Chapter 5.
IMPLICITATION

5.1 Introduction

The analysis of LXX Isaiah would be less complicated if we were able to outline a consistent and uniform translation method which was applied by its translator. But in fact, the opposite appears to be true. The Greek Isaiah is typified by contrasting translation tendencies. Just as chapter 2 and 3 have described two such contrary patterns, the present chapter will also discuss a feature that seems to be discrepant from the one analysed in the previous section. While chapter 4 has shown that many pluses in the Greek Isaiah can be explained by the translator’s inclination towards making his text more explicit, the present chapter will deal with his penchant for implicitation. “Implicitation” is a term used in translation studies to indicate that an element which in the source text is stated explicitly, is made implicit in the translation.¹ This technique may have been employed by the translator because he considered some information provided by the Hebrew text as redundant, since it could also have been derived from the context, or was supposed to have been familiar to the readers. Besides, he may have used implicitation so as to strengthen the textual coherence. If, for instance, a proper name instead of being repeated, is replaced by a pronoun, this makes a stronger link to the clause in which the name itself is mentioned.²

Implicitation often entails the replacement of one word or phrase by another, but in some cases it accounts for a minus. Such minuses, as found in LXX Isaiah, will be listed below. They will be grouped according to the following division:

- Implicitation through the omission of an attribute.
- Implicitation through the omission of the governing noun in a genitival construction.
- Omission of ב and רֶם.
- Implicitation of the subject.
- Implicitation through the omission of an object.

Sometimes the omission of details that may have seemed “insignificant” in the eyes of the translator, has led to the generalisation of the text (e.g. “the palm of his hand” becomes “his hand”). As it is not always easy to draw a line between “implicitation” and “generalisation,”

¹ Like explicitation, the term “implicitation” was first introduced by Vinay and Darbelnet (Vinay and Darbelnet, *Stylistique comparée du français*, 10). They define this technique as: “Procédé qui consiste à laisser au contexte ou à la situation le soin de préciser certains détails explicites dans LD [source language].” For the application of the term on the Septuagint, see van der Louw, “Transformations,” 71–72. Van der Louw defines implicitation as follows: “An implicitation is a transformation whereby elements that are explicit in the source text are made implicit in the target text. This transformation is close to ‘omission’, the difference being that the information explicit in the source text is not deleted altogether, but recedes into the background while leaving traces in the target text, thus becoming implicit” (*op.cit.* p.71).
² See van Peursen, *Language and Interpretation*, 393–395. An example can be found in Isa 63:6 καὶ κατέπατησα αὐτούς τῇ ὀργῇ μου; while in the MT v.6 repeats “the people” mentioned in v.3, in LXX Isa a pronoun replaces the noun, just as in the previous verses, which makes the internal connection between these verses stronger. For two cases in which the implicitation of the subject strengthens the cohesion of the text, see 33:24 and 49:23 in section 5.5.2 below.
these two phenomena will not be strictly differentiated, but will be treated alongside each other in the present chapter.

5.2 Implicitation through the omission of an attribute

Attributes, which modify the noun to which they are syntactically subordinate, can often be omitted without significantly changing the content of the text. They may consist of:

- an attributive pronoun, which in Hebrew is formed by a nominal suffix (i.e. a suffix joined to a substantive noun);
- the governed noun in a genitival (construct state) construction;
- an apposition.

5.2.1 The omission of a nominal suffix

In Greek it is not necessary to use an attributive (“possessive”) pronoun in order to denote the possessor, object, subject, or the whole of something or someone when this entity or being is made obvious by the immediate context. Particularly when attached to body parts, the possessor, object, subject, or the whole of something or someone when this is not clearly specifiable becomes declarative. To include this information in Greek, the translator would use an attributive or genitive pronoun. However, when the translator chose not to render a suffix because he wanted to remove or reduce the emphasis on the idea that something was in a genitive relationship to something else, or because he intended to generalise a notion by leaving out the specifying genitive pronoun, this might be considered as implicitation or generalisation.

See the following examples:

13:21 καὶ ἐμπληθήσονται αἱ οἰκίαι ἡχοῦ
14:32 καὶ δὲ γυνὴ Κιρᾶ, καὶ ταπεινοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ.
24:23 ὁ βασιλεὺς κύριος ἐν Σιὼν καὶ ἐν Ιερουσαλήμ καὶ ἐν τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ δοξάσθησεται.
26:19 καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ νεκροὶ.
40:16 καὶ πάντα τὰ πτερύγα ὁ αὸς ἐν ὀδόν.
49:11 καὶ πᾶσαι τρίβουν εἰς βόσκημα αὐτῶν.

3 In the Hebrew the suffix in יס עירא probably refers to the houses of the city referred to in the text (i.e. Babylon).
4 The omission of the genitive pronoun may have been influenced by v.14 where מתח appears in a similar phrasing, but without a suffix: מתח ב承德 / οἱ νεκροὶ ζωὴν οὐ μὴ ἴδωσιν.
5 Perhaps also under the influence of v.9 מתח ב承德 / καὶ ἐν πᾶσαις ταῖς τρίβοις οὐ μὴ αὐτῶν.
5.2.2 The omission of the governed noun in a genitival relationship

In a genitival relationship between words—which in Hebrew is expressed in a construct state conjunction—the second noun (the governed noun) qualifying the first one (the governing noun), has occasionally not been represented in LXX Isaiah. In most of these cases the qualifying noun is pleonastic. Perhaps the translator left it out because he thought it redundant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:13</td>
<td>בַּכַּנ יַעֲשֵׂה</td>
<td>ἡ Ἰάχύι ποιήσω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:6</td>
<td>בְּעֵפְרֵה</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τῶν κλάδων αὐτῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:3</td>
<td>כַּפֵּר יָשָׂד תֹּבָה</td>
<td>ως ἀμήτου εἰσφερομένου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:23</td>
<td>מֻשָּה דַּי</td>
<td>τὰ ξρύγα μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:29</td>
<td>יָשָׁתָה עִבּ</td>
<td>καὶ καὶ καὶ εὐφραίνομένους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:30</td>
<td>לֹא בֵּית עָנָכָה</td>
<td>καὶ φλογὸς κατεσθιόντος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34:6</td>
<td>מַחְלַל מִלְחַת מִלְכָּה</td>
<td>καὶ ἀπὸ στέατος τράγων καὶ κριῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58:11</td>
<td>נְפָצָתָה פָּס</td>
<td>καὶ ως πηγῇ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the omission of the governed noun in a genitival relationship when this noun is synonymous to the governing noun, see section 3.2.2a.

5.2.3 The omission of an apposition

Also appositions may primarily have been deleted in order to avoid redundancy.

a. The omission of a divine name

As we have seen in chapter 4, LXX Isaiah regularly offers κύριος ὁ θεὸς where the MT only has either יי or אלהים. However, the converse situation also occurs, appositionally used designations for God being absent in the Greek translation. Indeed, in nearly all cases where the Hebrew presents the combinations יי, יוהי, יוהו, יי יי יי יי, LXX Isaiah displays merely one divine name. These compound Hebrew titles are mostly represented in the translation by:

- κύριος:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:7</td>
<td>כִּי אִמֵּר יָהוּ</td>
<td>τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:16</td>
<td>כִּי שָׁלַח יָהוּ בְּנָאוֹת</td>
<td>ἄλλα ἀποστελεῖ κύριος σαβαωθ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:24</td>
<td>כִּי נָאֵם יָהוּ בְּנָאוֹת</td>
<td>Διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:2</td>
<td>בִּרְכָּי יָהוּ</td>
<td>διότι η δόξα μου καὶ η αἰνειοδοι μου κύριος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:4</td>
<td>לֹא רָאִית יָהוּ בָּנָאוֹת</td>
<td>τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:5</td>
<td>לֹא רָאִית יָהוּ בָּנָאוֹת</td>
<td>παρά κυρίου σαβαωθ ἐν φάραγγι Σιων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:12</td>
<td>רָאֵם יָהוּ בָּנָאוֹת</td>
<td>καὶ ἐκάλεσε κύριος σαβαωθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:15</td>
<td>הָלַךְ אָמִּד יָהוּ בָּנָאוֹת</td>
<td>Τάδε λέγει κύριος σαβαωθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:16</td>
<td>הָלַךְ אָמִּד יָהוּ בָּנָאוֹת</td>
<td>διὰ τοῦτο οὕτως λέγει κύριος 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:22</td>
<td>שָׁמֵעַ מֵאָמְר יָהוּ בָּנָאוֹת</td>
<td>ήκουσα παρά κυρίου σαβαωθ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 מָאָר is equally is missing in some Hebrew manuscripts (but not in the Qumran documents of Isaiah). According to Wildberger (Jesaja, 1:405) it was originally absent.
7 Wildberger (Jesaja, 1:417) thinks that the LXX translator has not read מָאָר in his Vorlage.
8 In 1QIsa 28:22 אָמִּד appears as superscript: יָהוּ שָׁמֵעַ מֵאָמְר (see section 12.3.1.2).
Also the noun "κύριος" appears as Hebrew שֲוַיָּיָהוֹ (šōw·yah·ō·wō) and פֶּרֶשֶׁה (pĕ·resh·ě). The Greek title is often interpreted as "the Lord" or "God" in English translations. The Hebrew counterpart שְׁוָיָּהוֹ (šōw·yah·ō) is a divine name, while מִשְׁכָּבֵנוּ (mî·she·ḵê·nū) and מִשְׁכָּבֵנוּ (mî·she·ḵê·nū) denote the sanctuary or temple. The noun שֵׁמֶשׁ (šê·mē·šē) is a common Greek title for "God" or "solar deity." The noun שַׁבָּעָה (šā·ḇā·á) is a Hebrew word for "sabbath."}

The translator probably did not translate שְׁוַיָּהוֹ because he was unable to think of an apt Greek counterpart. He could have rendered the word by δεσπότης, yet only uses that title three times, where the Hebrew in all three places displays שְׁוַיָּהוֹ. The combination of שְׁוַיָּהוֹ (+ suffix) has mostly received a literal rendering as κύριος ὁ θεὸς. Still, in the following places שְׁוַיָּהוֹ is represented by a mere ὁ θεὸς:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שְׁוַיָּהוֹ</td>
<td>κύριος ὁ θεὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִשְׁכָּבֵנוּ</td>
<td>κύριος ὁ θεὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מִשְׁכָּבֵנוּ</td>
<td>κύριος ὁ θεὸς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also the noun שָבָעָה (šā·ḇā·á) ("hosts"), which can be joined as an apposition to the divine name, has now and again no equivalent in LXX Isaiah. Often this can be attributed to the translator’s aspiration to assimilate clauses to related ones in the surrounding text or to similar formulations elsewhere in Scripture.

---

9 IQIsa reads שְׁוַיָּהוֹ (šōw·yah·ō·wō) (see section 12.3.1.2).
10 In IQIsa likewise is missing: שַׁבָּעָה (šā·ḇā·á) (see section 12.3.1.2).
11 In 10:16 and 19:4 the translator has omitted שְׁוַיָּהוֹ, though (see above).
12 On שָבָעָה being an apposition rather than the governed noun in a construct state conjunction, see Jouon §131o.
b. The omission of other appositions

Some other examples of appositions missing a counterpart:

8:2 άνευρεν ημείαν
tόν Ουριαν
20:2 έσφυεν Ερμαθημ
Ησαίαν
24:23 έν Σιων
37:4 μελλόντι άριστον
βασιλεύς Ασσορίων
37:5 άπειρον τιμός
οί πατέρες τοῦ βασιλέως
37:37 συνήχησεν μελλόντι
βασιλεύς Ασσορίων

5.3 The omission of the governing noun in a genitival relationship

Also when the translator did not render the first (governing) noun in a genitival relationship, this was probably mostly because that noun was not vital to the message of the text and hence could be left out without significantly changing the content.

13 ἀνατίθηται may have been removed in assimilation to the phrase κύριον αὐτόν ἁγιάσατε, which occurs in LXX Isa 3:14; 7:14; and 63:9, and elsewhere in the LXX e.g. in Deut 10:9; 18:2; and Ps 104:7,21; 151:3.
14 Possibly in harmonisation with Jer 10:21 καὶ τὸν κύριον οὐκ ἔξεζητήσαν; cf. section 8.4.3.3.
15 The omission of ἀνατίθηται in 10:23 and 26 is likely connected to the translation of ἥδη by οἱ θεοί, which on its own is rarely followed by σαβαωθ in the LXX (see only Isa 44:6 and 1 Esd 9:46). The use of θεοί instead of κύριος may be due to the appearance of the same title in v.20 (LXX) and v.21, or in assimilation to similar statements announcing what God will do in the future, which likewise use a mere οἱ θεοί; see e.g. 7:17 ἀλλά ἐπάθη σοί θεοί οὐκ ἴματος; 24:21 καὶ ἐπάθη οἱ θεοί ἐπὶ τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ σαβαωθ τὴν χεὶρά (see further e.g. 3:17; 4:2; 6:12; 14:3; 23:17; 25:10; and 30:30).
16 See the previous footnote. According to Wildberger (Jesaja, 1:417) άνατίθηται possibly has to be deleted.
17 Perhaps άνατίθηται was omitted because in the ensuing section—19:17–22—κύριος without σαβαωθ appears no less then twelve times, usually at the end of the clause; see section 7.3.1.1c.
18 Maybe in harmonisation with Isa 48:1 οἱ θεοί ἔργα θεοῦ ἔκτενον τῶν θεοῦ λαοῦ λαοῦ. Furthermore, parallel to κύριος in the preceding and following verses (cf. 19:17 and footnote above).
19 Parallel to κύριος in the preceding and following verses (cf. 19:17 and footnote above).
20 Possibly relying on Mic 4:7 καὶ βασιλεύσει κύριος ἐπ᾽ αὐτοῖς ἐν ὅρει Σιων.
5.3.1 The omitted governing noun consists of the name for a body part

The omitted governing noun relatively often is the name of a body part, which is used either in a literal sense (see e.g. 1:6; 25:11; 30:6; 34:16; 40:5; and 62:2 below) or in a metaphorical sense (see e.g. 11:15; 14:21; 24:18; 27:6; and 30:17 below). Concerning metaphorically used body parts, the translator may have opted not to represent them because he wanted to make his text more concrete. In the case of literally used ones the omission is probably largely the result of the translator’s inclination to shorten or simplify his text. Perhaps he considered it unnecessary to be very specific. Furthermore, he may have avoided rendering parts of the body governing a (pro)noun in order not to produce Hebraistic language (in analogy to his frequent rendition of compound prepositional expressions containing the name of a body part by a simple preposition [e.g. מתי becomesreeze])21. Nevertheless, on the whole the non-translation of body parts occurs only sporadically: Most commonly they did receive a rendering, both the ones used in a literal and those used in a metaphorical way.

Some instances of the omission of body parts in a genitive construction are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:6</td>
<td>מַפְרַשׁ עַד רְאָשׁוֹן &lt;הוֹיָה&gt; עַד רְאָשׁוֹן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>הָרְ決ִים הָתִים אַף שְׁמוֹנֶת מִשְׁמוֹנֶת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:18</td>
<td>וְנָגְסֶה מִקְלָא הַמַּשְּמֵשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:11</td>
<td>מִי אָזְחַת דוֹת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:6</td>
<td>שֵׂא עֲלֵי פֶּן עִירמָו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:17</td>
<td>בַּל בְּשָׁם הַמַּלְוָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:14</td>
<td>מִכָּל הַמֶּלֶבֶּם</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both times the phrase מָרְבּת בֶּהָרְסֶה occurs in Isaiah ונפיחנ has no equivalent in the LXX, most probably so as to escape a Hebraistic translation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:21</td>
<td>מֵלָא פְּרִיטֵתִי עָרֵם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:6</td>
<td>מֵלָא פְּרִיטֵתִי נָנֶב</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparable move is the rendering by a mere pronoun where the Hebrew offers a pronoun governed by a body part, see e.g.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:27</td>
<td>יָסִיְתָא מַשְּלָמָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:22</td>
<td>מַשָּׁמֵת בֵּית דוֹשָּׁן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:17</td>
<td>מְמַלְּכָּת אֶל הַמָּשָּׁמֵי</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also the few examples of the omission of body parts belonging to God can be clarified in the light of what has been discussed above. These minuses are sometimes explained as an attempt by the translator to avoid anthropomorphism:23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25:10</td>
<td>רִיָּמִית &lt;דְּיוֹתָה&gt; בָּרָה הָתִים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 See section 9.7.
22 The contrary has happened in 38:5, where one finds a word for “voice” as a plus: הַקְּרוּאָה מַשָּׁמֵי הַמֶּלֶבֶּם |
23 See section 10.3.2.
5.3.2 The omitted governing noun consists of a word other than a body part

When preceding geographical names, ὑπαρκτεῖ in LXX Isaiah generally received a rendering as γῆ or χώρα. However, on several occasions a translation of ὑπαρκτεῖ is missing:

19:18
27:13
34:6
37:38

Some additional examples of the omission of a governing noun:

2:17
6:4
7:3
10:12
10:20
14:14
14:19
14:30
16:14
21:17
22:22
24:4
30:2
30:3
30:6
30:30
40:12
40:14
48:1
52:1

has been added by a later hand:

24 ὑπαρκτεῖ may have been left out in parallelism to the preceding phrase ὅτι θυσία κυρίω ἐν Βοσρ.  
25 QIsa has been written supralinearly: ὅτι λέγεται ὑπαρκτεῖ after ἐπιχείρησαν τὸν Καυσάρ.  
26 In QIsa⁴ has been added by a later hand: ὅτι λέγεται ὑπαρκτεῖ after ἐπιχείρησαν τὸν Καυσάρ.  

IMPLICITATION
5.4 The omission of בונ, בּוֹן, בּוֹנִי and בּוֹנִי

The translator gives the impression of having been quite flexible in using or not using expressions in the sense of “all” and “together”. Whereas the previous chapter listed plenty of examples of his addition of such words, the next pages will demonstrate that he equally often has omitted Hebrew lexemes bearing these connotations. Representations of בּוֹן, בּוֹנִי and בּוֹנִי are absent in LXX Isaiah so regularly, that this cannot simply be attributed to a different Vorlage. Probably their frequent omission is due to the fact that in most cases the meaning of these words is logically inherent in the text in which they appear. For this reason the translator may have thought their lexical presence not absolutely necessary.

27 In 1QIsa שִׁלָּחַת בּוֹן is misspelling corresponding: שִׁלָּחַת בּוֹנִי. Probably it was left out for the sake of condensation (see section 12.3.1.2).
28 Cf. 1QIsa בּוֹנִי. The lack of representation of בּוֹן might be caused by an error of haplography (cf. sections 11.1 and 12.3.1.2).
29 בּוֹנִי may have been transposed to the previous clause: וְיִשָּׁרֶב שָׁמַיִם בּוֹנִי (cf. section 12.3.1.2). In the parallel text 4 Kgdms 18:13 a Greek equivalent for בּוֹנִי likewise is missing.
In a large proportion of these cases an extra motivation for the omission of ל does not seem to have been the amelioration of parallelism, given that in a parallel phrase or clause a word corresponding to ל is absent: see 1:23; 3:1; 5:28; 8:7; 21:16; 22:3; 29:20; 33:20; 34:1,12; 40:2; 53:6; 56:2; 57:5; 59:11; 60:14; and 62:2.

**IMPLICITATION**

Possibly in assimilation to v.4: τοὺς λόγους Πασχαλού, οὓς ἀπέστειλε βασιλέως Ασσυρίων (see section 8.2.2.2).

Perhaps in parallelism to the first two lines of v.5: αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραπεζήσθη διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν καὶ μεμάλκυσται διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν.  

LXX Isa has likely perceived ל is present in the MT as a relative clause modifying ל (“all [roads] on which they walk”), whereas in the LXX it forms the subject of the next clause: ל לדר 현 אל יהיה שלם —“no one who walks in them knows peace.”

May be ל has been moved to the next sentence: בְּנֵי הַצָּהוּר הָאָדָם. For an analysis of this translation, cf. section 2.7a.

According to Ziegler (Untersuchungen, 150) the Vorlage of the LXX read לדר 현 תאז, the more original form לדר 현 mistakenly having been copied as לדר 현. It is also thinkable, however, that the translator himself has read לדר 현 for לדר 현.
In four of the seven cases in which a rendering of רֵדֵד or כָּרָד (“together”) is missing, in the same clause the synonymous בָּכֹי appears (see 22:3[2x]; 40:5; and 45:16). Apparently, the combination of these two expressions was regarded as superfluous by the translator.

The noun רב (“abundance”) lacks a Greek counterpart in the following two verses:

47:9
beshol Amalim batu be’tul
by כְּפָדֶד
47:13
ne’al ba’reb ne’otz
by הקטיפתס אֵל נַתִּים בּוּלַאֵיס סֵו.

5.5 Implicitation of the subject

5.5.1 The omission of a pronominal subject

When in Hebrew an independent personal pronoun functions as a subject in a nominal clause, and is placed at the end of that clause (which means that it is not intended to give prominence to the subject),39 LXX Isaiah generally reproduces this pronoun by a form of εἰμί. See e.g.:

41:9  Παῖς μου εἶ
41:10  μὴ φοβοῦ, μετὰ σοῦ γὰρ εἶμι·
41:23  καὶ γνωσόμεθα оτι θεοί ἐστε·
43:2  ἀπῆκται
43:5  μὴ φοβοῦ, ὅτι μετὰ σοῦ εἶμι·
44:5  Τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμί
48:4  γνωσόμεθα εγώ ὃτι σκληρός εἶ

If the independent pronoun in nominal clauses does have an emphatic function, in which case it usually precedes the predicate,40 LXX Isaiah often renders it in a “double way”; by means of a form of εἰμί in combination with a Greek independent pronoun. See e.g.:

8:13  καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σοῦ φόβος.
37:20  οἵτι σοῦ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μόνος.
42:17  Υμεῖς ἔστε θεοὶ ἡμῶν.
43:1  εἰμὸς εἶ σοῦ.
44:8  μάρτυρες ὑμεῖς ἔστε
45:22  ἕγω εἰμὶ ὁ θεός
46:9  εἰμὶ πρῶτος
48:12  ἔγω εἰμὶ ὁ θεὸς σου
48:17  ἤν θεὸς ἀληθινός
56:3  ἔγω εἰμὶ ξύλου ἔρημον.

38 נֶהְרֵד might have been linked to נְהַרְרֵד and on those grounds translated as οἱ ἀντικείμενοι (cf. 41:11).
39 Cf. Jouon §154fa.
40 Cf. Jouon §154fa.
In expressions in which the Hebrew employs the independent pronoun together with a predicative participle in order to indicate the person who forms the subject of this participle, this construction is mostly reproduced into Greek by means of a finite verb form without an independent pronoun. See e.g.:

In nearly all of the instances offered (10:14; 34:16; 37:25; 38:17; 43:12) the omission of the independent pronoun. See e.g.:

Independent pronouns preceding finite verbal forms with the purpose of giving special prominence to the subject of these verbs, are virtually always represented in LXX Isaiah. Only incidentally do they not have a match in the Greek, namely in the following cases:

In nearly all of the instances offered (10:14; 34:16; 37:25; 38:17; 43:12) the omission of the independent pronoun could be brought about by the translator’s levelling the clause to a parallel one in which (in the Greek) an independent pronoun does not appear either.

5.5.2 The omission of a nominal subject

Subjects have repeatedly been omitted in LXX Isaiah because in the translation their function is adopted by an identical or synonymous subject in a neighbouring clause (“distributive rendering,” see section 3.6.2b). Under other circumstances, Hebrew nominal subjects are in LXX Isaiah only rarely transformed into subjects that are implied in the verb:

Subjects have repeatedly been omitted in LXX Isaiah because in the translation their function is adopted by an identical or synonymous subject in a neighbouring clause (“distributive rendering,” see section 3.6.2b). Under other circumstances, Hebrew nominal subjects are in LXX Isaiah only rarely transformed into subjects that are implied in the verb:

13:22
16:10
16:14
28:21
33:24

καὶ ύστερον ἐξέται καὶ οὐ χρονεῖ.  
καὶ οὐ μὴ πατήσουσι νιν εἰς τὰ υπολίνια  
καὶ νῦν λέγω  
ὁσπερ ὁρὸς ἀσεβῶν ἀναστήσεται  
καὶ οὐ μὴ εἶπῃ

Cf. Joüon §154f.
Cf. Joüon §146a.
Cf. Hab 2:3 (see section 8.4.5.6).
Cf. sections 3.5 and 8.4.3.1.
LXX Isa has changed indirect speech into direct speech, probably because an introduction of direct speech has already occurred (Τότε τὸ ῥῆμα, ὃ ἐλάλησεν κύριος ἔπει Μωσῆ, ὅποτε καὶ ἐλάλησεν).
In some of these examples, the omission entails that whereas the Hebrew starts with a new subject, the Greek continues with the subject of the preceding clause. Through this continuation the cohesion of the text is strengthened (see 16:10; 33:24; and 49:23)\(^{48}\).

### 5.6 Implicitation by the omission of an object

Just as was the case with other sentence elements, objects\(^{49}\) were probably also mostly omitted because their information was seen as redundant (see e.g. 9:3[4]; 25:10; 26:20,21; 28:4; 30:14,33; 31:7; 33:12; 36:21; 40:20; 44:5; and 54:1 below). Furthermore they may have been deleted in order to circumvent a certain suggestion in the text (e.g. 37:28–29 and 59:13), or to give a broader validity to the words (e.g. 8:11 and 40:17). Lastly, they may sometimes have been omitted for the sake of parallelism (e.g. 44:7; 46:11; and 48:15).

#### 5.6.1 The omission of a pronominal object

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:11</td>
<td>Οὕτως λέγει κύριος</td>
<td>The Lord says so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:3(4)</td>
<td>τὴν γὰρ ῥάβδον τῶν ἀπαίτουντων</td>
<td>for the staff of those who require it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:10</td>
<td>καὶ καταπατήθησαι ἢ Μωαβίτις</td>
<td>and you will be overturned or the Moabites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:20</td>
<td>εἶπεν δὲ λέγεται</td>
<td>He said:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30:33</td>
<td>οὐχ ἔσται διὸς δικαιοῦντας</td>
<td>There will not be a just one who judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:7</td>
<td>ἐκ δὲ λέγεται ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν</td>
<td>from which it is known to the Lord our God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:7</td>
<td>ἐκ δὲ λέγεται ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν</td>
<td>from which it is known to the Lord our God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:21</td>
<td>μηδένα ἄποκριθήναι</td>
<td>there will be none to answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:28–29</td>
<td>καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ὡς οὐδέν εἰσὶ</td>
<td>and all the nations will be nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:17</td>
<td>καὶ εἰς οὐθέν ἐλογίσθησαν</td>
<td>and for nothing will be accounted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:7</td>
<td>καὶ σοφὸς ζητεῖ πᾶσας στήσει αὐτοῦ εἰκόνα</td>
<td>and a wise man will look for an image of him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46:11</td>
<td>και ἡγαγον</td>
<td>and they lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:15</td>
<td>ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα, ἐγὼ ἐκάλεσα</td>
<td>I spoke, I called.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{47}\) Presumably omitted in order to avoid repetition.

\(^{48}\) See van Pearsen, *Language and Interpretation*, 395.

\(^{49}\) The term “object” includes direct, indirect, and prepositional objects.

\(^{50}\) According to Goshen-Gottstein (*HUB Isa*, 151) Πνεῦμα is omitted mistakenly, due to haplography (Πνεύμα). Yet, the translator may also have left it out deliberately, because he thought it superfluous.

\(^{51}\) Perhaps anger directed towards God was offensive in the eyes of the translator; cf. section 10.3.2.
Object suffixes are occasionally not represented when a reference to the object also occurs elsewhere in the same sentence (either in a different or in the same syntactical function):

- As object to a another phrase:\footnote{53}

\begin{align*}
27:11 & \text{diá touto ou mi oiktirhēs o poieías autōs,} \\
37:11 & \text{i ouk hēkousas a āpoieías basileías Asouriōn}
\end{align*}

- As an object in \textit{casus pendens}, located at the beginning of the clause and later resumed by way of a retrospective pronoun:\footnote{55}

\begin{align*}
13:17 & \text{oüde xerion xreian exousin.} \\
14:27 & \text{kai tēn xeiρa tēn uνηθήν tis āpostrēpeis;} \\
42:3 & \text{kai līnov katanizomēnou ouēbēsī;} \\
59:12 & \text{kai tā adikēmatā ēmōn ēγνωμεν.}
\end{align*}

- When the object is made explicit in an apposition at the end of the sentence (a figure called \textit{eperguson}). In the Greek the words of the apposition are integrated within the sentence:

\begin{align*}
15:7 & \text{maktherōn le tōn trekontōn} \\
23:9 & \text{ho kebatoi uνēes tēlē} \\
41:12 & \text{zetēseis autōs kai ou mi uṇēris}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
15:7 & \text{epiāzō gar ēpi tēn fāraga Ἀραβάς;} \\
23:9 & \text{kūrios saβbaωth ēbouleūsato paralūsai} \\
41:12 & \text{tous anbropouς, oï paraonēsousai eis σē}
\end{align*}

\footnote{52 Cf 1QIsa: ‘an ein dērithi me kēchari (see section 12.3.1.2).}

\footnote{53 Cf. also 8:16.}

\footnote{54 In the MT the sentence division lies in between and autōs is understood as a full subject, as in the reference to the object above: “Seek the LORD while he may be found, call upon him while he is near.”}

\footnote{55 Cf. Jojón §156. For an example in which such a construction has been maintained in LXX Isa, see e.g. 1:7 ἀνατέθηκεν τὸν αἰματήρα τῆς ζωῆς / tēn χεράν ζωῆς ἐνώπιόν των ζωῆς ἀλλήλοις κατεσθεῖσαν autēν. For an example in which both MT Isa and LXX Isa do not resume the object after a \textit{casus pendens}, see e.g. 5:17 τὴν βραβεῖαν παρακαλέσειν γινώμενος.}

\footnote{56 1QIsa displays the Latin 3rd masc. pl. pointing to: “For I will bring them to the valley, namely the Arabs.” In the MT, by contrast, to zōos is a genitive attribute to LXX, while to zōos is vocalised as a noun phrase meaning “their possessions” (zōos). The latter is the subject of a clause governed by the verb phrase Israel: “and their possessions they carry away over the Wadi of the Willows.” The rendering of zōos forms a separate clause in the LXX: καὶ λήψονται autēν—“and they will take her.”}
CHAPTER FIVE

63:11 ο ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς γῆς τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων.

- In another syntactical function, for instance as a subject or as an object complement:

24:9 μικρὸν ἐγένετο τὸ σικερά τοῖς πίνουσιν.
46:6 έποίησαν χειροποίητα

5.6.2 The omission of a nominal object

Elsewhere, the omission of objects bears on the application of distributive rendering. See for examples section 3.6.2a.

5.7 Implicitation without the occurrence of a minus

Implicitation is only now and then achieved by way of an omission. In other places it is done through the substitution of words, in particular of a noun by a pronoun. Three examples to illustrate this are:

14:22 καὶ ἀπολῶ σύνιον καὶ κατάλειμμα καὶ σπέρμα
Τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι
52:9 διότι ἦλθε κύριος αὐτὴν καὶ ἐρρύσατο ἱερουσαλήμ.
καὶ κατεπάτησα αὐτὸν τῇ ὀργῇ μου
63:6 οἰκονομεῖ διατήρησα

5.8 Conclusion

Even though the Isaiah translator was particularly apt to make his text more explicit and to add interpretative glosses to it, some instances of implicitation can also be encountered in his translation. He has regularly left out words that are already implied by the context (such as ל and 도, or information he may have supposed to be familiar to his readers. Now and then he has omitted specifying details that do not really influence the message and content of the text.

58 1QIsa gives אָשֶׁר תִּפְקַד (see section 12.3.1.2).
59 Possibly the translator regarded the idea of lying to God himself as too offensive.
(e.g. specifications of body parts). By removing such “superfluous” words, he may have wished to create a text that was more concise in character. Nevertheless, the avoidance of redundancy on its own does not provide a sufficient explanation for many of the translator’s omissions mentioned in this chapter. It does not answer the question of why in some cases he has made elements implicit, whereas in plenty of other cases he has rather made his text more explicit, sometimes even by adding the same words that in other verses he had discarded (such as words in the sense of “all”). One solution for this paradox is that the translator was quite willing either to add or omit (seemingly) “insignificant” elements if this could serve other purposes, such as the amelioration of parallelism, the assimilation of an expression to a related one nearby, or the strengthening of the coherence of his discourse. The possibility also exists that he occasionally deleted or inserted small words just because this favoured the rhythm of his text. Finally, he may sometimes have employed the implicitation of textual elements with the aim of extending or generalising a notion of the text, or in order to reduce the emphasis on—or sometimes even to remove—certain suggestions (see e.g. 37:29 and 59:13). This is were implicitation begins to touch on exegesis. In this twilight zone it could be used as a technique that on the one hand allowed the translator to remain close to the literal wording of Scripture, but which on the other hand gave him some room for a broader or slightly different interpretation of the source text. Without doubt this chapter has included some minuses that have not actually been caused by the application of implicitation, but by the fact that the translator had a source text in front of him that sometimes differed from the MT. Still, because the omission of redundant words closely accords with the translator’s penchant for condensation, this favours the attribution of implicitating minuses to the translator himself.

60 Despite the translator’s aim for conciseness, implicitation in LXX Isa hardly ever leads to ellipsis, i.e. the omission of syntactically required elements. See section 7.4a.