



O'Hare, Daniel

“Have You Seen, Son of Man?”: A Study of the Translation and Vorlage of LXX Ezekiel 40–48

Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 57

Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010. Pp. xiv + 251. Paper. \$32.95. ISBN 9781589835269.

William Tooman

St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews
St. Andrews, Fife, Scotland

This study of the Greek translation of Ezek 40–48 began life as a dissertation at the University of Notre Dame and was written under the supervision of Gary Anderson. The complementary objectives of the work are to “identify and illustrate the goals of the translation of LXX Ezek 40–48” and “to distinguish the translator’s *Vorlage* from his own contributions to the extent possible” (2, 29–30). This latter goal is one that appears to be missing from many recently published dissertations on the Septuagint and is a welcome consideration indeed.

In the first chapter (1–31), O'Hare establishes his goals, provides a review of relevant scholarship, and introduces his methodology. The chapter begins with a cogent summary of the content of Ezek 40–48 and a review of scholarship on LXX-Ezekiel from Thackeray (1903) to Crane and Stromberg (both 2008). The centerpiece of the chapter is an explanation of *Skopostheorie*, O'Hare's theoretical model for evaluating the translation technique of LXX-Ezek 40–48. *Skopostheorie* is a functional model of translation “that takes its point of departure from the idea that translation is bound up inextricably with the transfer of culture from the source text (*Ausgangstext*) to the receptor text (*Zieltext*) and its readers (*Zielrezipienten*)” (22). Thus, translation choices are constrained by the purpose and goals of the translator, who does more than “decode” the source text. The

translator mediates the text to a specific readership in a specific situation. Thus, emphasis is placed on the observation that translations are made for specific audiences and contexts and that the goals of translators differ, depending upon those audiences and their contexts. For those readers inspired to explore the potential of *Skopostheorie*, O'Hare's footnotes lead one, in particular, toward the work of Katharina Reiß and Hans Vermeer.

O'Hare argues that *Skopostheorie* is particularly fitting to his task, considering current trends in Septuagint research. It brings together two dominant trajectories in recent scholarship: approaches concerned with how translators rendered their source texts, and those that stress the Greek versions as works of reception. Following Carsten Ziegert, O'Hare shows how *Skopostheorie* can mediate between these two concerns. Second, by identifying the type of translation represented by LXX-Ezek 40–48, one can draw conclusions regarding its objectives and readership. Thus, the translator's habits and assumptions are thrown into relief, and the translation can be better contextualized within Hellenistic Judaism. Third, such careful attention to the translator's purposes assists greatly in the traditional text-critical task. That is, it assists one in weighing individual readings without losing sight of the broader habits and objectives reflected in the translation as a whole. O'Hare concludes that the translator of LXX Ezek 40–48 had three identifiable goals: (1) to “accurately and comprehensively render Ezek 40–48 into Greek”; (2) to “convey the substance of Ezekiel's prophecy using a style and diction that signal the translator is transmitting an authoritative divine word (philological translation)”; and (3) to “accommodate certain cultural aspects of Ezekiel's vision to the Hellenistic tastes of his target readership” (29).

In the second chapter, “Toward the *Übersetzungsweise* of the Translator” (33–71), O'Hare sets out to demonstrate the fidelity of the translator to his *Vorlage*. He illustrates this in several ways: by demonstrating the translator's adherence to Hebrew word order and quantitative representation and by close attention to lexical choice. As James Barr emphasized in his “Typology of Literalism,” a translation can be simultaneously literal in certain respects and free in others. O'Hare, sensitive to this point, notes a certain conflict in the habits of the translator of LXX-Ezekiel. On the one hand, the translator shows greater freedom in the matter of lexical choice than on other fronts. On the other hand, he transliterates Hebrew terms quite frequently, in an effort to preserve his source text precisely. Throughout the chapter O'Hare is careful to account for ambiguities in reconstructing the translator's *Vorlage* and for cases of graphic confusion or mechanical error. His results agree with the overall tenor of scholarship on LXX-Ezekiel, but he has nuanced our understanding significantly, particularly with regard to the issue of lexical choice. In the end, O'Hare concludes that the habits of the translator betray his reticence to deviate from his *Vorlage* any more than was absolutely necessary. Practically speaking, this places the burden of proof on the scholar who might suggest that a plus in LXX

Ezekiel 40–48 was the result of translator expansion rather than a reflection of a different *Vorlage*.

The third chapter, “The *Vorlage* of Ezekiel 40–48” (73–138), focuses attention on the plusses in the *Vorlage* of the LXX (LXX^V). O’Hare examines three types of plusses: (1) cases of simple transfer of wording, in which a verse is more closely aligned with other passages in Ezekiel or another book (often Leviticus); (2) additions of new material, that is, glosses in LXX^V, which tend to strengthen the position of the Zadokites; and (3) cases of “pastiche,” groups of plusses that appear in close proximity for an exegetical purpose.¹ In this latter case, there is a particularly fascinating discussion of LXX-Ezek 43:2–3 and its relationship to Ezek 1:24 and the *Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q405). In keeping with the conclusions O’Hare has drawn thus far, he suggests that these plusses, in the vast majority of cases, are not likely to be the product of the Greek translator but were already present in LXX^V. This Hebrew text, it is suggested, did not reach the form that was translated into Greek until the third or second century B.C.E. and derives, he suspects, from a Palestinian context.

In the fourth chapter, “Near and Far Contexts in the Rendering of Ezekiel 40–48” (139–56), O’Hare turns his attention to the other texts that exerted influence on the translator of LXX-Ezek 40–48, particularly the Greek Pentateuch. He examines cases wherein the translator allowed broad themes and ideas from the Pentateuch, particularly notions of purity, to influence his rendering of technical terms. This is followed by an examination of the translator’s vocabulary choices for sacrificial terms as compared with those in the Greek Pentateuch. O’Hare finds that, while the translator of LXX-Ezek 40–48 is dependent upon the notions and terminology of the Greek Pentateuch, he is neither slavish nor unthinking in his reuse.

Finally, the fifth chapter (“The Translator and His Target Readership,” 157–88) addresses the readers of LXX-Ezek 40–48. O’Hare looks for evidence that the translation was crafted to suit a particular audience, evidence that is found in the translator’s adoption of Hellenistic architectural vocabulary and “his assumption that economic and religious benefits enjoyed by Jews should be mediated outward” (157). That is, the translator had a vision of Judaism in which the blessings Judaism receives from God should be extended not only to Gentiles living within Palestine but to other nations as well.

Following some brief conclusions (189–92), O’Hare includes three valuable appendices. The first is a series of detailed architectural diagrams of the temple, the οἶκος, and the east

1. These three categories are adopted from D. Andrew Teeter, “Exegesis in the Transmission of Biblical Law in the Second Temple Period: Preliminary Studies” (Ph.D. diss.; University of Notre Dame, 2008).

gate according to the LXX. Appendix B provides examples of differences in word order between LXX-Ezek 40–48 and LXX^V, and appendix C is a reverse lexicon of select technical terms: Greek terms and their Hebrew hyponyms followed by Hebrew terms and their Greek equivalencies.

With regard to its place in current scholarly literature, the present work is, perhaps, most akin to Michael Konkel's *Architektur des Heiligen: Studien zur zweiten Tempelvision Ezechiels (Kap. 40–48)* (BBB 129; Berlin: Philo, 2001). The two works share certain goals, although Konkel has his eye fixed on the redaction history of Ezek 40–48. Although O'Hare's work has implications for the redaction history of Ezekiel, he is always and only concerned with the Greek translator, his *Vorlage*, and his literary achievements.

In sum, this is a clear, well-structured, and well-conceived work of scholarship. It is rigorous without being tedious, and it is written with clarity and grace (a boon with a work of this nature). It certainly deserves a place on the "must-read" list of any scholar of the book of Ezekiel and is a significant contribution to the study of translation technique in the Greek Bible.