

Croatian Slavonic Translations of Isaiah and the "Telephone Game"

Andrew R. Corin

The issue addressed in this celebratory essay is the relevance of the Hebrew original to the analysis of Slavonic translations, from Greek and Latin, of Hebrew Biblical texts. One central conclusion will be that it is not merely the Hebrew text that is relevant, but also its interpretive tradition. This is true even when (as is usually the case) a Greek and/or Latin translation intervenes between the original and the Slavonic text, and even if no striking circumstance suggests the need to consult the Hebrew original.

1. Introduction

In the analysis of Biblical translations from Hebrew directly into a second language, attention is due both to the Hebrew text and its interpretive framework, as there are numerous locations in which even the simple reading of the text is clarified by an interpretive tradition. The analyst of a Slavonic version, however, might assume that interpretation of the Hebrew text relevant to translation had been addressed sufficiently in an intervening Greek or Latin version from which the Slavic translator had worked. Yet, to a greater or lesser extent, the Hebrew text and its interpretation remain relevant to the analysis of indirect renderings into Slavonic through a Greek or Latin intermediary. In this essay, I will illustrate this relevance on the basis of a short excerpt from Isaiah found in the Croatian Church Slavonic missals.

2. Versions of Croatian Church Slavonic (CCS) Liturgical Texts

In the analysis of Biblical translations found in CCS liturgical codices, it has become customary to distinguish between an A version (older, redacted probably in the 2nd quarter of the 13th century) and a younger B version (Corin 1991). The A version is typically closer to the Greek from which it was originally translated, with a smaller number of adaptations toward the Vulgate (V). The B version, in contrast, typically shows greater adaptation toward V, though this pattern does not hold in regard to every detail. There may be a distinct pairing of A and B versions in each of the two major liturgical books—the missal and the breviary. The various versions (A and B; missal

and breviary) may show complex patterns of development over time, including contamination among the versions and further adaptation toward V.

3. Relevance of the Hebrew Text (H)

Analysts of Slavonic Biblical texts typically refer to H when circumstances suggest the need. Investigators of the East Slavonic book of Esther, for example, obviously examined H in their attempt to determine whether a Greek version interceded between the original and the Slavonic translation (Lunt & Taube). An example of a different nature arose in regard to the book of Jonah (Corin 2002). The CCS versions were translated from the Septuagint (S) and subsequently corrected against V. Yet recourse to H proved necessary to resolve an anomaly, in verse 3:3 of the A version of the missal, which cannot be explained by reference to internal developments within the Slavonic text, S or V. The H wording is itself problematical, and has been the subject of exegesis. It would appear that one 12th–13th century Jewish interpretation of the phrase came to be reflected in the literal wording of the missal's A version, just as occurred later in the King James version (KJ, English translation from the original completed in 1611).¹ However, where there is no such outstanding circumstance, it is a common practice to restrict analysis to the immediate Greek and/or Latin textual antecedents of a Slavonic version.

Still, despite its usually indirect relationship to them, H remains relevant, on general grounds, to analysis of the Slavonic versions, if only because H can never have been entirely without relevance to the producers and readers of those versions. Since reliance on translation is predicated on the belief that the translation adequately transmits the content of the original, the question of just what that original looked like and what issues it presented must have arisen in the minds of medieval Slavic translators, redactors and readers on numerous occasions. From time to time, this question must inevitably have surfaced in a form relevant to the redaction of Slavonic textual versions, especially when difficulties in the text could not be fully resolved by reference to available Greek or Latin versions. While this question might have been idle in times in which Christian scholarship lacked access to the original texts or the linguistic proficiency necessary for their use, the relevant knowledge did develop over time. In Paris, this process was underway in the 12th and 13th centuries (Corin 2002), which was early enough for Christian interest in the Hebrew text of Jonah 3:3 to find reflection in the A version of the CCS missal.

On a second general ground, reference to H allows analysts to view the Slavonic versions in the broader perspective of the overall development of the

¹ The difficulty concerns the description of the size of the city of Nineveh (H צָרְיָהוּ הַגְּדוֹלָה לְאֵלֹהִים). In the translations, this is rendered: S πόλις μεγάλη τῶ θεῶ; V *civitas magna Dei*; A *grad' veli zēlo*; B *grad' velik'*; KJ *an exceeding great city*.

text. Through H we can gauge, in fact—gradual divergence from the translations. The scholarly literature treats translations as being “faithful” to the sense in which this can ever be understood from H, as will be illustrated below.

A third basis for the relevance of H to meaning during the translation process is the text on the part of the earliest translators, which were in part interpretive, rather than literal. Interpretive translation can be observed in the intention of the translators to preserve the meaning of the original text.

Yet a fourth general ground for the relevance of H derives from the perspective gained from the *per se* of the text, but also the role of H in the functional role. The language and the meaning are dependent of one another. To return to the story of Jonah, the role of Jonah plays a prominent role in Jewish liturgy during the afternoon service. The theme of repentance and repentance is discussed within the community during the service. One aspect that is often discussed is it is precisely in the expression of the theme that an anomalous wording occurs in H (the missal). It was therefore inevitable that the theme of exegesis. An excerpt from Jonah 3:3 thus gained elevated prominence in the role of Jonah in Jewish liturgy that is reflected in the Hebrew text would necessarily be reflected in the Slavonic text, including some who, following the lead of the Hebrew text brought their ideas to bear in a manner that is in use in Christian communities.

² “Telephone game” is a well-known game in which a message during indirect transmission. The first person whispers a brief message to a second person, who then whispers it to a third person, etc. By the time the message reaches the third person, it is often quite different from its original version, even if participants are trying to be faithful to the message.

³ Lunt and Taube, for example (1994: 34) state: “Every other book of the Hebrew Bible has its faithful rendering (at least one, of course).” Lunt and Taube generally (1994: 350) that “It is also a common practice to reproduce the Greek faithfully.”

of development over time, in-
and further adaptation toward V.

refer to H when circumstances
avonic book of Esther, for exam-
t to determine whether a Greek
the Slavonic translation (Lunt &
se in regard to the book of Jonah
ated from the Septuagint (S) and
rse to H proved necessary to re-
on of the missal, which cannot be
ents within the Slavonic text, S or
l has been the subject of exegesis.
ry Jewish interpretation of the
rding of the missal's A version,
ion (KJ), English translation from
where there is no such outstand-
restrict analysis to the immediate
lavonic version.

ship to them, H remains relevant,
ic versions, if only because H can
to the producers and readers of
s predicated on the belief that the
t of the original, the question of
at issues it presented must have
slators, redactors and readers on
is question must inevitably have
of Slavonic textual versions, espe-
be fully resolved by reference to
question might have been idle in
access to the original texts or the
the relevant knowledge did de-
underway in the 12th and 13th
ough for Christian interest in the
the A version of the CCS missal.
to H allows analysts to view the
of the overall development of the

text. Through H we can gauge, *inter alia*, the extent of "telephone game"² ef-
fect—gradual divergence from the original over the course of successive
translations. The scholarly literature is replete with references to particular
translations as being "faithful" to their original,³ yet there is no meaningful
sense in which this can ever be entirely true, even in the S and V translations
from H, as will be illustrated below.

A third basis for the relevance of H, distinct from accidental drift of
meaning during the translation process, stems from conscious shaping of the
text on the part of the earliest translators, through translation techniques that
were in part interpretive, rather than literal. Among the ancient versions, in-
terpretive translation can be observed even in S and V, despite the apparent
intention of the translators to preserve meaning, rather than elaborate upon it.

Yet a fourth general ground for recourse to H in scholarly analysis de-
rives from the perspective gained by understanding not merely the language
per se of the text, but also the role of the text in the milieu in which it played a
functional role. The language and function of the text are not, ultimately, in-
dependent of one another. To return to the previous example, the book of Jo-
nah plays a prominent role in Jewish liturgy. It is read in full to the gathered
community during the afternoon service of Yom Kippur, to which its explo-
ration of the theme of repentance is uniquely suited. The text is often dis-
cussed within the community during Yom Kippur and in the days leading up
to it. One aspect that is often discussed is the size of the city of Nineveh, and
it is precisely in the expression of this size and its significance that seemingly
anomalous wording occurs in H (and, subsequently, version A of the CCS
missal). It was therefore inevitable that this location would become the topic
of exegesis. An excerpt from Jonah was read by Catholics during Lent, and
thus gained elevated prominence in the lectionary. Yet it is by considering the
role of Jonah in Jewish liturgy that we come to understand why this location
in the Hebrew text would necessarily draw the attention of Jewish scholars,
including some who, following conversion to Christianity, might have
brought their ideas to bear in a manner that could affect the versions of Jonah
in use in Christian communities.

² "Telephone game" is a well-known technique for demonstrating distortion of a
message during indirect transmission. It is played by a circle of people. One person
whispers a brief message to a second person, who then whispers the same message to
a third person, etc. By the time the message comes full circle, it may differ significantly
from its original version, even if participants attempt to faithfully transmit the original
message.

³ Lunt and Taube, for example (1994: 347), report a claim by Charles C. Torrey that
"Every other book of the Hebrew Bible [other than Esther, AC], whatever its nature,
has its faithful rendering (at least one, often several) in Greek." They go on to remark
generally (1994: 350) that "It is also a commonplace that Slavonic translations usually
reproduce the Greek faithfully."

size of the city of Nineveh (H צִיר־בְּדוֹלֵהָ (H
ὁλις μεγάλη τῶ θεῶ; V *civitas magna*
great city.)

It stands to reason that these same general considerations would hold true in regard to texts that, on the surface, present no such striking anomaly as that encountered in verse 3:3 of Jonah, or striking circumstance such as the apparent absence of a Greek translation intervening between the Hebrew and the Slavonic versions of the book of Esther.

The following brief notes concern one such passage in which there is no glaring anomaly that cries out for examination of the Hebrew original. Yet an examination of H reveals issues relevant to an understanding of the CCS versions, and thus allows for a fuller appreciation of the development of the Slavonic text and its place in the overall textual history of Isaiah. The issues that arise include interpretive (non-literal) Greek and Latin renderings, and a number of seemingly minor discrepancies between the simple reading H and the translations that nevertheless contribute to a gradual "telephone game" effect. These include at least one instance that may have originated through instability in H itself.

4. Isaiah 1:16–20: Functional Role of the Text

Portions of the first chapter of Isaiah are read in both the Jewish Sabbath morning liturgy and Catholic liturgy of the Mass.⁴ In the Jewish liturgy, verses 1–27 are read as the haftarah (supplementary reading from the prophets) that accompanies the first portion of the book of Deuteronomy. In the Slavonic Catholic liturgy of the 13th–15th centuries, Isaiah 1:16–20 was read late in the Lenten season. In both liturgies, these verses were read in a period of the year laden with expectation not without parallel in its factual basis, yet very different in its significance and the emotions that it evoked.

In the Jewish liturgy, this haftarah is one of three read during the period of grief leading up to the anniversary of the destruction of the First and Second Temple. These haftarot (pl. of haftarah) are referred to collectively as the haftarot of affliction, recalling the iniquities that resulted in the destruction of the Temple and the exile that followed. Each, however, concludes on a note of consolation, promising that the approaching destruction was not to be final and eternal, and that a time of consolation would ultimately follow. The prophecy of Isaiah in Chapter 1 expresses an offer of cleansing and redemption also in its verses 16–20, in addition to the promise of ultimate rebuilding and redemption in verses 26–27.

Isaiah 1:16–20 are the same five verses from Chapter 1 that were read in the Slavonic Catholic liturgy during Lent. For Catholics, this is also a period in which grief over imminent loss is mixed with the expectation of future re-

demption, but during which the holiday soon to follow and its ce-
verses thus had elevated visible
drama of their expression of con-
posed to the harsh rebuke contain-
pending calamity which they her-
full of blood," while verse 1:21 o-
harlot ..."

The message of these five v-
simple metonymy accessible to li-
sophisticated symbolism, allusio-
tract from the immediacy of its-
the attention of the simple as we-
that its prominence would offer-
during the process of translation.
of the passage, there are multip-
during the translation process th-
or interpretive translation.

5. Original Text and Translations o

Isaiah 1:16–20 appears in CCS :
1:16–19 appear in missals contain-
and KJ,⁶ are as follows:

A (based on III4):

16 Se glagolet' gospodi, izmi-
duši vaših' i zlae pomišleniē
vaših' 17 i učite se dobro i
sudēte siru opravdēte vdov-
gospodi. Ače budut' grēsi va-
budut' ēko črvleni, ēko vln-
vičnete me blagaē zemlskaē s-
vičnete me oružie poēst' vi us

⁵ An inventory and description of the

⁶ Readings from KJ have been inclu-
language glosses for the readings
independent translation from H din-
available at the time of its compilati-
comparison with A, B, S, and V.

⁴ I leave aside on this occasion the development of Isaiah in the Orthodox Slavonic traditions (on which a significant literature exists), as well as the more extensive readings from Isaiah, including Chapter 1, which are presented serially in some of the CCS breviaries for reading during the Advent season.

demption, but during which the community could look forward to the Easter holiday soon to follow and its celebration of the resurrection. While these five verses thus had elevated visibility in the Slavonic Catholic liturgy, the full drama of their expression of consolation emerges only in relief, when juxtaposed to the harsh rebuke contained in the surrounding passages and the impending calamity which they heralded. Verse 1:15 concludes "Your hands are full of blood," while verse 1:21 continues "How the faithful city has become a harlot ..."

The message of these five verses is expressed in language that employs simple metonymy accessible to listeners of minimal education, and is bereft of sophisticated symbolism, allusion and other coded meaning that would detract from the immediacy of its appeal. This is thus a text which could hold the attention of the simple as well as the learned. One might expect, in turn, that its prominence would offer some degree of protection to its integrity during the process of translation. Yet, despite this prominence and the brevity of the passage, there are multiple locations in which the text has "drifted" during the translation process through unintentional "telephone game" effect or interpretive translation.

5. Original Text and Translations of Isaiah 1:16–20

Isaiah 1:16–20 appears in CCS missals containing version A, while verses 1:16–19 appear in missals containing version B.⁵ The A and B versions, H, S, V and KJ,⁶ are as follows:

A (based on III4):

16 Se glagoleť gospodi, izmiite se čisti budete. Otiměte lukavstvie ot duši vaših' i zilaě pomišleniě vaša ot očiju moeju. Ostaněte se ot zlobi vaših' 17 i učite se dobro tvoriti. Ičěte suda izbavěte obidimago, suděte siru opravděte vdovicu. 18 Priděte i obličěte me glagoletu gospodi. Ačě budut' grěsi vaši ěko bročni, ěko sněg' oběljějut'. Ačě li budut' ěko črvleni, ěko vlma oběljějut'. 19 Ačě vshočete i poslušati vičnete me blagaě zemlskaě sněste. 20 Ačě li ne vshočete i neposlušati vičnete me oružie počest' vi usta že gospodna se glagolaše.

⁵ An inventory and description of these manuscripts can be found in Corin 1991.

⁶ Readings from KJ have been included in this essay primarily to serve as English language glosses for the readings from A, B, S, V, and H. Nevertheless, as an independent translation from H directly into English, utilizing all of the resources available at the time of its compilation (1604–11), it provides an additional basis for comparison with A, B, S, and V.

B (based on Novak):

16 Se glagoleti gospodi bogi omiite se i čisti budete. Otimize zlomišleniē' vaša ot očiju moeju. Ostanite se zla tvoriti 17 i učite se dobro tvoriti. Ičite suda prava pomozite pognetenom. Sudite siroti opravdaite v'dovicu. 18 Pridite i obličite me glagoleti gospodi. Ače buduti grěsi vaši ěko bročni, ěko sněg' oběljějuti. I ače buduti ěko č'rvleni ěko vl'na běla oběljějuti. 19 Ače vshočete i vsposlušaeete me (Novak: "vsposlušaeete me" corrected to "vshočete (i) vsposlušaeete me"; Berlin, Ill8, LjI: Ače v'shočete pos'lušati me; VbI follows version A) blaga zemlskaē sniste. Reče gospodi vsemogi.

H (following HUB, with cantillation omitted):

16 כְּחַצְוֹ הַזֶּה הִסִּירוּ ר' ע' מִשְׁלֵיכֶם מִגֵּד עֵינֵי חַתְּלוֹ הַרְעוּ: 17 לְמַדוּ הַיָּטִב דְּרָשׁוּ מִשְׁפָּט אֲשֶׁר
 חָזַק וְיָשׁוּטוּ יְהוָה מִיָּבוֹ אֲלֵמְנָה: 18 לְכֹרְנָא וְנִנְכְּהָ י' אִמְרַי אִם-יִהְיֶה חֲסִידֵיכֶם בְּשָׁנִים בְּשָׁלָל
 יִלְבִּינוּ אִם-יִלְאָדִימוּ כְּתוֹלַע בְּצִמְרֵי יְהוָה: 19 אִם-תִּאָּבוּ וְשִׁמְעֵמֶם טוֹב הַרְאָה תִּאָּכְלוּ:
 (אִם-תִּקְרָאוּ וְיִמְרִיאוּ עֲרֵב תִּקְרָאוּ כִּי פִי י' דָּבָר:

S (following SG):

16 λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένησθε, ἀφέλετε τὰς πονηρίας ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν ἀπέναντι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου, παύσασθε ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν, 17 μάθετε καλὸν ποιεῖν, ἐκζητήσατε κρίσιν, ῥύσασθε ἀδικούμενον, κρίνατε ὀρφανῶ καὶ δικαιοῦσατε χήραν · 18 καὶ δεῦτε καὶ διελεγχθῶμεν, λέγει κύριος, καὶ ἐὰν ὣσιν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν ὡς φοινικοῦν, ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ, ἐὰν δὲ ὣσιν ὡς κόκκινον, ὡς ἔριον λευκανῶ. 19 καὶ ἐὰν θέλητε καὶ εἰσακούσητέ μου, τὰ ἀγαθὰ τῆς γῆς φάγεσθε · 20 ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλητε μηδὲ εἰσακούσητέ μου, μάχαιρα ὑμᾶς κατέδεται · τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου ἐλάλησε ταῦτα.

V (following BS, with capitalization and punctuation added):

16 Lavamini, mundi estote; auferte malum cogitationum vestrarum ab oculis meis: quiescite agere perverse, 17 discite benefacere; quaerite iudicium, subvenite oppresso, iudicate pupillo, defendite viduam. 18 Et venite, et arguite me, dicit Dominus. Si fuerint peccata vestra ut coccinum, quasi nix dealbabuntur; et si fuerint rubra quasi vermiculus, velut lana (alba) erunt. 19 Si volueritis, et audieritis me, bona terrae comeditis. 20 Quod si nolueritis, et me provocaveritis ad iracundiam, gladius devorabit vos, quia os Domini locutum est.

⁷ Some manuscripts have a small space between *zlo* and *mišleniē*, indicating scribal uncertainty as to the reading of this phrase.

KJ:

16 Wash you, make you clea before mine eyes; cease to do relieve the oppressed, judge Come now, and let us reas sins be as scarlet, they shall like crimson, they shall be a ye shall eat the good of the l: be devoured with the sword it.

6. A and B Compared against S, V,

Comparison of the several correspondences:

6.1. Differences between A : from, nor bring it closer to, S, examples CCS forms are given in

6.1.1. A lexical or morpholog omiite se (בְּרָשָׁה / *Lavamini* / λούσα ὀρφανῶ / *the fatherless*); *opravděte* / *plead for*).

6.1.2. Expression of future t differ: *i poslušati vičnete* / *i v'sposlu* / and [be] obedient).

6.1.3. The following example added word in B is viewed as bri (בְּרָשָׁה / *iudicium* / κρίσιν / *judgmen*

6.2. Verse 1:18: *Ače li budut' ē et si fuerint rubra* / ἐὰν δὲ ὣσιν ὡ which translates most simply in conditional sentence (cf. verses meaning. KJ offers an interpretiv of concessive meaning (*though*; cf. 1:20). S (ἐὰν δὲ) and V (*et si*), and each employing a conditional α junction *et si*, as such, expresses how medieval Croatian readers in

KJ:

16 Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil: 17 Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. 18 Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. 19 If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land: 20 But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.

6. A and B Compared against S, V, H, and KJ

Comparison of the several versions shows, *inter alia*, the following correspondences:

6.1. Differences between A and B that neither distance one or the other from, nor bring it closer to, S, V or H. These include (in the following examples CCS forms are given in the order A/B):

6.1.1. A lexical or morphological difference between A and B: *izmiite se / omiite se* (רָחַץ / *Lavamini* / λούσασθε / *Wash you*); *siru / siroti* (יָתוֹם / *pupillo* / ὀρφανῶ / *the fatherless*); *opravděte / opravdaite* (רִיבּוּ / *defendite* / καὶ δικαιώσατε / *plead for*).

6.1.2. Expression of future tense, a feature in which A and B regularly differ: *i poslušati vīcnete / i v'sposlušate* (וְשָׁמַעְתֶּם / *et audieritis* / καὶ εἰσακούσητέ / *and [be] obedient*).

6.1.3. The following example may be included in this category, unless the added word in B is viewed as bringing the text closer to V): *suda / suda prava* (טִשְׁפִּיחַ / *iudicium* / κρίσιον / *judgment*).

6.2. Verse 1:18: *Ače li budut' ěko črvleni / I ače buduti ěko čr'oleni* (אִם יִבְיֶהוּ אֶדְמִימִים / *et si fuerint rubra* / ἐὰν δὲ ὦσιν ὡς κόκκινον / *though they be red*). Hebrew אִם, which translates most simply into English as "if," marks the protasis of a conditional sentence (cf. verses 1:19–20), but can also express concessive meaning. KJ offers an interpretive translation through its explicit expression of concessive meaning (*though*; cf. the translation of אִם as *if* in verses 1:19 and 1:20). S (ἐὰν δὲ) and V (*et si*), and through them A and B, remain closer to H, each employing a conditional conjunction. Still, the Latin compound conjunction *et si*, as such, expresses concessive meaning, and it is not obvious how medieval Croatian readers interpreted the expression in B, which follows

se i čisti budete. Otimate se zla tvoriti 17 i učite se pognetenomu. Sudite siroti me glagoleti gospodi. Ače obelējuti. I ače buduti ěko vshočete i vsposlušate me "vshočete (i) vsposlušate išati me; VbI follows version semogi.

ted):

16 רָחַץ תְּבַרְכֵנוּ הַיְיָ רֵעֵנוּ מִכָּל עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ 17 לָמַדְנוּ לַעֲשׂוֹת טוֹב וְלִישׁוֹעַת הַיְיָ יִבְיֶהוּ אֶדְמִימִים כְּתוֹלַעַת כְּצִמְרֵי יִהְיֶה אֶדְמִימִים וְיִמְרִיטוּ אֶת פִּי יְיָ

ετε τὰς πονηρίας ἀπὸ τῶν μου, παύσασθε ἀπὸ τῶν ποιεῖν, ἐκζητήσατε κρίσιν, καὶ δικαιώσατε χήραν · 18 κύριος, καὶ ἐὰν ὦσιν αἱ λευκανῶ, ἐὰν δὲ ὦσιν ὡς ἄν θέλητε καὶ εἰσακούσητέ 19 ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλητε μηδὲ εται · τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου

punctuation added):

lum cogitationum vestrarum erse, 17 discite benefacere; iudicate pupillo, defendite t Dominus. Si fuerint peccata tur; et si fuerint rubra quasi ñ volueritis, et audieritis me, ritis, et me provocaveritis ad os Domini locutum est.

a zlo and mišleniě, indicating scribal

V (*i aĉe*; cf. modern Serbian/Croatian *iako* "although" vs. *i ako* "and if" or "even if").

6.3. Verse 1:18: *aĉe li* / *I aĉe* (אֲכִי / *Et si* / ἐὰν δὲ / *though*). A second related issue at the same location concerns the syntactic relation between two parallel portions of verse 1:18. The first is expressed in KJ as "though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow," the second as "though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." S, and possibly V (depending on the interpretation of the compound conjunction *et si*), introduce a paratactic link between the two sentences (δὲ, *et*). This interpretation is supported by the contrast within verse 1:18 (S καὶ ἐὰν ..., ἐὰν δὲ ...; V *Si* ..., *et si* ...), and the parallel contrast between verses 1:19 and 1:20 (S 1:19 καὶ ἐὰν θέλητε ... 1:20 ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλητε ...; V 1:19 *Si* volueritis, ... 1:20 *Quod si* nolueritis, ...). The explicit paratactic link expressed in S and, arguably, V, was transmitted to A (*aĉe li*) and B (*i aĉe*), respectively. However clearly this link may seem to be implied by the context, this is nevertheless an interpretive element if introduced into the literal wording of the translation. The standardized Masoretic H, like KJ, expresses no paratactic link, though some H manuscripts (see HUB) do have a conjunction: אֲכִי "and if".

The interpretive translations discussed in sections 6.2 and 6.3 (though the latter could have originated as a variant within H itself), both of which concern the rendering of Hebrew אֲכִי, may seem insignificant in their effect. Nevertheless, each contributes to a "telephone game" effect in the transmission of the text, through explicit rendering of content (in one case primarily on the part of KJ) felt to be implied in the original text.

6.4. An interpolated conjunction that distances B from A, V, S and H, albeit minimally, again through the explicit expression of a paratactic link to the previous clause: *čisti budĉete* / *i čisti budete* (יְהִי / *mundi estote* / καθαροὶ γένεσθε / *make you clean*).

6.5. Anomalous readings in V, S, A and B: *lukaostvoie ot duši vaših' i zlaž pomišlenië vaša* / *zlo mišlenië vaša* (מַעֲלֵי רָעָה / *malum cogitationum vestrarum* / τὰς πονηρίας ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν / *the evil of your doings*). KJ presents a straightforward word-for-word rendering of the singular noun רָעָה, the plural noun with 2nd pl. pronominal suffix מַעֲלֵי רָעָה, and the genitive relationship between the two words. However, S, V, A and B depart from this model in regard to lexical meaning, number, or phrase construction, while A presents an interpolation through doubled translation, juxtaposing a translation based on S to one based on V. The simple meaning of מַעֲלֵי רָעָה is "deeds, doings," as expressed in multiple Biblical locations. In a majority of instances, to be sure, מַעֲלֵי רָעָה is used in reference to misdeeds reflecting evil intent. S and V, in other words, are rendering an interpretive translation. While based on an controversial interpretive tradition, this nevertheless results in a "telephone game" effect

through elimination of explicit reference to mental processes. In A achieved through the doubled translators that distinct contents were

6.6. *i obličĉete me* / *i obličĉite me* and let us reason together). A and I personal pronoun in V, translated reciprocal meaning of argument subjunctive) and KJ, which is cohortative). The chain of transmission the meaning of the original H exp

6.7. *uĉite se dobro tvoriti* / *uĉite* μάθετε καλὸν ποιεῖν / *Learn to do* absolute from the verb יָדַע "to be functions, as a syntactic accusative Isaiah 1:17 by Arnold and Choi (they also note (2003: 77) that certainly so naturally and frequently that those most often used in this work might thus be read as meaning "learn a reader to expect a reference to it in study. In fact, it is the adverbial 1:17 by Even-Shoshan in his *Conc* 1996). This is one of 10 example entry for the adverb יְהִי, as opposed adduced in his entry for the verb :

Interpretation of יְהִי is not the imperative לָמַד varies between on the vowel pointing. The pointing this is the imperative *qal* form meaning "teach," which would

The two potential ambiguities of the commentators who standard editions of the *Mikra'ot G* Hebrew text and Targum (Aramaic form לָמַד), Rabbi Shlomo Yitzhaki to explain this parsing. In regard to complement or modifier of the verb the proper reading at this location. In their view, the proper reading is A, B, S, V, KJ. While all of these tr

although" vs. *i ako* "and if" or

rv δὲ / *though*). A second related
tic relation between two parallel
in KJ as "*though your sins be as
red as though they be red like crim-*
depending on the interpretation
ce a paratactic link between the
supported by the contrast within
of *si* ...), and the parallel contrast
θέλητε ... 1:20 ἐὰν δὲ μὴ θέλητε
eritis, ...). The explicit paratactic
transmitted to A (*ače li*) and B (*i ače*),
seem to be implied by the context,
if introduced into the literal
of Masoretic H, like KJ, expresses
of Masoretic H, like KJ, expresses
of Masoretic H, like KJ, expresses
of Masoretic H, like KJ, expresses

sections 6.2 and 6.3 (though the
within H itself), both of which
seem insignificant in their effect.
"telephone game" effect in the
ordering of content (in one case
in the original text.

stances B from A, V, S and H, al-
pression of a paratactic link to the
(*הָיְיָ* / *mundi estote* / *καθαροί*

B: *lukavstvie ot duši vaših' i zilaě*
/ malum cogitationum vestrarum /
evil of your doings). KJ presents a
the singular noun *פְּעָלָיִם*, the plural
פְּעָלָיִם, and the genitive relationship
and B depart from this model in
the construction, while A presents
the juxtaposing a translation based
of *פְּעָלָיִם* is "deeds, doings," as
majority of instances, to be sure,
of evil intent. S and V, in other
of evil intent. S and V, in other
of evil intent. S and V, in other
of evil intent. S and V, in other

through elimination of explicit reference to "deeds" in favor of explicit refer-
ence to mental processes. In A, a further "telephone game" effect was
achieved through the doubled translation, which would have suggested to
readers that distinct contents were transmitted through each of the phrases.

6.6. *i obličete me / i obličite me* (*וַיְנַקְהוּ*) / *et arguite me / καὶ διελεγχθῶμεν /*
and let us reason together). A and B agree with the transitive construction and
personal pronoun in V, translatable as "accuse me." They differ from the
reciprocal meaning of argumentation expressed by S (1st pl. aorist active
subjunctive) and KJ, which more directly translate H *וַיְנַקְהוּ* (1st pl.
cohortative). The chain of transmission has thus resulted in a distancing from
the meaning of the original H expression, both lexically and syntactically.

6.7. *učite se dobro tvoriti / učite se dobro tvoriti* (*לְמַדוּ הַיָּטִב*) / *Discite benefacere /*
μάθετε καλὸν ποιεῖν / Learn to do well). Hebrew *הַיָּטִב* is, in form, an infinitive
absolute from the verb *יָטַב* "to be/do good," and can be used, among other
functions, as a syntactic accusative. This is the function ascribed to *הַיָּטִב* in
Isaiah 1:17 by Arnold and Choi (2003: 74), in line with A, B, V, S and KJ. Yet
they also note (2003: 77) that certain infinitive absolutes were used for *manner*
so naturally and frequently that they came to be treated as adverbs, one of
those most often used in this way being *הַיָּטִב* (well, thoroughly). *לְמַדוּ הַיָּטִב*
might thus be read as meaning "learn well," although the context would lead
a reader to expect a reference to righteous behavior rather than to proficiency
in study. In fact, it is the adverbial meaning that is attributed to *הַיָּטִב* in Isaiah
1:17 by Even-Shoshan in his *Concordance of the Hebrew Bible* (Even-Shoshan
1996). This is one of 10 examples adduced by Even-Shoshan in his lexical
entry for the adverb *הַיָּטִב*, as opposed to just three instances of the same form
adduced in his entry for the verb *יָטַב*.

Interpretation of *הַיָּטִב* is not the only complexity in this phrase. Parsing of
the imperative *לְמַדוּ* varies between "learn" (*qal*) and "teach" (*piel*) depending
on the vowel pointing. The pointing *לְמַדוּ* in the Masoretic text indicates that
this is the imperative *qal* form meaning "learn," rather than the causative *piel*
form meaning "teach," which would be pointed *לְמַדוּ*.

The two potential ambiguities at this location inevitably attracted the at-
tention of the commentators whose interpretations are reproduced in stan-
dard editions of the *Mikra'ot Gedolot* ("Rabbinic Bible") along with the
Hebrew text and Targum (Aramaic translation). In regard to the imperative
form *לְמַדוּ*, Rabbi Shlomo Yitzhaki (Rashi) composed an interpretive passage
to explain this parsing. In regard to the form *הַיָּטִב*, which represents either the
complement or modifier of the verb, the commentaries appear to agree that
the proper reading at this location is as an infinitive with accusative meaning.
In their view, the proper reading is "learn to do good (deeds)," analogously to
A, B, S, V, KJ. While all of these translations agree with one another and with

these interpretations, what is lost is the surface ambiguity of the original H. The uniformity of the translations erases any clue to the difficulties.

6.8. *ěko vlna oběljut' / ěko vl'na běla oběljuti* (כְּעֵמֶר יָדִי / *velut lana (alba) erunt / ὡς ἔριον λευκανῶ / they shall be as wool*). KJ renders a word-for-word translation. A large part of the V stemma (see BS), including, apparently, that relevant to the development of A and B, interpolates an explicit reference to the concept of "whiteness" through the adjective *alba*, thus metonymically rendering the sense of "cleanliness" or "purity" that is implicit in H.⁸ S interpolates an analogous explicit reference to "whiteness" through the verb λευκανῶ.

What appears to have occurred is thus as follows. The compilers of S rendered this location in accordance with interpretive tradition, rather than the literal text of H. One branch of the V stemma introduced an analogous interpretive wording, utilizing an adjective rather than a verb. Both S and V went beyond the interpretive rendering of the Targum, adding a layer of metonymy through reference to "whiteness" (though, to be sure, the applicability of this metonymy was understood even in the Hebrew interpretive tradition⁹). The compilers of A retained a word-for-word translation from S. B, in turn, retained the wording of A, but added to it a translation of the interpolation contained in V (*alba > běla*). B thus combines two distinct interpretive interpolations, one deriving from S and the other from V, of a single meaning that had not been expressed explicitly in H.

The account of this location is far from complete. *Inter alia*, it leaves entirely out of consideration the previous stages of Slavonic translation that were utilized by the compilers of A. Yet even such an abbreviated and selective exploration suggests multiple aspects of the divergence of the text from its original.

7. Conclusions

The preceding comments, albeit selective and tentative, provide support for the main thesis of this paper and the four aspects of relevance of H identified in the introduction. The main thesis, to reiterate, is the claim that the Hebrew original remains relevant to an understanding of Slavonic Biblical translations even when there exist intervening Greek and/or Latin translations, and even in the absence of striking anomalies that cannot be explained by reference to internal processes or to the intervening Greek or Latin translations.

⁸ This is expressed explicitly in the interpretive translation of the Targum by the adjective כְּעֵמֶר יָדִי "clean" or "pure": כְּעֵמֶר יָדִי יְהוָה.

⁹ This is indicated by the commentary of Rabbi David Kimchi reproduced in standard editions of the *Mikra'ot Gedolot*.

Comparison of A and B again of interpretive translation and these present seemingly insignificant translation, while others appear they present a significant "tele even though most instances of of translators' attempts to present elaborate upon it. In at least on inevitably out of ambiguity in whether translating into Greek. ated an ambiguous location in the V, and through them A and B, tradition concerning this location

Ultimately, there is no near cal book can render the content out deviation). "Telephone gam texts, or indeed any text contain ties, or corruption. The only way and extent of this effect is by ref tion, and to the functional role c has circulated. This is true even Hebrew into Slavonic through a

Bibliography

- Arnold, Bill T. and John H. Ch
Cambridge: Cambridge Univ
[HUB] (1975) *The Book of Isaiah*. I
H., ed. Jerusalem: The Magn
ersity Bible.)
[BS] (1969) *Biblia sacra iuxta latin
Isaiae*. Rome: Typis polyglotti
Corin, Andrew R. (1991) *The N
Analysis*. Columbus, OH: Slav
———. (2002) "Jonah 3, 3: A Re
Church Slavonic Missals?" *Sl
Even-Shoshan, Avraham. (1996) .
Khetuim*. Jerusalem: Kiryat S

face ambiguity of the original H. clue to the difficulties.

lējuti (לֵּיָּטִי / *velut lana* (*alba* *ool*). KJ renders a word-for-word (e BS), including, apparently, that interpolates an explicit reference to adjective *alba*, thus metonymically "whiteness" through the verb

follows. The compilers of S interpretive tradition, rather than the *ia* introduced an analogous inter- r than a verb. Both S and V went argum, adding a layer of meton- gh, to be sure, the applicability of e Hebrew interpretive tradition⁹). rd translation from S. B, in turn, a translation of the interpolation two distinct interpretive interpo- from V, of a single meaning that

complete. *Inter alia*, it leaves en- ages of Slavonic translation that an such an abbreviated and selec- of the divergence of the text from

and tentative, provide support for aspects of relevance of H identified erate, is the claim that the Hebrew ng of Slavonic Biblical translations nd/or Latin translations, and even nnot be explained by reference to ek or Latin translations.

ve translation of the Targum by the David Kimchi reproduced in standard

Comparison of A and B against H, S, V, and KJ reveals multiple instances of interpretive translation and accidental drift. Taken individually, some of these present seemingly insignificant departures from a simple or literal translation, while others appear significant even individually. Taken together, they present a significant "telephone game" effect in the history of the text, even though most instances of interpretive translation presumably arose out of translators' attempts to *preserve* the meaning of the original, rather than to elaborate upon it. In at least one instance (6.7), interpretive translation arose inevitably out of ambiguity in H. Whatever solution a translator chose, whether translating into Greek or Latin, or Slavonic, it inevitably disambiguated an ambiguous location in the literal wording of H. The solutions in S and V, and through them A and B, appear to rely on an established interpretive tradition concerning this location.

Ultimately, there is no meaningful sense in which a translation of a Biblical book can render the content of the original faithfully (i.e., fully and without deviation). "Telephone game" effect is a fact of life in translating Biblical texts, or indeed any text containing layered meaning, ambiguity, uncertainties, or corruption. The only way to approach an understanding of the nature and extent of this effect is by reference to the original, to its interpretive tradition, and to the functional role of the text in the communities within which it has circulated. This is true even in the case of texts rendered indirectly from Hebrew into Slavonic through a Greek or Latin intermediary translation.

Defense Language Institute
Presidio of Monterey
Monterey, California 93944
andrew.corin@us.army.mil

Bibliography

- Arnold, Bill T. and John H. Choi. (2003) *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [HUB] (1975) *The Book of Isaiah. Part One. Part Two*. Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H., ed. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, Hebrew University. (Hebrew University Bible.)
- [BS] (1969) *Biblia sacra iuxta latinam vulgatem versionem ad codicum fidem. Liber Isaias*. Rome: Typis polyglottis Vaticanis.
- Corin, Andrew R. (1991) *The New York Missal: A Paleographic and Phonetic Analysis*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- . (2002) "Jonah 3, 3: A Reflection of Jewish Exegesis in the Croatian Church Slavonic Missals?" *Slavic and East European Journal* 46(1): 125–49.
- Even-Shoshan, Avraham. (1996) *Ḳoṅkordantsyah ḥadashah le-Torah, Nevi'im, u-Khetuvim*. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer.

- Lunt, Horace G. and Moshe Taube. (1994) "The Slavonic Book of Esther: Translation from Hebrew or Evidence for a Lost Greek Text". *The Harvard Theological Review* 87(3): 347-62.
- . (1998) *The Slavonic Book of Esther. Text, Lexicon, Linguistic Analysis, Problems of Translation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [SG] (1983) *Isaias*. 3rd Edition. Joseph Ziegler, ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (*Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*, 14.)

On Vasilii Aksenov's T

Lis

The critical silence surrounding E.L. Doctorow's *Ragtime* (*Ragtime Literature*) has contrasted. While the post-Soviet period has as materials that describe the novel's self-described "free" translation in Aksenov's oeuvre largely to contextualize Aksenov's translatorial policy toward publishing in the 1970s, and offer an analysis of emphasizing the implications of the cultural and professional context.

For *Ragtime*, Doctorow de "seeming negation of style" (Fictive sentences lacking any quotation relates the story of America century through the experiences such as "Teddy Roosevelt groes" demonstrates how the subjective misrepresentations, America's self-conception shifts as the of the novel, such sentences would translator, and at least one Soviet novel's didactic structure, describing contemporary America" (Zasur).

In this light, Aksenov emerges *Ragtime*, which would appear a of this period. After an initial difficulty publishing his work (*Which Something Thumps*, 1975), the children's novel (*Which Something Thumps*, 1976), 1978), and the short story "Sup publish as a Soviet citizen (Jo

Craig Cravens, Masako U. Fidler, Susan
Festschrift for Michael Henry Heim. Blox