

# MT and LXX Version of Psalm 44[45] in the light of the Vulgate iuxta Hebraicum

**Konrad Kremser**

University assistant (postdoc) for Old Testament, Department of Biblical Studies,  
Faculty of Catholic Theology, University of Vienna, Austria

konrad.kremser@univie.ac.at  1072101017  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8476-0511>

**ABSTRACT** • A comparison of the Masoretic text and the Septuagint text of Ps 44[45] with the text of the Vulgate iuxta Hebraicum leads to the surprising result that Jerome translates difficult passages very precisely and in accordance with the Masoretic text. In less challenging passages, on the other hand, he allows himself to be more influenced by the Septuagint. In any case, it turns out that the Hebrew text used by Jerome was almost, but presumably not completely, identical to the Masoretic text known today.

**KEYWORDS** • Jerome as translator – Epistula LXV – Ad Principiam – Psalm 44 – Psalm 45 – Psalmi iuxta Hebraicum – Masoretic text – wedding song

**ZUSAMMENFASSUNG** • Ein Vergleich des Masoretentextes und des Septuagintatextes von Ps 44[45] mit dem Text der Vulgata iuxta Hebraicum führt zu dem überraschenden Ergebnis, dass Hieronymus schwierige Stellen sehr exakt und in Übereinstimmung mit dem Masoretentext übersetzt, während er sich bei weniger herausfordernden Abschnitten stärker von der Septuaginta beeinflussen lässt. Jedenfalls zeigt sich aber, dass der von Hieronymus benutzte hebräische Text mit dem heute bekannten Masoretentext nahezu, aber vermutlich nicht vollständig identisch gewesen sein dürfte.

**SCHLAGWORTE** • Hieronymus als Übersetzer – Epistula LXV – Ad Principiam – Psalm 44 – Psalm 45 – Psalmi iuxta Hebraicum – Masoretentext – Hochzeitslied

## 1. Introduction

There are significant differences between the Masoretic text of Ps. 45 and the text of Ps. 44 in the Septuagint. These can usually be explained by the fact that the LXX interprets the Hebrew consonant text differently than the MT does, but in some cases, it must be supposed that the LXX also assumes other Hebrew consonants than can be found in the MT. Although the Hebrew text is older and the Greek text as its translation is younger, the manuscripts that attest to those texts are of the opposite age: the oldest Greek manuscripts, which contain Ps. 44, are about half a millennium older than the oldest Hebrew manuscripts, which contain Ps. 45 completely.<sup>1</sup> This results in the paradoxical situation that an (arbitrary or erroneous) change in the Hebrew consonant text and its vocalization and accentuation that took place after the Greek translation cannot be ruled out. Here Jerome's translation of the Psalm into Latin *iuxta Hebraicum* is of particular importance. For an epoch from which no Hebrew manuscripts of the Psalm are known, conclusions about the Hebrew consonant text and its vocalization can be drawn from Jerome's very accurate Latin translation.<sup>2</sup> From Jerome's remarks in his letter to Principia<sup>3</sup> in which he interprets Ps. 44 it can be inferred that he knew Symmachus, Aquila, Theodotion and the fifth and sixth columns of the Hexapla to Ps. 44. Therefore, important readings are pointed out in the footnotes, even if Jerome does not discuss them explicitly.

## 2. Verse by Verse Comparison between MT, LXX and Vg<sup>Hebr</sup>

The superscript (v. 1) cannot be dealt with here, as it raises very specific questions which can only be discussed in comparison with other similar Psalm superscripts.

<sup>1</sup> Fragments of Ps. 45:1-2,6-8,8-11 were found at Qumran, cf. 4Q171,3-10,IV, Z. 23-24; 11Q8 Frg. 8; 4Q85 Frg. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Regarding Jerome's translation of the Psalms, cf. Margoni-Kögler, Michael, „Hieronymus philologus. Einblicke in sein Bibelübersetzen: Prinzipien, Praxis, Relevanz“, *Vulgata in Dialogue* 1 (2017) 31-69, here 41-64, <https://doi.org/10.25788/vidbor.v1i0.28> (retrieved 14.11.2022); Wissmann, Michael, „Das doppelte Psalterium der Vulgata“, *Vulgata in Dialogue* 5 (2021) 9-19, <https://doi.org/10.25788/vidbor.v5i1.819> (retrieved 14.11.2022).

<sup>3</sup> Hieronymus, *Ep. LXV*, according to the edition: Hieronymus, Sophronius Eusebius, „Epistula LXV. Ad Principiam virginem explanatio Psalmi XLIV“, in Hilberg, Isidor (ed.), *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistulae*, vol 1., *Epistulae I – LXX* (CSEL 54), Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien <sup>2</sup>1996, 616–647. The study of Boylan is not taken into account in this article since the text of Psalm 44 used by him is obviously not the translation *iuxta Hebraicum*, cf. Boylan, Patrick, *The Psalms. A Study of the Vulgate Psalter in the Light of the Hebrew Text*, M. H. Gill and Son, Dublin 1920, 160-164.

**v. 2**

a.

While the MT formulates with a nominal sentence, **אמר אני**, the LXX has a verb sentence in the present tense, which does not indicate an alternative text template, but can be due to the target language.<sup>4</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> formulates, like the LXX, with a verb sentence in the present tense. This can also be explained by the target language.

b.

Both the LXX and the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> derive the Hebrew word **מהיר** from the root **מהר** | and conclude that the meaning is “quick”. It seems that knowledge of the exact meaning of **מהיר** according to modern biblical scholarship, namely “knowledgeable”, “experienced”,<sup>5</sup> which also fits here perfectly, was not present when these translations were made.<sup>6</sup>

**v. 3**

The difficult Hebrew form **יִפְיֹיֵת** is explained differently: GKB considers it a dittography of **יִפְיֹיֵת**,<sup>7</sup> the BHS assumes an erroneous contraction and suggests **יִפּוּ יִפִּית** or **יִפּוּ יִפִּית** as conjecture.<sup>8</sup> According to Joüon / Muraoka however, the form can be interpreted as P<sup>e</sup>al'al.<sup>9</sup> The LXX translates **ὠραῖος κάλλει**, leading to the conclusion that it is rendering a two-part Hebrew expression, not a single verb.<sup>10</sup> Böhler, however, gives a different explanation. He considers **יִפִּית** to be original: “Die alten Übersetzungen verstanden die Reduplikation als Intensivierung”.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Brucker, Ralph, „Psalm 44[45]“, in Karrer, Martin / Kraus, Wolfgang (eds.), *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*, vol. II, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart 2011, 1623-1626, here 1623.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Ringgren, Helmer, „**מהר** mhr“, ThWAT 4 (1984) 713-717, here 717.

<sup>6</sup> This also applies to the translations of Aquila and Symmachus, cf. Field, Frederick, *Origenis Hexaplorum Fragmenta*, vol. II, E Typographeo Clarendoniano, Oxford 1875, 161, <https://archive.org/details/origenhexapla02unknuoft/> (retrieved 14.11.2022).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. GKB § 55.5.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. BHS Apparatus, note on Ps 45,3; Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1623.

<sup>9</sup> Joüon, Paul / Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (SubBi 27), Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Roma 2006, reprint 2008, §59 d.

<sup>10</sup> The same is true of Origen's recension, Aquila, Symmachus, and the fifth column of the Hexapla, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 161.

<sup>11</sup> Böhler, Dieter, *Psalmen 1-50* (HThKAT), Herder, Freiburg i. B. et al. 2021, 816.

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> formulates – similar to the LXX and different from the MT – a two-part expression (+ auxiliary verb): *decore pulchrior es*. In *Ep. LXV*, 8, Jerome brings his translation without pointing out any difficulties, as he occasionally does. For him the passage does not seem to contain any abnormalities. The hypothesis of the BHS that there is an erroneous contraction in the MT is thereby given additional weight. This contraction must have slipped in after the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD, since Jerome does not seem to have known about it.

#### v. 4

The LXX inserts a personal pronoun 2.m.sg. after μηρόν,<sup>12</sup> suggesting a Hebrew text template with an additional Kaph at the end of רך'.

In accordance with the MT, the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> does not insert a personal pronoun 2.m.sg. after the corresponding word *femur*.

#### v. 4-5

The MT ends v. 4 with the same word that begins v. 5: וְהִדְרָךְ – וְהִדְרָךְ. The different vocalization seems only to be due to the accents. The LXX, on the other hand, recognizes two different roots here: first, at the end of v. 4, it translates καὶ τῷ κάλλει σου, corresponding to the MT, but at the beginning of v. 5 καὶ ἔντεινον, which according to Karrer / Kraus can only be a translation of the verb form וְהִדְרָךְ.<sup>13</sup> The LXX thus comes through a different vocalization to a completely different understanding of which word the consonant text wants to express here.<sup>14</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> starts v. 5 earlier and moves the last two words of v. 4 (MT) to the beginning of v. 5.<sup>15</sup> Apart from that, it confirms the MT. It translates the phrase *et decore tuo decore tuo*. In contrast to the LXX, the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> assumes that the same root is present twice, like the MT does.

#### v. 5

αα.

The MT adds two imperatives to the first word at the beginning of the verse without a copula. The LXX, on the other hand, has three imperatives (because it reads already the first word as

<sup>12</sup> The same applies to other Greek translations, cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1623; Field, *Fragmenta*, 162.

<sup>13</sup> Hif'il-form of the root רךד, cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1614.

<sup>14</sup> In contrast, Symmachus recognizes the same Hebrew root twice here, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 162.

<sup>15</sup> Different in Hieronymus, *Ep. LXV*, 10-11, where the colometry corresponds to MT. Jerome points out that *decore tuo* is placed there according to the Hebrew text and not repeated in error.

imperative as discussed above) and uses καὶ to connect them. Much more important, however, is how the LXX renders its third imperative: It reads βασιλευε, what can hardly be a translation of רכב.<sup>16</sup>

Because it follows the MT's understanding of והדרך, the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> has only two imperatives (not three like the LXX). These are lined up unconnected – just like in MT. The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> renders רכב as *ascende*, which is an extension of meaning compared to Hebrew, since the Hebrew word refers to mounting a horse, a cart or a chariot, while the Latin word is much more general. But there is no doubt that Jerome is actually translating the verb רכב.

aβ.

אמת gives the LXX fully corresponding to the MT with ἕνεκεν ἀληθείας.<sup>17</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> translates *propter veritatem*. MT, LXX and Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> agree that דבר על forms a related phrase meaning “because of”. Seen purely with reference to the Hebrew consonant text, רכב על “mounting/riding on” could also belong together, whereby the riding or draft animal would be indicated in the following.<sup>18</sup>

aγ.

Another passage worth mentioning in this verse is: וענוה־צדק. It is mostly denied that this can be a construct connection. צדק is usually understood as an apposition.<sup>19</sup> The LXX simply adds a copula, creating a tripartite enumeration beginning with ἀληθείας. It can be discussed whether the LXX is based on a different consonant text, which contains an additional copula, but this is not necessarily the case. Goulder argues that the Hebrew text may well have in mind a tripartite enumeration: “The missing second ‘and’ seems to be characteristic of the poet, coming in v. 8 also.”<sup>20</sup> According to the BHS, however, there are also manuscripts that show the text variant וענות־צדק (and thus quite clearly a construct connection).<sup>21</sup>

<sup>16</sup> The same applies for ακολουθει in Symmachus. In contrast, Aquila tries with great probability to translate רכב, when he says επιβηθι, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 162.

<sup>17</sup> The consonant text could also be read differently, as Aquila does: ἐπι λόγου ἀλεθείας, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 162.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Kremser, Konrad, *Die Hochzeit des Königs. Exegetisch-theologische Untersuchungen zu Psalm 45* (ÖBS 51), Peter Lang, Berlin et al. 2019, 135-136.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Böhrer, *Psalmen 1-50*, 817, 824.

<sup>20</sup> Goulder, Michael D., *The Psalms of the Sons of Korah* (JSOTS 20), JSOT Press, Sheffield 1982, 127.

<sup>21</sup> Aquila agrees with this, cf. BHS Apparatus, note on Ps. 45,5; Field, *Fragmenta*, 162.

The translation *mansuetudinem iustitiae*, which the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> opts for, suggests that it interprets the passage as a construct connection. It cannot be clarified whether it presupposes the mentioned text variant וְעֹנֹת or not. In any case, it translates without inserting an additional copula.

b.

The translation of נֹרְאוֹת with θαυμαστῶς is unusual but not unique. Something similar can also be found in Psalm 68[67]:63.<sup>22</sup> In addition, however, here the Hebrew object becomes an adverb in Greek.

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> renounces the euphemism of the LXX and translates *terribilia*. At the same time, it mimics the Hebrew syntax more closely than the LXX, keeping the object rather than turning it into an adverb.

## v. 6

The LXX adds a word that has no equivalent in the MT: δυνατέ.<sup>23</sup> In v. 4 δυνατέ is the translation for גְּבוֹר. One may speculate that this word slipped here from v. 4 as a result of a transcription error, but it cannot be decided whether this happened first in Greek or in a hypothetical Hebrew version. The verse is divided into three cola in the Hebrew by Ole we-Yored and Atnach. The Göttingen Septuagint notes that some Greek manuscripts only have two cola.<sup>24</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> corresponds exactly to the MT, but only divides the verse into two cola.<sup>25</sup>

## v. 7

The LXX does not help to clarify the question of whether אֱלֹהִים should be understood here as a vocative, since this also remains unclear with ὁ θεός.<sup>26</sup> While there is no preposition before וְעַד עוֹלָם and the syntax of the sentence in the MT therefore remains ambiguous, the LXX adds εἰς to clarify it.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1624.

<sup>23</sup> Theodoret also knows an expanded and rearranged version of this verse: τα βελη σου γαρ ηκονημενα, δυνατε, εν καρδια των εχθρωντου βασιλεως, τουτων δε τρωθεντων λαοι υποκατω σου πεσουνται [Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.), *Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*, vol. X, *Psalmi cum Odis*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen <sup>3</sup>1979, 152.]; the Qumran fragment 11Q8 Frg. 8 (= 11QPsd Frg. 8) indicates an additional word that has not yet been clarified, cf. Kremser, *Die Hochzeit*, 39-40.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, 152.

<sup>25</sup> In *Ep.* LXV, 12, Jerome points out that *potentissime* is missing here in Hebrew.

<sup>26</sup> Aquila uses a vocative: θεέ, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 162; When the verse is quoted in Hebr 1:8, an understanding as vocative is to be assumed, cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1624.

With the translation *deus*, the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> does not contribute to a better understanding.<sup>27</sup> It also adds a preposition (which is used twice) where the MT has none and thereby clarifies the sentence in the same way as the LXX does.

## v. 8

aα.

While the other two fragrances, myrrh and cassia, are simply translated by the Septuagint, it writes for אהלֹות στακτη, which is actually an adjective meaning “dripping”.<sup>28</sup> However, Sirach 24:15 suggests that this word was also used to designate a fragrance or an oil.<sup>29</sup> The LXX adds καὶ between the second and the third fragrance, which has no correspondence in the MT.<sup>30</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> uses, probably following the LXX, the Greek foreign word *stacta* to render אהלֹות. In *Ep. LXV*, 14, Jerome specifically points out that the Hebrew word is *aloth* and uses the word *aloe* in his explanation. Like the LXX, the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> also adds *et* between the second and third fragrance and interprets this series as an enumeration.

aβ.

For כֹּל, the LXX writes ἀπὸ and may have read a different preposition here.

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> supplements the preposition *in*, which has no equivalent either in the MT or in the LXX, but ultimately confirms with its translation *cunctis* the MT.

bα.

מִן־הַיָּם the LXX unusually translates as ἀπὸ βάρεων,<sup>31</sup> in contrast to v. 16, where בַּיָּם is then rendered as εἰς ναὸν.

Strikingly, the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> proceeds in a similar way: Here it translates *de domibus*,<sup>32</sup> but in v. 16 *thalamum*.

<sup>27</sup> Jerome says in *Ep. LXV*, 13 that Aquila uses the vocative Θεε. Field puts this vocative in v. 7 (see note above), but Jerome seems to refer to v. 8 (which Field erroneously refers to as v. 9, so that there are two v. 9).

<sup>28</sup> Aquila has ἀλώθ instead, cf. Field, *Fragments*, 163.

<sup>29</sup> A Hebrew version of this Sirach passage is not yet known.

<sup>30</sup> Aquila omits it, cf. Field, *Fragments*, 163. However, a few Hebrew manuscripts attest to it, cf. BHS Apparatus, note on Ps. 45:9a.

<sup>31</sup> Aquila and Symmachus: ἀπὸ ναῶν, cf. Field, *Fragments*, 163.

<sup>32</sup> However in *Ep. LXV*, 14, Jerome mentions that an exact translation should read *de templo dentium*.

bβ.

The word מני is understood by the LXX as the preposition מן (in this case referring backwards),<sup>33</sup> which is why the LXX adds a relative pronoun. In contrast to this, modern translations almost always<sup>34</sup> translate as a noun (“musical instruments” or something similar), which serves as subject to “they pleased you”. However, if musical instruments are not mentioned here at all, the subject of “they pleased you” is missing. There does not seem to be a solution to this problem in the MT, nor in the LXX in the edition of Rahlfs / Hanhart.<sup>35</sup> One can only try to find the subject in the fragrances or the robes at the beginning of the verse, but in this case the sentence construction would be very cumbersome. Without punctuation, in both cases (MT and LXX) there would be the possibility of looking for the subject at the beginning of v. 10: “daughters of kings pleased you”. For the Hebrew, this would mean to ignore the Masoretic accents, but for the Greek only to ignore the punctuation of the modern critical edition.<sup>36</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> translates מני with *quibus*, which, however, should not be seen as relating spatially to the ivory halls, but instrumentally to the fragrances or the robes from the beginning of the verse. The syntax of the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> also makes it possible to take the daughters of kings at the beginning of v. 10 as the subject to the predicate at the end of v. 9. In *Ep. LXV*, 14, Jerome expressly confirms that he understands the text in this way.

## v. 10

a.

ביקרותיך is in the plural, ἐν τῇ τῆς σου, on the other hand, in the singular.<sup>37</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> here also has singular, like the LXX.

<sup>33</sup> The same applies to the other Greek translations, cf. Kremser, *Die Hochzeit*, 179-184.

<sup>34</sup> Only traditional Jewish translations have not adopted the idea that מני refers to musical instruments, cf. Feuer, Avrohom Chaim / Scherman, Nosson / Zlotowitz, Meir (eds.), *Tehillim. Psalms. A New Translation with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic and Rabbinic Sources*, vol. I (ArtScroll Tanach Series), Mesorah Publications, New York 2013, 569-570; Hirsch, Samson Raphael, *Die Psalmen übersetzt und erläutert*, vol. I, *Buch 1 und 2*, Kauffmann, Frankfurt am Main 1914, 250-251.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Kraus, Wolfgang / Karrer, Martin (eds.), *Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart 2009, 796, note 9a.

<sup>36</sup> Some Greek manuscripts and Theodoret indeed combine v. 9b and v. 10a in a single colon, cf. Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, 153; Kraus/Karrer, *Septuaginta Deutsch*, 796, note 10b; also the Qumran fragment 4Q85 Frg. 12 (=4QPs<sup>c</sup> Frg. 12) has v. 9b and v. 10a in a single line, cf. Kremser, *Die Hochzeit*, 40-41.

<sup>37</sup> That ביקר<sup>1</sup> can be translated as τμή is confirmed by Psalm 48[49], cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1624-1625.



bα.

לַשֵּׁל is most likely a Babylonian loan word meaning the chief wife of the king.<sup>38</sup> The LXX accordingly translates as βασιλισσα (unlike in Neh. 2:6).

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> has a different focus and translates *coniux*, which also seems justified. The Hebrew word according to Jerome's *Ep. LXV*, 15, is *segal*.

bβ.

The end of v. 10 poses a special challenge. Where the MT has **בַּכְתָּם אוֹפִיר** "goldsmith work from Ophir", the LXX gives a completely different text: ἐν ἱματισμῷ διαχρῦσῳ. It is not possible to explain in detail how this came about.<sup>39</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> gives no reference to Ophir here either. However, Jerome deals with the difficulties of this passage in *Ep. LXV*, 15. The whole phrase *in diademate aureo* seems to be his translation of **בַּכְתָּם**. While he does find the word *Ophir* in his Hebrew text and correctly understands it as a more detailed description of the gold, it is not clear to him what kind of gold is exactly meant by this. This seems to be the reason why he omits the word in his translation.<sup>40</sup>

c.

The last two words of this verse in the LXX, περιβεβλημένη πεποικιλμένη, which have no correspondence in the MT, are also found at the end of v. 14 and can be explained there from the Hebrew text (see below). It can therefore be assumed that from there they intentionally<sup>41</sup> or accidentally got to the end of v. 10.<sup>42</sup>

These additional words are not found in the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup>. Jerome briefly mentions the addition in *Ep. LXV*, 15, but does not go into it further.

<sup>38</sup> And not, for example, his mother, a possibility that has also been discussed, cf. Schroeder, Christoph, „A Love Song'. Psalm 45 in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Marriage Texts", CBQ 58/3 (1996) 417-432. Regarding the question of a gradual decline in meaning of this word, which led to the meaning "concubine", from which the later translations of Aquila, Symmachus and the fifth column can be explained, cf. Kremser, *Die Hochzeit*, 187-189; Field, *Fragmenta*, 163.

<sup>39</sup> The translations of Aquila and Symmachus are also not traceable. Only Theodotion brings a translation that matches the MT, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 163.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Hieronymus, *Ep. LXV*, 15.

<sup>41</sup> It might have happened intentionally, because with a change in the colometry (see above on v. 9) v. 10 gets quite short, which could have motivated an addition.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]", 1625; Rahlfs, *Psalms*, 153.

**v. 12**

The LXX renders the Hebrew copula at the beginning of the verse with ὅτι and then (unusually) an aorist follows for the Hebrew preformative conjugation.<sup>43</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> corresponds to MT and as expected, renders the preformative conjugation with the future tense.

**v. 12-13**

In v. 12 of the MT the “daughter” is addressed throughout. The following v. 13 then starts somewhat strangely with וּבַת־צָר, whereby either the same daughter or another one, who represents the city of Tyre, may be meant.<sup>44</sup> The LXX delimits the cola differently,<sup>45</sup> and a slightly different Hebrew consonant text must be assumed to explain the translation.<sup>46</sup> It is not clear either in the MT or in the LXX where the “gift” (in Greek plural) mentioned in the middle of the verse belongs: to the daughter (in Greek plural) or to the rich of the people?

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> follows the MT in the delimitation of the cola and corresponds exactly to it. This is particularly evident at the beginning of v. 13, where it has to deal with a difficult passage. Here it makes the decision to take וּבַת־צָר as a vocative: *et o filia fortissimi*. The city of Tyre is not mentioned. Jerome explains in *Ep. LXV*, 18, how he came to this translation. The Hebrew word he translates is *sor*, but he does not want to recognize the city of Tyre in it. The “gifts”, which are plural like in the LXX, denote in the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> the manner in which the rich of the people beseech the face of the daughter.

**v. 13**

Some manuscripts add της γης at the end (perhaps under the influence of v. 17b), for which there is no equivalent in the MT.<sup>47</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> does not know this addition.

<sup>43</sup> However, some manuscripts have the expected future tense, cf. Kraus/Karrer, *Septuaginta Deutsch*, 796, note 12a; Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, 153.

<sup>44</sup> Whether צָר means here Tyre cannot be clarified with absolute certainty. Other translations are found in Aquila and Symmachus, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 164; Kremser, *Die Hochzeit*, 209-212.

<sup>45</sup> The last verb of the Hebrew v. 12 is pulled to v. 13.

<sup>46</sup> In particular, predicate and subject are in the plural, cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1625. Different manuscripts offer different variants, which cannot be discussed here, cf. Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, 153. Aquila, Theodotion and Symmachus are closer to the Hebrew text, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 164.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, 153.

**v. 14**

a.

The LXX interprets the “ה” at the end of כבודה as an enclitic personal pronoun 3.f.sg.<sup>48</sup> Since the king’s daughter, to whom this refers, is named immediately afterwards, this leads to a cumbersome sentence construction. It is more obvious to interpret כבודה as a feminine nominal formation of כבד.<sup>49</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> has no difficulties with this passage and shows no additional personal pronoun.

b.

Instead of εσωθεν, some manuscripts have εσεβων, which can probably be interpreted as a place name for Heshbon and has no counterpart in the MT.<sup>50</sup>

Jerome mentions in *Ep. LXV*, 19, the translation *esebon* and thinks that this means *cogitationes*.

**v. 14-15:**

The translation of the LXX can be explained by a division of the cola that differs from the MT. It moves the first Hebrew word from v. 15 to the end of v. 14.<sup>51</sup> The LXX does not take לבושה – like modern translations – as a noun with a suffix, but as a passive participle of לבש, which is grammatically possible.<sup>52</sup> Surprisingly, in this case the colometry of the LXX makes more sense than that of the MT, even regarding the Hebrew syntax. According to Jenni, “Die hebräischen Präpositionen”, לרקמות in connection with the verb of motion תובל (from יבל) should be understood in such a way that the preposition ל indicates the direction of the movement, so that it would have to be translated: “She is brought to a colorfully knitted, to the king.”<sup>53</sup> So, contrary to the usual understanding that the daughter is dressed in knitted fabrics when she is escorted to the king, the knitted things must represent the whereabouts of the king or the king himself. However,

<sup>48</sup> Some manuscripts also omit the resulting αὐτῆς, cf. Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, 153.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1625; Stenmans, Peter, „כָּבֵד kābeḏ II–V“, ThWAT 4 (1984) 17–23, here 22–23.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Kraus/Karrer, *Septuaginta Deutsch*, 796, note 14b; Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, 153.

<sup>51</sup> Symmachus’ and Aquila’s translations differ markedly from the LXX and from each other, but they too move the first Hebrew word of v. 15 to the end of v. 14, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 164.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1625.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Jenni, Ernst, *Die hebräischen Präpositionen*, vol. III, *Die Präposition Lamed*, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart et al. 2000, 84–85 (Rubrik 3), 93 (Rubrik 3311), 94 (Rubrik 3315), 270 (Rubrik 86), 271 (Rubrik 8684).

if one adds this word to v. 14, like the LXX does, the problem is solved: Since לבושה already has a suffix, לרקמות can be added using the preposition "ל": "her colorfully knitted garment".

The cola of the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> correspond to the MT. However, like the LXX, it also takes לבושה as the passive participle of לבש. לרקמות is understood (against Jenni) as a statement of circumstances at the beginning of v. 15.

### v. 15

In this and in the following verse the MT shows a play on words. The two verbs יבל and בוא return in v. 16. The LXX puts the whole (remaining) verse in the plural<sup>54</sup> and relates the two verbs, which are uniformly translated ἀπενεχθήσονται, to the two groups of women.<sup>55</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> corresponds to MT in that it leaves the first verb in the singular referring to the king's daughter, but it unifies the verbs in a similar way as the LXX does by using a passive form of *duco* twice. In addition, it also translates אחריה as a verb: *sequentur eam*. It can only be assumed that it read אחרוה.

### v. 16

a-b.

Here, too, the first verb is translated ἀπενεχθήσονται, this time in accordance with the MT. The second verb, on the other hand, is now translated differently.

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> mimics the play on words of the LXX, not that of the MT. The first verb is again translated *duco* in the passive, the second differently.

b.

בהיכל is translated εἰς ναόν, i.e. with the highly theologically charged word to be expected in the Psalter (unlike in v. 9).<sup>56</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> now uses *thalamum*, a word used for the bridal chamber in Ps. 18:6 (Vg<sup>Hebr</sup>). Elsewhere in the Vg, it is also used for rooms of the temple in Ezek. 40. It can hardly be denied that Jerome wants to give the Psalm a specific theological meaning by this kind of translation.

<sup>54</sup> Possibly due to a translation error and under the influence of v. 16a, cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1625-1626.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1625-1626.

<sup>56</sup> „Dies erlaubt eine allegorisierende Gleichsetzung des Königs mit Gott“. [Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1626.]

**v. 17**

αα.

The first verb of the MT is in the prefix conjugation, which the LXX unusually renders with the aorist. Contrary to what Brucker suggests, this does not necessarily mean that according to the LXX the sons were already born in the past. It can also serve to generalize and allegorize the text.<sup>57</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> translates this first verb, as expected, with future tense.

αβ.

Instead of σοι υιοί, some manuscripts formulate closer to Hebrew: υιοι σου.<sup>58</sup>

With *fili tibi* the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> follows the LXX rather than the MT. In *Ep.* LXV, 20, Jerome takes the view that up to and including v. 17 the *sponsa*, i.e. the king's daughter, is addressed. However, it is not clear whether this is a theological interpretation of the Latin translation, or whether he thinks that the daughter is already being addressed in the Hebrew text. In the latter case, he must have known a different vocalization than in the MT.<sup>59</sup>

**v. 18**

α.

While in the MT the "I" (the poet) from the beginning of the psalm once again speaks up, the LXX has 3.m.pl.: It is the sons who will remember the name.<sup>60</sup>

In the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup>, as in the MT, the "I" from the beginning has its say again.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Brucker, „Psalm 44[45]“, 1626. Aquila has future tense, Symmachus aorist, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 164.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, 154; Kraus/Karrer, *Septuaginta Deutsch*, 796, notes 17a, 18a; likewise Symmachus, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 164.

<sup>59</sup> Earlier in his interpretation, Hieronymus repeatedly asked which voice was speaking and gave interpretations that were strongly influenced by his theological point of view. So far, however, this has not been relevant to the question of translation.

<sup>60</sup> Some manuscripts as well as Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion have according to MT 1.sg., cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 164; Rahlfs, *Psalmi*, 154.

b.

The short phrase at the end in the MT, **לעלם ועד**, is embellished in the LXX – as elsewhere in the Psalms, but differently than in v. 7 – *το εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος*.<sup>61</sup>

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> uses exactly the same phrase as in v. 7.

### 3. Summary

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> usually follows the Hebrew text closely and confirms the reading of the MT. In some cases, mostly when the text does not present any particular difficulties and it is simply a matter of making it easier to read, the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> is closer to the LXX than to the MT, as the following overview will show.

The only important exception from this seems to be the word **יפיפית** in v. 3a. It would be useful to check whether the LXX (and other Greek versions) and the Vg reflect Hebrew reduplication as intensification in other cases. If not, it should be assumed that the Hebrew text, which the LXX and the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> used for their translations, was different from the Hebrew text attested in the MT.

Concerning Vg<sup>Hebr</sup>'s deviation from the MT and the LXX in v. 15 when translating the word **אחריה**, the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> seems to have read "י" instead of "י'". However, since Jerome does not discuss this translation further in his letter<sup>62</sup> (and Field does not know of any other versions<sup>63</sup>), the question can hardly be pursued further.

#### Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> + MT vs. LXX

The Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> confirms the MT against the LXX in many cases. This is true for the additional personal pronoun that the LXX has in v. 4, but not the MT and the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup>; for the interpretation of the double **והדרך** at the transition from v. 4 to v. 5, which the LXX interprets as two different roots, while the MT and the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> as the same; in v. 5 the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> confirms the MT regarding the presence of the root **רככ** against the LXX; also in v. 5 the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> shows through its translation *mansuetudinem iustitiae* that it does not understand **וענוה־צדק**, like the LXX, as the second and third part of an enumeration; at the end of v. 5 it confirms the MT against the LXX, which formulates more freely; in v. 6 the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> (apart from the number of cola) corresponds exactly to the MT, in contrast to the LXX, which adds a word; in v. 8, where the MT brings the word instead of an **כל** expected preposition, the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> confirms exactly this reading, but also adds a preposition in Latin; the text of the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> speaks against the addition that the LXX has at the end of v. 10; at the beginning of v. 12 the Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> shows none of the peculiarities of the LXX but corresponds to

<sup>61</sup> Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion stay closer to Hebrew, cf. Field, *Fragmenta*, 164.

<sup>62</sup> Hieronymus, *Ep.* LXV, 20.

<sup>63</sup> Field, *Fragmenta*, 164

the MT; in the particularly difficult transition from v. 12 to v. 13, where the LXX offers a significantly different but clear and understandable text, the  $Vg^{Hebr}$  follows the MT exactly and is able to make sense of it; at the end of v. 13 it agrees with the MT that the addition some LXX manuscripts offer is not included; at the beginning of v. 14 it avoids the problems unnecessarily raised by the LXX regarding the word כבודה; at the transition from v. 14 to v. 15 the  $Vg^{Hebr}$  agrees with the MT against the LXX in the colometry; at the beginning of v. 15 it puts the first verb in the singular and refers it to the king's daughter, like the MT but differently from the LXX; in v. 17 the  $Vg^{Hebr}$  translates the first verb in prefix conjugation, as expected (but unlike the LXX), with the future tense; in line with the MT and in contrast to the LXX, the "I" that spoke at the beginning has its say again in v. 18 of the  $Vg^{Hebr}$ .

### **$Vg^{Hebr}$ + LXX vs. MT**

In v. 2b the  $Vg^{Hebr}$ , in agreement with the LXX, formulates a verbal sentence in the present tense, not a nominal sentence like the MT; perhaps the most significant correspondence of LXX and  $Vg^{Hebr}$  against the MT is found in v. 3a: The word יפיפית, which is difficult to interpret in Hebrew and possibly arose from a transcription error, is rendered with a two-part expression; in v. 7 the  $Vg^{Hebr}$ , similar to the LXX, adds a preposition where the MT has none and thereby clarifies the meaning of the sentence; in v. 9 the  $Vg^{Hebr}$ , just like the LXX, adds a copula between the second and the third fragrance and thus clarifies that it is a tripartite enumeration; at the transition from v. 9 to v. 10, the syntax of the LXX and of the  $Vg^{Hebr}$  makes it possible to take the "daughters of kings" at the beginning of v. 10 as the subject to the predicate at the end of v. 9, which would also be possible with regard to the Hebrew consonant text, but contradicts the sentence structure given by the accents of the MT; insignificant seems to be that the  $Vg^{Hebr}$  like the LXX renders ביקרותיך as a singular; all the more important is the question about the words at the end of v. 10: Like the LXX, the  $Vg^{Hebr}$  makes no reference to Ophir; while in v. 13 the  $Vg^{Hebr}$  strictly follows the MT, although it is difficult to understand, it surprisingly puts the "gifts" in the plural like the LXX does; in v. 15-16 the  $Vg^{Hebr}$  does not imitate the play on words of the MT, but that of the LXX; finally in v. 17 the  $Vg^{Hebr}$  follows with the translation *fili tibi* rather the LXX than the MT.

### **$Vg^{Hebr}$ + MT + LXX interpret the Hebrew consonant text in unison**

In v. 5 MT, LXX and  $Vg^{Hebr}$  read the consonant text in such a way that they take על-דבר as a related phrase, not רכב על.

### **$Vg^{Hebr}$ + LXX interpret MT in unison**

In v. 2 LXX and  $Vg^{Hebr}$  agree (contrary to modern knowledge) that the meaning of מהיר is "quick"; in v. 8 the  $Vg^{Hebr}$  agrees with the LXX that מני is a preposition (and not musical instruments); in v. 9  $Vg^{Hebr}$  uses the Greek foreign word *stacta*, which is also found in the LXX; the Hebrew

term **היכל** is translated differently in **Vg<sup>Hebr</sup>** in v. 9 and in v. 16, just like the LXX does; in v. 10 the **Vg<sup>Hebr</sup>** confirms that **שגל** signifies the king's chief wife, whom the LXX calls "queen"; in v. 14, the **Vg<sup>Hebr</sup>** like the LXX (and contrary to modern interpretations), interprets **לבושה** as passive participle of **לבש**.

### **Vg<sup>Hebr</sup> vs. MT + LXX**

In v. 15 the **Vg<sup>Hebr</sup>** translates **אחריה** like it is a verb 3.pl.SK with an enclitic personal pronoun 3.f.sg., which is hardly possible unless its consonant text template read **אחרוה**; the LXX (ὀπίσω αὐτῆς), on the other hand, agrees with the MT.