

Michael A. Lyons\*

# A Note on καὶ ἀφανίσθητε (LXX Hab 1:5)

<https://doi.org/10.1515/zaw-2024-2005>

## 1 Introduction

The Masoretic Hebrew and Old Greek texts of Hab 1:5 read as follows:

ראו בגוים	ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί,
והביטו	καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε
והתמהו	καὶ θαυμάσατε
תמהו	θαυμάσια
	καὶ ἀφανίσθητε,
כי־פעל פעל בימים	διότι ἔργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν,
לא תאמינו כי יספר:	ὃ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἕάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται.

The variant in the first clause has been widely discussed.<sup>1</sup> For the following words, the Greek translator appears to have rendered the two verbs תמהו והתמהו with a

<sup>1</sup> For MurXII and MT בגוים (cf. Vg in *gentibus*; Tg בעממיה, LXX has οἱ καταφρονηταί (cf. Syriac *mrh'* »presumptuous ones«). Some argue for the originality of בגוים, and suggest that the Greek translator either misread the text or deliberately altered it to בגודים in line with Hab 1:13; 2:5; see e. g. Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Habakuk: Text, Übersetzung und Erklärung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1906), 18; Jimmy J.M. Roberts, *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), 91; Lothar Peritt, *Die Propheten Nahum, Habakuk, Zephania*, ATD 25/1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 52; Walter Dietrich, *Nahum Habakuk Zefanja*, IEKAT (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014), 112; Jörg Jeremias, *Habakuk*, BKAT XIV/5.2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2022), 66. However, others have argued that the translator's *Vorlage* had בגדים (which might suggest that בגוים is an error or deliberate change); see J.W. Rothstein, »Über Habakuk Kap. 1 u. 2,« *ThStKr* 67 (1894) 51–85: 55; 57; Karl Marti, *Das Dodekapropheton*, KHC 13 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1904), 338; Wilhelm Nowack, »Librum Duodecim Prophetarum,« *Biblia Hebraica*, Pars II, ed. Rudolf Kittel (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1906) 878; F.F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), 12; William H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran* (Philadelphia: SBL, 1959), 7; Innocent Himbaza, »Texte massorétique et Septante en Habaquq 1,5a. Réévaluation des témoins textuels en faveur de l'antériorité de la LXX,« in *Un carrefour dans l'histoire de la Bible: Du texte à la théologie au IIe siècle avant J.-C.*, ed. Innocent Himbaza and Adrian Schenker, OBO 233 (Fribourg, Academic

\*Kontakt: Michael A. Lyons, St Mary's College, University of St Andrews, South Street, KY16 9JU St Andrews, United Kingdom, E-Mail: mal26@st-andrews.ac.uk. <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2940-3965>

verb plus cognate accusative (καὶ θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια),<sup>2</sup> and translated the material beginning with כִּי פִעַל פִּעַל with only minor differences. But how should we account for the plus καὶ ἀφανίσθητε »and be annihilated«<sup>3</sup>, given that there is nothing in any Hebrew witness for which it is an appropriate rendering?<sup>4</sup> In this essay I will consider several explanations, and offer two suggestions for the source of this word.

## 2 Explanations for the Plus

There appear to be three possible explanations for the reading καὶ ἀφανίσθητε in the Greek translation of Hab 1:5: first, it may reflect a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from the Masoretic textual tradition; second, it may be a double translation of an element in וְהִתְמַהוּ תְּמַהוּ; third, it may be an »interpretive« addition by the translator.

The first explanation is represented by Humbert<sup>5</sup> and Elliger,<sup>6</sup> who suggest that καὶ ἀφανίσθητε reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* וְשָׁמַיִךְ.<sup>7</sup> The sequence »regard, be astonished, be devastated« would make good sense in context (cf. Jer 2:12), and it is conceivable that if וְשָׁמַיִךְ was the original reading, it could have been lost by parablepsis in the proto-MT of Habakkuk. However, this suggestion has not been widely adopted, as there seems to be a consensus that the Old Greek and proto-MT

Press / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007) 45–57; Csaba Balogh, »Tracing the Pre-Masoretic Text of the Book of Habakkuk.« *Sacra Scripta* 17/1 (2019) 7–29: 16. The latter argument gains in plausibility given the evidence from 1QpHab: while the lines that would have contained the lemma from Hab 1:5 are missing due to damage, the peshar contains the word הַבְּגִדִים in 1QpHab 2.1,3,5.

2 On this translation, see the discussion in Roberts, *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*, 91; Francis I. Andersen, *Habakkuk: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 25 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 141 f.; James A.E. Mulrony, *The Translation Style of Old Greek Habakkuk: Methodological Advancement in Interpretative Studies of the Septuagint*, FAT 2/86 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 115 f., n.145.

3 The reading καὶ ἀφανίσθητε also appears in the quote of Hab 1:5 in Acts 13:41 (though the preceding καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε is lacking in most witnesses); see Holger Strutwolf, Georg Gäbel, Annette Hüffmeier, Gerd Mink and Klaus Wachtel, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior. III Acts of the Apostles. Part 1.1. Text, Chapter 1–14* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 476.

4 There is no equivalent to καὶ ἀφανίσθητε in MurXII or the medieval Masoretic witnesses to Hab 1:5 (nor is there any equivalent in 8HēvXIIGr, the Vulgate, the Targum, and the Syriac Peshitta).

5 Paul Humbert, *Problèmes du livre d'Habacuc* (Neuchâtel: Secrétariat de l'Université, 1944), 33 f.

6 »⊗\* + ἀφανίσθητε = וְשָׁמַיִךְ?«; so Karl Elliger, *Liber XII Prophetarum*, BHS 10 (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1970).

7 Note that וְשָׁמַיִךְ is only one of several verbs that are translated by ἀφανίζω in the prophetic corpus, so Humbert's and Elliger's caution about the retroversion is well-founded. Humbert also suggested metrical reasons for the presence of an original וְשָׁמַיִךְ or וְשָׁמַיִךְ.

of Habakkuk share a common *Vorlage*, even though in places they offer significantly different interpretations of it.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, this reading is not attested in any other textual witness (not even the Syriac, which supports the other distinctive LXX reading in Hab 1:5a).

The second explanation for the presence of καὶ ἀφανίσθητε is that it may be a double translation of an element in והתמהו תמהו. The idea is not implausible, given the presence of other double translations in LXX Habakkuk.<sup>9</sup> But which element is it translating? According to Rudolph,<sup>10</sup> Roberts,<sup>11</sup> and Andersen,<sup>12</sup> it is a double translation of the second verb; according to Barthélemy, it is a double translation of one of the verbs.<sup>13</sup> One weakness of this explanation is the lack of certainty regarding which element is being double translated. The other weakness is that the semantic difference between θαυμάσατε and ἀφανίσθητε makes the latter

8 See Marguerite Harl, Cécile Dogniez, Laurence Brottier, Michel Casevitz and Pierre Sandevioir, eds., *Les Douze Prophètes: Jôel, Abdiou, Jonas, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie*, La Bible d'Alexandrie 23.4–9 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999), 239: «La version grecque d'Ambakoum est un décalque formel presque parfait des phrases du texte hébreu que nous supposons sous-jacent, un texte certainement proche du TM. En même temps, elle en est une ›relecture‹ très souvent divergente.» See further George E. Howard, «To the Reader of the Twelve Prophets,» in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) 777–781: 777; 779; David Cleaver-Bartholomew, «One Text, Two Interpretations: Habakkuk OG and MT Compared,» *BIOSCS* 42 (2009) 52–67: 52; Emanuel Tov, «The Textual Value of the Septuagint Version of the Minor Prophets,» in *Les Douze Prophètes dans la LXX. Protocoles et procédures dans la traduction grecque: stylistique, poétique et histoire*, ed. Cécile Dogniez and Philippe Le Moigne, VTSup 180 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 129–147.

9 See e. g. והרעל (MT והרעל) as καὶ διασαλεύθητι καὶ σείσθητι (LXX Hab 2:16); יראתי (understood as from both ירא and ראה) as ἐφοβήθη, κατενόησα, and ἐξέστην (3:2); בברק as ἐν μέσῳ, ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν, and ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι (3:2); שנים as δύο, τὰ ἔτη, and τὸν καιρὸν (3:2); תודיע as γνωσθήσῃ, ἐπιγνωσθήσῃ, and ἀναδειχθήσῃ (3:2); והז as κραταῖον ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ (3:4).

10 Wilhelm Rudolph, *Micha – Nahum – Habakuk – Zephanja*, KAT 13/3 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1975), 203: «das in 9 folgende καὶ ἀφανίσθητε ist eine zweite Übersetzung, jetzt von והתמהו.»

11 Roberts (*Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*, 91) seems to suggest that καὶ θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια translates והתמהו and καὶ ἀφανίσθητε translates תמהו: «LXX's *thaumasia* has been taken as an indication that the second form was originally an infinitive absolute *tāmōah*, but the additional word in the LXX may simply be an attempt to give a fuller rendering to the longer hithpael form.» However, none of the other t-prefixed or reduplicating verbforms in Habakkuk are given a ›fuller rendering‹ in the Greek translations of verbs in the hithpael (Hab 1:5,10; 2:1), pilpel (2:7), polel (2:12; 3:6), hithpoel (3:6) and hithpalpel (2:3).

12 See tentatively Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 142: «LXX possibly has a conflate reading of originally alternative renderings of the final verb» – though note that Andersen appears to reject this possibility in his surrounding remarks (see the quote by Andersen below n. 15).

13 Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament: Tome 3. Ézéchiël, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes*, OBO 50/3 (Fribourg, Switzerland: Editions Universitaires / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), cxlvii: «Cette leçon du 9 est un doublet de l'un des deux mots précédents.»

word an unlikely choice as a double translation of the verb תָּמָה or a »doublet« of θαυμάσατε.<sup>14</sup>

The third explanation for the presence of καὶ ἀφανίσθητε is that it is an interpretive comment inserted by the translator.<sup>15</sup> Both Robertson<sup>16</sup> and Mulrone<sup>17</sup> suggest that the plus is a response to a perceived incompleteness or lack of clarity in Hab 1:5. I would agree that without the plus, v. 5 itself does not specify the consequences for the »despisers« when God rouses the invading nation of vv. 6 ff. The Greek translator's insertion of »be annihilated!« therefore makes explicit the fate of the »despisers«,<sup>18</sup> just as his rendering of כָּלָה לַחֲמַס יְבוּא in 1:9a as συντέλεια εἰς ἀσβεβίς ἤξει makes explicit the fate of the »ungodly« mentioned in 1:4.<sup>19</sup> But if

14 Fabry concludes: »Es ist nicht mehr zu erschließen, ob dieses Textplus aus einer Doppelübersetzung hervorgegangen ist«; see Heinz-Josef Fabry, *Habakuk Obadja*, HThKAT (Freiburg: Herder, 2018), 198.

15 Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 142: »The match of MT's cognate verb with LXX's cognate noun suggests that *kai aphanisthēte* (found also in Acts 13:41) is an extra, with no evident basis in MT ... The LXX command *kai aphanisthēte*, »and perish!« has moved further from this idea [*viz.*, *the progression from complex to simple in Isa 29:9 and MT Hab 1:5*] and, in spite of its use in NT to address a hostile audience, must be set aside as interpretive.« See also Anthony Gelston, *The Twelve Minor Prophets*, BHQ 13 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010), 192, who describes the plus as »amplification«.

16 O. Palmer Robertson, *Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 313 f.: »The introduction of these words may indicate that the Greek translators had sensed an incompleteness in the thought of the passage as they had rendered it apart from this addition. If the MT is followed, the admonition to »look among the nations« is completed quite naturally by the reference in the next verse to that particular »nation« (the Chaldeans) whom the Lord would raise up. But if the LXX is followed, nothing in the succeeding verses satisfactorily completes the thought begun by an address to »scoffers« that they »behold ... and look«. What is to be the consequence for them specifically when God raises up the Chaldeans? Although it could be concluded that the implication is that they would »perish«, the LXX sensed a need to fill out the thought by adding this comment.«

17 Mulrone, *Translation Style*, 118 f.: »it is difficult to know whether the additional clause at the end of v. 5 was due to some kind of improvisation, or was a free contextual addition ... the additional clause καὶ ἀφανίσθητε expegetically clarifies what is meant, in context, for the scoffers to marvel at marvellous things. It guards against any possible misunderstanding about who is to be destroyed. In fact, that scoffers marvel and do not respond commensurately with what they have seen is certainly judgement against them. It is their undoing, something which is tacitly disambiguated here and further clarified later in the prophecy ... The translator expanded the text for the sake of clarity.«

18 The reading »despisers« and the interpolation »be annihilated!« in LXX Hab 1:5 bring vv. 5–11 into closer connection with vv. 2–4, linking the addressees of v. 5 with the evildoers described in the preceding verses; see A.B. Davidson, *The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896), 68; Jeremias, *Habakuk*, 66. On the perception that MT Hab 1:5–11 does not really answer the complaint of 1:2–4, see Karl Budde, »Die Bücher Habakkuk und Zephaniah«, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 66 (1893) 383–399; Andersen, *Habakkuk*, 139.

19 On the rendering of כָּלָה (MT »all of it«) with συντέλεια »an end« in Hab 1:9, see also LXX Hab 1:15 (cf. LXX Hos 13:2; Amos 8:8; 9:5; Nah 2:1; Mal 3:9).

the translator was filling a perceived gap in 1:5, what was the source for his interpolation? The statement in 2:5 – namely, that the »despiser« (καταφρονητής) will »complete nothing« (οὐδὲν μὴ περάνη) – does not provide sufficient information to explain the plus. Some other source seems to be required.<sup>20</sup>

One way to resolve this problem is to look outside the immediate context. As Mulroneo has noted, »often the textual differences to MT find inner-Twelve and -Septuagintal thematic and lexical connections ... the translator, in this case, was aware of the wider theological perspectives of the biblical books, and in particular those for which he was responsible.«<sup>21</sup> In light of this, I want to suggest an intertextual solution to explain the plus in LXX Hab 1:5. One possible source for the plus is LXX Hos 14:1, and the second is the Hebrew text of Ps 94.

### 3 Possible Sources for the Plus

One explanation for the source of καὶ ἀφανίσθητε is that the Greek translations of both Hab 1:5 and 1:9 are informed by LXX Hos 14:1, which states that Samaria will »be annihilated« (ἀφανισθήσεται) because it »stood against« (ἀντέστη) God. This could explain the translator's interpolation of »and be annihilated« (καὶ ἀφανίσθητε) in LXX Hab 1:5 and his translation of the difficult פנימה קדימה of Hab 1:9 with the rendering »standing against with their faces opposed« (ἀνθεστηκότας προσώποις αὐτῶν ἐξ ἐναντίας). In this scenario, the scribe used the translation of a text about the punishment of Samaria to aid in his translation of a text about the guilt of Judah. Given that the translator's source text made numerous analogies between the guilt of Samaria and Judah (e. g., Hos 5:5,14; 6:4; 8:14; Amos 2:4–8; Micah 1:5), this seems plausible.

The second possible explanation for the plus is that the Greek translator of Habakkuk perceived lexical and argument parallels between Hab 1 and Ps 94, and that these motivated him to add καὶ ἀφανίσθητε »and be annihilated« in LXX Hab 1:5, based on the double occurrence of יצמיתם »he will wipe them out« in Ps 94:23. It seems likely that a scribe who was translating the book of Habakkuk would have noted the repeated lexemes in chap. 1. Here the speaker complains that Yhwh has made him »regard trouble« (גבב עמל, Hab 1:3) because of the lack of »justice« (משפּט, Hab 1:4 [2×]) in his community. To make matters worse, he is told that Yhwh

<sup>20</sup> Andrew Teeter suggested to me [personal communication] that here the verb ἀφανίσθητε may retain its etymological meaning »be made unseen, disappear«, and may have been chosen in light of the preceding verbs of sight (ἴδετε, ἐπιβλέψατε). While this is possible, the verb does not seem to have distinctively visual connotations in the rest of the Twelve.

<sup>21</sup> Mulroneo, *Translation Style*, 201.

is summoning invaders, and the introductory address of Yhwh's response contains a summons to »regard« (נבט, Hab 1:5) the »work« that Yhwh is »working« (פעל פעל), Hab 1:5; taken up later in 3:2). These invaders will define »justice« (משפט, Hab 1:7) on their own terms. The speaker then questions Yhwh's plan on the grounds that Yhwh must dispense »justice« (משפט, Hab 1:12), because his eyes are too pure to »regard trouble« (נבט עמל, Hab 1:13).

It also seems plausible that a scribe who was highly familiar with other Israelite compositions could have recalled contexts that contained these repeated lexemes.<sup>22</sup> As it happens, the verb נבט, the noun עמל, and forms of the root פעל occur together only in Num 23, Hab 1, and Ps 94.<sup>23</sup> If we include the noun משפט in the constellation of words, the only contexts with shared occurrences are Hab 1 and Ps 94.<sup>24</sup> In fact, there are a considerable number of non-trivial lexemes shared by these two units:<sup>25</sup>

עד־אנה / עד־מתי	Hab 1:2 // Ps 94:3 [2×]
ראה	Hab 1:3,5,13 // Ps 94:7
נבט	Hab 1:3,5,13 [2×] // Ps 94:9
און	Hab 1:3 // Ps 94:23
עמל	Hab 1:3,13 // Ps 94:2
תורה	Hab 1:4 // Ps 94:12
משפט	Hab 1:4 [2×],7,12 // Ps 94:15
רשע	Hab 1:4,13 // Ps 94:3 [2×]
צדיק	Hab 1:4,13 // Ps 94:21
פעל	Hab 1:5 // Ps 94:4,16
יכה	Hab 1:12 // Ps 94:10
צור	Hab 1:12 <sup>26</sup> // Ps 94:22
עין	Hab 1:13 // Ps 94:9
הרג	Hab 1:17 // Ps 94:6

22 For the erudition of the Greek translator of the Twelve, see the evidence in Myrto Theocharous, *Lexical Dependence and Intertextual Allusion in the Septuagint of the Twelve Prophets: Studies in Hosea, Amos and Micah*, LHBOTS 570 (New York: T&T Clark, 2012). For an overview of the profile of the translator, see Jennifer M. Dines, »The Minor Prophets,« in *T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, ed. James K. Aitken (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015) 438–455.

23 The occurrences are: נבט (Num 23:21; Hab 1:3,5,13; Ps 94:9); עמל (Num 23:21; Hab 1:3,13; Ps 94:20); פעל (nominal and verbal forms: Num 23:23; Hab 1:5 [2×]; Ps 94:4,16).

24 The occurrences of משפט are in Hab 1:4 [2×],7,12 and Ps 94:15.

25 Note that I am not arguing for literary dependence between Hab 1 and Ps 94 at the compositional or redactional levels.

26 For the rendering of וצור as καὶ ἔπλασέν με in LXX Hab 1:12, see the discussion in Mulrone, *Translation Style*, 140–146.

Of course, there is nothing remarkable about any one of these lexemes when taken individually; each one is so common as to be unlikely *by itself* to evoke Ps 94 in the translator's mind. Moreover, some of the lexemes are used in different ways: in Hab 1:5, פֶּעַל is used for Yhwh's work, while in Ps 94:4,16 it refers to the doers of evil. Likewise, the lexeme עֵינַי is used in Hab 1:13 to refer to the inability of God's eyes to tolerate evil, while in Ps 94:9 it is used to refer to the human eye that is formed by God (adduced as evidence that God is able to perceive). Nevertheless, given that some of the shared lexemes are repeated, that they are significant for the development of the argument, and that they can be perceived as parts of a cluster of lexemes, it seems plausible that Ps 94 may have come to the Greek translator's mind after reading Hab 1.

But these shared lexemes are not the only point of contact between Hab 1 and Ps 94; there is also similarity in argument. In both Hab 1 and Ps 94, the speakers complain that the »righteous« (צַדִּיק, Hab 1:4,13; Ps 94:21) are threatened by the »wicked« (רָשָׁע, Hab 1:4,13; Ps 94:3,13). This is widely recognized as one of the central problems, if not the central problem, in both texts.<sup>27</sup> In Ps 94, the stated solution to this problem is that Yhwh will »wipe out« (צָמַח, Ps 94:23 [2×]; = LXX Ps 93:23 ἀφανιῖ) the wicked for what they have done. This statement could have provided the motivation for the translator to add καὶ ἀφανίσθητε »and be annihilated!« in LXX Hab 1:5.<sup>28</sup> This insertion makes explicit the appropriate fate for the »despisers«.

The likelihood that the Greek translator was motivated either by his recollection of Hos 14:1 or Ps 94 to make an allusive interpolation in Hab 1:5 can be supported by two other examples of allusion in LXX Habakkuk. As Mulronev has noted, the translator's decision to render חָמַס as ἀδικούμενος »being wronged« in

27 See e. g. A.H.J. Gunneweg, »Habakuk und das Problem des leidenden צַדִּיק,« ZAW 98/3 (1986) 400–415; Marvin A. Sweeney, »Structure, Genre, and Intent in Habakkuk,« VT 41/1 (1991) 63–83: 66 f.; 73; Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, trans. Hilton C. Oswald (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 239; Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, *Psalms 2*, trans. Linda M. Maloney, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 452–455.

28 In Ps 94:23 (= LXX 93:23) the Hebrew verb צָמַח is translated with ἀφανίζω; elsewhere it is rendered with a wide range of verbs (note the different renderings in the parallel texts LXX 2Sam 22:41 // LXX Ps 17:41, and the different renderings in LXX Ps 100:5,8), including: θανάτω (2Sam 22:41; Lam 3:53); ἐξολεθρεύω (LXX Pss 17:41; 53:7; 72:27; 142:12); ἐκδιώκω (LXX Pss 68:5; 100:5); ἐκταράσσω (LXX Ps 87:17); ἀποκτείνω (LXX Ps 100:8); ἐκτήνω (LXX Ps 118:139); τήνω (Job 6:17; see also the highly interpretive rendering in Job 23:17). Likewise, in the prophetic corpus alone, the Greek verb ἀφανίζω is used to translate several words, including שָׂמַם (e. g., Ezek 4:17; 19:7; Hos 2:14 [12]; Amos 7:9; 9:14; Mic 6:13; Zeph 3:6), אָשַׁם (Hos 5:15; 10:2; Joel 1:18), שָׂמַד (Ezek 14:9; Mic 5:13), שָׁבַת (Ezek 34:25), גָּרַשׁ (Ezek 36:5), חָרַד (Ezek 30:9), חָרַם (Jer 27:21 [50:21]), and סָפָה (Jer 12:4).

LXX Hab 1:2b probably reflects an allusion to Job 19:7 (הַן אֶצְעַק חֶמְס וְלֹא אֶעֱנֶה וְאִין) (משפט), a passage that shares several lexical parallels with Hab 1.<sup>29</sup> Likewise, the translator's insertion of ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ in LXX Hab 1:15 may reflect an allusion to Zech 10:7 (וּשְׂמַח לְבָבָם ... וּבְנִיחָם יֵרָאוּ וּשְׂמָחוּ יִגַּל לְבָבָם בִּיהוָה) (וּשְׂמָחוּ לְבָבָם), triggered by the shared verbs שמח and גיל in Hab 1:15.<sup>30</sup>

## 4 Conclusion

It was not at all uncommon for scribes to interpolate material based on recognized similarities between the text they were copying / translating and another text that they recalled. One example of such »triggered« scribal intervention can be seen in MT Ezek 6:5, where the insertion of וְנִתְחַי אֶת פְּגָרֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְפָנַי גְּלוּלֵיהֶם (absent in LXX) represents an allusion to Lev 26:30 that was triggered by the existing shared locutions in Ezek 6:3–6,8,11–14 and Lev 26:25,30,33. Another example can be seen in LXX 1Sam 2:10, which has been expanded with material from Jer 9:22–23; the trigger for this was likely the shared references to boasting (1Sam 2:3 // Jer 9:22), the mighty (1Sam 2:4,9b // Jer 9:22), and the rich (1Sam 2:7 // Jer 9:22).<sup>31</sup> Similarly, the reading καὶ οἰκοδομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς πύργον in LXX Isa 9:9 represents an allusion to Gen 11:4, triggered by the shared word πλίνθοι »bricks« (Isa 9:9 // Gen 11:3).<sup>32</sup> And the reading Γῶγ ὁ βασιλεύς in LXX Amos 7:1 is an allusion to Ezek 38–39 (cf. LXX Num 24:7), triggered by the references to locusts in Amos 7:1

<sup>29</sup> Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 7: »In the latter text [Amb 1:2], the prophet suffers, which is not true of Hab 1:2 ... However, Hab 1:2 has lexica that correspond with the lexica of MT Job 19:7, where Job complains about his suffering. Literarily speaking, Ambakoum suffers, which may be due to both the inner-biblical connection of Hab 1:2 with MT Job 19:7 and also to the immediate context of Amb 1:2 – the lack of justice and deliverance (1:2–4). This connection is also in spite of the differences that exist with OG Job 19:7. Therefore, there is an allusion to the unjust suffering of the righteous in MT Job 19:7 with Amb 1:2.«

<sup>30</sup> Mulroney, *Translation Style*, 120 f.; so also Dominique Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, VTSup 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 186–187.

<sup>31</sup> See Emanuel Tov, »Different Editions of the Song of Hannah and of Its Narrative Framework,« in *Tehillah le-Moshe. Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg*, ed. Mordechai Cogan, Barry L. Eichler and Jeffrey H. Tigay (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997) 149–170: 164–168.

<sup>32</sup> See also LXX Isa 10:9. Regarding the allusion to Gen 11 in LXX Isa 9:9, Williamson notes that »The translator presumably thought that this was a paradigmatic example of hubris«; see H.G.M. Williamson, *Isaiah 6–12: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, ICC (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2018), 419.



and Joel 1:4; 2:25, and to invaders in Joel 1–2.<sup>33</sup> Numerous other examples could be cited.<sup>34</sup>

Allusion and analogy were among the most important literary conventions used by the composers and redactors of ancient Israelite texts. It is no surprise to find that these conventions continued to be used by the scribes who translated these texts. The plus in LXX Hab 1:5 can be regarded as another example of such scribal erudition.

**Abstract:** The Greek translation of Hab 1:5 contains an element that is absent in other textual witnesses: καὶ ἀφανίσθητε »and be annihilated.« In this essay I will consider three possible explanations for the presence of this plus, and I will suggest two potential sources for its origin: LXX Hos 14:1, and the Hebrew text of Psalm 94.

**Keywords:** Hab 1:5; Septuagint; translation technique; intertextual

**Zusammenfassung:** Die griechische Übersetzung von Hab 1,5 beinhaltet ein Element, das in anderen Textzeugen fehlt: καὶ ἀφανίσθητε »and be annihilated.« Der Beitrag diskutiert drei mögliche Erklärungen für dieses Plus und schlägt zwei

---

33 See W. Edward Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*, VTSup 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 204–207. As Glenny notes (205), while there are no references to locusts in Ezek 38–39, »Ezek. 38:17 (where Gog is described as the one the Lord has spoken about in former times through his servants the prophets of Israel) indicates that Ezekiel has summarized and collected invading figures in preceding prophets in his picture of Gog in chapters 38–39, and if so it would be natural to connect the invaders in Joel with all these other invaders. There are several thematic connections between Ezekiel and Joel. In both passages many nations (Ezek. 38:5, 7, 15; Joel 2:20; 3:1) from the north (Ezek. 38:6; 39:2; Joel 2:20) invade the land of Israel (γῆ; Ezek. 38:8, 9; Joel 1:6; 2:18, etc.), and in both contexts the fate of the enemy is similar (Ezek. 39:2–8; Joel 2:20).«

34 On allusion in the Septuagint, see Emanuel Tov, »The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books,« in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, ed. Emanuel Tov, VTSup 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 183–194; 192–194; Johann Cook, »Intertextual Relationships Between the Septuagint of Psalms and Proverbs,« in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, ed. Robert J.V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox and Peter J. Gentry, JSOTSup 332 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 218–228; idem, »Intertextual Readings in the Septuagint,« in *The New Testament Interpreted: Essays in Honour of Bernard C. Lategan*, ed. Cilliers Breytenbach, Johan C. Thom and Jeremy Punt, NovTSup 124 (Leiden: Brill, 2006) 119–134; Cécile Dogniez, »L'intertextualité dans la LXX de Zacharie 9–14,« in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust*, ed. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne, BETL 192 (Leuven: Peeters, 2005) 81–96; Theocharous, *Lexical Dependence and Intertextual Allusion in the Septuagint of the Twelve*, 107–148; idem, »The Septuagint and Biblical Intertextuality,« in *T&T Clark Handbook of Septuagint Research*, ed. William A. Ross and W. Edward Glenny (New York: T&T Clark, 2021) 109–119.

potenzielle Quellen für seinen Ursprung vor: LXX Hos 14,1, und den hebräischen Text des Psalm 94.

**Schlagwörter:** Hab 1,5; Septuaginta; Übersetzungstechnik; intertextuell

**Résumé:** La traduction grecque de Ha 1,5 contient un plus qui est absent des autres témoins textuels : καὶ ἀφανίσθητε »et être anéanti«. Dans cet article, j'examinerai trois explications possibles pour la présence de ce plus, et je suggérerai deux sources potentielles pour son origine : la LXX de Os 14,1 et le texte hébreu du Ps 94.

**Mots-clés:** Ha 1,5; Septante; technique de traduction; intertextualité