read and write, see Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education*, 142-43. That some teachers were women, see Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 47.

¹⁹¹ Joyal et al., *Greek and Roman Education*, 134-38. Joyal et al., say that Gymnasiums were public buildings that had some intellectual activities associated with them, but were not themselves schools. A Palaistra was a private ground that could be rented or lent to various teachers, philosophers, or instructors when it was not being used as a wrestling yard. Joyal et al. also shows some evidence that suggests, at least in some places, at various

tutors (or purchase slaves) to instruct children at home. We can find lists of the various tutors that tormented children in Teles the Cynic and Pseudo-platonic Axiochus, they include: the paidagogos, the paidotribes, the grammatodidaskalos, the music theory teacher, the art teacher, a teacher of arithmetic, of geometry, teachers of literary criticism, and of equestrian skills.¹⁹² It should be noted that it was entirely possible for adults to begin or resume education at various levels, if they had the time and the money.¹⁹³ For our purposes, we will skip the other topics of study and focus on issues related to literary and rhetorical learning.

Literary education can generally be divided into the tasks of three teachers. At the primary level, a didaskalos was concerned with teaching letters and literacy.¹⁹⁴ It seems absurd, but the first thing a student would learn was how to write.¹⁹⁵ Existing student exercises show that students copied their teacher's writing without knowing what it meant.¹⁹⁶ They would do exercises to learn the alphabet involving writing it in reverse order, or skipping letters regularly; after this they moved on to writing various permutations of syllables even those that do not occur in any Greek words.¹⁹⁷ Next they would copy words or passages (mostly from Homer) as they learned to read, and would memorize sections of Homer as well.¹⁹⁸ At first, they would copy texts with various reading aids, such as some space between words, some accent marks, line marks, etc., but would work their way up to reading scriptio continua.¹⁹⁹

By the end of "primary school" a student could recite some texts from memory, copy a short text, sign their name, dictate or copy a phrase, and read documents posted in large clear letters.²⁰⁰ Learning to read Greek, even for a more or less native speaker, involved much more than simply learning the alphabet. As Cribiore says:

The skill of reading was a complex affair, fragmented into a series of acquisitions that aimed at understanding a text thoroughly. Ancient manuscripts did not make many concessions to readers. A passage made of words written without separation in continuous blocks and containing almost no punctuation was only an ensemble of letters in need of interpretation. Reading at first sight was practically impossible: a text needed to be scrutinized beforehand

periods, some degree of public education (or at least funds for teachers) was available: *Greek and Roman Education*, 134-35, 138-39. For more on whether intellectual education took place at the gymnasium, see Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 34-35.

¹⁹² See the relevant passages in translation in: Joyal et al., *Greek and Roman Education*, 128-35. In many cases a single instructor could probably handle several of these topics, particularly at the lower levels.

¹⁹³ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 2, 20.

¹⁹⁴ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 19-20.

¹⁹⁵ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 177-78.

¹⁹⁶ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 133-34.

¹⁹⁷ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 133-34. This was probably for learning to read and for practicing diction. Vocalists and choirs still warm up by singing various syllables (such as "ma me mi mo mu"). As we will see, reading a word aloud properly is the first part of grammar, according to Dionysius of Thrax.

¹⁹⁸ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 133-34. Elsewhere Cribiore says, based on the papyriological evidence, most of the passages they practiced with came from Iliad books 1-12. Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 194.

¹⁹⁹ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 140-41, 172-74. Here Cribiore mentions that the exercises with syllables probably also were used for training them to read scriptio continua.

²⁰⁰ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 184.

to identify the relationship between the elements of a sentence and to understand their function in conveying meaning.²⁰¹

Those who did not go on to study with a grammarian, then, could only read with great difficulty and only the shortest and simplest of texts. It is difficult to imagine someone producing a Greek translation of a Hebrew text with such a basic proficiency in writing.

At this stage a student was handed over to the grammarian (if the first teacher's expertise had reached its limit). At this level the curriculum was roughly what was described by Dionysius of Thrax.²⁰² He defines grammar as "the empirical knowledge of what is for the most part being said by poets and prose writers."²⁰³ What we consider grammar today (parts of speech, paradigms etc.) was a science still in development, and largely did not enter curriculums until the first century AD.²⁰⁴ Dionysius of Thrax lists six parts to this knowledge: how to read the text aloud properly (in terms of clause and word division, accents, and diction), the meaning of tropes, the meaning of obscure words, the subject matter (for example, who the people mentioned are, their family, place of origin, etc.), the etymologies of words and the setting out of analogy (*ἀναλογία*, *ἐκλογισμός*), and literary criticism (this last part was done more extensively under the tutelage of the rhetor).²⁰⁵ To master these six parts, students would mostly copy and memorize excerpts from literature, mostly Homer but also Hesiod, Euripedes (particularly his *Phoenissae*), Meander, and the gnomic sayings of Isocrates.²⁰⁶ The teacher would explain the difficult terms, using synonyms (metalepsis was also practiced by students) and etymology.²⁰⁷ They would also explain and discuss the figures and tropes the text presented.²⁰⁸ The subject matter (*historia*) was also taught, so students would know all about the various characters and places discussed in their literature, both actual and mythological (though these were not necessarily distinguished).²⁰⁹ At this level, knowledge of literature was more important than original writing, though they did do some composition exercises.²¹⁰ Students would have copied hundreds of passages of Homer and been thoroughly drilled in interpreting the various grammatical elements of his text.²¹¹ As Cribiore says:

²⁰¹ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 189-90.

²⁰² Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 185-86. Rudolf Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1968), 272.

²⁰³ Translation from Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 268.

²⁰⁴ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 210.

²⁰⁵ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 185-86. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 268-70.

²⁰⁶ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 194-202.

²⁰⁷ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 206-07, 209-10. For the relationship between synonyms and etymology and their didactic uses, see Helen Peraki-Kyriakidou, "Aspects of Ancient Etymologizing," *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 52, No. 2 (2002), 481-82, 489.

²⁰⁸ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 206.

²⁰⁹ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 206, 208-09.

²¹⁰ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 215.

²¹¹ Folker Siegert, "Early Jewish interpretation in a Hellenistic style," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Interpretation: Vol 1 From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)* (ed. Magne Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 130-31. As Siegert explains, Homer was used not only as an

the practice of reading texts closely and of reaching a deep textual experience through careful verbal analysis, as learned in the school of the grammarian, gave students a sound knowledge of language and the ability to use words with dexterity.²¹²

Once a student was handed over to a rhetor the focus of his or her studies shifted from reading to composition and speaking. What they read, copied, and memorized was more focused on authors to be imitated. From the rhetors this meant Isocrates, Hyperides, Aeschines, and Demosthenes (and the teacher himself, no doubt), and from the historians this meant Herodotus, Theopompus, Xenophon, Philistus, Ephorus, and of course Thucydides.²¹³ The writing exercises, or progymnasmata, were already done under the grammarian, but now became longer and more elaborate. They were aimed at letting the student apply what they had learned and to prepare the way for larger compositions, chiefly speeches.²¹⁴ The sort of exercises done included writing fables, simple narratives, writing a discussion about a famous action or quote (from the literature they had previously studied), writing a confirmation or refutation that a story happened based on possibility and probability, writing summaries of common opinions about stock characters (such as the murderer, the tyrant, etc.), writing praise or blame of some action, comparing various characters or their actions, writing imagined speeches of a character at some event, and describing an event vividly.²¹⁵ Students would be corrected on these exercises and some times would spend considerable effort revising and refining their work.²¹⁶ Creativity and originality was not valued as much as careful planning and organization of the work.²¹⁷ The goal of these exercises was to build the ability to properly and persuasively use rhetoric in writing and in delivering speeches in court, in municipal councils, or in other public venues.²¹⁸

Few except the most elite would make it all the way through the education described. Only two years (out of the full course of six years) with the rhetor would be sufficient to argue at a court.²¹⁹ Many were not able to complete the tutelage of the grammarian. Ancient sources show the existence of “slow writers” who could write little more than their name, and read only enough to see if a document was formatted properly.²²⁰ But among the elite,

instructor for reading and grammar, but was searched for insights into every subject of learning and science. Epicureans, on the other hand, thought it was best to not know any Homer. See Elizabeth Asmis, “Basic Education in Epicureanism,” in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (ed. Yun Lee Too; Leiden, Brill: 2001), 215.

²¹² Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 248.

²¹³ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 234-35.

²¹⁴ Ruth Webb, “The Progymnasmata as Practice,” in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (ed. Yun Lee Too; Leiden, Brill: 2001), 282-90.

²¹⁵ Webb, “The Progymnasmata as Practice,” 294-95.

²¹⁶ Webb, “The Progymnasmata as Practice,” 297-98.

²¹⁷ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 231.

²¹⁸ For some of the possible venues for showing off one’s rhetorical ability, see Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 239.

²¹⁹ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 224.

²²⁰ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 176.

education continued beyond the school days; they would often continue to read whatever they could, and listen to the rhetors or philosophers.²²¹ Some even went on to write their own books and conduct their own scholarship.

This shows, as Aitken has said,²²² that anyone who was competent enough to compose a Greek text (either original or a translation) would have had rigorous training in reading and writing and would have had some exposure to classical ideas of rhetoric in general, including some discussion of tropes.

1.3.1.3. Scholarship in Alexandria

The center of scholarship in the Hellenistic age was Alexandria, and more specifically, the institutions of the Mouseion and the Library.²²³ Neither institution was entirely unique or original, but what they became were to be models for similar institutions elsewhere, such as in Pergamum and Ephesus.²²⁴ The Mouseion was started under Soter,²²⁵ and the Library under Philadelphus,²²⁶ both under the influence of Peripatetic scholars.²²⁷ The influence of Demetrius of Phaleron, Theophrastus' student and former tyrant of Athens, on the founding of the Mouseion is nearly certain.²²⁸ The library was an institution based on the practice of peripatetic scholars; as Fraser argues, Aristotle himself collected a library at the Lyceum.²²⁹

Indeed the Peripatetic influence was so great in Alexandrian scholarship that the terms Peripatetic and Alexandrian became synonymous.²³⁰ That is not to say that they were all rigidly Aristotelian. Callimachus and his followers, for example, were somewhat anti-Aristotelian in their poetic sensibilities, rejecting "unity, completeness, and magnitude" and aiming "at a discontinuous form."²³¹ Even if Aristotle's poetic sensibilities were not always followed, his influence can not be denied. Indeed, Ptolemy I tried hard to get one of Aristotle's students to come to Alexandria, Theophrastus refused, Strato came only for a short time, but Demetrius came and stayed once he had to flee Athens.²³² In addition, it seems not

²²¹ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 249.

²²² Aitken, "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch," 508-509.

²²³ Pfeiffer seems to suggest the Library was a part of the Mouseion. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 98. And distinguishes this library from that of the Serapeum built by Ptolemy II. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 101-102.

²²⁴ P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, Clarendon, 1972), 312-14.

²²⁵ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 315.

²²⁶ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 321.

²²⁷ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 320.

²²⁸ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 315. Pseudo-Aristeas par. 9-11 claims that Demetrius of Phaleron, was the first librarian, but this is very unlikely, since Philadelphus' first act as king was to exile Demetrius for advising Soter to appoint his other son as king. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 321.

²²⁹ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 320.

²³⁰ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 320.

²³¹ Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 137.

²³² Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 95-96.

only plausible but highly likely that the Library had as many of Aristotle's and his follower's works as they could get a hold of in its collection.

In the Library, one of their most important tasks of these scholars was to collect and preserve texts. Perhaps related to or based on a catalogue of books, Callimachus wrote his *Πίνακες*.²³³ This monumental work involved organizing all the books by genre (lyrical poetry, epic poetry, comedy, tragedy, etc), and in the case of prose writers, organizing them by topic (botany, mathematics, paradoxical writings, geography, etc.) and author.²³⁴ In the Mouseion they were often concerned with studying the ancient poets in order to produce good poetry themselves.²³⁵ Alexandrian scholarship was by no means limited to literary studies, mathematics and what today is called natural science also flourished there.²³⁶ Eratosthenes, for example, besides an impressive amount of original poetry and literary criticism, was an accomplished mathematician, geographer, and chronographer, to name just the fields in which he was widely acclaimed.²³⁷ Another genre many worked on was paradoxical writings, which addressed such things as foreign customs, local names for things, and geography.²³⁸

The most famous work done in Alexandria was its Homeric Scholarship. In many ways it was an advanced continuation of the work done under the instruction of the grammarian in secondary school. Critical work on Homer, of course, predates the establishment of the Mouseion and Library; Aristotle and Heraclides Ponticus both wrote books dealing with various problems and solutions in Homer.²³⁹ These books were largely only concerned with interpretive questions, as was Demetrius of Phaleron's books on the Iliad and the Odyssey.²⁴⁰ To deal with the growing number of textual variations, the first librarian, Zenodotus of Ephesus, edited Homer's texts to produce what we would call a critical edition (*ἐκδόσις* or *διορθώσεις*).²⁴¹ He included critical marks for passages he believed should be atheticized. Several other major Alexandrian scholars worked on Homer's (as well as Pindar's and other poets') texts critically, including Apollonius,²⁴² Callimachus,²⁴³ and Aristophanes of Byzantium.²⁴⁴ But the most important editor of Homer was Aristarchus of Samothrace, who appears to have made an impact on many manuscripts of Homer²⁴⁵ and also greatly developed

²³³ Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 127-31. Fraser insists it was not a catalogue for the library, Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 453.

²³⁴ Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 129-32. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 452-53.

²³⁵ Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 88.

²³⁶ See "Ch 7: Alexandrian Science," in Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. He says that biology and botany appear to have been essentially the same as what was said by Aristotle and Theophrastus, Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 337-38.

²³⁷ Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, chapter IV.

²³⁸ Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 134-35. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 453-55.

²³⁹ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 448-49.

²⁴⁰ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 448-49.

²⁴¹ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 449-50. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 107-20.

²⁴² Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 452.

²⁴³ For Callimachus' scholarship see Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 124-40.

²⁴⁴ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 459.

²⁴⁵ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 446-47.

Zenodotus' text-critical sigla.²⁴⁶ Many of the scholars doing text-critical work would explain their sigla, as well as the text of Homer in a separate commentary (ὕπόμνημα).²⁴⁷ These commentaries would not only discuss text critical issues,²⁴⁸ but other difficulties such as strange words and Aristarchus even made comments about the function of particular metaphors and other tropes.²⁴⁹ Aristarchus is also famous for his hermeneutical methods, particularly the maxim “Ὁμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου” or “Interpret Homer from Homer.”²⁵⁰

As mentioned earlier, many of the other scholarly works done in Alexandria were related to Homer scholarship, such as geographies, and the paradoxologies, since they shed light on places mentioned (even mythical places) and on the at times obscure or obsolete vocabulary used by Homer (and other poets). Callimachus,²⁵¹ Aristophanes of Byzantium,²⁵² and Aristarchus are all important also for their work with words and grammar.²⁵³

While Alexandria was the center of scholarship, it did crop up in other places as well, though not as much under the influence of the peripatetics. For example, Antiochus the Great started a library in Antioch, with Euphron of Chalcis as librarian.²⁵⁴ Pergamum, though, was the biggest rival to Alexandria, both in terms of its influence and in its scholarly positions. Pergamum was dominated by Stoic scholars, who were generally more interested in the history and topography of Homer, than the philology or literary features.²⁵⁵ Regarding grammar, they bitterly opposed the idea of analogy, arguing declensions and verb forms were all anomalous.²⁵⁶ When they interpreted Homer, they often used allegory so that Homer taught all their philosophical ideas, particularly their views of physics.²⁵⁷ Another method that allowed them to advance their own philosophy through Homer was through etymology.²⁵⁸ Etymology was not strictly a stoic practice, it was dealt with in Plato's *Cratylus*, and was still being employed in the scholia of Homer.²⁵⁹ Etymology was not about finding the origin or preceding form of words, but was largely a didactic exercise aimed at explaining why something has a given name; it is about “binding of the meaning of a certain word with cluster(s) of other meaning(s).”²⁶⁰

²⁴⁶ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 463-65.

²⁴⁷ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 447.

²⁴⁸ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 447.

²⁴⁹ Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 232.

²⁵⁰ Pfeiffer believes that Aristarchus never said this, but that it does reflect his method. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 225-27.

²⁵¹ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 460.

²⁵² Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 197-200. Aristophanes studied a word's force and meaning.

²⁵³ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 462-63. He is particularly noted for his ideas about grammatical analogy, as opposed to the Stoic idea of anomaly.

²⁵⁴ Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 122.

²⁵⁵ Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 251.

²⁵⁶ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 465-66.

²⁵⁷ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 465-66.

²⁵⁸ Siegert, “Early Jewish interpretation in a Hellenistic style,” 139-40.

²⁵⁹ For an example see Peraki-Kyriakidou, “Aspects of Ancient Etymologizing,” 484.

²⁶⁰ Peraki-Kyriakidou, “Aspects of Ancient Etymologizing,” 480-82.

As even this superficial survey has shown, in Hellenistic times, particularly in Alexandria, textual, literary, grammatical, and lexical studies were highly developed and a dominant force in education at all levels. Homer's work was the focus of study, regardless of the philosophical leanings or a particular place or teacher. While we do not know exactly what was said about tropes in the various levels of education, we do know that they were discussed in some detail, and there is reason to believe it was discussed largely in Aristotelian terms.

1.3.1.4. Jews Educated in Classical Literature

It is plausible that there were a fair number of Jews with some degree of Hellenistic education, who worked in courts and as magistrates in Egypt, and who were among the elite in Judea. Chaim Rabin thought the Egyptian Jews of the third century BCE would certainly not have had access to schools and so had no practice in writing educated Greek, but suggests that some of them were literate.²⁶¹ As we have seen, most education started with writing before reading, so if they were literate, they undoubtedly could also write to some degree. The question of access to schools is anachronistic since education was typically about hiring a teacher (which required only money), not being accepted into some institution. We will briefly give some known examples of Jews in Egypt and Judea who received sufficient education to compose in Greek and who were interested in similar scholarly questions to the scholars of the Museum.

The earliest known such writer is Demetrius the Chronographer.²⁶² His concern for chronology and various logical problems is consistent with the methods and the work done by Eratosthenes.²⁶³ Maren Niehoff has argued that Demetrius quotes from earlier Jewish commentators on the Bible who apply Aristotelian methods of Homer scholarship.²⁶⁴ This includes using question and answers, as described in Aristotle's fragmentary *Aporemata Homerica*,²⁶⁵ finding contradictions and filling in gaps in the text,²⁶⁶ and resolving problems of verisimilitude in the text.²⁶⁷ These un-named scholars also used methods similar to Aristarchus to resolve the problems they found in the biblical text.²⁶⁸

Several known Jewish authors were interested in historical and textual issues of the Bible, and even tried to argue that various aspects of science and learning had their origin in

²⁶¹ Chaim Rabin, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint," *Textus* 6 (1968), 21-22.

²⁶² Carl R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians* (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983), 51-52.

²⁶³ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 691-92.

²⁶⁴ Maren R. Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 38-39.

²⁶⁵ Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship*, 39-43.

²⁶⁶ Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship*, 45-46.

²⁶⁷ Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship*, 46-49.

²⁶⁸ Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship*, 55-56.

Moses. These include Pseudo-Eupolemus (probably a Samaritan),²⁶⁹ Artapanus,²⁷⁰ Cleodemus Malchus²⁷¹ (whose existing fragments also glorify the patriarchs while connecting them with Greek heroes: he has Abraham's granddaughter marrying Hercules),²⁷² Pseudo-Aristeas (who wrote "Concerning the Jews"²⁷³ and about Job),²⁷⁴ and Pseudo-Hecataeus.²⁷⁵

An interesting example of a Jewish historian is Eupolemus son of John, who probably wrote in Judea. He is mentioned as one of the envoys sent to Rome in 1 Macc 8:17-32 by Judas.²⁷⁶ He was sent, no doubt, along with Jason, because he had some education and could deliver a speech and make negotiations before the Roman senate. He was from the elite, a member of a priestly family, with his father on the council of elders (the gerousia) and may have served on it himself.²⁷⁷ The existing fragments of his work describe the history of Israel in exaggerated terms: David's conquests are much larger and Solomon's temple is much more wealthy than seems probable.²⁷⁸ Moses is given credit for inventing the alphabet and giving it to the Jews, who in turn gave it to the Phoenicians who then gave it to the Greeks.²⁷⁹ His Greek writing, from the fragments that have survived, seems crude and unusual in its features and constructions, according to Holladay,²⁸⁰ which should not be surprising if Greek were his second language. Despite this, he was well educated, since his work shows knowledge of the writings of Ctesias and Herodotus.²⁸¹ Particularly telling is his use of etymology; he tells us that Jerusalem is named for its temple, and so is called Ἱερουσαλῆμ.²⁸²

Aristeas should also be mentioned as he was likely a Jew in a high position in the Ptolemaic court, who writes in late Hellenistic style comparable to Polybius.²⁸³ Without diving into the many issues this work has,²⁸⁴ it is interesting to note that in par. 120-122 he presents the seventy elders as pious and wise Jews who had carefully studied both Jewish and

²⁶⁹ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 158, 170-75.

²⁷⁰ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 189-90, 192, 208-211. Fraser believes he was a Jew of mixed descent, living in an urban center outside Alexandria where there was more tension between Jews and locals. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 706.

²⁷¹ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 245-46.

²⁷² Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 255.

²⁷³ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 261-62.

²⁷⁴ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 261.

²⁷⁵ For the discussion of Pseudo-Hecataeus' identity, number, and date, see: Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 277-90.

²⁷⁶ For a discussion that they are indeed the same person, see Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 2.962 nt. 101.

²⁷⁷ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 93-95, 100 nt.6.

²⁷⁸ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 114-31.

²⁷⁹ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 112-13.

²⁸⁰ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 95.

²⁸¹ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 95.

²⁸² Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. 1: Historians*, 128-29.

²⁸³ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 699, 703.

²⁸⁴ For a recent discussion of the value of this work for LXX origins, see Sylvie Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship* (London: Routledge, 2003). And the extended review: Arie van der Kooij, "The Septuagint and Alexandrian Scholarship," in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* LXVIII,5-6 (2011): 492-509. An alternative explanation for the origin of the LXX is offered in van der Kooij, "Chapter 2: The Septuagint of the Pentateuch," in Johann Cook and Arie van der Kooij, *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom: On the Provenance of Translators and their Books in the Septuagint Version* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 68; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 15-62.

Greek literature. Whether or not this is true of the translators, it does show that the author thought it was plausible that these pious Jewish elders could be knowledgeable in Greek literature. This idea of a bilingual Jewish scribe is true of Jesus ben Sirach's grandson.²⁸⁵ Niehoff has argued that Aristaeas attempts to make the case that the methods of Homeric scholarship should not be applied to the LXX, since the text is pristine,²⁸⁶ and even goes so far as to curse those who would suggest emendations using the signs of Aristarchus.²⁸⁷

The greatest Alexandrian scholar (critic or grammaticos) of Jewish stock (before Philo) was Aristobulus. His principle known work is "Explanation of the Book of Moses," of which only a few fragments survive and may not all be from this book.²⁸⁸ All of his fragments show a scholar well versed in Greek learning and literature. In the first fragment Holladay provides, Aristobulus makes rather precise astronomical descriptions of the position of the sun and moon during Passover.²⁸⁹ In the third fragment, he shows knowledge of various Greek philosophers in that he argues that the ideas of Plato and Pythagoras were derived from the law of Moses.²⁹⁰ In the fourth fragment we can see more of this argument based on specific ideas, such as the idea of the divine voice which is read about in Genesis, but Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato claim to have heard by examining the cosmos.²⁹¹ He also argues that the law of Moses agrees with the philosophers regarding such things as devotion to God, piety, and justice.²⁹² In the fifth fragment this theme is also seen, as he quotes classical texts, including Homer, Hesiod, and Solon, that agree with Moses on the holiness of the seventh day.²⁹³ While Clement and Eusebius claim Aristobulus was peripatetic, these fragments show a much more eclectic influence.²⁹⁴ As Holladay argues, Aristobulus offers a definition of wisdom that sounds similar to what the Stoics would say, his interest in the number seven in the fifth fragment shows signs of Pythagorean influence, and the way he talks about the unity of man and deity sounds similar to Cynic doctrine.²⁹⁵ Niehoff, however, makes a strong case that he is best understood primarily as belonging to the peripatetic tradition.²⁹⁶ In any case,

²⁸⁵ See van der Kooij, "The Septuagint and Alexandrian Scholarship," 503.

²⁸⁶ Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship*, 21-24, 33-34.

²⁸⁷ Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship*, 27-30, 37.

²⁸⁸ Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 694. For the fragments, see: Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. 3: Aristobulus*.

²⁸⁹ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. 3: Aristobulus*, 128-33.

²⁹⁰ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. 3: Aristobulus*, 150-61.

²⁹¹ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. 3: Aristobulus*, 163. He also quotes at length an alleged poem of Orpheus.

²⁹² Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. 3: Aristobulus*, 174.

²⁹³ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. 3: Aristobulus*, 176-97. His quotes have various difficulties including that some cannot be found in the authors they allege to be from or have been altered. These alterations or perhaps even fabrications may have been done by Aristobulus or his sources or by Polyhistor or Eusebius who preserved his fragments. See Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 694-95.

²⁹⁴ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. 3: Aristobulus*, 46-47. Niehoff makes the case that his methods are Aristotelian both directly and in following the model of Aristarchus and style of Apollodorus. Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship*, 74, 60.

²⁹⁵ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. 3: Aristobulus*, 72-73.

²⁹⁶ Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship*, 58-74.

this shows he was well versed in classical thought and literature. The second fragment of Aristobulus found in Holladay is particularly interesting, in that Aristobulus explains to king Ptolemy (probably VI Philometer) why the law of Moses uses hands, arms, visage, feet, and walking to signify (σημαίνεται) divine power.²⁹⁷ We will discuss this passage below (1.3.2.2.).

According to 2 Macc 1:10, Aristobulus was from the family of the priests. Whether this is true or not is not as important as that it is perfectly plausible to the writer of 2 Macc that someone from the priestly family would have learned Greek literature so well and would write the sorts of books Aristobulus wrote.²⁹⁸

Philo of Alexandria should also be mentioned as a very well educated Jew, though he comes from a later period. Maren R. Niehoff has argued that in some of Philo's writings there is evidence of earlier Jewish scholars who were doing Alexandrian style philology on the LXX, excising texts they thought did not meet certain poetic and ethical standards for being authentic.²⁹⁹ Unfortunately no fragments of these authors exist outside of Philo to see what they actually said.

Besides engaging in Hellenistic style scholarship, some Jews were sufficiently educated to compose literary texts in verse. Some fragments of Theodotus survive which show his work on the Jews was written in imitation of Homer's epic style, though still biblical in content.³⁰⁰ Philo the epic poet, on the other hand, wrote his epic praising Jerusalem in a style more like late Hellenic poets, such as Apollonius of Rhodes and Rhianus of Bene.³⁰¹ Ezekiel the Tragedian's play about the Exodus, written in iambic trimeter, shows his "thorough familiarity with classical authors, most notably Euripides and Aeschylus...Homer, Sophocles, and Herodotus."³⁰²

Other Jewish poets wrote pseudepigraphal texts in Homeric style, claiming to be Greek religious texts that advocate Jewish religion. One example of this is the rather complicated texts of Orphic literature from the second century BCE written in hexameters.³⁰³ Another example is the third book of Sibylline Oracles, which is associated with the party of Onias, sometime around 155-161 BCE.³⁰⁴ Without discussing their manifold difficulties and complexities, we can conclude from them that there were educated Jews in the second century BCE, able to write in high registers of Greek and to harmonize Greek myth with the Bible in extended poetic works.

²⁹⁷ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. 3: Aristobulus*, 134-35.

²⁹⁸ For discussion of the accuracy of this statement, see: Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. 3: Aristobulus*, 46 nt. 3, 74.

²⁹⁹ Maren R. Niehoff, "Homeric Scholarship and Bible Exegesis in Ancient Alexandria: Evidence from Philo's 'Quarrelsome' Colleagues," *The Classical Quarterly* 57:1 (2007): 166-82. Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship*, 77-129.

³⁰⁰ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol.2 Poets*, 61-75.

³⁰¹ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol.2 Poets*, 205-9.

³⁰² Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol.2 Poets*, 301-3.

³⁰³ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol.4 Orphica*.

³⁰⁴ James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Vol.1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983), 355.

The examples of authors we have surveyed show that various facets of Alexandrian scholarship had well educated Jews participating with them or at least imitating them. If the top Hellenistic scholarship had a Jewish counterpart, it is fair to assume there were many more Jews who had received some Hellenistic schooling but had ceased their education at various levels. The nature of many of these texts shows that it was not just overly Hellenized Jews who were highly educated, but also pious Jews dedicated to preserving and even promulgating their ancestral traditions (some living in Judea). The apologetic character of the histories they were writing may have made Greek literature safe for Jews with the claim that they are derived ultimately from the wisdom of Abraham and Moses.

It would appear, then, that it is perfectly plausible that the translator of Isaiah had received a fair amount of Greek education, though perhaps not enough to compose in verse or harmonize Hesiod to the Torah. It would be much more unexpected for such a large project as translating Isaiah into Greek, that it would be done by someone, even if bilingual, who had no training in writing or Greek literature if someone with training was available. Even composing a work in Greek that closely follows a Hebrew original requires a fair amount of education, so that the text can be legible, have proper spelling, and follow the rules of grammar enough to be intelligible.

1.3.1.5. Evidence of a Hellenistic Education in the Septuagint

James K. Aitken has demonstrated that the translators of the Pentateuch appear to have attained at least the education of one of the more skilled Egyptian bureaucratic scribes.³⁰⁵ He gives examples that show that the translators paid attention to the genre of their text, and so were more inclined to use rhetorical figures for poetic passages, like Exod 15.³⁰⁶ There are some examples, as Aitken shows, of rhetorical figures used in prose passages.³⁰⁷ Aitken compares these examples of the translators' skill to use rhetorical figures with contemporary bureaucratic and official texts from the papyri that show that their authors could use rhetorical devices to some degree.³⁰⁸ He concludes that the translators were well educated in Greek and so could use Homeric vocabulary or a rhetorical figure here and there.³⁰⁹ He also admits this evidence could suggest the translators were much more educated, but their choice in translation style restrains them from using more Greek rhetorical figures and style.³¹⁰

LXX-Isa is a more free rendering than the Pentateuch, so there is more potential evidence of the translator's rhetorical knowledge and ability. Various scholars have shown evidence within LXX-Isa that suggest the translator had received some degree of Hellenistic education and was concerned about rhetorical issues.

³⁰⁵ Aitken, "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch," 520.

³⁰⁶ Aitken, "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch," 512-15.

³⁰⁷ Aitken, "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch," 512-13.

³⁰⁸ Aitken, "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch," 517-18.

³⁰⁹ Aitken, "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch," 520.

³¹⁰ Aitken, "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch," 521.

G. B. Caird, who shared the older view that the LXX-Isa translator was unskilled or incompetent, is surprised by the occasional use of rare words from Homer and Herodotus; he marvels: “It is as though he had learnt his Greek from a manual containing selections from great authors.”³¹¹ Based on what we have seen, it is indeed likely that the translator read Homer as he learned to read and write. It should not be surprising that he picked up some high vocabulary from reading the great authors.³¹²

Theo van der Louw calls the translator a man of learning, but does not go so far as to specifically claim the author was familiar with classical rhetoric.³¹³ When he discusses the rhetorical style of LXX-Isa 1 he frames it as how it would have been understood, not as deliberately put into a certain style.³¹⁴ He points out some features of this chapter that explicitly go against what rhetorical handbooks require: namely, the translation contains several *clausulae* (ending a clause or sentence with a poetic foot) which is considered bad form for prose texts.³¹⁵ Van der Louw says the translator was not following the rules of a rhetorical handbook, but was making common sense changes to make the text natural and understandable.³¹⁶ But, he also points out some examples where the translator has made changes that show a concern for eloquence, such as avoiding repeating lexemes in 1:9 and 26, in accordance to Greek style.³¹⁷ Van der Louw believes the translator stays close to the Hebrew text as a part of his translation method, not because he is incompetent.³¹⁸

Ronald L. Troxel has examined the scholarship of Alexandria to better understand how the scholarship of the Museum gives insight into LXX translation.³¹⁹ He says the translator appears to be well educated, since he knows enough about Greek literature to write in its style.³²⁰ Troxel prefers the view that the LXX-Isaiah translator is best understood in terms of a dragoman,³²¹ but does not discuss what this entails about the probable education level of the translator, or whether features in LXX-Isaiah reflect this. He does, however, discuss some methods used in the translation that are parallel to those used by Alexandrian scholars (γραμματικοί). Troxel talks about etymology and analogy, using the terms nearly synonymously;³²² as van der Kooij has pointed out, these are two different techniques used by

³¹¹ Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, 125-26.

³¹² More recently Baer has commented on LXX-Isa’s large and diverse vocabulary, which seems to exceed that of other LXX translators. Baer, *When We all Go Home*, 281.

³¹³ van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 246.

³¹⁴ van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 155-57.

³¹⁵ van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 156.

³¹⁶ van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 244-45.

³¹⁷ van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 244.

³¹⁸ van der Louw, *Transformations in the Septuagint*, 246.

³¹⁹ Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJSup 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008). See especially Chapter Two: “Alexandria and the LXX.”

³²⁰ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 132.

³²¹ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 71.

³²² Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 107-13.

Alexandrian γραμματικοί.³²³ Another method Troxel describes which is parallel to those of the Alexandrian scholars is the principle of *adagium* or “Ὁμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου, interpreting a text in light of the text or analogous textual parallels.”³²⁴ He says:

The form of contextual interpretation we have seen him [the LXX-Isa translator] engage in by drawing on passages in the Torah is quite explicable under the hypothesis of his familiarity with the work of the Alexandrian γραμματικοί and accords with the use of intertextuality as an interpretative ploy in other Jewish compositions of the Hellenistic era.³²⁵

So, Troxel too thinks the translator was well educated, and that he employed some of the methods used by the Alexandrian γραμματικοί in his translation.

Another hint of this is pointed out by van der Kooij, namely, that LXX-Isa 33:18 uses the unusual equivalent γραμματικοί for ספר.³²⁶ This shows the translator’s familiarity with these elite scholars, and van der Kooij suggests that the translator thought of himself as an expert like the Alexandrian γραμματικοί, except he was an elite expert of the Jewish writings.³²⁷ This is similar to how LXX-Dan portrays the training of Daniel and the three youths, they are described as γραμματικοί in Dan 1:4 and in 1:17 are said to be blessed in their ability with the γραμματικῇ τέχνῃ, a technical Alexandrian term for expertise in reading and interpreting texts.³²⁸

Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs’ exhaustive study of pluses and minus in LXX-Isa has shown many examples where the translator’s concern for good style can be clearly seen.³²⁹ She carefully notes all the pluses that improve rhetorical figures, such as: inclusio, anaphora, epiphora, reduplicatio, annominatio, polyptoton, synonymia, and so forth.³³⁰ While many of these rhetorical figures described with classical terminology also exist in the Hebrew Bible and could have been known simply through knowledge of Biblical literature, the minuses of LXX-Isa more clearly suggest the translator was influenced by Greek rhetorical sensibilities. As van der Vorm-Croughs points out, Greek rhetoric tended to avoid over-ornamentation

³²³ Arie van der Kooij, “Review of Ronald L. Troxel, LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation etc.,” *BIOSCS* 42 (2009), 148.

³²⁴ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 150-51.

³²⁵ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 151.

³²⁶ Arie van der Kooij, *Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 35; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 63. Arie van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision* (VTSup LXXI; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 115.

³²⁷ van der Kooij, “The Septuagint and Alexandrian Scholarship,” 502. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 63-65.

³²⁸ Arie van der Kooij, “The City of Alexandria and the Ancient Versions of the Hebrew Bible,” *JNSL* 25.1 (1999), 142. van der Kooij, “The Septuagint and Alexandrian Scholarship,” 502. van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 63-65. van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, 115.

³²⁹ Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, “The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of its Pluses and Minuses” (PhD diss., Universiteit Leiden, 2010). See especially chapter 7. A short version of this research can also be found in the article: Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, “LXX Isaiah and the Use of Rhetorical Figures,” in *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives* (eds. Arie van der Kooij and Michaël N. van der Meer; Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 55; Leuven: Peeters, 2010): 173-88.

³³⁰ For the section on pluses that improve the rhetorical style, see van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 142-75.

(κακόζηλια), particularly repetition (*homoeologia*), and likewise the translator has removed many examples of different sorts of repetition.³³¹ Hebrew poetic and rhetorical assumptions, on the other hand, rather like repetition of all sorts. Van der Vorm-Croughs only goes so far as to say that this evidence supports the assumption that the translator had some familiarity with classical rhetoric, as he was a learned man.³³²

All these studies taken together suggest there is good reason to believe that the LXX-Isa translator (and many of the other LXX translators) received a solid Hellenistic education. They also appear to show he was even able to apply some of the techniques used by the Alexandrian γραμματικοί in order to understand his Hebrew text, to express its meaning more clearly, and to improve the style of his translation.

1.3.2. Jewish Views of Metaphor

Older scholarship thought the LXX-Isa translator's understanding of Hebrew was quite bad, but this view has been reevaluated in light of our knowledge of scribal culture and exegetical practices.³³³ In this section we will first briefly describe Jewish scribal culture and its exegesis, and second, we will discuss evidence for how different types of metaphor were understood and interpreted in Early Judaism.

1.3.2.1. Jewish Scribal Culture

Just as in Hellenistic culture, there must have been various degrees of literary or scribal skill in Jewish circles. Some may have had to learn the Hebrew language before learning to read it, and others progressed enough to even write in Hebrew. Since we have even less data about Jewish education at this time period, we will touch on it only briefly before shifting focus to the best and most authoritative scribes in our brief discussion.

How exactly reading Hebrew was being taught at this time is worthy of further research. Studies addressing the issue typically survey information from the Talmud and Josephus and assume it applies to this earlier period.³³⁴ Applying this information to the situation in Egypt is even more difficult. The typical description of learning to read Hebrew is that after learning the alphabet backwards and forwards they would then begin learning to read words and sample exercises, such as the Shema and Hallel, learning to read words in their contexts to pick the proper meaning, and also memorizing the sentence, its meaning, and translation.³³⁵ Then they would move on to reading the Pentateuch, either Genesis 1-5 or

³³¹ van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 203.

³³² van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 204, 409.

³³³ See van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 66.

³³⁴ Nathan Drazin, *History of Jewish Education from 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E.: (During the Periods of the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaim)* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1940). And Eliezer Ebner, *Elementary Education in Ancient Israel: During the Tannaitic Period (10-220 C.E.)* (New York: Bloch, 1956).

³³⁵ Drazin, *History of Jewish Education*, 81-82. Ebner, *Elementary Education*, 75-77.

Leviticus 1-8, again learning the meaning and to translate it, and learning the grammar as they proceeded.³³⁶ This seems feasible for boys who spoke Aramaic, heard Biblical Hebrew in Synagogue each week, and perhaps knew some Late Hebrew as well. But it seems doubtful this pedagogy would have worked very well in Egypt if conducted in Greek.³³⁷ A Greek speaking student lacking knowledge of Aramaic would have a much more difficult time learning vocabulary and understanding how the grammar and syntax worked, since there probably was no systematic description of Hebrew Grammar.

The question of how Jews in Egypt could have learned to read the Hebrew Bible has provided the context for a model of the origin of the LXX. This model, known as the “Interlinear Paradigm,” suggests that the LXX is dependent and subservient linguistically to the Hebrew text, and that it arises out of the need for a crib translation to aid in learning Hebrew.³³⁸ To support this theory, bilingual Greek-Latin texts used in schools in antiquity are described.³³⁹ The Interlinear Paradigm has been criticized on several grounds.³⁴⁰ Relevant to the topic of education, Troxel points out that the bilingual texts mentioned are not explanations of the parent text, but are rhetorical exercises in expressing the same thoughts in vernacular language.³⁴¹ Joosten says we have no evidence of any Greek-Hebrew texts, but on the contrary, the earliest Hellenistic Greek writers we know about living in Egypt are already reading the LXX as a text in its own right.³⁴² Another problem Joosten describes, is that if the LXX is a crib for learning the Hebrew, how is it that in some places the Greek is unintelligible on its own (as Pietersma likes to point out)³⁴³ and is dependent on the Hebrew to be understood?³⁴⁴

³³⁶ Drazin, *History of Jewish Education*, 81-82. Ebner, *Elementary Education*, 77-78.

³³⁷ Drazin assumes the situation in Egypt was the same as in Palestine, only in Greek instead of Aramaic. He even thinks Philo knew Hebrew but quotes the LXX because it is more convenient as he is writing in Greek. Drazin, *History of Jewish Education*, 84.

³³⁸ Albert Pietersma, “A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint,” in *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique “From Alpha to Byte”*. University of Stellenbosch 17-21 July, 2000 (ed. Johann Cook; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 350, 360.

³³⁹ Pietersma, “A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions,” 346-48.

³⁴⁰ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 65-71. Jan Joosten, “Reflections on the ‘Interlinear Paradigm’ in Septuagint Studies,” in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (eds. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008): 163-78. And Takamitsu Muraoka, “Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-called Interlinear Model,” in *Die Septuaginta—Text, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006* (eds. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008): 221-35. Pietersma’s response to Muraoka can be found at: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/discussion/pietersma-re-muraoka.html>

³⁴¹ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 68.

³⁴² Joosten, “Reflections on the ‘Interlinear Paradigm,’” 170-71.

³⁴³ Pietersma, “A New Paradigm,” 350-51.

³⁴⁴ Joosten, “Reflections on the ‘Interlinear Paradigm,’” 172-73. Pietersma strongly states that the Greek in places only makes sense in light of the Hebrew. For example, see Pietersma, “A New Paradigm,” 350-51.

Cameron Boyd-Taylor has delineated the presuppositions of the Interlinear Paradigm and provided a theoretical framework for it.³⁴⁵ He clarifies that the paradigm is not meant to propose the actual existence of an interlinear text, but to be a way of conceptualizing the Greek's dependence on and subservience to the Hebrew.³⁴⁶ He argues that the translators used norms of translation proper to school texts,³⁴⁷ but unfortunately does not take Troxel's criticism into account, that the bi-lingual texts referred to by proponents of the Interlinear Paradigm were written by the students, not used by them as cribs.³⁴⁸

Muraoka objects to the theory on lexicographical grounds; he jests that he does not assume the LXX was meant to be read as an aid in learning Hebrew, as in a modern university;³⁴⁹ which raises an important issue: can we assume Jews in Alexandria would have learned to read Hebrew with Greek instruction (and also already know how to read Greek)? It seems more logical that they would have learned the language (if they did not know even Aramaic) before learning to read it.³⁵⁰ In the case of the LXX translators, they appear not only to have knowledge of Biblical Hebrew, but also of Aramaic and Late Hebrew, since they sometimes give definitions from these languages for Biblical Hebrew words.³⁵¹ But for the general Jewish population in Egypt, we do not know if they even learned Hebrew; the success of the LXX is generally believed to be based on the fact that Egyptian Jews mostly could not read Hebrew.

More can be said regarding the elite Jewish scribal culture in this period. Whereas there was a religious element to the literary studies of the Alexandrian scholars,³⁵² for them the texts they studied were not normative the way the biblical books were for the Jews. Arie van der Kooij has shown that in the second century BCE "the law, prophets, and other books," as ben Sirach calls them, were highly regarded as the ancient and ancestral basis for the Jewish religion and culture.³⁵³ Van der Kooij shows that part of why these books were held in

³⁴⁵ Cameron Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies* (Biblical Tools and Studies 8; Leuven: Peeters, 2011). Unfortunately, it does not address the criticism of the Interlinear Paradigm.

³⁴⁶ Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines*, 52-4, 91.

³⁴⁷ Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines*, 317, 327, 341-352. This as opposed to the norms used by dragoman or legal/official translators.

³⁴⁸ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 68.

³⁴⁹ Muraoka, "Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography," 226.

³⁵⁰ Quintilian 1.1.12-14 assumes Latin speaking students learn not just to read Greek but to speak it.

³⁵¹ For the use of Aramaic definitions of Hebrew words see van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 69. For Late Hebrew definitions of Biblical Hebrew words see Jan Joosten, "The Knowledge and Use of Hebrew in the Hellenistic Period Qumran and the Septuagint," in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (eds. Takamitsu Muraoka and J.F. Elwolde; Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah 36; Leiden: Brill, 2000): 115-30.

³⁵² Remember the Museum was a shrine for the Muses.

³⁵³ Arie van der Kooij, "Authoritative Scriptures and Scribal Culture," in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Mladen Popović; Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism Vol 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 55-56.

high esteem is because they were regarded as ancestral and were kept in the Temple.³⁵⁴ In addition, he shows that these books were regarded as objects of study.

To begin studying these books, the reader would need to have some knowledge of Biblical Hebrew and some training besides just how to pronounce the alphabet to make sense of and interpret the unpointed text.³⁵⁵ Reading, it must be noted, does not mean just understanding what the text says, but is about understanding the text from careful study and being able to read it out loud so that those who hear can understand.³⁵⁶ This means the reader is not stumbling over words, trying different possible parsings until it makes sense, they can read clearly putting the pronunciation, pauses, accents, and punctuations where they belong.³⁵⁷ Van der Kooij shows that this is the case for the Levites reading the Torah in Neh 8:8 and for Jesus ben Sirach (Wisdom of ben Sirach ln. 7-11), who developed a thorough knowledge of the ancestral books by reading them.³⁵⁸ According to the Letter of Aristeas par. 305 the translators read the law and interpreted it, which van der Kooij has argued, is likely a prerequisite for anyone who would be accepted to translate the Jewish scriptures.³⁵⁹

Developing a familiarity and knowledge of a text naturally means they developed an interpretation of the text, which requires some sort of authority. Van der Kooij argues that there was a hierarchy of authority in interpreting the scriptures, so that the head of the community (someone like Ezra, the High Priest, or the Teacher of Righteousness at Qumran) was the leading scholar who had the authority to say what the text means, whereas at lower levels they could teach this interpretation to others.³⁶⁰ It makes good sense to suppose that the LXX-Isa translator belonged to the Jewish religious elite and had the authority to interpret the meaning of the text as he translated it. As we have seen above, the Greek interest in Homer was largely in its cultural value, and its study in Greek education was in order to hang on to a sense of Greek identity.³⁶¹ The added religious element in the Hebrew classics required not just a skilled critic but someone who had some religious authority.³⁶²

³⁵⁴ van der Kooij, "Authoritative Scriptures and Scribal Culture," 56-57.

³⁵⁵ van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 113. Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 108-9. For Seeligmann's suggested sources of Hebrew knowledge see Isaac Leo Seeligmann, *The Septuagint of Isaiah: A Discussion of its Problems* (eds. Robert Hanhard and Hermann Spieckermann; *Forschungen zum Alten testament* 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 195-96 [50-51].

³⁵⁶ van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 112-13.

³⁵⁷ van der Kooij argues that in Neh 8:8, "reading clearly" refers to pronouncing and "giving the sense" refers to intonation and marking clauses and punctuation, van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 116.

³⁵⁸ van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 113.

³⁵⁹ van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre*, 114-15.

³⁶⁰ van der Kooij, "Authoritative Scriptures and Scribal Culture," 61-66.

³⁶¹ Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 8-9.

³⁶² That this authority could have been the Oniads in Leontopolis, see van der Kooij, "Chapter 3: The Septuagint of Isaiah," in *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom*, 63-85.

1.3.2.2. Metaphor in Early Judaism

As far as we know, there was no Early Jewish handbook on rhetoric. In this brief survey we gather some evidence of ideas about metaphor, or at least their use, from the writings of the contemporaries of the LXX-Isa translator and in the following generations.

First, it is worth discussing how the Hebrew Bible understands metaphors; but unfortunately, not much can be said about this. The closest thing to a word for metaphor we know of is **הַשְׁמָה**, but this term is too broad and covers too many quite different phenomena to be very enlightening. Stephen Curkpatrick says **הַשְׁמָה** is used to describe allegory, simile, parable, proverb, riddle, taunt, irony, aphorism, fable, apocalyptic revelation, riddle, similitude, symbol, pseudonym, example, theme, argument, apology, refutation, jest, sovereign saying, and/or word of power.³⁶³ The term at least shows an understanding of the distinction between literal speech and symbolic or representative speech.

The LXX translation of **הַשְׁמָה** complicates rather than clarifies the issue. Most often it is rendered with *παραβολή* (27x), the first occurrence being in reference to Balaam's "curse" in Num 23:7. Aristotle describes examples (*παράδειγματα*) as either coming from things that have happened (such as Persian kings always securing Egypt before attacking Greece) or from things invented.³⁶⁴ Invented examples can be either *παραβολή* which are situations that could happen in real life or fables (*λόγος*) which are completely made up.³⁶⁵ This understanding of parable is much more narrow than a mashal, and fits quite poorly the situation in Num 23:7. In Stephen Curkpatrick's study showing how unsuitable the translation of mashal with parable is, he comments that: "Unlike the Hebrew mashal comparison, the rhetorical use of *παραβολή* does not appear to have the same density or resistance to transparent interpretation as the mashal. While the mashal as simile encompasses metonymic opacity, the rhetorical use of *παραβολή* as simile seeks analogical clarity."³⁶⁶ A parable should be used to explain and illustrate an idea, whereas a mashal is an encoded idea that requires consideration to unravel. This translation equivalent is adequate if both terms are understood to be "similitudes," but given the range of meaning mashal has, and the rather specific definition parable has, the equivalence is questionable. The LXX-Isa translator, at least, in the one place **הַשְׁמָה** occurred (Isa 14:4) rendered based on what exactly it meant in that particular context: *θρῆνος*, a dirge (this of course does not mean he was aware of or concerned about the problems in translating **הַשְׁמָה** with the rhetorical term *παραβολή*).

For Ben Sirach too, the *παραβολή* is not a trope that illustrates or communicates an idea but one that encodes and hides an idea and must be engaged and interpreted. This is seen especially in 39:1-3, where the study of the Law of God by a sage is described. The sage must seek out the wisdom of the ancients, occupy himself with prophecies (*ἐν προφητείαις*

³⁶³ Curkpatrick, "Between Mashal and Parable," 58-59.

³⁶⁴ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 2.20.2-3.

³⁶⁵ Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 2.20.4-5.

³⁶⁶ Curkpatrick, "Between Mashal and Parable," 67.

ἀσχοληθήσεται), treasure the sayings of the famous, penetrate the intricacies of parables (ἐν στροφαῖς παραβολῶν συνεισελεύσεται), search out the hidden meanings of proverbs (ἀπόκρυφα παροιμιῶν ἐκζητήσεται), and engage with the enigmas of parables (ἐν αἰνίγμασι παραβολῶν ἀναστραφήσεται). This study of the ancestral books is very different from what was done by the Greeks in Alexandria. Ben Sirach does not talk about textual criticism, the poetics or rhetoric, the history, chronology, or other matters that the grammatikoi of Alexandria were concerned with (and even the Jewish Hellenistic writers we saw above). For Ben Sirach, the study of these books is a search to understand the meaning and wisdom, not that has been lost to time, but has been preserved by the wise and is gathered by those who seek to be wise. The αἰνίγμασι παραβολῶν (see also the similar phrase in 47:15) is not a trope but a mystery or riddle; Siegert shows that in Hellenistic interpretation, αἶνιγμα is a riddle where “the words do not mean what they seem to mean, but are there for the sake of a hidden meaning to be found through some art of decoding.”³⁶⁷ In Num 21:27 the authors of an ancient song about Heshbon are referred to as מְלִיץֵי־הַנֶּחֱשִׁבִּים which the LXX renders as οἱ αἰνιγματισταί. While this is a literal rendering, it suggests that the song in the following verses was not understood by the translators simply as a fragment of epic poetry but as some kind of riddle containing a hidden meaning.³⁶⁸

Another informative piece of information comes from Aristobulus. It should be admitted that the fragments that have come down to us are related by Eusebius of Caesarea, Clement, and Anatolius who may have paraphrased or adjusted the quotes.³⁶⁹ According to Siegert, Aristobulus uses μεταφέρειν in the sense of the solutions to tropes, and not allegorization, and uses other vocabulary to talk about allegorical and higher meanings.³⁷⁰ In fragment two, Aristobulus explains to the king why Moses talks about divine power in terms of hands, arm, visage, feet, and the ability to walk.³⁷¹ He warns that these things should be interpreted in their natural (φυσικῶς) sense, and not in a mythical or common way of thinking.³⁷² While he could, in theory, have explained these things rhetorically, as metaphors or anthropomorphisms (cf. Adrian, who describes these metaphors as stylistic peculiarities characteristic of Hebrew thought),³⁷³ perhaps because it is a religious text or due to his purpose in writing this book, he explains them in allegorical terms, saying they signify

³⁶⁷ Siegert, “Early Jewish Interpretation in a Hellenistic style,” 139.

³⁶⁸ Cf. Ps. 78(77), which describes itself as a mashal (parable in Greek) yet is essentially a rehearsal of history from the Exodus to the building of the temple.

³⁶⁹ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. III: Aristobulus*, 43-45. Niehoff accuses Eusebius and Clement of introducing the term “allegory” to the fragments, Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis*, 59.

³⁷⁰ Siegert, “Early Jewish interpretation in a Hellenistic style,” 161.

³⁷¹ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. III: Aristobulus*, 135. This fragment comes from Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 8.9.38-10.18a.

³⁷² Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. III: Aristobulus*, 135. *Praeparatio Evangelica* 8.10.2. See note 31 for Holladay’s explanation of his translation (which I follow) of φυσικῶς.

³⁷³ Adriani, *ΕΙΣΑΓΩΓΗ ΕΙΣ ΤΑΣ ΘΕΙΑΣ ΓΡΑΦΑΣ*, in *Patrologiae Cursus Completus Series Graeca* 98, (ed. J.P. Migne; Paris 1865).

(σημαίνεται) divine power.³⁷⁴ He then explains how even in common speech the hands of a king can be used to refer to his power; he says that we can think metaphorically of all men's strength and actions in their hands.³⁷⁵ Aristobulus then says that Moses did well in speaking metaphorically in an expanded sense, talking about God's deeds as his hands (διόπερ καλῶς ὁ νομοθέτης ἐπὶ τὸ μεγαλεῖον μετενήνοχε, λέγων τὰς συντελείας χείρας εἶναι θεοῦ).³⁷⁶ So it seems in some ways the difference for Aristobulus between metaphor as simply a way of speaking (a trope) and the words of a text having a spiritual or allegorical meaning is slight; or at least that the relationship between the text and its allegorical meaning is analogous to how metaphors function. In fragment five, after saying the seventh day of rest can be understood in a deeper sense as the first day, since it is the origin of light through which all things are seen, he says that the same can be applied metaphorically to wisdom, since light issues from it.³⁷⁷ So again a higher, allegorical sense is spoken of next to the possibility of speaking metaphorically in the same terms.

While Aristobulus explains what moderns might call anthropomorphisms as allegories, Aristeas sees allegories where no modern would see any sort of trope. In par. 143 he says that the dietary laws were given for a deep or profound reason (λόγον βαθύν) and proceeds to explain how the different sorts of animals permitted or prohibited symbolize (par. 148, σημειοῦσθαι), for men of understanding, how to live morally.³⁷⁸ He also says in par. 150 that the regulations concerning what can be eaten are put forth by way of allegory (τροπολογῶν ἐκτέθειται).³⁷⁹ Aristeas, then, seems to be in line with the sage of Ben Sirach, and is searching out hidden meanings, but he is seeing symbols where no rhetorical device is being employed.

Aristobulus, Ben Sirach, and Aristeas were all likely Jews who attained a high level of Hellenistic education, undoubtedly at least as high as the LXX translators. Yet in the material we have from them, they do not approach the Hebrew Bible (or the Greek, as the case may be) with rigid Hellenistic ideas about tropes but with an interest in hidden allegorical meanings to the various symbols used. Metaphors, then, may not have always been understood as tropes (even by those well trained in rhetoric) but as symbols encoding a hidden meaning.

³⁷⁴ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. III: Aristobulus*, 135. Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 8.10.1. That this refers not to a trope but to an extended meaning, or *sensus plenior*, see Siegert, "Early Jewish interpretation in a Hellenistic style," 156-57, 161. Niehoff, however, believes Aristobulus is in fact interpreting it as metaphorical speech, and is not interpreting allegorically. Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis*, 68-71.

³⁷⁵ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. III: Aristobulus*, 139. *Praeparatio Evangelica* 8.10.8.

³⁷⁶ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. III: Aristobulus*, 138-39. *Praeparatio Evangelica* 8.10.9. In note 38, page 209 Holladay explains that Aristobulus uses τὸ μεγαλεῖον to refer to a greater, that is allegorical, sense.

³⁷⁷ Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol. III: Aristobulus*, 178-79. *Praeparatio Evangelica* 13.12.10 and 7.14.1.

³⁷⁸ See also in par. 150-51.

³⁷⁹ For more on the exegesis of this letter, see Siegert, "Early Jewish interpretation in a Hellenistic style," 143-54.

This search for hidden meanings could be connected to some Hellenistic ideas, such as stoic allegorical exegesis,³⁸⁰ but it also has strong affinities with the pesher interpretations of Qumran and the explicating tendencies of the Targumim. Michael Fishbane has shown that the interpretive techniques used in pesher material are similar to those used for interpreting oracles, scripture, and dreams,³⁸¹ and have similar hermeneutical features to those used both in ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia as well as within the Hebrew Bible itself.³⁸² One technique important in the context of metaphors is that in pesher Habakkuk symbols are interpreted typologically; for example לבנון is interpreted as referring to the sect.³⁸³

Similar to pesher, as mentioned above, is the exegesis of the Targum.³⁸⁴ Unlike the documents so far addressed, the Targum is a translation (of sorts) of the Hebrew Bible and so provides data on how specific metaphors were understood. The metaphors in Targum Jonathan of the Prophets, to which we will frequently refer to compare alternate translation strategies, have been studied by Pinkhos Churgin.³⁸⁵ He concludes: “The targumist made it a principle to render not the metaphor but what it represents, the event described and not the description. It is the purpose which is of chief import to him.”³⁸⁶ This feature of Targum Jonathan is well known, that it aims to explain the meaning of the text and not simply to translate it. When discussing metaphors, then, we should expect the Targum to translate the metaphor with a non-metaphor, that is, with what the metaphor represents. But Churgin shows how the Targum still takes up various strategies to render metaphors.

Parabolic metaphors, he says, are stripped of their parabolic nature by having their “underpoetical parallels” rendered,³⁸⁷ that is, the Targum substitutes the vehicle³⁸⁸ for what it represents; sometimes both are given, the vehicle being introduced by the phrase דמה דמא: “which is equal.”³⁸⁹ He provides as examples Ezek 19:3, 6, where lions are replaced in the

³⁸⁰ For an introduction to stoic allegorical exegesis see: Siegert, “Early Jewish interpretation in a Hellenistic style,” 131-35. On Aristobulus’ allegorical method’s similarity to stoic thought, see Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors Vol.3*, 178f.

³⁸¹ The similarity of pesher to oracle and dream interpretation is also pointed out by Johann Maier, “Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Interpretation: Vol 1 From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)* (ed. Magne Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 127-28; and William H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 24; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), 26-31.

³⁸² Michael A. Fishbane, “The Qumran pesher and traits of ancient hermeneutics,” in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies, vol 1, held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1973* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), 97-98. The six features Fishbane points out can undoubtedly be found in LXX-Isa as well, with the exception of gematria.

³⁸³ Fishbane, “The Qumran pesher and traits of ancient hermeneutics,” 99. This interpretation occurs in 1QpHab XII:3f.

³⁸⁴ On the possibility that they both have their root in orally explaining scripture as it is read, see Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*, 34.

³⁸⁵ Pinkhos Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1927).

³⁸⁶ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 85.

³⁸⁷ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 85.

³⁸⁸ We will describe terminology below. *Vehicle* refers to the language adopted in a metaphor, whereas *Tenor* is what the vehicle represents.

³⁸⁹ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 85.

Targum by kings, and Ezek 23:2, 5 where daughters and lovers are replaced by cities, and playing the harlot by erring from God's worship.³⁹⁰

Churgin shows how the comparative metaphor, or similitude, in Ezek 31:3-15, which compares Assyria to a cedar in Lebanon, is rendered by the Targum as a description of the greatness and strength of Assyria.³⁹¹

The poetical metaphor, "forms of expression given in objects of nature," again has the tenor rendered instead of the vehicle.³⁹² Sometimes a simile is still present to give the vehicle, though not usually.³⁹³ An example, without simile, is Isa 2:13, where cedars and oaks are rendered as princes and tyrants.³⁹⁴

The simile is usually rendered with what it is thought to represent, followed by a translation of the simile (Isa 8:6, 7; cf. van der Louw strategy number 5).³⁹⁵ Sometimes the Targum assumes a passage is a comparative metaphor, so renders in this same way (Ezek 2:6).³⁹⁶

Symbolic expressions (Isa 6:6; Ezek 2:8) are rendered literally, yet some metaphors are rendered as if they were allegories in a Midrashic way (Amos 4:14).³⁹⁷ Another common Targum strategy is to add exegetical complements to clarify terse metaphoric speech (Mal 1:4, Jer 17:4).³⁹⁸

Churgin also points out how certain words, "though not metaphorical, bear a poetical stamp, and in reality convey more or less the **idea** of the meaning than the meaning itself."³⁹⁹ These words, which seem to be sort of dead metaphors, typically have their underlying value rendered, rather than their surface meaning. The examples given are "bring" becoming "exile" in Ezek 12:13; and "therefore the land will mourn" becoming "therefore the land will be laid waste" in Hos 4:3, etc.⁴⁰⁰

Comparing these translations to other versions, Churgin says that the LXX does not practice the allegorical or metaphorical strategies the Targum uses.⁴⁰¹ But it does, at times, use exegetical complements as well as the lexical principle (giving the idea of the meaning rather than the word's surface meaning).⁴⁰² Further research is needed to determine to what extent the interpretation of metaphors in the Targum is a separate activity or in continuity with

³⁹⁰ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 86.

³⁹¹ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 86.

³⁹² Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 86.

³⁹³ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 86-87.

³⁹⁴ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 87.

³⁹⁵ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 87.

³⁹⁶ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 87.

³⁹⁷ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 88.

³⁹⁸ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 88-89. He goes on to describe how this principle is also applied to repetition.

³⁹⁹ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 90.

⁴⁰⁰ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 90.

⁴⁰¹ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 90-91.

⁴⁰² Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 91.

how the prophecies themselves are interpreted. Perhaps when the language of the metaphor is preserved in a simile the translator shows he considers the rhetorical figure important though still in need of clarification.

To conclude our brief look at metaphor in early Judaism, it would appear that it did not hold its own place. If we consider deciphering symbols or unraveling mysteries in the context of interpreting a prophetic book, then actualizing exegesis (typology as Fishbane calls it) and giving the meaning of a metaphor could operate along the same continuum of the sage's searching out the meaning of enigmas. An example, which will be discussed below, is the interpretation of the vineyard in Isa 5 verses the interpretation of the vineyard in Isa 27; the first works on the metaphorical level and is explained already in the Hebrew, while the later is deciphered in the Greek to represent Jerusalem under siege. Making explicit what a metaphor says is an easier riddle than giving what contemporary event the prophet is thought to predict (even if the prophet did not know the *true* interpretation of his prophecy). The Targum's tendency to interpret and make explicit both metaphors and the referents of prophecies are likely two closely related parts of the same impulse or interpretive program. As stated above, מִשְׁלָּה is much broader than the idea of metaphors or tropes, but in practice seems to govern how tropes were understood and interpreted as well as proverbs, allegories, parables, riddles, taunts, irony, aphorisms, fables, apocalyptic revelations, riddles, similitudes, symbols, etc.

1.3.2.3. Early Jewish Views of Metaphor in LXX-Isaiah

It is undoubtedly possible to find examples in LXX-Isa of metaphors treated in ways consistent with the methods used in Qumran,⁴⁰³ by Hellenistic Jews,⁴⁰⁴ or even within the Hebrew Bible itself. But here we will content ourselves with the comparison of LXX-Isa to the Targum. This is a more suitable comparison in that both texts are translations (of sorts) and since the Targum represents a more developed stage of Jewish exegesis and its interpretive tendency is very well known. In addition, van der Kooij, as we have shown (1.1.2.), has already pointed out various similarities between how LXX-Isa and the Targum render metaphors.⁴⁰⁵ In this section, then, we will show a few examples van der Kooij has pointed out to demonstrate how the LXX at times translates metaphors in a Targumic fashion.

The method described by Churgin, where the translator gives the object represented by the metaphor yet stays close to the words of the original, is particularly striking.⁴⁰⁶ In 1:25 the LXX stays close to many of the words of the Hebrew and yet interprets the imagery, giving instead what he thinks the refining metaphor represents: burning to bring purity and to remove

⁴⁰³ We will mention the similarity between LXX-Isa 10:33-34 and Damascus Document II.19 in section 2.6.2.

⁴⁰⁴ Such as interpreting the metaphor in 10:12 by metonymy as does Aristobulus of the hand metaphor in fragment 2.

⁴⁰⁵ van der Kooij, "The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language," 179-85.

⁴⁰⁶ Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, 86. See below in IV.B.1.c. for more examples of LXX-Isa using this method.

the wicked.⁴⁰⁷ To do this, he adds a phrase in the first part of the verse that is suggested in the Hebrew (the destruction of the disobedient), and also adds a clause in the second part of the verse that explains what he thinks will happen to the wicked. As van der Kooij points out,⁴⁰⁸ the Targum has a similar interpretation to the passage: that God will cleanse them of the wicked and remove their sinners, though it uses a different method of rendering the metaphor. A similar translation technique can be seen in LXX-Isa 8:6-8, where the rendering is close to the Hebrew, but certain words have been interpreted to give the meaning of the metaphor.⁴⁰⁹ This is seen particularly in 8:7, where once the rising river is said to represent the king of Assyria in both the Hebrew and the Greek, the LXX interprets the bursting of the river banks as the king walking over every wall. In the next verse, the water rising to the neck is interpreted in the LXX as the king removing everyone “who can lift his head,” and the Targum interprets as the king passing over everything, even the head of the country: Jerusalem. We have already seen the example of 22:22-25 which van der Kooij analyzed (1.1.2.),⁴¹⁰ here again, though, the translation stays close to the Hebrew while interpreting the metaphors so as to give their meaning. The Targum gives a similar interpretation, that the peg represents authority.

These examples demonstrate van der Kooij’s assertions that LXX-Isa and the Targum share a similar approach to metaphors and sometimes even make similar interpretations of them. This positions LXX-Isa within the tradition of Jewish interpretation of metaphors, anticipating some methods to be used more extensively later. We will discuss further similarities in section 4.2.1.

1.3.3. Summary and Conclusions

This brief survey of ancient views of metaphors has attempted to show some of the Hellenistic and Jewish context of LXX-Isa’s translator. Here we will summarize what we have seen, first for the Hellenistic context, then the Jewish, and will draw some conclusions about what sort of assumptions we can make about how the translator probably thought about metaphors.

The Greeks had sophisticated descriptions of tropes and metaphors in several schools of philosophy, which remained stable (apart from elaboration of details and a refinement of distinctions) at least from Aristotle through the time period of the LXX-Isa translator. Based on what we know about the process of learning to read and write Greek at this time period, it is likely that the LXX-Isa translator was exposed to these descriptions of tropes throughout

⁴⁰⁷ For Ziegler’s analysis of this passage, see *Untersuchungen*, 81.

⁴⁰⁸ van der Kooij, “The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language,” 181.

⁴⁰⁹ For Ziegler’s analysis of this passage, see *Untersuchungen*, 62.

⁴¹⁰ van der Kooij, “The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language,” 183. For Ziegler’s analysis of this passage, see *Untersuchungen*, 86-87.

his Greek education.⁴¹¹ In addition, in Hellenistic education, the processes of reading was inextricably bound with the process of interpretation at a certain level; the LXX translators would have been trained to read very closely, looking at entire sentences and passages as well as at its individual parts to find the intended meaning. They would have been trained to notice tropes and to interpret their meaning and evaluate their use. They would have learned how to find the meaning of obscure words by examining their context and usage in other passages, and would have been used to having difficult words explained by etymology and synonyms. Then, on top of this training just to read, some students had some further training in literary criticism so that they could proficiently read literary and poetic works.

We have also looked at the most elite Greek intellectuals of the time and at the sort of scholarship that was being done, and showed some of the known examples of Jews who did similar work and operated in the same circles. That there were Jews in the most elite scholarly circles suggests that there were many more who attained various levels of education short of reaching the white halls of the Museum. We also collected some observations that have been made by LXX scholars which point out features that betray the translators' knowledge of Hellenistic literature and stylistic sensibilities. We can conclude, based on external evidence, that the LXX translators in general would have had access to high levels of Hellenistic education, and, based on internal evidence, that the translator of LXX-Isa in particular had a solid Greek education.

Having a Greek education entails some knowledge of Greek literature. In this study we will at times compare specific plant metaphors to those found in Classical Greek works. We do not intend to imply that the translator necessarily knew these particular pieces of literature, though he may have, but only to show that a given metaphor would not have sounded too absurd or strange in Greek, since a renowned native speaker used a similar metaphor. Likewise we will often mention Theophrastus' works on botany; our intention is not to suggest that the translator had read Theophrastus (though if he had wanted to read a book on botany, Theophrastus would have been the most readily available and complete work), but we refer to it as a source for plant terminology and as an insight into the ideas people in that day had about various plants.

What ideas about tropes and metaphors the LXX-Isa translator may have had from his Jewish context is a more complex question and requires further research to clarify. Not much is known about Jewish education or how people learned to read Hebrew at this period. We saw that the highly educated Jewish scribes also read their texts very closely, had extensive knowledge of their texts (and their meaning), and some even had the authority to offer interpretations of the text. Within the Bible and its early interpretive traditions, there appears to be a distinction between literal and representative ways of speaking. Interpreting symbols was very much a part of Jewish scribal culture, even if the difference between a symbolic

⁴¹¹ As claimed in Aitken, "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch," 508.

literary device (or trope) and a symbolic enigma or allegory was not explicitly described. Based on some examples comparing how LXX-Isa and the Targum interpret metaphors, we saw that LXX-Isa fits within the trajectory of later Jewish interpretive traditions.

The attempt to contextualize the possible ideas about metaphor to which the translator may have been exposed, has provided some information about what sort of person the translator may have been. The older view, that the translator was some enthusiastic and determined amateur who managed to produce (and have accepted and copied by others) a complete translation of Isaiah, despite having a rather poor knowledge of Hebrew, has rightly been rejected.⁴¹² Also, it should be considered anachronistic to suppose that the LXX translators approached the Hebrew text one word at a time with no regard for the meaning of the sentence or the passage as a whole; this goes against the way they were trained to read Greek and there is no evidence that this is the way people were being trained to read Hebrew.⁴¹³ Likewise the dragoman model has been rightfully criticized;⁴¹⁴ while it helps explain some of the literal translation techniques, a dragoman presumably would have avoided creating difficulties in his translation.⁴¹⁵ Troxel's suggestion that the LXX-Isa translator should be understood in the milieu of Alexandrian scholarship is helpful.⁴¹⁶ As we have seen, the LXX-Isa translator appears to have received a good Hellenistic education. We have also seen examples of Jews writing books similar to those written by the elite Alexandrian γραμματικοί, such as the historical and textual investigations written by Demetrius the Chronographer, Eupolemus, Cleodemus Malchus, and the others. But LXX-Isa, on the other hand, is a translation of a book of prophecy, a very different genre than what interested the Alexandrian γραμματικοί, who were generally not interested in oracles or translation but focused on studying and writing literary and historical texts and commentaries.

Regarding the LXX-Isa translator's knowledge of tropes, we should expect him to know a fair amount about Greek rhetoric, but not be surprised if he does not explicitly use it, but rather works like the other Hellenistic Jews we surveyed. If the translator were to think explicitly about metaphors, it is likely that he would think about them in the Hellenistic terms of his time, but he would not have felt compelled to rigidly follow rhetorical handbooks when preparing his translation. He probably had some concern for Greek style, but interpreted primarily as a Jewish scribe. In the conclusions of this study we will gather some examples

⁴¹² Ottley held that the translator's knowledge of Hebrew was deficient. R. R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah According to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* (London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1904), 1.49-50.

⁴¹³ Nor does it accord with later methods for reading Hebrew.

⁴¹⁴ For discussion of the LXX translators working like dragoman, see Rabin, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint," 1-26; and Elias Bickerman, "The Septuagint as a Translation," in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History part I* (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 9; Leiden, Brill, 1976): 167-200.

⁴¹⁵ For this critique, see Pietersma, "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions," 343-44. Another problem with the dragoman suggestion is the wide range of competency dragomen had; some could barely read and write, others could use sophisticated literary devices.

⁴¹⁶ Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, 20-25, 38-41.

that could show the translator was following the suggestions of Greek rhetorical handbooks (4.3.). Also, we will give some examples of the translator using methods or making interpretations that place him within the stream of Jewish exegetical tradition (4.2.).

1.4. The Method and Outline of this Study

In this section, first we will describe the terminology adopted in this study. Then we will delimit the scope of the present study. Third, our method will be described, and finally, we will sketch the outline of this study.

1.4.1. Terminology

Having already attempted to describe the context from which the LXX-Isa translator most likely derived his understanding of metaphor (to whatever degree he actively engaged in thinking about it), we must now turn to how we will discuss metaphor. We will draw our terminology and framework for understanding what is happening in the texts from the stream of cognitive metaphor theory (see 1.2.1.), even though the translator undoubtedly did not explicitly think in these terms. Ancient terminology is not completely adequate since Aristotle's definition of a metaphor as the use of a word that belongs to another thing (*Poetics* XXI.7-9) is broad enough to refer to all the figures defined below.

Metaphor: For this study, we will use Janet Soskice's definition of metaphor, which appears to be a nuanced restatement of Aristotle's definition. A metaphor is "speaking about one thing in terms which are seen to be suggestive of another."⁴¹⁷ The parts of a metaphor will be described using Richards' terms: the vehicle and the tenor.⁴¹⁸ The *vehicle* is what Aristotle calls the word that belongs to another thing, it is the figurative language used in a metaphor. The *tenor* is the other thing, what the metaphor refers to and what the vehicle represents. For the purposes of this study, metaphor will be described primarily as a rhetorical figure.

Lexicalized Metaphor: A lexicalized or dead metaphor is one that is used so often it has largely lost its metaphorical value and become an extended meaning of the word. Soskice says dead metaphors can be recognized in that there is less tension or dissonance in them than a

⁴¹⁷ Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 49, 53. This is close to the definition in Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 108. He says of metaphor: "it says one thing, it means another."

⁴¹⁸ I use Richards' terms because I find them clear and describe the parts of the metaphor that need to be discussed in this study. Richards, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, 96-97. Black's terms, "focus" and "frame," are not as useful since they do not address what is meant by the metaphor. Black, *Models and Metaphors*, 28. For a critique of Black, see Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 38-43.

living metaphor, they are more easily paraphrased, and are further removed from the models or cognitive metaphors from which they come.⁴¹⁹

Simile: While similes often lack the force of metaphors, they operate in a similar way, except they offer both the tenor and the vehicle linked in some way, often by a comparative marker.⁴²⁰ In the Hebrew Bible it is difficult to separate metaphors from similes, as D. F. Payne has pointed out. That in Hebrew poetry comparative markers can be dropped by ellipsis does not make matters easier.⁴²¹ Aristotle did not think metaphors and similes were terribly different,⁴²² and Soskice says they can have the same function and differ primarily in grammatical form.⁴²³ It is of note and worthy of further research that the LXX-Isa translator tends to insert a comparative marker if a parallel clause has a simile.⁴²⁴ In general we will identify similes primarily on the basis of whether there is a comparative marker or not.

Metonymy: I use metonymy broadly to include synecdoche. Metonymy uses a word that belongs in some relationship to the thing it is used for, that is, the vehicle has some kind of relationship to the tenor. This relationship could be such things as giving a part for a whole, source for a product, means for an end, an action for its result, and so forth.

Imagery: For the sake of simplicity, imagery will be used to refer to the tropes in general present in a given text unit, as well as, at times, to the domain from which vehicles are drawn.

These definitions are crude, but should provide clear terminology for describing what is happening in the text. Having an overly refined terminology may not be useful in that the translator probably was for the most part working intuitively, unconcerned with whether he was dealing with a dead metaphor or catachresis. Likewise, even if he very carefully followed Aristotle's ideas about rhetoric, it should be remembered that most of Aristotle's examples of metaphor are more properly metonymies or synecdoches.

1.4.2. Scope

The scope of this research is to expand on the findings of Ziegler and van der Kooij by taking a different cross section of metaphors from LXX-Isa. Ziegler noted that the translation

⁴¹⁹ Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 73-74. Kövecses, on the contrary, thinks they are deeply entrenched and closer to how we conceptualize things. Zoltán Kövecses, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (2nd ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), xi.

⁴²⁰ Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 106-7 shows that some comparisons can be linked in other ways, such as repeating a word in the two halves.

⁴²¹ D. F. Payne, "A Perspective on the Use of Simile in the OT," *Semitics* 1 (1970), 114.

⁴²² Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 3.4.1.

⁴²³ Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language*, 59.

⁴²⁴ See van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah*, 132-33.

of metaphors is often literal,⁴²⁵ but since he aimed to show how the translator felt free to interpret, the metaphors he presented are mostly those that feature interpretation in their translation. His treatment of similes is more complete, but again his examples focus on the more unexpected renderings. Van der Kooij pointed out some interesting similarities between how the LXX and the Targum of Isaiah interpret metaphors,⁴²⁶ which warrants further investigation.

The cross section of metaphors in LXX-Isaiah that this study takes will be conducted in order to see primarily what can be observed about the translation strategies used for different sorts of metaphors, and what can be observed about how the translator seems to think about metaphors. To accomplish this, a vehicle based approach has been adopted that focuses on plant imagery. The advantage of this approach is that all figurative language concerning different kinds of plants or their parts will be examined, so that how the translator understands the source domain of plants can be seen against how he understands metaphors drawing vehicles from this source domain. Focusing on plant imagery will also allow for gaining insight into how the translator may understand one plant metaphor in light of a similar metaphor elsewhere in the book. This approach should produce an even treatment of metaphors, showing many of the different translation strategies used by the translator, rather than focusing only on the more interpretive renderings.

To build on van der Kooij's work with the metaphors of LXX-Isa, this study will also briefly note how the Targum has rendered each metaphor under consideration. This provides a sort of second opinion for how a metaphor could have been rendered or understood when it differs from the LXX, and where they agree it helps place LXX-Isa within the trajectory of early Jewish interpretative tradition.⁴²⁷ In addition, we will attempt to place LXX-Isa's treatment of metaphors within its Hellenistic context by comparing in the last chapter some of its renderings to the guidelines laid out in Greek Rhetorical handbooks.

1.4.3. Method

In this section we will clarify some principles that guide this study. First we will discuss the assumptions concerning the translator that are adopted. Then we will describe the guiding principles for the analysis of the passages that will be treated.

This study will refer to the translator as "he." This is because it seems most likely that the LXX-Isa translation was done by a man. The singular is used so that it is not thought that

⁴²⁵ Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, 80.

⁴²⁶ van der Kooij, "The Interpretation of Metaphorical Language," 179-85.

⁴²⁷ Olofsson regarding LXX-Isa (and LXX-Lam) maintains Swete's view that the translators were not acquainted with Palestinian Jewish interpretations of difficult words and contexts. Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (ConBOT 30; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990), 30. Comparing LXX-Isa with the Targum can aid in evaluating this assertion.

we hold to the view that LXX-Isa was translated in parts by different translators.⁴²⁸ While this may have been the case, or a team may have been at work in the translation process like described by van der Louw,⁴²⁹ this study assumes that the book as a whole was translated as a unified project and has common translation techniques and interpretation throughout, and so refers to a singular translator for convenience.

Since this study is about the translation strategies used for metaphors, we seek to compare the Hebrew and Greek texts in order to understand how the translator read the Hebrew text and understood it. In addition to this comparison, we seek to investigate how the translator communicates what the metaphor was thought to represent.⁴³⁰ The question, as each metaphor is analyzed, is: has the translator modified the metaphor in some way, and if so, why?

To analyze the various passages, first of all, we consider what the translator thought the Hebrew meant. At this level we consider possible differences in *Vorlage*. It should be stated that this study approaches the question of *Vorlage* from the perspective that, in general, differences between the LXX-Isa and MT should first be investigated as the possible result of the translator's activity before positing a different *Vorlage*.⁴³¹ Relevant differences from the Dead Sea Scrolls will be noted and places where the LXX may have had a different Hebrew *Vorlage* will be pointed out as we come across them. If a different Hebrew text was read, or the translator understood it differently than modern scholarship understands the text, then we must be careful in evaluating the metaphor as a translation.

In the second place, we must consider why the Greek translation may have deliberately adjusted a metaphor. On this side, there could be cultural or environmental differences, such as different flora or agricultural practices, which prompted the translator to make his metaphors match what his audience would recognize.⁴³² This is why it is at times necessary to see what the translator does both for literal passages involving the terms examined as well as the metaphors that use the terms. An underlying issue is whether the translator identified the Hebrew term as having the same meaning we consider it to have and to what extent his own knowledge of the plant may have affected how he understood the meaning of the metaphor. At this level, whether a metaphor "works" or makes sense in Greek must be taken into account.

⁴²⁸ For an early exponent of multiple translators, see G. Buchanan Gray, "The Greek Version of Isaiah: Is it the Work of a Single Translator?" *The Journal of Theological Studies* 12 (1911): 286-93. For a more recent discussion, see van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 30-31, who argues for one translator.

⁴²⁹ Theo A. van der Louw, "Dictation of the Septuagint Version," *JSJ* 39 (2008): 211-29.

⁴³⁰ This method is adapted from Arie van der Kooij, "Accident or Method? On 'Analogical' Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in 1QIsa," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* XLIII (1986): 366-76.

⁴³¹ See Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2nd Ed.; Jerusalem biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997), 18, 39-40.

⁴³² LXX-Isa's tendency to update to match the culture of his time is the topic of Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, "Kapital 8. Der alexandrinisch-ägyptische Hintergrund der Js-LXX."

In the third place, theological or hermeneutical considerations should be addressed regarding the translations made. At this level, we look at how a given metaphor was understood in light of a similar or the same metaphor used elsewhere in Isaiah. Also at this level, the function of a metaphor in its context is examined, since a literally translated metaphor could easily become a bizarre non-sequitur if not translated thoughtfully. But on the other hand, how the translator shapes a metaphor reflects his interpretation of the passage in which it occurs.

It is not always possible to understand the translation on all these levels, but they must be considered if we are to attempt to distinguish the translator's reception of a metaphor from his production of metaphors in his translation. Often there will be numerous issues affecting how a metaphor was translated. We must practice caution in discussing how a particular metaphor is rendered. For example, in Isa 10:33-34 a description of trees being cut down is rendered as high people falling by the sword; is this a metaphor being explicated as a rhetorical device, or is it a prophetic enigma being interpreted? In other places it would be easy to purport evidence for the translator's ideas about metaphor, such as claiming that rendering a metaphor as a simile, like in Isa 50:3, is evidence he had a comparison view of metaphor; or that rendering אֶת־הָרָחָק with ἐθιμῶθη ὁργῆ in 5:25 shows he held the substitution view of metaphor. Caution, then, is key.

The Greek rendering of the metaphor in each passage will then be compared to how the Targum rendered the metaphor. At the end of sections, the different ways metaphors are rendered by the LXX will be summarized and discussed to see how the various vehicles are understood and used by the translator.

1.4.4. Outline for the Study

The second and third chapters are a vehicle based study of plant imagery in LXX-Isa, as described above. In the second chapter metaphors with vehicles from the various parts of plants will be examined, and in the third chapter metaphors that use different kinds of plants as vehicles will be examined. The chapter division between parts of plants and kinds of plants is logical and for simplicity's sake, not because the situation between these kinds of metaphors are drastically different. Nevertheless, this division does allow for some interesting observations. Parts of plants are used in metaphors from many different cultures, as Kövecses pointed out,⁴³³ and so we will make observations at the end of chapter two about how these metaphors should easily cross from Hebrew into Greek. On the other hand, metaphors can be culturally specific, and so the conclusions to chapter three, dealing with kinds of plants, will remark on how differences in ecology and flora effect how the metaphors cross from Judea into Egypt. A drawback to this vehicle based approach is that it atomizes the text into verses

⁴³³ Kövecses, *Metaphor*, 19.

that use plant language; ideally each metaphor should be taken in the context of the entire textual unit in which it is used. The conclusions to chapters two and three will contain other general remarks about LXX-Isa's approach to metaphors.

In the concluding chapter, more global remarks will be made and the various translation strategies used to render metaphors will be catalogued. In addition, a comparison with the Targum's treatment of the metaphors examined will be made to position the LXX-Isa translator's understanding of metaphors in Jewish tradition. Then we will list possible evidence for the translator complying with Hellenistic rhetorical sensibilities regarding the use of metaphors.