

TRANSLATION TECHNIQUES IN THE SEPTUAGINT: SABBATH COMMANDMENTS AND THEIR POSSIBLE THEOLOGICAL MESSAGE AND BACKGROUND¹

OTTILIA LUKÁCS²

Abstract: The Septuagint offers valuable insights into the theology of Hellenistic Judaism. Keeping in mind that each translation is at the same time an interpretation, the translator(s) of the Septuagint provide a new (theological) interpretation or adaptation of the Hebrew Scriptures to the readers. The translation may reflect the community's understanding of certain issues, in this case the Sabbath. This paper aims at scrutinizing the possible theological and/or ideological understanding of the Sabbath commandment reflected by the process of translation, on the one hand. On the other hand, it explores whether the translator(s) noticed the literary and redactional relationship between these Sabbath commandments, undeniably present in the Hebrew texts. This investigation applies the “content related criteria” developed by Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn as well as the “theological(ly motivated) exegesis” proposed by Emmanuel Tov.

Keywords: Septuagint, Sabbath commandment (Ex 20,8-11; 23,12; 34,21; 31,12-17; 35,2; Lev 23,3; Dt 5,12-15), translation techniques.

Studying the Literalness of the Translation Technique: Three Approaches

The Septuagint (LXX) is the product of the earliest Jewish endeavour to translate the Hebrew Bible in the Hellenistic cultural milieu. Therefore, studying the process of translation bears a paramount importance. It is especially interesting to focus on the way in which the translators conveyed to their readers

¹ The present article is reworked version of the Hungarian conference paper: Lukács Ottilia, “A szombatparancsokban megmutatkozó fordítástechnikák: lehetséges teológiai üzenet és ihletettség,” in *Az alexandriai Biblia. Nemzet- és felekezeti tanulmányok a görög Ószövetségről*, eds. Zoltán Oláh and György Papp (Budapest, Kolozsvár: SZIT, Verbum, 2019), 161-194.

² Lecturer in Hebrew Bible and Biblical Hebrew, Episcopal Theological College of Pécs (Hungary), Praesidium member of the European Society for Catholic Theology, member of the European Society of Biblical Studies. Contact: lukacs.ottilia@pphf.hu.

the message of the Hebrew parent text, more precisely the meaning that they have grasped. Hence, there is little wonder that the study of translation techniques has a long tradition in Septuagint studies.

The exploration of the translation techniques reveals two key concepts, *viz.* two approaches: the “literal” and the “free” (or “paraphrastic”) translations of the Hebrew text: the translator(s) are guided by faithfulness to the text or make use of the freedom of translation.³ The “literal” translation follows faithfully the Hebrew *Vorlage*, and produces a very accurate, almost mechanical translation. Contrary to this tendency, the “free” translation reflects a linguistic, grammatical, and exegetical freedom. The LXX translation can be subsumed thus under the following four categories: *very* or *relatively literal* translation, *very* or *relatively free* translation.⁴ Several scholars,⁵ however, have recently emphasised a

³ Emanuel TOV, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015, 18–31; Emanuel TOV and Benjamin G. WRIGHT, “Computer Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of the Translation Units in the Septuagint,” in *The Greek Bible and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by Emanuel Tov, Leiden: Brill, 1999, 219–237; James BARR, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979, 279–325; Benjamin G. WRIGHT, “The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating ‘Literalism’ in the LXX”, in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986*, edited by Claude E. Cox, Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1987, 311–335 (311–314); Galen MARQUIS, “Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel”, in *Sixth Congress* [above], edited by Claude E. Cox, 405–424; Bénédicte LEMMELIJN, “Two Methodological Trails in Recent Studies on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint”, in *Helsinki Perspective on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999*, edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä, Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001, 43–63 (43–52); Hans AUSLOOS and Bénédicte LEMMELIJN, “Content Related Criteria in Characterising the LXX Translation Technique”, in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. Die Septuaginta: Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse. 2. Internationale Fachtagung (LXX.D) Wuppertal, 23–27 July 2008*, edited by Kraus Wolfgang and Martin Karrer, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010, 357–376.

⁴ AUSLOOS and LEMMELIJN, “Content-Related Criteria,” 1–2; Barr, *Typology*, 279–325; Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 149–187; Bénédicte LEMMELIJN, *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called ‘Plagues Narrative’ in Exodus 7,14–11,10*, Leiden: Brill, 2009, 108–110.

more conscious distinction between the categories of “literalness” and “faithfulness”: “Indeed, a very literal translation does not imply a very faithful translation and a free translation is not *ipso facto* a less faithful translation”.⁶ In other words, a translation categorized as “free”, at the same time, can be very faithful to its *Vorlage*. *Vice versa*, a “literal translation” can be less faithful. The endeavour to understand these categories and their relationship, i.e., the translation technique of the LXX, implies three different methodological approaches.

The “quantitative approach” (introduced by James Barr and further elaborated by Emanuel Tov, Benjamin G. Wright. and Galen Marquis), departs from the “literalness” of a translation. Studying the degree of the literal rendering, the approach focuses on the translation technique of the LXX, described with statistical data. For instance, Tov proposes several *criteria for the analysis of literal renderings*:⁷ (1) *internal consistency* in the choice of translation equivalents, e.g. studying the degree of ‘stereotyping’ or ‘stereotyped rendering’ on the basis of statistical distribution of renderings in the books of the LXX [CATSS database],⁸ (2) *segmentation: the representation of the constituents of Hebrew words by individual Greek equivalents*, e.g., the literal translator’s tendency “to segment Hebrew words into meaningful elements, which were then represented by their individual Greek equivalents”;⁹ (3) *word-order*: the translator attempted to preserve the Hebrew word order as much as possible; (4) *quantitative representation* (correspondence): the endeavour to find a Greek equivalent to each Hebrew element (partially related to the stereotyped rendering); (5) *linguistic adequacy of lexical choices*: this criterion corresponds only partly to the *analysis of literal renderings* since every translation attempts to transpose the message of the original text into another linguistic-cultural context, resulting in the relatively subjective choice of words. Hence, each translation involves interpreta-

⁵ Anneli AEJMELEAUS, “The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint”, in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23), edited by Claude E. Cox, Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1987, 361–380 (362–363).

⁶ AUSLOOS and LEMMELIJN, “Content Related Criteria”, 362.

⁷ TOV, *Text-Critical Use*, 17–29.

⁸ Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint/Scriptural Study Bibliography

⁹ TOV, *Text-Critical Use*, 23.

tion and exegesis.¹⁰ Consequently, the “quantitative approach” aims at exploring the “literalness” of rendering with statistical data.

The “qualitative approach”, also known as that of the “Finnish school” (introduced by Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, Raija Sollamo, Anneli Aejmelaus¹¹) emphasises the freedom of translation and focus on the Greek rendering of certain Hebrew linguistic and grammatical features. This approach explores linguistic phenomena (e.g., syntax and translation of grammatical structures, idiomatic Greek) and argues that faithfulness cannot be described with statistical data. In other words, the representatives of this approach explore the translator’s attitude towards the Hebrew *Vorlage*: does he tend to be “very literal”, producing a non-idiomatic translation, or does he tend to be “literal” and yet “faithful”, producing a more accurate, idiomatic Greek translation.¹²

Considering this background, Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn argue that these methodological approaches complement each other and propose their combination. They have developed a third methodological approach based on “the content-oriented analyses of the LXX technique”¹³, and they have defined “content-related criteria”. The text-based analysis broadens the grammatical and linguistic focuses of the qualitative approach by taking into account specific criteria based on the content of the text. This innovative approach illuminates the translator’s creativity, the translation techniques used to render

¹⁰ TOV, *Text-Critical Use*, 21–24.

¹¹ See for instance Anneli AEJMELAEUS, “Septuagintal Translation Techniques: A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account,” in id., *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993, 116–130; ID., “The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint,” in *Sixth Congress*, edited by Claude E. Cox, 361–380; Ilmari SOISALON-SOININEN, “Der Gebrauch des Genitivus Absolutus in der Septuaginta”, in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax. Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987. FS Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen* (AASF Series B 237), edited by Anneli Aejmelaus and Raija Sollamo, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1987, 175–180; Raija SOLLAMO, “The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch”, in *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea. V. Congreso de la IOSCS*, edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos, Madrid: Arias Montano, 1985, 101–113.

¹² Cf. the presentation of the Finnish school by AUSLOOS and LEMMELIJN, “Content-Related Criteria,” 364–367.

¹³ AUSLOOS and LEMMELIJN, “Content-Related Criteria”, 368.

“difficult cases”, problematic Hebrew lexemes in their context, by studying the semantic adequacy, lexical and grammatical accuracy. The attitude towards the *Vorlage* and the translation techniques are examined in very specific cases, such as the Hebrew jargon-defined vocabulary, aetiologies, proper names, common nouns, wordplays, puns, or *hapax legomena*.¹⁴

Against this methodological background, this paper proposes a concrete example for the application the content-related criteria, exploring the LXX translation of the Sabbath reference in the Sabbath commandments. We will study the way in which the translator(s) handled the name of the Sabbath day, an example of a special or “difficult” case. I use the plural “Sabbath-commandments” based on my earlier research on the literary and redactional development of the Sabbath-commandment in the Pentateuch (Torah).¹⁵ Developing a criterion to track a form or a model of the Sabbath commandments recurring outside of the Decalogue (Ex 20,1-17 and Dt 5,6-21), I have distinguished two forms of the Sabbath commandments in the Pentateuch, presented in a ‘relative chronological’ order¹⁶, from the least to the most developed one. I have called the first the long form or the *core commandment*, שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי תִשְׁבֹּת / שִׁבְתָּ (Ex 34,21; 23,12; 20,8-11; Dt 5,12-15; Lev 23,3; Ex 35,2-3; 31,12-17) and the second the short form, אֶת־שִׁבְתְּךָ תִּשְׁמְרוּ (Lev 19,3b.30a; 26,2; Ex 31,13).

¹⁴ See further Hans AUSLOOS, “LXX’s Rendering of Hebrew Proper Names and the Characterization of the Translation Technique of the Book of Judges”, in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls*, FS Raija Sollamo, edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, Leiden: Brill, 2008, 53–71; Bénédicte LEMMELIJN, “Flora in Cantico Canticorum. Towards a More Precise Characterisation of Translation Technique in the LXX of Song of Songs”, in *Scripture in Transition*, 27–52; EAD., *A Plague of Texts?*, 96–125; AUSLOOS and LEMMELIJN, “Characterizing the LXX Translation of Judges on the Basis of Content-Related Criteria: The Greek Rendering of Hebrew Absolute *Hapax Legomena* in Judges 3,12-30,” in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books*, edited by Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Jullio Trebolle Barrera, Leuven: Peeters, 2012, 171–192 (171–173).

¹⁵ Ottilia LUKÁCS, *Sabbath in the Making: A Study of Inner-Biblical Interpretation of the Sabbath Commandment*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020.

¹⁶ The term “relative chronology” is borrowed from Reinhard G. KRATZ, “Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate”, in *The Pentateuch: International Perspective on Current Research*, edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, Baruch J. Schwartz, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011, 31–61 (51, 53, 58–59).

Here I discuss the names used for the seventh day and their rendering in Greek in the light of their immediate contexts, in the Sabbath commandments. The redactional, literary and theological development of the Sabbath commandments is also reflected by the names used for the Sabbath in the Hebrew Bible.¹⁷ As a consequence, the references to the Sabbath day bear a theological, ideological perspective. The question is therefore whether this perspective is also reflected in the LXX, and if so, what do we learn of the theological and ideological understanding of the Sabbath in the LXX? Can we speak with Emanuel Tov of a “theological exegesis” or a “theologically motivated exegesis”¹⁸ in the Greek translation of the Sabbath commandments or we find only semantic and linguistic correspondences?

The Sabbath Commandments

Ex 34,21

שִׁשְׁתַּיִם	ἕξ
יָמִים	ἡμέρας
תַּעֲבֹד	ἐργᾶ
וְ	τῆ δὲ
כִּיּוֹם	----
הַשְּׁבִיעִי	ἑβδόμη
תִּשְׁבֹּת	καταπαύσεις [2x]

My core-commandment refers to the seven-day period as a sequence of six working days followed by the seventh day as rest day or Sabbath day. Although Ex 34,21 and Ex 23,12 are not commonly referred to as Sabbath commandments, in my relative chronology they are the first two, because they contain the *core-commandment*.

The demand to observe the seventh day rest is expressed in the Hebrew with the verb שָׁבַת. The translator renders this with καταπαύω which can be considered as a faithful rendering:

¹⁷ Lukács, *Sabbath in the Making*, 43-45.

¹⁸ Emanuel Tov, “Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint”, in id., *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, 257–269 (258).

ששת ימים תעבד וביום השביעי תשבֹת
 ἕξ ἡμέρας ἐργᾶ, τῆ δὲ ἐβδόμη καταπαύσεις·

The LXX proposes a literal translation, although the Rahlfs-Hanhart edition differs from the Wever-(Göttingen-)edition. In the former there is no Greek translation for וּבְיוֹם: we read only τῆ δὲ ἐβδόμη, as opposed to the Göttingen-edition, which matches the MT: τῆ δὲ ἡμέρα τῆ ἐβδόμη καταπαύσεις (cf. וּבְיוֹם (ה)שְׁבִיעִי תשבֹת). Using the terminology proposed by B. Lemmelijn, the rendering of Ex 34,21 is relatively literal, as we find here a ‘minus’. Referring to ‘minus’ and ‘plus’ I wish to avoid for the moment the assessment of the Greek translation, inevitably found in the use of the classical ‘omission’ or ‘addition’, leaving aside the question of the differences resulting from a different *Vorlage*.¹⁹

Ex 23,12

שִׁשִּׁי	ἕξ
יָמִים	ἡμέρας
תַּעֲשֶׂה	ποιήσεις
מֵעֲשֵׂיךָ	τὰ ἔργα σου
וְ	---
בְּיוֹם	τῆ δὲ ἡμέρα
הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῆ ἐβδόμη
תַּשְׁבֹּת	ἀνάπαυσις
לְמַעַן	ἵνα
יָנוּחַ	ἀναπαύσῃται
...	
וְיָנוּחַ	καὶ ἵνα ἀναψύξῃ

LXX Ex 23,12 also reflects some textual variants. First, it renders the Hebrew verb עָשָׂה with the verb ποιέω preserving its meaning;²⁰ nonetheless, the noun

¹⁹ LEMMELIJN, *A Plague of Texts?*, 23–25.

²⁰ Johan LUST, Erik EYNIKEL and Katrin HAUSPIE, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2015: “ποιέω⁺,” 501–502: to do, make, create, build, perform, execute, sacrifice [Ex 31,16!] etc. For more details see also Takamitsu MURAOKA, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets the Septuagint*, Leuven: Peeters, 2002, “ποιέω,” 466–468: to perform actions, to do something and affect somebody, to fashion, construct manufacture, to engage oneself in and effect, to act upon etc. It should be noted that we encounter the same

מעשה is rendered by ἔργον.²¹ Although based on the quantitative approach ἔργον may be the literal translation, from the perspective of the “content related criteria” it is both faithful and free translation, because it does not preserve the Hebrew pun תעשה מעשיך. This translation is surprising, because the Greek has two possible terms to render the noun מעשה, i.e., ποίημα (*work, deed, act*) or ποίησις (*fabrication, creation, work, fulfilling/performing of the law*),²² which would allow the translation of the Hebrew pun. Second, the LXX renders the verb שבת with a noun in nominative feminine singular, ἀνάπαυσις (*repose, rest, stopping, cessation, free from tiring actions*).²³ Thus, it faithfully renders the meaning of the Hebrew verb, but it differs grammatically (noun instead of verb). This rendering is surprising because: (1) the previous commandment has the verb καταπαύω, (2) the noun ἀνάπαυσις has the verbal form, ἀναπαύω, that could have been used. Moreover, the translator uses this verb to render the verb נוה. Thus, the Greek translation uses the same root for two different verbs: the noun ἀνάπαυσις for the verb שבת and the verb ἀναπαύω for the verb נוה. This may mean both freedom of translation and theological exegesis. It should also be mentioned at this point that the verb σαββατίζω, the Hebrew loanword שבת,²⁴ is attested in the LXX (cf. Ex 16,30; Lev 23,32). Thus, presumably the translator(s) did not see any connection between the two commandments, nei-

rendering in the case of Ex 31,16 [the last Sabbath commandment on our relative chronology]: עשה is rendered by the verb ποιέω. In this context, however, the verb ποιέω expresses most likely the idea of celebration or observing the feast of Sabbath.

²¹ LUST *et al.*, “ἔργον, -ου”, 241: *work, deed, occupation*. Muraoka adds to this list the *cultic activity*. I would like to highlight Muraoka’s statistics, namely, ἔργον is used to render the noun מעשה [60x], מלאכה [55x], עודה [31x] etc. MURAOKA, “ἔργον, -ου”, 228–229.

²² LUST *et al.*, “ποίημα, -ατος+”, 502: *work, deed, act* or “ποίησις, -εως+”: *fabrication, creation, creation, work, fulfilling / performing of the law*. Cf. MURAOKA, “ποίησις”, 469.

²³ Cf. LUST *et al.*, “ἀνάπαυσις, -εως+”, 42; Albert PIETERSMA and Benjamin G. WRIGHT (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007, 23 ἀναπαύω: *to give rest, to refresh, to abide, to quiet, to take rest*. Cf. Lust *et al.*, “ἀναπαύω+”, 42. See also MURAOKA, “ἀναπαύω”, 32: (1) *to put an end to*; (2) *to give rest*; (3) *to take rest, leave off working* (e.g., Ex 23,12), (4) *to stop moving and come to rest*; and (5) *to be / become free from agitation*. From Muraoka’s short statistics transpires that ἀναπαύω is a typical rendering of the verb נוה [4x]. cf. MURAOKA, “ἀνάπαυσις, -εως”, 32.

²⁴ LUST *et al.*, “σαββατίζω+”, 546.

ther between these commandments and the rest of the Sabbath commandment, though the Hebrew texts are clearly related.

It should also be mentioned that the LXX has a plus, i.e., the subordinating conjunction ἵνα appears twice: once as a rendering of למען which introduces the first verb of resting (ἀναπαύω) and a second time when it introduces the second verb (ἀναψύχω) in the motivation clause. Therefore, it creates a parallel formulation and a rhythm within the motivational clause, pointing to a skilled translator to whom stylistic features were important.

Ex 20,8-11

The Sabbath commandment of the Decalogue, the “classical” Sabbath commandment is handed down in two versions, Ex 20,8-11 and Dt 5,12-15. The redactional and literary critical analysis of the relationship between these two commandments is beyond the scope of this paper, therefore I focus only on the words referring to the Sabbath day. There are three references to this day:

v. 8	אֶת־יְוָם הַשַּׁבָּת	τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων
v. 10	יּוֹם הַשַּׁבְעִי שַׁבָּת לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	τῆ δὲ ἡμέρα τῆ ἑβδόμη σάββατα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου
v. 11	וַיִּנַּח בַּיּוֹם הַשַּׁבְעִי עַל־כֵּן בְּרַךְ יְהוָה אֶת־יְוָם הַשַּׁבָּת וַיְקַדְּשֶׁהָ	καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῆ ἡμέρα τῆ ἑβδόμη· διὰ τοῦτο εὐλόγησεν κύριος τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑβδόμην καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτήν

A closer look at the structure of Ex 20,8-11 shows that vv. 8 and 11 are designed to form the frame of the commandment (introduction and conclusion,

respectively). This frame, however, could be set apart as a commandment on its own. Theoretically speaking, v. 8 could be the introduction of the commandment and v. 11 could be the theological motivation. Nevertheless, the style and the phraseology of these two verses is very closely related. In v. 8, the Israelite is commanded to remember (זָכַר) the Sabbath day (אֶת־יְוָם הַשַּׁבָּת) and to consecrate it (לִקְדָּשׁוֹ); likewise, v. 11 states that God blessed (בֵּרַךְ) the Sabbath day (אֶת־יְוָם הַשַּׁבָּת) and consecrated it (וַיִּקְדָּשׁוּהוּ). Then v. 11 opens with כִּי, the conjunction applied to introduce the idea of reasoning in a causal clause that follows the main clause.²⁵ Most likely this commandment is the result of the Priestly redactional work which combined the traditions of the week and that of the Sabbath.

The first commandment (vv. 8 and 11) uses the expression יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת, ‘Sabbath day’ both in v. 8 and v. 11 and prescribes the sanctification of the seventh day by rest, just as the LORD did on the seventh day of the creation (cf. Gen 2,2-3). The Greek translation, however, does not reflect consistency in the rendering. On the one hand, it renders יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת by τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων ‘Sabbath day’ in v. 8, and by τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑβδόμην ‘the seventh day’ in v. 11, on the other hand. Both renderings can be considered faithful, and even literal, nevertheless, it should be underlined that two different translation techniques are reflected. In the first case (v. 8), the translator opted for the easiest solution with some changes and offered a transliteration of the noun שַׁבָּת. The latter rendering, however, combines two traditions, the seventh day rest (the week cycle of 6+1 days) and the Sabbath tradition. Obviously, the Greek translation repeats the expression that is used to designate the seventh day of creation בְּיוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי / τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑβδόμην in v. 11 (cf. Gen 2,2). Contrary to the Hebrew, in the Greek translation we encounter the phenomenon of exegetical homogenization: the LORD rested on the seventh day and as a consequence He consecrated it. The translation is faithful, but at the same time it expresses the freedom of the translator when he decides to use τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἑβδόμην to avoid the more literal rendering τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων. This could be an example of theological exegesis: the motivation of the Sabbath commandment in v. 11 apparently draws on the creation narrative (Gen 2,1-3), where the expression יוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי (‘seventh day’) is used con-

²⁵ William L. HOLLADAY, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988, “כִּי”, 155. Bill T. ARNOLD, John H. CHOI, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003, 149.

sequently both in the Hebrew version and in the Septuagint. As a consequence, we can highlight two different tendencies in the two traditions. On the one hand, the Hebrew text uses *יִום הַשְּׁבִיטָה* twice in order to integrate more adequately the frame of the Sabbath commandment in Ex 20,8-11. On the other hand, the translator opts for more a consequent translation and remains faithful to the theology of the creation narrative, the ‘first Sabbath’, in Gen 2 and presumably in Ex 16, too. Thus, the approach of ‘context-related criteria’ illuminates again the Greek translation.

The second commandment (vv. 9-10) incorporates the *core commandment*. The morphological change attested by the root *שבת* involves an ideological change as well. *שבת* does not stand alone, rather it appears to be attached to the name of God, i.e., *שבת ליהוה אלהיך*: the seventh day does not merely imply rest, but it has to be dedicated to God. In other words, the root *שבת* underwent a crucial development: from prescribing rest on the seventh day²⁶ to the Sabbath day dedicated to the LORD. Moreover, this development considerably affects the seventh day as well, which becomes a feast day or more precisely a holy day. Moreover, the Greek rendering *σάββατα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου* (‘Sabbath to the LORD your God’) is a faithful and literal translation.

Furthermore, it should be mentioned that within my relative chronology, the root *שבת* is attested as a noun starting from the Decalogues. Therefore, it seems crucial to begin the discussion concerning the vocabulary with a short survey on the root *שבת*.

Its verbal form reflects a rather small number of occurrences in the Pentateuch (18x) in comparison with the rest of the Hebrew Bible (55x). In the Pentateuch, the meanings of the verb *שבת* can be divided into three groups according to its semantic field. First, it is a conventional verb for the principle of *rest, cease, come to an end* (in the *qal* [27x] and *niphal* [4x]) and its causative version (*hiphil* stem) expresses the act of *removing, destroying, putting to an end* (Ex 5,5; 12,15). The second meaning covers the rest on the seventh day: God’s rest on the seventh day of creation (Gen 2,2.3; Ex 31,17) and human beings’ rest on the seventh day of the week (Ex 16,30; 23,12; 34,21[2x], Lev 23,32 [*Yom Kippur*]).²⁷

²⁶ It must be noted, however, that the use of *שבת* to prescribe resting on the seventh day reflects already a further development of the root in Hebrew. Cf. Ernst Haag, “שבת”, *TDOT* 14, Grand Rapids, MI, Cambridge UK: Eerdmans 2004, 381–386.

²⁷ Cf. Hans RECHENMACHER, “*šabbat[t]* – Nominalform und Etymologie”, *ZAH* 9 (1996) 199–203 (202); Ina WILLI-PLEIN, “Anmerkungen zu Wortform und Semantik des Sab-

The third meaning refers to the rest of the land during the Sabbatical year (Lev 25,2; 26,34.35[2x]). This short survey shows that the basic meanings of the verb שָׁבַת are to *cease, come to an end, finish* and there is a tendency to apply this verb to the idea of *rest* in the Pentateuch (12 out of 18 occurrences).²⁸ The idea of rest is linked either to the seventh day, Sabbath day or to the Sabbatical year. In line with Ernst Haag, we can conclude that the meanings *to rest, keep or observe the Sabbath* represent the specialized meaning, in the sense of *to celebrate* that developed in Hebrew in the light of the Sabbath institution.²⁹ Moreover, the use of this verb for the rest on the seventh day or on the Sabbath day belongs particularly to Exodus, and to the Sabbath commandments.

Second, the noun שְׁבֻת is well attested in the Pentateuch (out of the 112 occurrences, 47 are in the Pentateuch). Despite the highest number of occurrences in Leviticus (25x)³⁰, the noun שְׁבֻת occurs only five times in the context of the Sabbath commandment, mainly in the context of the Sabbatical year.³¹ Unlike Leviticus, in Exodus (15x), the noun שְׁבֻת is recurrent in the Sabbath commandments and in Ex 16, which narrates the first Sabbath observed by the Israelites

bat,” ZAH 10 (1997) 201–206 (202–203); Ernst JENNI, “Lexikalisch-semantische Strukturunterschiede: hebräisch HDL – deutsch ‘aufhören / unterlassen’”, ZAH 7 (1994) 124–132 (128) (the verb שָׁבַת is characterized as “Negationsverb”); BDB, “שְׁבֻת”, 991.

²⁸ Cf. Ernst HAAG, “שָׁבַת”, TDOT XIV, 382–384; id., “שְׁבֻת”, TDOT 14, 387–397 (389); Fritz Stolz, “שְׁבֻת”, TLOT 3, 1611–1617 (1612–1613); Francis BROWN, Samuel R. DRIVER and Charles A. BRIGGS, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: Coded with Strong’s Concordance Numbers* (BDB), Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 12008; “שָׁבַת”, 991–992; HOLLADAY, “שָׁבַת”, 360: 1. *cease, stop, be at a standstill*; 2. *stop working, take a holiday*; DCH VIII, “שְׁבֻת I”, 254–258; BDB, “שְׁבֻת”, 991: 1. *cease, desist, rest*; 2. *desist from labour, rest*. Cf. RECHENMACHER, “šabbat[t]”, 202; WILLI-PLEIN, “Anmerkungen”, 202–203; Jenni, “Lexikalisch-semantische Strukturunterschiede”, 128; JENNI characterizes שָׁבַת as “Negationsverb”.

²⁹ HAAG, “שְׁבֻת”, 385–386.

³⁰ Lev 16,31; 19,3.30; 23,3[2x].11.15[2x].16.32[2x].38; 24,8[2x]; 25,2.4[2x].6.8[2x]; 26,2.34[2x].35.43 (= Holiness Code).

³¹ Sabbath commandments: Lev 19,3.30; 23,3[2x];26,2; the idea of complete rest on a feast: Lev 16,31; 23,32[2x]; the Sabbath day is merely mentioned in various contexts: Lev 23,11.15[2x].16.38; 24,8[2x]; in the context of the Sabbatical year: Lev 25,2.4[2x].6.8[2x]; 26,34[2x].35.43; cf. David J.A. CLINES, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* [DCH] 8, Sheffield: Phoenix, 2011, “שְׁבֻת”, 258–261.

within the manna narrative.³² In Numbers it appears in the instructions regarding sacrifices on the Sabbath day (3x)³³ and once in the short story of a man who was put to death because he had collected sticks on the Sabbath day (15,32). In Deuteronomy, it occurs only in the Decalogue (Dt 5,12.14.15). Finally, it is worth mentioning that the noun שַׁבַּת is hardly attested in Genesis. To sum up, similar to its verbal form, שָׁבַת is mainly represented in Exodus and Leviticus, and it seems to be the favoured noun of Exodus for the name of the seventh day.

Against this background, I suggest that the Sabbath commandments reflect not only the morphological change regarding the root שָׁבַת but they also witness the extra meaning of this root, i.e., the idea of rest or observance of the Sabbath on the seventh day. It should also be stressed that the additional meaning of *rest* can be primarily traced back to the institution of the week (Ex 34,21; 23,12). In light of the Sabbath institution, the root שָׁבַת developed further and became the name of the seventh day of the week, denoting the established Sabbath institution at the same time. This understanding of the Sabbath as institution (feast day) transpires from the Greek translations as well: for instance, the preference for the transliterations in vv. 8 and 10 may designate the use of σάββατα as technical term for the seventh day (names used for the Sabbath feast).

Before moving on, it is important to refer briefly to the Greek renderings of the Hebrew noun שַׁבָּת. Remarkably, the Greek translator employs the plural form of (τὰ) σάββατα as the rendering of the singular noun שַׁבָּת. Furthermore, the plural σάββατα could be considered as the transliteration of the Aramaic שַׁבְתָּא ‘Sabbath’. If it is true, then we are facing the phenomenon of “etymological understanding” or “etymological exegesis”³⁴ discussed by Tov, which presupposes etymological considerations behind the translation. Tov notes that the translators’ etymological exegesis or etymological search for meaning of difficult words often has an Aramaic background.³⁵ However, it is also possible that the translator con-

³² Sabbath commandments (11x): Ex 20,8.10.11; 31,13.14.15[2x].16[2x]; 35,2.3; and Ex 16,23.25.26.29 (4x).

³³ Num 28,9.10[2x].

³⁴ For a detailed discussion of “etymological exegesis” see further Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 188–190. Cf. Hans AUSLOOS and Bénédicte LEMMELIJN, “Etymological Translations in the Septuagint,” in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta / Handbook of Septuagint, LXX.H 3: Die Sprache der Septuaginta / The Language of the Septuagint*, edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten, Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 2016, 193–201.

³⁵ TOV, *Text-Critical Use*, 196.

sidered the noun שָׁבַת as *terminus technicus* and did not even try to translate it. This procedure might be a good example for the stereotypical rendering of the proper noun, the noun of the feast day. In the light of the content-related criteria we can assume that the translator faced a difficult word and he opted for the easiest solution, i.e. the transliteration, although he also had other options, like the simple translation or etymological rendering. The transliteration itself is a proof that the Hebrew word penetrated the culture of Greek-speaking Jewish community and was used to refer to the feast of Sabbath.

Dt 5,12-15

v. 12

אֶת־יְיֹום הַשַּׁבָּת τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων

v. 14

יְיֹום	τῆ δὲ ἡμέρα
הַשַּׁבְעִי	τῆ ἐβδόμη
שַׁבָּת	σάββατα
לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ	κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου

v. 15

לַעֲשׂוֹת	φυλάσσεσθαι
אֶת־יְיֹום הַשַּׁבָּת	τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων
----	καὶ ἀγιάζειν αὐτήν

In spite of the fact that the two MT Decalogues include the two versions of the same tradition, we discover many divergences between them both on the level of theology and text. We can say without exaggeration that the two Sabbath commandments include the highest number of divergences. The discussion of these divergences and of the literary link between the two Decalogical Sabbath commandments, goes however beyond the scope of this paper. Therefore, I mention briefly only a few relevant information. First, the redactional activity points towards a very skilled redactor-scribe, mindful of the fine details. This carefulness is reflected by the consistent use of the vocabulary (יהוה, צוה, אלהיך, יום השבת, אלהיך) as well as the ideology of the text (e.g., the Sabbath commandment is directly from God; the use of the verb שמר in inf. abs. that occurs only in Dt to express the idea of obligation or observance in legal context [cf. “em-

phatic imperative”³⁶). Similar carefulness is noticeable in the Greek text in the case of the reference to the Sabbath day, i.e., LXX Dt 5,12-15 reflects a stronger faithfulness *vis-à-vis* Ex 20,8-11. For instance, הַשַּׁבָּת יְיָ־הוֹמֵם is rendered by τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων in vv. 12 and 15.

Lev 23,3

וּבְיֹמֵם	καὶ τῆ ἡμέρα
הַשַּׁבְּעִי	τῆ ἐβδόμη
שַׁבְּתֵי שַׁבְּתֹן	σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις
מִקְרָא־קֹדֶשׁ	κλητὴ ἁγία
---	τῷ κυρίῳ
...	
שַׁבְּתֵי הוֹא	σάββατά ἐστιν
לַיהוָה	τῷ κυρίῳ

In this commandment, we must highlight two textual variants: the translation of שַׁבְּתֵי שַׁבְּתֹן with σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις and the plus τῷ κυρίῳ.

The rendering of the name of the Sabbath with σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις can be considered as a free, yet faithful translation. However, two things come to the fore: first, different translation techniques are applied to render the two components of the Hebrew name. The noun שַׁבְּתֵי is rendered or rather transliterated as σάββατα (cf. the previous Sabbath commandments), whereas the noun שַׁבְּתֹן is translated with the noun ἀνάπαυσις. The noun ἀνάπαυσις is in fact a literal and faithful translation, nevertheless, the translator’s decision of “root-linked [etymological] rendering”³⁷ is surprising as the noun σάββατα was at his disposal. It should also be mentioned that the noun ἀνάπαυσις occurs in the Sabbath commandment of Ex 23,12 (*supra*) as the translation of the verb שַׁבַּת.

³⁶ For the inf. abs. in the sense of the imperative see also Dt 16,1 (שְׁמֹר) and 24,9 (זָכֹר), cf. Ex 20,8.11. On the “emphatic imperative”, see further John D.W. WATTS, “Infinitive Absolute as Imperative and the Interpretation of Ex 20:8,” *ZAW* 74 (1962) 141–145; John I. DURHAM, *Exodus* (WBC 3), Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987, 277; Carmel MCCARTHY, *Deuteronomy* (BHQ), Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007, 67.

³⁷ AUSLOOS and LEMMELIJN, “Etymological Translations”, 195.

The peculiarity of this translation is emphasized by the fact that שבתון reveals the same meaning as שבת, *abstention from work, rest*,³⁸ and it could be considered the sufformative form of the root שבת.³⁹ The sufformative form (*qatalān*) is formed of *qatal* + *ān* (קטלון) and is the form of abstract nouns, e.g., רעבון (*famine*). שבתון is the only sufformative that preserves the primitive first vowel ‘a’, probably under the influence of the noun שבת.⁴⁰ As Propp shows:

Like other nouns of the pattern *qittālōn* (< **qattālōn*), *šabbātōn* denotes a concrete example or the condition of its root meaning, in this case *šbt* ‘cease, rest’. In other words, *šabbātōn* means something like “quintessential cessation”, (The reason we do not find the expected evolution **šabbatōn* > **šibbātōn* was doubtless the influence of *šabbāt* ‘Sabbath.’) To call the Sabbath a “Sabbatical” provides emphasis through tautology. [...] *Šabbāt šabbātōn* is also coordinated with *qōdeš* ‘Holiness’ ([Ex] 16,23; 31,15; 35,2; Lev 23,3), evoking the phrase *qōdeš qōdāšim* ‘Holiness of Holinesses.’⁴¹

³⁸ BDB, “שבתון”, 992: “sabbath observance, sabbatism”; Johnstone, *Exodus 20-40*, 339: “complete rest”; Durham, *Exodus*, 411: “the sabbath of sabbath-rest, set apart for Yahweh”; Hendrik L. Bosman, “שבת”, *NIDOTTE* 4, 1157–1163 (1157): “*šabbātōn* is a denom. nom., and the suffix *-ōn* probably indicates an abstract meaning, ‘restfulness’. [...] This derivation from the *šabbāt* designates the weekly Sabbath (Ex 16:23; 31:15; 35:2; Lev 23:3), the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:31; 23:32), the sabbatical year (Lev 25:4-5), the day of rest commemorated by trumpets (Lev 23:34), and the first and eighth day of the Feast of Succoth (Lev 23:39).” STOLZ, “שבת”, *TLOT*, 1297–1302 (1298); Ernst HAAG, “שבת”, *TDOT* 14, 387–397; HASEL, “Sabbath”, 849: “Sabbath feast.”

³⁹ *DCH* 8, “שבת”, 259, 262: Clines translates “special sabbath”, “(special) sabbath (observance)”: 1. “(special) day of sabbath (observance)”, e.g., Lev 16,31; 23,3.24.39; Ex 16,23; 31,15; 35,2; 2. “(special) year of sabbath (observance)”, e.g., Lev 25,4.5. Thus, he suggests the translation “a sabbath of special sabbath observance, a holy convocation” for Lev 23,3. Cf. Baruch A. LEVINE, *Leviticus* (JPS Torah Commentary), Philadelphia, New York, Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 5749/1989, 155; BOSMAN, “שבת”, 1160: “The paronomastic construction *šabbāt šabbātōn* has the function of superlative to indicate that all forms of labor are prohibited.”

⁴⁰ Paul JOÜON and Takamitsu MURAOKA, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (SB 27), Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2008, 240–241.

⁴¹ William H.C. PROPP, *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2A), New York: Doubleday, 2006, 493. Propp translates “Sabbatical Sabbath” for the combined formula. In the case of presenting the pattern development, Propp

Consequently, שבת שבתון is to be understood as a superlative, i.e., “the most restful rest”, “the absolute day of rest”⁴² or “one individual and particular שֶׁבֶת”,⁴³ Against this background, one can safely assume that the combined formula שבת שבתון belongs to the same tradition or scribal-redactional activity.⁴⁴ Even if Lev 23,3 displays a shorter formula since it does not include ליהוה, it can still be ascribed to this tradition or scribal-redactional activity. All the more so since its LXX version includes the τῶ κερῖω which corresponds to ליהוה and hence, it reflects a *Vorlage* which might have contained ליהוה. It should not be excluded that the harmonizing tendency of the Greek translator(s) lies behind the formula τῶ κερῖω considering its other occurrences.

Against this background, we may conclude that the use of שבת שבתון for the Sabbath reveals a further interpretation of the seventh day, classifying it among God’s appointed festivals and holy convocations (cf. Lev 23,2: מִקְרָאֵי קֹדֶשׁ /

draws on Barth’s study. See further Jacob BARTH, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894, 324. Furthermore, Lettinga categorizes the suffix *-ān* (> *-ōn*) as the primary marker of abstract nouns and of diminutive. See further J. P. LETTINGA, Takamitsu MURAOKA, *Grammatica van het bijbels Hebreeuws: Elfde, gecorrigeerde editie*, Leiden: Brill, 2000, 43.

⁴² HAAG, “שֶׁבֶת”, 387–397 (389); BDB, “שֶׁבֶת שֶׁבֶתוֹן”, 992: “sabbath of sabbatic observance”; Holladay, “שֶׁבֶת שֶׁבֶתוֹן”, 360: “the most solemn sabbath”; Jacob MILGROM, *Leviticus 23–27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3B), New York: Doubleday, 2000, 1959; Thomas HIEKE, *Leviticus 16–27* (HThKAT), Freiburg: Herder, 2014, 886: שֶׁבֶתוֹן “völlige Ruhe” and שֶׁבֶת שֶׁבֶתוֹן “ein »Schabbat völliger Ruhe« (als Superlativ).” Willi-Plein characterizes שֶׁבֶתוֹן as an abstract noun (“Abstraktbildung”) and situates it in the cultic context: “Ohne ausdrückliche Verbindung mit dem Sabbat kann aber šbtwn auch des Ausbleiben anderer mit einem kultischen Anla »nicht vereinbarer Dinge oder Aktivitäten bezeichnen, nämlich im Zusammenhang mit Festrandtagen (Lev 25,24.39), mit dem Sabbatjahr (Lev 25,5) und mit dem Ausbleiben des Manna (Ex 16,23)”. See further WILLI-PLEIN, “Anmerkungen”, 201; Karl ELLIGER, *Leviticus* (HAT 1/4), Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966, 313.

⁴³ Ludwig KOEHLER and Walter BAUMGARTNER, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, Leiden: Brill, 1958, 1411.

⁴⁴ Hieke assumes that “Der Begriff *šabbātōn* ist eine priestliche Prägung, die den verschiedenen gelagerten Verboten der Arbeitsruhe korrespondiert: *šabbātōn* steht immer dort, wo auch »jegliche Dienstarbeit« (*mela’ket ‘abodā*) verboten wird – die etwas mildere Form, die nach Ex 12,16 die persönliche Zubereitung des Essens noch erlaubt.” See further HIEKE, *Leviticus 16–27*, 886.

κλητὰς ἀγίας and מועדי / ἑορταί μου).⁴⁵ The Greek translation, however, does not transmit the superlative understanding of שבת שבתון or at least, the rendering σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις is not as eye-catching.

⁴⁵ LEVINE, *Leviticus*, 154: “There is, however, a problem in using the term *mo’ed* with reference to the Sabbath. Elsewhere in the ritual legislation it usually designates an annual occurrence. A *mo’ed* occurs at the same time each year; its annual dates must be “fixed.” There is, however, no need to “fix” the time of the Sabbath, which is not, strictly speaking, a calendrical phenomenon, as Rashi has pointed out. Furthermore, biblical usage regularly differentiates between *shabbat*, “the Sabbath,” and *mo’ed*, as in verses 37-38 of our chapter [Lev 23,37-38], which speaks of the “set times of the LORD” as being “apart from the sabbaths of the LORD.” Accordingly, the use of *mo’ed* for the Sabbath is most likely to be explained by the influence of the language of verse 4 [Lev 23,4] upon that of verse 2 [Lev 23,3].” Cf. DCH V, “מועד”, 179–182: (1) *appointment, meeting*; (2) *meeting place*; (3) *appointed time, due season*; (4) *festival, time of appointed feast, of national festival* (included sabbath and new moon) = *calendar of festivals* [Lev 23,2.4.37.44]; (5) *agreement, appointed signal*. Clines notes that the Sabbath and the new moon are listed into the festival or calendars of festival as מועד in several places though this is not a usual way to refer the Sabbath or to the new moon. See also H. KOCH, “מועד – *mô’ēd*,” *TDOT* 8, 167–173: “The term has long been used to refer to the appointed time and place of the more important cultic celebrations, i.e., feasts of worship. [...] Yet in the majority of OT passages [...] it refers to the time of the (three) great annual festivals (Lev. 23:2ff.; Nu. 10:10; 15:3; 28:2; 29:39; 2 Ch. 8:13; Ps. 75:3[2]; Isa 1:14; Lam. 1:4; 2:7,22; Ezek. 36:38; 44:24; 45:17; 46:9,11; Hos 9:5; Zeph. 3:18; Zech. 8:19; cf. Dt. 31:10). [...] In its statements about the cultic festivals as *mô’ēd*, the lexeme occurs surprisingly often together with the terms “sabbath and new moon” (Lev. 23:2ff.; Nu. 10:10; 1 Chr. 23:31; 2 Chr. 2:3[4]; 31,3; Isa. 1:14; Lam. 2:6; Hos. 2:13[11]; cf. Ezek. 36:38; 46:9,11; Hos. 9:5), so that the Sabbath and new moon, while apparently not referring to a *mô’ēd*, do designate a closely related quantity. [...] However, it is not only about the natural cycle that these *mô’ēd*-times are thrown into relief; at the same time, they represent those days when God approaches Israel as Creator and meets with his cultic community. Such times are thus filled with holiness (qdš, Ps. 73:4f.; Lev. 23:2ff. and *passim*), and such occasions are marked by solemn convocations (qr’, Lev. 23:2ff.; Nu. 16:2; Lam. 1:4,15; 2:22 and *passim*).” [p. 170] Bosman also distinguishes two usages of this term: (a) a non-cultic use: determined, appointed place or time (e.g., Gen 17,21; Jer 8,7); and (b) cultic use: referring to the religious festivals (e.g., Lev 23,2; 4,44; Isa 1,14; Ezek 36,38; 44,24; 45,17; Hos 2,9[11]). Interestingly, Bosman lists the Sabbath among the most important OT feasts without highlighting the inappropriate or strange association of the Sabbath with the term מועד. See further Hendrik L. BOSMAN, “מועד”, *NIDOTTE* 2, 871–873.

Ex 35,2

וּבַיּוֹם	τῆ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ
הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῆ ἐβδόμῃ
יְהִי־לָכֶם	----
---	κατάπαυσις
שְׁבִיעִי	ἅγιον
שַׁבָּת	σάββατα
שְׁבִיתוֹן	ἀνάπαυσις
לַיהוָה	κυρίῳ

In the Septuagint version of Ex 35,2, we may notice several textual variants over against the Hebrew text. The expression *שְׁבִיעִי שַׁבָּתוֹן לַיהוָה*, the well-defined name of the Sabbath day highlights the theological importance of the day. Obviously, the translation of this expression challenged the knowledge and creativity of the translator. Hence, the translator opted for the simple solution which resulted in four nouns (all in nominative): (1) *κατάπαυσις* ('rest')⁴⁶, which is a 'plus' noun *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew version, (2) *ἅγιον* ('[something] holy'), (3) *σάββατα* ('Sabbaths'), and (4) *ἀνάπαυσις κυρίῳ* ('rest, repose for the LORD').⁴⁷ Thus, this can be translated as 'a rest, something holy, Sabbaths, a repose for the LORD' over against the Hebrew expression that could be translated as 'a holy Sabbath of solemn rest to the LORD'. Consequently, we have here a very free and faithful translation with two variants, presumably due to the complexity of the Hebrew expression: (1) *יְהִי־לָכֶם* '[it] should to you' is not translated, i.e., it is a 'minus', but (2) the noun *κατάπαυσις* is a 'plus'. The presence of *κατάπαυσις* is striking: on the one hand, it complicates the rendering of the Hebrew expression which is in itself very complex; on the other hand, it is almost unnecessary since it is the synonym of *ἀνάπαυσις*.

Ex 31,12-17

v. 13

וְאַתֶּם	≠	Ὁρα̃τε
----		καὶ

⁴⁶ LUST et al., "κατάπαυσις, -εως+", 322. Cf. MURAOKA, "κατάπαυσις, -εως", 302.

⁴⁷ LUST et al., "ἀνάπαυσις, -εως+", 42. Cf. MURAOKA, "ἀνάπαυσις, -εως", 32 [typical rendering of *מַנַּח, מְנוּחָה* and *שְׁבִי*].

	אֶת־	---
	שְׁבֻתַּי	τὰ σάββατά μου
	תִּשְׁמְרוּ	φυλάξεσθε
v. 14		
	אֶת־הַשְּׁבֻתֹת	τὰ σάββατα
	כִּי	ὅτι
	קֹדֶשׁ	ἅγιον
	הוא	τοῦτό
	לָכֵן ≠	ἐστιν κυρίου ὑμῶν
v. 15 (core-commandment)		
	ובימים	τῆ δὲ ἡμέρα
	הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῆ ἐβδόμη
	שְׁבֻת	σάββατα
	שְׁבֻתוֹן	ἀνάπαυσις
	קֹדֶשׁ	ἅγια
	לַיהוָה	τῷ κυρίῳ

	בִּימֵינוּ	τῆ ἡμέρα
	הַשְּׁבֻתֹת ≠	τῆ ἐβδόμη
v. 16		
	אֶת־הַשְּׁבֻתֹת	τὰ σάββατα
	לַעֲשׂוֹת	ποιεῖν
	אֶת־הַשְּׁבֻתֹת	≠ αὐτὰ
	לְדַרְתָּם	εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν
	בְּרִית	διαθήκη
	עוֹלָם	αἰώνιος
v. 17		
	אֵת הַהוּא לְעֹלָם	σημεῖόν ἐστιν αἰώνιον
	ובימים	καὶ τῆ ἡμέρα
	הַשְּׁבִיעִי	τῆ ἐβδόμη
	שְׁבֻת	ἐπαύσατο
	וַיִּנְכַּס	καὶ κατέπαυσεν

The excessively complex structure and content of this Sabbath commandment should be highlighted. A closer examination shows that Ex 31,12-17 is a collection of Sabbath commandments, which includes the elements of the pre-

vously discussed commandments. This holds true for the names used for the Sabbath day and remarkably, to their Greek renderings.

In v. 13 (= the first commandment of the collection), the commandment is expressed by the verb שמר in imp. 2nd pers. pl.⁴⁸ *vis-à-vis* the LXX version, which applies two verbs and reflects a different word-order: ὁράω (imp. 2nd pers. pl.) opens the commandment and φυλάσσω (fut. mid. ind. 2nd pers. pl.) is found at the end of it. The verb φυλάσσω is the stereotypical rendering of שמר, therefore, ὁράω should be considered the ‘plus’ material of the LXX. The verb ὁράω⁴⁹ might have been introduced to serve together with the conj. καί as an appropriate translation of the emphatic adverb אך. The translation of שְׁבַתֵּי שַׁבָּתַי ‘my sabbaths’, however, is rendered faithfully: τὰ σάββατά μου (n.acc.pl.).

As for the rest of the Sabbath references, we can observe the following tendencies present in the Greek translation. Similarly to the previous commandments, the Hebrew singular noun שְׁבַת(ה) ([the] Sabbath) is rendered consistently by the plural τὰ σάββατα (vv. 14.15.16). This rendering might reflect the translators’ freedom or theology since all Hebrew traditions (the MT, Samaritan Pentateuch, and Qumran scrolls) use the singular שְׁבַת. In v. 14 (= the second commandment of the collection) a striking textual variant is detectable: the LXX has ὅτι ἅγιον τοῦτό ἐστιν κυρίου ὑμῖν *vis-à-vis* כִּי קֹדֶשׁ הוּא לַכֹּהֵן (‘it is holy for your LORD’ and ‘for it is holy for you’, respectively). Accordingly, the Hebrew text argues that the Sabbath should be kept because it is holy for the community, the בני ישראל (‘sons of Israel’ in Ex 31,12-17). Unlike the theology or ideology of the Hebrew text, the Septuagint translator states that the Sabbath should be observed because it is holy for the LORD. This is the mark of theologically motivated exegesis.

The Sabbath reference in v. 15 (= the *core-commandment* of the collection) is closely connected to the previously discussed Sabbath commandment in Ex 35,2:

שבת שבתון קדש ליהוה Ex 31,15

קדש שבת שבתון ליהוה Ex 35,2

Ex 31,15 σάββατα, ἀνάπαυσις ἀγία τῷ κυρίῳ

Ex 35,2 κατάπαυσις, ἅγιον, σάββατα, ἀνάπαυσις κυρίῳ

⁴⁸ It was categorized as the short form of the Sabbath commandment, attested only in the Holiness Legislation (Lev 19,3.30; 26,2) as well as Ex 31,13.

⁴⁹ LUST *et al.*, “ὁράω”, 443; MURAOKA, “ὁράω”, 502503.

It has been argued that this expression is the elaborated name of the Sabbath commandment. Contrary to LXX Ex 35,2, however, we encounter a ‘better’ or more faithful translation in LXX Ex 31,15. For instance, the term קדש is rendered by the adjective ἅγιος, and the noun κατάπαυσις , the ‘plus’ material of Ex 35,2, does not occur here: ‘on the seventh day there is Sabbath, a holy rest to the LORD.’ Similarly to Ex 35,2, the singular שַׁבָּת is rendered by the plural σάββατα and the noun שבֹּתוֹן by the noun ἀνάπαυσις. It is remarkable that the שַׁבָּת occurs twice in this verse, nevertheless, the second time the construction of בְּיֹם הַשַּׁבָּת ‘on the Sabbath day’ is translated with $\text{τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἑβδόμης}$ ‘on the seventh day’. This difference might be explained by the stereotyped nature of the two references, namely, the rendering of שבֹּתוֹן שַׁבָּת by the σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις and of the בְּיֹם הַשַּׁבָּת by the $\text{τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἑβδόμης}$ (cf. Ex 20,11).

In v. 16 (= the fourth commandment of the collection), the Sabbath reference corresponds to the previously discussed translation, i.e., the expression $\text{שַׁבָּת־הַשַּׁבָּת}$ (sg.) is rendered by the τὰ σάββατα (pl.). There is, however, a slight textual variant, which is presumably meant to contribute to a more idiomatic translation: the construction $\text{שַׁבָּת־הַשַּׁבָּת}$ is attested twice in MT, whereas the second time it is substituted with the personal pronoun אֹתָא in neutral plural, corresponding to τὰ σάββατα (pl.) in the LXX.

V. 17 includes the motivation of the Sabbath commandment in Ex 31,12-17 and recalls the seventh day of creation similarly to the Decalogical Sabbath commandment in Ex 20,11. In contrast to Ex 20,11, the verb שַׁבַּת is applied (cf. Gen 2,2-3) and translated with the verb παύω . It should also be reiterated that in the case of Ex 34,21 and Ex 23,12 the verb שַׁבַּת is rendered by the verb καταπαύσεις and by the noun ἀνάπαυσις , respectively.

In sum, the Septuagint version of the Sabbath commandment in Ex 31,12-17 reflects a faithful translation. The translation techniques points towards a skilled translator aware of the conventional terms used to translate the Sabbath references. Among others, the harmonization and theological adaptation found in vv.14-15 should be underlined: ἅγιον τοῦτό ἐστιν κυρίου ὑμῖν and ἀγία τῷ κυρίῳ.

Conclusion

Being the product of Hellenistic Judaism, the Septuagint provides valuable insights into the translation work and theology of the early Greek speaking Jew-

ish community. Every translation is at the same time an interpretation. The translator of the Septuagint provides a new (theological) interpretation or adaptation of the Hebrew Scriptures to the readers, on the one hand. On the other hand, the translation may reflect the community's understanding of certain issues in this case the Sabbath. This paper has aimed to scrutinize the possible theological and/or ideological understanding of the Sabbath commandment reflected by the process of translation. Furthermore, I wanted to explore whether the translator(s) noticed the literary and redactional relationship between these Sabbath commandments, undeniably present in the Hebrew text. In order to explore these possible intentions, we have relied on the "content related criteria" developed by Ausloos and Lemmelijn and the "theological(ly motivated) exegesis" proposed by Tov.

The analysis of the main features of the Greek Sabbath commandments has highlighted different tendencies in the translation of the names or references to the Sabbath in these texts. These examples reflect the translators' endeavour to find a suitable Greek equivalent for the Sabbath day, which deeply engrained in the ancient Israelite cultural and religious life. The main task of the translators was to transpose an institution developed within a very specific Judean community into a Jewish, yet completely different cultural milieu.

Regarding the translation technique employed in the Sabbath commandments, in certain cases, the translators provided a very literal translation, in other cases they opted for the simplest solution of transliteration. In other instances, we can identify a theologically motivated translation. These observations allow a number of remarks. First, in the case of the verb *שבת* we cannot speak about consistent renderings; the verb is translated with the verb *καταπαύω* in Ex 34,21, the noun *ἀνάπαυσις* in Ex 23,12 and the verb *παύω* in Ex 31,17. Second, contrary to its verbal cognate, the noun *שבת* (sg.) is rendered consistently by the plural *σάββατα*: (a) the reference *יום השבת* occurs only three times, only in the Decalogical Sabbath commandments, and is translated with *τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων* (Ex 20,8; Dt 5,12.15); (b) the expression *שבת ליהנה אלקיך* is attested again only in the Decalogues, and is rendered in both cases by the faithful translation *σάββατα κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου* (Ex 20,10; Dt 5,14). The following reference that should be highlighted, *שבת שבתון*, is rendered by *σάββατα ἀνάπαυσις* (Lev 23,3). The same expression translates its expanded versions, *שבת שבתון קדש ליהנה* (Ex 35,2) and *שבת שבתון קדש ליהנה* (Ex 31,15) as well, although the translations of the expanded versions differ considerably. At this

point, the rendering of the singular noun שבת by the plural from σάββατα should also be emphasized.

Against this background, we can observe that although the basic structure of the *core commandment* is preserved in the Greek renderings, the different renderings of the verb שבת show that the translators did not see a strong relationship between the commandments. Moreover, the close literary and redactional relationship between the two identified forms of the Sabbath commandments in the Hebrew Pentateuch does not appear in the Septuagint. The consistency in the rendering of the Sabbath references, however, indicates that the plural form σάββατα might have been the widespread or accepted name to the Sabbath feast. Furthermore, this usage may imply the weekly observance of the Sabbath. As a concluding remark, I would like to underline the impact of the Sabbath commandment on the Hellenistic cultural milieu beyond the immediate community that produced and received the Greek translation(s) of the Torah. First, translating the Sabbath commandments enriched the Greek vocabulary with the term σάββατον (pl. σάββατα). Second, the observance of the Sabbath introduced the cycle 6+1 of days, known today as the week, into the Hellenistic cultural and social milieu.

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, Anneli, “Septuagintal Translation Techniques: A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account”, in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*, edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus, Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993, 116–130.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli, “The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint”, in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23), edited by Claude E. Cox, Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1987, 361–380.
- Arnold, Bill T. and John H. Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Ausloos, Hans and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, “Etymological Translations in the Septuagint”, in *Handbuch zur Septuaginta / Handbook of Septuagint, LXX.H 3: Die Sprache der Septuaginta / The Language of the Septuagint*, edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 2016, 193–201.
- Ausloos, Hans and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, “Characterizing the LXX Translation of Judges on the Basis of Content-Related Criteria: The Greek Rendering of He-

- brew Absolute *Hapax Legomena* in Judges 3,12-30”, in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books* (BETL 246), edited by Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Jullio Trebolle Barrera, Leuven: Peeters, 2012, 171–192.
- Ausloos, Hans and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, “Content Related Criteria in Characterising the LXX Translation Technique”, in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. Die Septuaginta: Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse 2. Internationale Fachtagung (LXX.D) Wuppertal, 23-27 July 2008*, edited by Kraus Wolfgang and Martin Karrer, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010, 357–376.
- Ausloos, Hans, “LXX’s Rendering of Hebrew Proper Names and the Characterization of the Translation Technique of the Book of Judges”, in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls, FS Raija Sollamo* (JSJSup 126), edited by A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta, Leiden: Brill, 2008, 53–71.
- Barr, James, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979.
- Barth, Jacob, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1894.
- Bosman, Hendrik L., “מועד”, *New International Dictionary of the Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 2, edited by Willem A. VanGemeren, Carlisle, Cumbria, UK: Paternoster, 1996, 871–873.
- Bosman, Hendrik L., “שבת”, *New International Dictionary of the Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* 4, edited by Willem A. VanGemeren, Carlisle, Cumbria, UK: Paternoster, 1997, 1157–1163.
- Brown, Francis, Samuel R. Driver, Charles A. Briggs (eds.), *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: Coded with Strong’s Concordance Numbers*, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, ¹²2008.
- Clines, David J.A. (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* 8, Sheffield: Phoenix, 2011.
- Durham, John I., *Exodus* (WBC 3), Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987.
- Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, Heinz-Josef Fabry (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* 14, Grand Rapids, MI, Cambridge UK: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Elliger, Karl, *Leviticus* (HAT 1/4), Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966.
- Hieke, Thomas, *Levitikus 16-27* (HThKAT), Freiburg: Herder, 2014.
- Holladay, William L. (ed.), *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Jenni, Ernst, “Lexikalisch-semantische Strukturunterschiede: hebräisch ḤDL – deutsch ‘aufhören/unterlassen’”, *ZAH* 7 (1994), 124–132.

- Joüon, Paul and Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (SB 27), Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, ²2008.
- Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, Leiden: Brill, 1958.
- Kratz, Reinhard G., “Pentateuch in Current Research: Consensus and Debate”, in *The Pentateuch: International Perspective on Current Research* (FAT 78), edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, Baruch J. Schwartz, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011, 31–61.
- Lemmelijn, Bénédicte, “Flora in Cantico Canticorum. Towards a More Precise Characterisation of Translation Technique in the LXX of Song of Songs”, in *Scripture in Transition. Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea scrolls in honour of Raija Sollamo* (JSJSup 126), edited by Jutta Jokiranta, Raija Sollamo, Anssi Voitila, Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2008, 27–52.
- Lemmelijn, Bénédicte, “Two Methodological Trails in Recent Studies on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint”, in *Helsinki Perspective on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint: Proceedings of the IOSCS Congress in Helsinki 1999* (PFES 82), edited by Raija Sollamo and Seppo Sipilä, Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001, 43–63.
- Lemmelijn, Bénédicte, *A Plague of Texts? A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called ‘Plagues Narrative’ in Exodus 7,14–11,10* (OTS 56), Leiden – Boston, MA: Brill, 2009.
- Lettinga, Jan Pieter, Takamitsu Muraoka (with W. Th. Peursen), *Grammatica van het bijbels Hebreeuws: Elfde, gecorrigeerde editie*, Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Levine, Baruch A., *Leviticus* (The JPS Torah Commentary), Philadelphia, New York, Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 5749/1989.
- Lukács, Otilia, *Sabbath in the Making: A Study of Inner-Biblical Interpretation of the Sabbath Commandment*, Leuven: Peeters, 2020.
- Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, Katrin Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ³2015.
- Marquis, Galen, “Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel”, in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23), edited by Claude E. Cox, Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1987, 405–424.
- McCarthy, Carmel, *Deuteronomy* (BHQ), Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.
- Milgrom, Jacob, *Leviticus 23-27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* vol. 3B (AB), New York: Doubleday, 2000.

- Muraoka, Takamitsu, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets the Septuagint*, Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin G. Wright (eds.). *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Propp, William H.C., *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 2A), New York: Doubleday, 2006.
- Rechenmacher, Hans, “šabbat[t] – Nominalform und Etymologie”, *ZAH* 9 (1996) 199–203.
- Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari, “Der Gebrauch des Genitivus Absolutus in der Septuaginta”, In *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax. Zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 4. Juni 1987. FS Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen* (AASF Series B 237), edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo, 175-180, Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.
- Sollamo, Raija, “The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch”, in *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea. V. Congreso de la IOSCS* (Textos y Estudios “Cardenal Cisneros” 34), edited by Natalio Fernández Marcos, Madrid: Arias Montano, 1985, 101–113.
- Stolz, Fritz, “שבת”, *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* 3, edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann, translated by Mark E. Biddle, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997, 1611–1617.
- Tov, Emanuel, “Theologically Motivated Exegesis Embedded in the Septuagint”, in id., *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, Leiden: Brill, 1999, 257–269.
- Tov, Emanuel, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research, Third Edition, Completely Revised and Expanded*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- Tov, Emanuel and Benjamin G. Wright, “Computer Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of the Translation Units in the Septuagint”, in *The Greek Bible and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, edited by Emmanuel Tov, Leiden: Brill, 1999, 219–237.
- Watts, John D.W., “Infinitive Absolute as Imperative and the Interpretation of Ex 20:8”, *ZAW* 74 (1962) 141–145.
- Willi-Plein, Ina, “Anmerkungen zu Wortform und Semantik des Sabbat”, *ZAH* 10 (1997) 201–206.
- Wright, Benjamin G., “The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating ‘Literalism’ in the LXX”, in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23), edited by Claude E. Cox, Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1987, 311–335.