

4QProv AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Jan de Waard

Introduction

In the *Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche*, edited by E. Tov, the 4Q fragments of Proverbs have been classified as 4Q102 (4QProv^a), containing Prov 1:28-2:1,¹ and as 4Q103 (4QProv^b), containing Prov 9:16; 13:6-9; 14:7-10; 14:12-13; 14:31-15:8 and 15:19-31.² The photographs clearly show the rather fragmentary state of these texts.

As can easily be seen from the photographs, 4Q102 and 4Q103 have been written by different hands. In the first there is hardly any distinction between *waw* and *yodh*,

¹Emanuel Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993). For 4Q102 Prov a (1:28-2:1) the reader is invited to consult photographs 40988 and 43016. On photograph 40988 the upper right part of the fragment is lacking. It figures on photograph 41913, where the following text can be deciphered:

ישחרנני
ויראת יה
נאצו כ
[ו]פממ

The two parts of the fragment have apparently been put together for photograph 43016.

²As to 4Q103 Prov b, photographs 43016 and 43563 have to be compared. Prov 9:16 figures on both photographs in the upper-left part, Prov. 13:6-9 in the lower-left part of photograph 43016 and the upper-central part of 43563. Prov. 14:7-10 figures on photograph 43016 (lower-right) and 43563 (upper-left), Prov. 14:12-13 on photograph 43016 (lower-right) and 43563 (upper-left). Prov 14:31-15:8 appears on photograph 43016 (lower- middle part) and 43563 (lower-right part), Prov 15:11-12 occurs on photograph 43563 (lower-middle) and Prov. 15:19-31 on the same in the lower-left part. Most of the last fragment is also represented on the lower-left part of photograph 43016, but a small fragment at the upper-right angle is lacking.

For a simple negative in the edition, two different exposures were chosen, enabling an optimal readability of both the light and dark fragments on the negatives. In addition, readability has been the criterion for the selection of the photographs joint to this article. It should, however, be noted, that for an optimal decipherment the use of the microfiches and of a good microfiche reader with a magnification of 42x remains obligatory.

[*Textus* 19 (1998) 87-96]

whereas in the second they are distinguished, the *yodh* being shorter than the *waw* and its head being broader. Skehan in his report on Proverbs speaks in both instances of a “relatively late hand.”³ A careful comparison with the different scripts presented by Cross (138-139),⁴ and even better, with the same as shown on photographs 43127 and 43127A of the Tov edition, makes it possible to speak more precisely of a Herodian hand.

Transcription and apparatus

In another brief report, Skehan, to whom the publication of the Proverbs material from Qumran had been entrusted, referring to these two 4Q manuscripts of Proverbs, makes the following remark: “because of the United Bible Societies’ O.T. project, Prof. J. A. Sanders has had a complete transcription from me for some time....”⁵ Unfortunately, it has been impossible to consult this transcription since after having been handed on to the late Prof. Rieger it was lost. The following transcription, therefore, is entirely my own. Prof. Eugene C. Ulrich (University of Notre Dame) has now been charged with the final publication of these fragments.⁶

Prov 1:28 - 2:1

ישחרנני [ו]לא ימצאנני²⁹ תחת כי [שנאו דעת]
 ויראת יהוה לא בחרו³⁰ לא אבו לעצ[תי]
 נאצו כ[ל] תוכחתי³¹ ויאכלו מ[פרי דרכם]
 [ו]ממעצתיהם ישבעו³² כי מושבת פ[תים תהרגם]
 [וש]לות כסילים תאבדם
 [ושמע לי ישכן בטח³³ ושא]נן מפחד רעה
 [בני אם תקח אמרי ומ]צותי תצפן אתך¹

³O. P. Benoit, *et al.*, “Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran,” *BA* 19 (1956) 88.

⁴Frank M. Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (W. F. Albright Festschrift, ed. Ernest G. Wright; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961) 138-139.

⁵P. W. Skehan, “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism,” *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; Paris/Gembloux: Editions Duculot and Leuven University Press, 1978) 163.

⁶After the completion of this article I have been able to consult Skehan’s working editions of the two manuscripts in the possession of Prof Eugene Ulrich. I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Ulrich for making these editions available to me. No reason was found to change the transcription presented here. The conventions and symbols used in the apparatus below are those of BHQ (cf. *Biblia Hebraica Quinta — Librum Ruth* [ed. J. de Waard; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1998])

9:16

[מי פתי יסר הנה וחסר ל]ב ואמרה [לו]

13:6-9

[צדקה תצר תם דרך ור]שעה [תסלף חטאת]

[יש מתעשר ואין כל מ]תרושש והון רב

[כפר נפש איש עשרו ורש] לא שמע [גערה]

[אור צדיקים ישמח ונר רש]עים [ידעך]

14:7-10

[לך מנגד]

[לא]יש כס[יל ובל ידעת שפתי דעת⁸ חכמת ערום הבין דרכו]ואולת כס[לים מרמה⁹ אולים יליץ אשם ובין ישרים רצון][לב יודע¹⁰ מרת נפשו ובשמחתו לא יתערב זר]

14:12-13

[ואחרי]תה

[תוגה]

14:31 - 15:8

[עשק דל ח]רף עשה[ו ו]מכבדו חנ[ן אביון]

[ברעתו י]דחה רש[ע וחס]ה במותו [צדיק]

[בלב נבון] תנוח חכמה ו[ב]קרב כסילי[ם תודע]

[צדקה] תרומם גוי ו[ח]סד לאמים [חטאת]

[רצון מל]ך לעבד משכיל ועב[ר]תו תה[יה מביש]

[מענה רך י]שיב [חמה] ודבר עצב עלה אף

[לשון חכ]מים תיטי[ב דעת ופי כס]ילים יבי[ע אולת]

[בכל מקום] עיני יהוה צפות [רעים וטובים]

[מרפא] ל[שון ע]ץ חיים [וסלף בה שבר ברוח]

[אויל ינאץ] מוסר א[ביו ושמר תוכחת יערם]

[בית צדי]ק [חסן רב ובתבואת רשע נעכרת]

[שפתי חכ]מים יז[רו דעת ולב כסילים לא כן]

[זבח רשע]ים תוע[בת יהוה ותפלת ישרים רצונו]

15:11-12

] אברון [11

] לץ [12

15:19-31

19 וארח ישרים] סוללה 20 בן חכם ישמח א] ב
 וכסיל אדם בווה אמו] 21 אולת שמחה לחסר לב ואיש]
 תבונה יישר לכת 22 הפר [מ]חשבון] באין סוד]
 וברב יועצים תקום 23 שמחה] לאיש במענה]
 פיו ודבר בע[תו מה] טוב 24 א]רח חיים]
 למעלה ל[מש]כי[ל למ]ען סור משא[ול מטה]
 25 בית גאים יסח יה[ה ויצב גבול] אלמנה]
 26 תועבת יהוה מחשב]ות רע וטהר]ים אמרי נעם]
 27 ע[כר ביתו בן]צע בצע ושנא מ[תנת יחיה]
 28 לב צ[דיק לענות] ופי רשעים יב[יע רעות]
 29 רח]וק יהוה מרשעים ותפלת צ[דיקים ישמע]
 30 מאו]ר עינים ישמח לב שמ[ועה טובה תדשן עצם]
 31 אזן שמעת] תוכח]ת חיים בקשר חכמים תלין]

1:32 מושבת 4Q102 | משובת] MVST | ἡδίκου G'

13:6 שעה 4Q103 σ' MV | τὸς δὲ ἀσεβείς G (comp. Kenn. 95 | (ורשעים

ST

14:32 במותו 4Q103 Mα'σ'θ'VT | τῆ ἐαυτοῦ ὀσιότητι GS

14:34 סד 4Q103 Mσ'T | ἐλασσονοῦσι δέ G(V)S

14:35 ועתבו 4Q103 (G) | ועברתו Mθ'V | S | ובסורחניה

15:2 תיטיב 4Q103 MVST | καλὰ (ἐπίσταται) G

15:7 מודעין 4Q103(?)MV | δέδεται G | φυλάσσουσι σ' | S | תחך

15:28 יהגה MGVST | > 4Q103

Comments

1:32 The reading מושבת of M is confirmed by V, S, and T. The variant ἡδίκου of G may be the result of an exegesis which considered פתים משובת to be a *genitivus obiectivus* construction, together with a more generic translation of משובת. Interestingly, 4Q102 testifies in its variant מושבת (to be preferred to a reading מושכת),⁷ to a metathesis of

⁷This is the transcription provided by Skehan in his brief report on the Proverbs portions (Benoit, "Editing," 88). At first sight, this transcription is correct, but it is difficult to see how

waw and *shin*. This metathesis could simply be accidental, but it could also indicate a derivation from the root **שׁוׁ**. If, in addition, such a derivative could have the meaning of “idleness,” 4Q102 would provide a much better parallel with **שלות**, “ease-taking.”⁸ To obtain such a meaning for the form in M seems to be far more difficult. 9:16 The upper left part of the photograph shows an unidentified fragment reading **וואמרה ב**. In fact, this reading should now be identified as a fragment of 9.16b, the preceding **ב** representing the final consonant of the expression **לבו וחסר**.⁹ G has here a double translation *παρακελεύομαι λέγουσα*, a verb of saying preceded by a qualification. According to Pinkuss **באבא** in 9:4 (= 9:16 in S) could be the translation of the 1 pers. imperf. cohortative vocalization **וואמרה**.¹⁰ In view of the translation of S of 9:3 this suggestion seems preferable to the opinion of Ehrlich, who opts for the participle.¹¹ It is difficult to know on which of these two proposals the critical apparatus of BHS is based. Unfortunately, 4Q103 is indeterminate as a witness since it cannot resolve the problem of vocalization.

13:6 The right bottom side of the first photograph clearly shows a fragment of 13:6-9. Its first line only presents **שעה** which should be the last three characters of the word **ורשעה**. 4Q103 therefore confirms the reading of M which only had the support of V: *impietas*. It has several times been proposed (see e.g. Gemser, 62) to read **ורשעים** with one Hebrew ms and G: *τὸς δὲ ἄσεβεις*. The readings of S and T, which like G personify but with a collective singular, also have been cited in favor of such a proposal. However, the Hebrew ms 95 of Kennicott is late and it is one of the characteristics of the Greek translator to often render abstract nouns with concrete ones.¹²

the form could be parsed. A comparison with the *beth* two lines below may, however, makes the transcription **מושבת** possible.

⁸Mitchell Dahood, *Proverbs and Northwest Semitic Philology* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1963) 6f.

⁹Unless, though much less likely, the fragment would represent the text of Ezra 8: 27-28, the only other instance in the Hebrew Bible in which a form **וואמרה** is preceded by a **ב**, in this case the final **ב** of **והנהב**. For details of the Ezra fragments from Qumran see the *Companion Volume* of the Facsimile Edition, 33 and the *Inventory List of Photographs*, 74 as well as photograph 43089, top.

¹⁰Hermann Pinkuss, “Die syrische Übersetzung der Proverbien,” ZAW 14 (1894) 161.

¹¹Arnold B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel* (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968) 6.46.

¹²Ant. J. Baumgartner, *Étude critique sur l'état du texte du livre des Proverbes d'après les principales traductions anciennes* (Leipzig: Imprimerie orientale W. Drugulin, 1890) 127.

13:7 The reading of M והון also has the support of 4Q103. It is, moreover, entirely incomprehensible why the critical apparatus of BHS wants to oblige its user to read והונו. The Targum can certainly not be quoted as a witness for such an evidence. In fact, only the first and second Bomberg editions have the reading ומזליה. Urbinates I reads ומזלא, whereas Berlin Or and Zamora read the synonym ומולא. The non suffixed reading clearly is the original one.

13:8 In 8b all versions are only an interpretation of a *Vorlage* such as M, the meaning of which probably is that the poor are not vulnerable to blackmail.¹³ There is therefore no issue of textual criticism in a restricted sense. However, the reading לא שמע preserved in the fragment of 4Q103 is not in favor of the "speculative" emendation לא מצא גאלה,¹⁴ proposed by Steuernagel and taken over by Gemser and in BHS. Moreover, the surface form of 8b לא שמע גערה is the same as in 1b although the underlying semantic structures are totally different.¹⁵

14:12-13 The identification of the small fragment in the lower central part of photograph 43016 is certain. Of course, תודה could also be the residue of לתוגה of Prov 17:21, but the fact that ואחריו most probably is the remnant of ואחריתה in Prov 14:12 of M makes this hypothesis impossible. However, the position of ואחריו in the fragment, directly above תיגה, remains puzzling. Unfortunately, the text is too fragmentary to permit any reconstruction of lines.

14:32 The reading במותו of M which was already supported by α'σ'θ'V and T, now also receives the support of 4Q103 Prov^b. The rendering of G τῆ ἐαυτοῦ ὀσιότητι, supported by S, is,¹⁶ based upon a reading בתומו, as already Jäger had seen. Qumran discoveries considerably weaken the evaluation of such a rendering as more origi-

¹³W. McKane, *Proverbs* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1970) 458.

¹⁴R. N. Whybray, *Proverbs* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1994) 203.

¹⁵I. L. Seeligmann, (1953). "Voraussetzungen der Midraschexegese," *VTSup* 1 (1953) 163-164.

¹⁶J. G. Jäger, (1788). *Observationes in Proverbiorum Salomonis Versionem Alexandrinam* (Meldorf and Leipzig, 1788) *ad loc.*

¹⁷So BHS, B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1963) 67; O. Plöger, *Sprüche Salomos* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984) 16) and, with some hesitation, McKane, *Proverbs*, 36 and 47). For A. Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel...* (Breslau: J. Hainauer, 1857) 175, M is the result of a theological correction of Pharisaic origin. It remains, however, very doubtful whether במותו could ever mean "auf die Belohnung, die ihm in der erneuten Welt werden wird." According to the *Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew Old Testament Text Project* (Stuttgart, 1977) 496-497, the committee was divided. One half favored M, the other half G, both with a C rating.

nal,¹⁷ whereas they reinforce the thesis that the reading in G is due to a kind of 'al *tiqrâ* treatment.¹⁸

14:34 G and S read a derivation from the root חסר in their *Vorlage*. More specifically, the reading *miseros* of V is based upon a vocalization חסר. Although one never can be entirely sure, the final character of 4Q103 shows more resemblance to a *daleth* than to a *resh*. The variant can easily be explained as being caused by orthographical error and/or ignorance of the meaning of חסר I.

14:35 M reads in the second half line ועברתו, a reading confirmed by θ' and V, whereas 4Q103 Prov^b presents the variant reading ועבתו. It seems most likely that this variant was the basis of the rendering τῆ δέ ἐαυτοῦ ἐστροφίᾳ in G (followed by S) and that the translator derived the form from the root עבת "to twist." It is improbable that G would depend upon a reading וערמתו, "and his cunning,"¹⁹ even if the complexity of a metathesis and an additional *beth/mem* confusion is not impossible. It is unlikely because of the unnoted fact that G also seems to know the reading of M, whose consonants are reproduced in the phonological transcription of the following verb ἀφαιρεῖται which has no other corresponding term in M.²⁰ The question can be raised whether even the scribe of 4Q103 was not aware of such a reading in view of the otherwise incomprehensible space left between the *beth* and the *taw* of the word.

15:1 4Q103 only reads עלה[in the second part of the verse instead of יעלה in M. Although on the photographs there is sufficient space for a *yod*, no traces of this character can be detected. Did the scribe of 4Q103 read the verbal form as a participle according to its frequent defective writing? Such a reading would have the support

¹⁸More carefully formulated, the reading could be the outcome of an interpretational procedure similar to the 'al *tiqrâ*' approach. For 24 possible cases of such a treatment in Proverbs see my article "Metathesis as a Translation Technique?" *Traducere Navem*. (Festschrift Katharina Reiß; ed. Justa Holz-mänttari and Christiane Nord; Tampere: Universitätsbibliothek, 1993) 249-260. A complete survey of such readings will be the subject of another paper.

¹⁹Jäger, *Observationes, ad loc.*; Baumgartner, *Etude critique*, 142; Paul de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1863) 49.

²⁰In another paper ("'Homophony' in the Septuagint," *Biblica* 62 [1981] 552) I used the terminology phonological translation, following J. C. Catford, *A Linguistic Theory of Translation. An Essay in Applied Linguistics* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967) 61. In a personal communication dated February 14, 1982, Prof. Reiß correctly disapproved of the used of the term "translation," since translation only takes place when meaning is involved, and phonemes, although differentiating meaning, are not bearers of meaning as such. She therefore proposed to speak of "Äquivalenz auf Phonemebene." However, such an equivalence is the goal of the translation process whereas the concern in this paper is the process itself. For this reason the expression "phonological transcription" has been coined. There are quite a number of

of S, *ܬܒܝܬܐ*, and T, *ܡܥܝܪܐ*. However, Nöldeke has clearly shown that in order to denote general truths and gnomic expressions the participle has in Syriac almost entirely taken the place of the imperfect.²¹ In view of this and in view of the probable dependencies of T upon S, very little textual value can be attributed to a possible participle reading of 4Q103. The verbal form in the first semi-colon can unfortunately not be reconstructed.

15:2 The reading of M *ܕܥܬ ܬܝܬܝܒ*, supported by V, S, and T, now also seems to be confirmed by 4Q103 Prov^b, at least with regard to the first word of which all characters can be read except for the last. The Qumran reading does not favor the emendation *ܬܝܬܝܦ*, proposed since Dyserinck and violently attacked by Ehrlich.²² Nor does it provide a key to the understanding of the isolated rendering of G *καλὰ ἐπίσταται*. G can only be due to another kind of *'al tiqrâ* treatment, namely a twofold metathesis *ܬܘܒܘܬ ܬܕܥ*. The reason for the metathesis was no doubt the uncertainty with regard to the meaning of *ܝܬܒ* in this context.

15:7 The verbal form *ܝܘܪܘ* is usually derived from the root *ܝܘܪ* and given the figurative meaning "to spread." Such is also the understanding of V and maybe of S and T. The rendering *ܡܘܕܥܝܢ*, "they make known" in T may simply be a different translational gloss of *ܝܘܪܘ*. Another key to the understanding of T could be a variant *ܝܘܪܝ*, "they teach," with implied *zayin/waw* confusion.²³ The Hebrew form which has inspired the rendering of σ' *φυλάσσοις* is no doubt *ܝܘܪܘ* from the root *ܢܘܪ* whereas G *δέδεται* may have been inspired by some derivation from Hebrew *√ܘܪ* or by a Hebrew form *אזרו* (Baumgartner, 144) from *√אזר*. In the last case, if M is taken to be the more original reading, G could be explained by vowel metathesis.²⁴

4Q103 Prov^b is of relative help. Only the first character is readable on the photographs and there can be no doubt that this is a *yod*. Further, only the bottom part of a

phonological transcriptions in the Greek text of Proverbs, some of them involving metathesis as e.g. in 14:18: *ܝܚܬܪܘ / κρατήσοις*.

²¹T. Nöldeke, *Compendious Syriac Grammar* (trans. J.A. Crichton; London: Williams and Norgate, 1904) 211.

²²Johannes Dyserinck, "Kritische Scholiën bij de vertaling van het boek der Spreuken," *Theologisch Tijdschrift* (1883) 582; Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 6.82.

²³The Zamora text of the Targum (185) reads *ܡܒܥܝܢ*, from the root *ܒܥܝ*, "to ask for," and this rendering seems to be based upon a misunderstanding of G, *δέν* having been taken in the sense of *δέν* II.

²⁴As to the reading of σ', for an interchange of *tsade* and *zeta* see G's phonological transcription *ὀρίζεται* of Hebrew *קריץ* in Prov xvi 30.

down stroke of what could either be a *zayin* or a *waw* is visible. Therefore, readings such as אָזְרוּ and יָצְרוּ have to be excluded and readings such like יָזְרוּ and יוּרוּ remain possible.

15:19 סללה of M is written plene in 4Q103: סללה

15:22 Occasionally a Hebrew *Vorlage* עצה has been postulated on the base of G: βουλή, S: חכָּמָה and T עִצְתָּא.²⁵ The complete text of 22b in 4Q103 joins, however א', ס', ת', and V in confirming M. The rare syntactical phenomenon of a plural feminine noun, considered as a collective and therefore ruling a feminine singular form of the verb,²⁶ was misunderstood by the Greek translator who therefore made a different grammatical subject of תקום explicit in his translation. This translational operation apparently influenced S directly and T indirectly.²⁷

15:27 וְשׁוּנָא of M is written defectively in 4Q103: וְשׁוּנָא.

15:28 In 28a 4Q103 clearly reads צַדִּיק but it lacks the verb יהגה of M. In addition, the deterioration of the manuscript is such that the reading of the last word cannot be determined with certainty. The tear in the manuscript has caused an upward movement and deformation of the final character which could either be a *taw* or a final *mem*. It is true that the reading of M לענות has always presented problems. On the base of πίστεις in G (variant πίστις) corrections such as אמונות/אמונה,²⁸ and even אמונים (BHS) have been proposed. However, the readings of G (followed by S and T) and V (*oboedientiam*) could be considered as interpretations of ענה. As Delitzsch has correctly stated, the meaning of M is "recht zu antworten."²⁹ If the last character of the word in 4Q103 can be identified as a final *mem*, a reading לעניים or לענייים could be suggested: "the heart/attentiveness of the righteous is for the humble." As only one *yod* or *waw* figures in the manuscript, one would have to admit a contraction as well.

Could the omission of the verb have been a syntactical deletion of a verb יהיה originally read through ג'/י confusion?

²⁵Ferdinand Hitzig, *Die Sprüche Salomo's* (Zürich: Orell, Füssli und Comp., 1858) 452; Crawford H. Toy, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1970) 318f.

²⁶Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993) §150g.

²⁷Pinkuss, "Proverbien," 109f.

²⁸Toy, *Proverbs*, 319.

²⁹Franz Delitzsch, *Das Salomonische Spruchbuch* (Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1873) 257.

³⁰Skehan, "Qumran," 163.

Conclusions

Skehan's first reaction was that the two 4Q manuscripts of proverbs are "textually uninteresting."³⁰ This appears to be an understatement. If one eliminates the particular reading of 4Q102 in 1:32, the particular *minus* of 4Q103 in 15:28 and the uncertain reading of 15:7, one is left with four out of five instances in which 4Q103 supports M against G. In view of the idiosyncrasies of the Greek translator such a result is not surprising. On the other hand, the extremely limited material does not permit any further extrapolations and the evidence of 4Q in favor of M therefore remains limited. In the framework of this paper no full description of the interdependencies of versions nor of their implied translation techniques could be given; for this, the reader can be referred to some literature.³¹ The major analysis of these subjects has been done by the present writer and it is his intention to deal extensively with these subjects in his introduction to the book of Proverbs of which he is the responsible editor in the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* project.

³¹Of particular interest in this respect are the investigations by Ioh. Frieder. Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus philologico-criticus sive Lexicon in LXX et reliquos interpretes graecos ac scriptores apocryphos Veteris Testamenti* (Lipsiae: In libraria Weidmannia, 1820); Baumgartner, *Observationes*; and Pinkuss, "Proverbien." More recently Gillis Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint III. Proverbs* (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N.F. Avd. 1. Bd 52. Nr 3. 3-63; Lund, 1956), and J. Cook, "אשה זרה (Proverbs 1-9 Septuagint): A Metaphor for Foreign Wisdom?" *ZAW* 106 (1994) 458-476; "Are the Syriac and Greek Versions of the אשה זרה (Prov 1 to 9) Identical? (On the Relationship between the Peshitta and the Septuagint)," *Textus* 17 (1994) 117-132, have paid some attention to the translation techniques implied in versional evidence.