



Seattle Pacific University
LIBRARY
Discover, Create, Share

Seattle Pacific University
Digital Commons @ SPU

Honors Projects


University Scholars

2014

A Foreign Text in a Foreign Land

Dylan A. Vernon
Seattle Pacific University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.spu.edu/honorsprojects>

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Classical Literature and Philology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Vernon, Dylan A., "A Foreign Text in a Foreign Land" (2014). *Honors Projects*. 8.
<http://digitalcommons.spu.edu/honorsprojects/8>

This Honors Project is brought to you for free and open access by the University Scholars at Digital Commons @ SPU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ SPU.

A FOREIGN TEXT IN A FOREIGN LAND

by

DYLAN A. VERNON

FACULTY ADVISOR, DR. OWEN EWALD

SECOND READER, SARA KOENIG

A project submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the University Scholars Program

Seattle Pacific University

2014

Approved _____

Date _____

Abstract

The Bible has passed through different languages and cultures, and in the process the words of the text lose their original meaning and gain new meanings. This process influences the way that commentators interpret the biblical text. This study looks at the Hebrew verb פתה that appears in Hosea 2:16, the Greek verb *πλανω* that translates פתה in Hosea 2:16, and the Latin verb *lacto* that translates פתה in Hosea 2:16. This study then looks at the interpretations of Hosea 2:16 by three commentators, Rabbi Shlomo ben Issac (Rashi), Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nicholas of Lyra. Rashi read the Hebrew text, Theodore read the Greek text, and Nicholas read the Latin text; and each commentator was influenced by the version of the biblical text that he read.

Using a cognitive linguistic approach, this study develops a profile-base-cognitive domain relationship for each verb. This approach highlights the differences between each verb and allows for easy comparison.

The goal of this study is to emphasize the importance of connotation for the interpretative process.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank Dr. Owen Ewald and Dr. Sara Koenig for their help. They were always available for paper consultation and general encouragement—the paper writing process had many ups and downs, and much confusion on my part, but Dr. Ewald and Dr. Koenig kept me on the straight and narrow. And now that the project is over, I can see how much help they have given me. This project would have been more stressful and more difficult without their help.

A Foreign Text in a Foreign Land

The Old Testament has a long history of transmission through different cultures and languages. The translation history began around the third century B.C.E. with the Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament. But the composition of the Old Testament began, according to scholarly consensus, in the sixth century B.C.E. As the history of the Old Testament progresses it is translated, and the meaning of the text is altered in the process. The Hebrew word מִפְתִּיחַ (mepeteh), which appears in Hosea 2:16, has a complex meaning that later translations do not fully capture. By exploring the Hebrew Old Testament and two translations—the Greek Septuagint and the Latin Vulgate—I hope to provide evidence of these phenomena.

The earliest translation of the Hebrew Old Testament began in the third century B.C.E. This was the Greek translation of the first five books of the Hebrew Old Testament, also called the Pentateuch. Unlike the Latin Vulgate, the Greek Septuagint was the work of a committee of translators who were familiar with Hebrew and Greek. After the Septuagint translators finished the translation of the Pentateuch, the rest of the Hebrew Bible was translated into Greek over the next few centuries. The other translation that I will explore is the Latin Vulgate translated by Jerome from Hebrew between 390 and 405 C.E. Jerome was familiar with Hebrew, Latin, and Greek.

Other scholars have recognized that the meaning of a text can change during translation. For example, in his study on the translation of the divine name in the Septuagint,

Martin Rosel shows that the Septuagint Pentateuch translates the divine name with either \square $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (ho theos) or $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (kurios). Rosel limits his study to the Pentateuch because the rest of the Septuagint used the Pentateuch as a model for translation (Rosel 419). The translators generally translated the tetragrammaton or four letter name of God, יהוה (adonai), with $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (kurios) and the Hebrew word אלהים (elohim) with \square $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (ho theos). There are some situations, however, where \square $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (ho theos) translates יהוה (adonai), and $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (kurios) translates אלהים (elohim) (Rosel 419).

After establishing that these examples do not result from a different Hebrew text underlying the Septuagint translation, Rosel concluded that these departures from the traditional translation of יהוה (adonai) and אלהים (elohim) suggest a theological influence (Rosel 419). Rosel shows that the Septuagint translators rendered the name of God with the Greek word \square $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (ho theos) when the deity performs acts of power or aggression, and with the Greek word $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (kurios) when the deity performs acts of compassion (Rosel 423). This implies that the Septuagint translators wanted to draw a rough distinction between God as $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (kurios) and God as \square $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (ho theos).

Within the Minor Prophets, W. Edward Glenny identified 23 differences between the Hebrew text and the Septuagint text of Amos. Glenny then showed that the translators departed from Hebrew in order to make sense of difficult or obscure verses and to update the Hebrew text for their contemporary audience (Glenny 539). This adaptation led to the differences between the Hebrew text and the Septuagint text of Amos. Glenny also showed that these differences arose because of the act of translating but not because of a different or corrupted Hebrew text underlying the Septuagint translation (Glenny 547).

In addition to looking at translations, biblical scholars use many different methods of biblical criticism, including form criticism, historical criticism, textual criticism, and others. Each method of biblical criticism has its own value; I will, however, adopt a newer method called Cognitive Linguistics.

Cognitive Linguistics is a sub-field within modern linguistics.¹ Ronald Langacker developed the theory behind Cognitive Linguistics in his book *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. This theory adopts a unique perspective on words and their meaning. Behind every word, lies a web of meaning that develops from a unique cultural and historical background. Because of this view, cognitive linguists do not accept a dictionary view of meaning but adopt an encyclopedic view (van Wolde *Reframing* 8). The dictionary view assumes that a word's meaning can be preserved by a definition of the sort that is seen in a dictionary, the encyclopedic view assumes that a dictionary definition cannot preserve the meaning of a word but only captures superficial aspects of the word's deeper meaning. In order to understand a word, cognitive linguists identify three parts of a word's web of meaning: 1) profile, 2) base, and 3) cognitive domain.

The profile includes information specific to the word's particular use in a sentence. In other words, the profile is the tip of the word's meaning. From here, the cognitive linguist attempts to discover what concepts underlie the profile or are necessary to understand the profile. This search leads the researcher to an understanding of the word's base. The base includes background information that is necessary for the conceptualization or understanding of the word's profile. The profile and base are held closely together in a profile-base

¹ For a description of the development of Cognitive Linguistics read Ellen van Wolde, *Reframing* pp. 29-34.

relationship (van Wolde *Reframing* 57). Without understanding the concepts contained within the word's base, the profile cannot be conceptualized.

Two examples will help in understanding the profile-base relationship. For the concept [CIRCLE], the base is two-dimensional space and the profile is the shape of a circle. In order to conceptualize the profile one must first have a concept of space. Only on the base of space can a person build the concept [CIRCLE]. The second example shows the profile-base relationship for the concept [ARC]. For this concept, the base is a circle and the profile is a curved line segment. In order to understand the concept [ARC], the profile must be built upon the base of a circle. If a person builds the profile on the base of two-dimensional space, as in the previous example, the person only understands the concept [CURVED-LINE-SEGMENT]. Only when a person builds the profile on the base of a circle can the person understand the concept [ARC]. This is because the concept [ARC] assumes the concept [CIRCLE] in its base. Without the intermediary base of circle, a person cannot understand the concept [ARC].²

Cognitive domains form the background to the profile-base relationship. For example, the cognitive domain of the concept [ARC] would be two-dimensional space. Cognitive domains separate into two groups: abstract domains and basic domains. Basic domains include fundamental concepts such as space and time. These domains do not derive from more fundamental domains. Abstract domains include any domain that can be derived from a more fundamental domain such as space or time. As the two examples above have shown, the cognitive domain, profile, and base change depending on the concept. The cognitive domain of one concept can become the base of another concept, or the profile of one concept can

² This example comes from Langacker's book *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar* 183-4.

become the base of another concept as in the example of [ARC]. On the other hand, different profiles can have the same base. For example, the concepts [ARC] and [DIAMETER] both have [CIRCLE] as their base (Langacker 185). Similarly, the concepts [CIRCLE] and [TRIANGLE] share the common base of space.

Ellen van Wolde has adapted this approach for Biblical studies. She outlines her approach in her book *Reframing Biblical Studies: When Language and Text Meet Culture, Cognition, and Context* and in numerous articles. One such article applies the Cognitive Linguistic approach to the word קשת (qeshet) in Genesis 9:12-17. This Hebrew word means “bow,” but it is commonly translated as “rainbow.” In Genesis 9:12-17, God places his קשת (qeshet) in the sky as a sign of his promise not to flood the earth. Van Wolde first identifies two different profiles for the word קשת (qeshet): 1) the word profiles the concept [RAINBOW] or 2) the word profiles the concept [WARRIOR’S BOW].³ If the word profiles [RAINBOW] then its base will include concepts of [ARC] and [COLORS]; the profile-base relationship occurs in the cognitive domain of [METEOROLOGY]. If the word profiles [WARRIOR’S BOW], then its base will include concepts of [ARROW] and [ENEMY]; this profile-base relationship occurs in the cognitive domain of [WAR]. Van Wolde then identifies other instances in the Old Testament and contemporary Near Eastern texts where the word קשת (qeshet) appears. As a result of this study van Wolde concludes that the word קשת (qeshet) profiles the concept [WARRIOR’S BOW].

³ Van Wolde includes a third profile, [BOW STAR]. This third option, however, is related to the second profile, [WARRIORS BOW]. Because of the relationship between [BOW STAR] and [WARRIORS BOW], I have chosen to include only the first two profiles, [RAINBOW] and [WARRIORS BOW]. I think that these two profiles are sufficient for the purpose of this paper.

She supports her conclusion by showing that elsewhere in the Old Testament the word קשת (qeshet) usually refers to a warrior's bow. Contemporary Near Eastern texts also support her conclusion. In Near Eastern myths, the gods place their bow in the sky as a sign of victory over their enemies. After looking at this evidence, van Wolde concludes that the word קשת (qeshet) does not profile [RAINBOW] but [WARRIOR'S BOW] (van Wolde "Bow" 380-400).

Van Wolde describes three steps in a cognitive linguistic analysis of a Biblical text (van Wolde *Reframing* 204). The first step deals with the cultural and cognitive background of the text. This step produces a preliminary inventory of cognitive categories or domains. For this step van Wolde suggests exploring relevant secondary literature. The second step involves a detailed study of the word's profile-base-cognitive domain relationship. In this step the cognitive linguist explores the instances of the word in the Old Testament and the word's relationship to similar words in other Near Eastern languages. The third step focuses on the word's meaning in a single instance in the text. In the third step, the cognitive linguist attempts to understand what this instance can tell the reader about the author's conception of the world.

To recapitulate, the process begins by exploring the word's meaning within the larger framework of ancient Near Eastern thought. Then the study narrows to focus on a single instance of the word, but uses the results of the previous steps to understand the meaning of the word in a single instance. My study will expand the scope of van Wolde's analysis by applying her method to three different texts, the Hebrew Old Testament and two translations—the Greek Septuagint and the Latin Vulgate.

Before dealing with the text of Hosea 2:16 in the different translations, I will provide an outline of the history of the Old Testament from the Hebrew original to the Latin Vulgate. Understanding the transmission of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek and Latin will provide a context for understanding their importance for my study.

Early Semitic peoples began writing the Hebrew Old Testament during the pre-exilic period, around the sixth century B.C.E. Before this period, individual proverbs or prophetic sayings were written on scraps of pottery called *ostraca* (Wurthwein 5). After Hebrew scribes adopted papyrus and leather for writing, they gained the ability to record longer compositions. Our earliest Hebrew papyrus is from the eighth or seventh century B.C.E. (Wurthwein 6). This means that large portions of the oral tradition of the Hebrew Old Testament were being recorded at this time. From this point on, the Hebrew Old Testament grows to include the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Writings.

In the third century B.C.E., the need for a Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament arose. By this time, many Jews who lived in Hellenistic Egypt had lost their Hebrew fluency. In order to read the ancient scriptures, the Jews needed a Greek translation. To meet this need, a committee of Hellenistic Jews worked together to produce the Greek translation called the Septuagint. The translation began with the first five books of the Hebrew Old Testament and expanded over a long period of time to include the entire Old Testament (Wurthwein 53).

In the Septuagint, the ideas of the Old Testament meet the Greek world for the first time. Accordingly, the ideas of the Old Testament as mediated through the Septuagint played a

crucial role in the formation of early Christian thought (Wurthwein 50). The Hellenistic Jews working on this translation, however, were separated from the culture of the original text by many centuries, meaning that cultural differences may have played a role in the translation. If these differences exist, they also influenced early Christian thought.

During the centuries after the Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament, the Latin language spread throughout the Western world. This development required that the Old Testament and New Testament be translated into Latin. Between the years 390 C.E. and 405 C.E. Jerome translated the Hebrew Old Testament into Latin; his translation is called the Vulgate (Wurthwein 96). In his translation, Jerome shows influences from Christian tradition and from the Septuagint translation (Wurthwein 97). These influences may have led to differences in his translation of the Hebrew Old Testament. In order to show the kind of change in meaning that can result from a translation, I have provided an example. Here I have reproduced Isaiah 7:14b in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin with English translations from each language:

The verse in Hebrew:

הִנֵּה הָעַלְמָה הָרָה וְיִלְדֶת בֵּן וְקָרְאת שְׁמוֹ עִמָּנוּ אֵל:

(hineh haalmah harah veyoledet ben veqarat shemo imanu el)

The English translation from the Hebrew:

Behold, the young woman is pregnant and she will bring forth a son, and you (feminine, singular) will call his name Immanu El (With us is God).

The verse in Greek:

ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τεξέται υἱόν, καὶ καλεσεῖς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουήλ·

(idou he parthenos en gastri exei kai texetai hwion, kai kaleseis to onoma outou Emmanouel)

The English translation from Greek:

Behold, the virgin will have a son in her womb and she will bring him forth, and you (singular) will call his name Emmanouel,

The verse in Latin:

ecce virgo concipiet et pariet filium et vocabitis nomen eius Emmanuhel

The English translation from Latin reads:

Behold, the virgin will conceive and she will bring forth a son, and you (plural) will call his name Emmanuhel,

In the Hebrew text the word עלמה (almah) means “young woman” as distinguished from “young man.” In fact, the Hebrew word for “young man” is the masculine version of the word for “young woman.” In the Septuagint, the Hebrew word is translated with the word παρθενος (parthenos), which means “virgin.” In his translation, Jerome was likely influenced by the Septuagint and translated עלמה (almah) with the Latin word *virgo*, which also means “virgin.” The Septuagint translation of this verse also influences later Christian tradition surrounding the virgin birth of Christ (D Rousseau 177).

Another significant difference is the translation of the Hebrew verb וקראת (veqarat), which means “and you (feminine, singular) will call.” In the Vulgate, Jerome translates the Hebrew with the Latin phrase *et vocabitis*, which means “and you (feminine and masculine, plural) will call.” The Latin translation changes the subject of the verb from the young woman in the Hebrew text to a larger group of people, perhaps all of Israel or all Christians.

After applying a cognitive linguistic approach to the Hebrew word עלמה (almah) and the Greek word παρθενος (parthenos), the difference becomes apparent. The Hebrew word profiles

the concept [YOUNG WOMAN], which builds upon the base concept [YOUTH]. The Greek word, however, profiles the concept [VIRGIN], which builds upon the base concept [YOUNG WOMAN]. This approach shows that the Greek word has narrowed the meaning of the Hebrew word. In this way, the meaning of the Hebrew word changes from “young woman” to the more specific meaning “virgin.”

For my study, I will focus on the Hebrew word מַפְתִּיחַ (mepeteḥa), which appears in Hosea 2:16, and its Greek and Latin equivalents. Hosea wrote his book sometime in the eighth century B.C.E., but scholars disagree on a more precise date. Freedman and Andersen argue that the proper context for Hosea’s book is the time before the Syro-Ephraimitic war, which began in 734 B.C.E. as a conflict between Rezin of Damascus and Tiglath-Pileser III of Assyria. Brad E. Kelle, on the other hand, argues that chapter two of the book of Hosea specifically addresses the issue of the Syro-Ephraimitic war (Kelle 34). Kelle uses rhetorical criticism to argue that chapter two employs rhetorical and metaphorical language that makes sense within the context of the Syro-Ephraimitic war.

Rhetorical criticism assumes that texts persuade their readers and that the historical situation is important for an understanding of the text. The content of the text can also create a textual reality that is different from the historical reality (Kelle 26). In order to distinguish between a textual reality and a historical situation, Kelle uses the terms *rhetorical horizon* and *rhetorical-historical situation*. The rhetorical horizon is a textual reality that develops from a historical situation. Because the historical situation is interpreted through the lens of the text and its rhetorical horizon, Kelle refers to the historical situation as the rhetorical-historical situation (Kelle 27).

In the case of Hosea, a historical eighth century situation existed for the author of the book of Hosea. But because no one from the eighth century is alive to report the events of that century, no one today knows the historical situation absolutely. By studying the rhetorical horizon of Hosea Chapter Two, modern readers can gain an approximate understanding of the historical situation, and this approximate understanding is called the rhetorical-historical situation. In summary, the historical situation is called the rhetorical-historical situation because the modern reader understands the historical situation through the text's rhetorical horizon—the rhetorical horizon, developed from the historical situation, shapes the modern readers understanding of the text's historical situation.

In order to reproduce the rhetorical horizon of Hosea chapter two, the modern reader also needs to understand the metaphors that Hosea uses in chapter two. A metaphor transfers meaning from one verbal element to another verbal element. When authors use metaphors, they place two verbal elements in a relationship, and both elements transfer meaning to each other, a process which creates a third meaning that is different from the meaning of the two verbal elements—a triangle with the metaphorical meaning at the peak (Kelle 36). Sometimes one of the verbal elements is left unsaid, and the modern reader has to reproduce the cultural context in which the metaphor was originally made in order to rediscover the implied verbal element—the modern reader needs to build the missing half of the triangle's base (Kelle 37).

In Hosea, many of the verbal elements are implied, and the modern reader must rediscover them. In order to rediscover the verbal elements that Hosea left unsaid, Kelle studied Hosea two in light of its historical background, which included other Near Eastern texts and traditions, and other Biblical texts (44). Once Kelle established a cultural understanding of

the metaphors in Hosea two, he used the metaphors to develop the text's rhetorical horizon, which he used to uncover the text's rhetorical-historical situation.

Kelle begins with a study of the marriage metaphor, which compares the marriage of Hosea to Gomer with the relationship of God to Israel. He identifies four possible historical situations that the metaphor draws upon for its meaning; among these four possibilities, two will be discussed here. A common view is that the marriage metaphor relates to a widespread fertility cult, which was devoted to the worship of a foreign deity called Baal (Kelle 50). After studying Near Eastern texts that describe marriage procedures, Kelle concludes that the marriage metaphor does not relate to a fertility cult but to actual marriage practices performed in the Near East (78). The marriage practices in the Near East, however, do not explain all of the imagery used to describe the metaphor in Hosea 2.

The woman in Hosea 2 is subjected to various acts of physical violence and humiliation, which Near Eastern marriage practices do not explain. In order to explain the physical violence and humiliation, Kelle analyzes the wife metaphor. Throughout the Hebrew Bible, cities are identified as female and often described as wives of Yahweh (Kelle 93). Also, the destruction of a city is narrated using imagery of violence and humiliation (Kelle 93). For example, in Ezekiel 23:25-26 Jerusalem is threatened with physical violence; in Nahum 3:5 the prophet tells Nineveh, a city, that he will uncover its shame and nakedness (Kelle 92). Similarly, Lamentations Chapter One narrates the destruction of a city that is personified as a woman. In light of this evidence, Kelle concludes that the wife metaphor in Hosea 2 relies on a metaphorical tradition that personifies cities as wives and punishes them with physical violence and humiliation (Kelle 93). Because the capital city Samaria is mentioned elsewhere in the book of Hosea, Kelle

narrows the identification of the woman in Hosea 2, whom he identifies as the capital city Samaria (Kelle 89). Related to this is the metaphor of adultery, which Kelle describes as a metaphor for political alliances with foreign nations (Kelle 108).

In Hosea 2, the woman chases after “lovers” or “Baals.” The common view interprets both of these terms in the context of a religious crisis, and relates the terms “lovers” and “Baals” to foreign Gods. According to this view, Hosea’s chief concern was the mixing of Israelite religion with a Canaanite fertility cult (Kelle 113). This view, however, ignores a Biblical tradition that describes political allies as “lovers” (Kelle 122). For example, Jeremiah 2:20-25 describes Israel as an adulterous wife who chases after Baal, who is a metaphor for foreign powers. And, as Kelle argues, Biblical and extrabiblical material suggest that the worship of Yahweh was not threatened by a Canaanite fertility cult in the eighth century B.C.E. (163). The use of the term “Baal” in Hosea 2, while not referring to a contemporary Baal or fertility cult, does relate the political alliances between Samaria and other nations to the Baal cult of earlier centuries. The term “Baal” with its religious undertones suggests a theological interpretation of Samaria’s political alliances (Kelle 165).

This analysis of the metaphors in Hosea 2 has outlined the texts rhetorical horizon. The text assumes that the reader would be aware of various metaphorical traditions that personified cities as wives of Yahweh, and that used the terms “lovers” and “Baals” as metaphors for political allies. The rhetorical horizon suggests a time when Samaria was seeking political alliances with foreign powers and when the city was in danger (Kelle 181). Using the rhetorical horizon as his point of departure, Kelle uses Biblical and extra-Biblical texts to find the historical situation that the texts rhetorical horizon suggests.

Kelle identifies the Syro-Ephraimitic war as the most likely context for Hosea 2 because the city Samaria was a key element in the conflict, and because the conflict involved political alliances with foreign powers (181). The key players in the Syro-Ephraimitic war were Rezin, King of Damascus; Pekah, King of Israel; Ahaz, King of Judah; and Tiglath-Pileser III, King of Assyria. In the eighth century, Assyria ruled Israel and Judah. Leading up to 734 B.C.E., there was an anti-Assyrian movement (Kelle 187). And in 734 B.C.E. the Syro-Ephraimitic war began as a rebellion against Assyrian rule. Rezin of Damascus and Pekah of Israel were chief among the opponents of Assyrian rule (Kelle 187). Ahaz of Judah, however, remained loyal to Assyria throughout the rebellion (Kelle 188). Soon after the outbreak of the rebellion led by Pekah and Rezin, Tiglath-Pileser III led a campaign, during which Tiglath-Pileser III defeated Rezin and many other opponents of Assyrian rule; Tiglath-Pileser III, however, did not attack Pekah (Kelle 188).

Pekah was instead removed from power by a popular Jewish uprising from within the capital city Samaria. This uprising was led by Hoshea—not to be confused with Hosea—who wanted to reestablish the political relations between Israel and Assyria, which the rebellion had interrupted (Kelle 188). By reestablishing relations with Assyria, Hoshea reunited the two halves of the Jewish empire, Israel and Judah (Kelle 199). While Pekah was in control of Israel there was a division between Israel and Judah, and the danger of destruction from Assyria. Hosea saw the danger for Israel, and in Chapter Two of his book, he tells Samaria to stay faithful to Yahweh and the divinely approved alliance with Assyria.

The above rhetorical analysis has provided a context for Hosea Chapter Two, which will contribute to an understanding of the meaning of the Hebrew root פתה (patah). The meaning of

the root that develops from this context will be the point of comparison when I analyze the meaning of the word in Greek and Latin. This is not to say that the meaning of the root in the eighth century context is the correct meaning. The goal of my project is not to establish the correct meaning of the root but to show that the meaning of the root can change. I will begin with an analysis of the Hebrew root.

In the Hebrew text, the Hebrew root appears 47 times: 20 times as a substantive construction in the form of פתי (peti) or פתייות (petaiyut), and 27 times as a verb form—not including the six times that the verb form appears in the apocryphal Sirach (Mosis 162). The root most often appears in Wisdom literature, and the other occurrences should be interpreted in light of the root's meaning developed from the Wisdom literature (Mosis, 162).

The 27 occurrences of the verb form appear in four conjugations: five times in the qal, two times in the niphal, two times in the pual, and 18 times in the piel (Mosis 164). The verb form always emphasizes the establishment of the condition suggested by the substantive construction; each of the conjugations qualifies the emphasis, but the emphasis is always on the establishment of the condition. In this way, the verb is concerned with making the object of an active verb form and the subject of a passive verb form into a פתי (peti), and it is not concerned with how the object or subject got there (Mosis 164).

The substantive construction appears in singular and plural forms, which both refer to a group but with the individual's unique identity in mind (Mosis 165). פתי (peti), which means "simple/naïve," appears most often in the book of Proverbs where the word is described in terms of what the group lacks, what the group needs, and what the group inherits (Brown 834).

Proverbs 8:5 describes the פתי (peti) as those people who lack ערמה (ormah). This word can refer negatively to the process involved in premeditated murder, but in the book of Proverbs this word always refers positively to someone who has prudence; in fact, an English equivalent of ערמה (ormah) is “prudence” (Niehr 362). More important is that ערמה (ormah) represents the ideal way of life that the book of Proverbs hopes to lead its readers to; if the פתי (peti) lack ערמה (ormah), they will not achieve the way of life described in the book of Proverbs (Niehr 365).

Proverbs 21:11 describes the פתי (peti) as those people who need חכמה (chachma). Elsewhere in the book of Proverbs, חכמה (chachma) is personified as a divine figure of salvation and as the giver of life; an English equivalent of חכמה (chachma) is “wisdom” (Muller 385). If the פתי (peti) find the personified חכמה (chachma), they will find protection from forces that would harm them, such as אולת (ivelet) (Mosis 167). Proverbs 14:18, however, describes the פתי (peti) as those people who inherit אולת (ivelet).

אולת (ivelet) is associated with another Hebrew word כסיל (kesil), which corresponds to the English word “fool” (Cazelles 140). In Proverbs 9:13, the enemy of חכמה (chachma) is called כסילות (kesilyut), which is related to the word כסיל (kesil) (Schupphaus 266). While the personified חכמה (chachma) attempts to protect the פתי (peti) from harm, a personified כסילות (kesilyut) is trying to capture the פתי (peti) and keep them from ערמה (ormah) and חכמה (chachma) (Schupphaus 266). This analysis gives rise to a narrative, which has the פתי (peti) in a state of equipoise, pulled between two personified forces—חכמה (chachma) and כסילות (kesilyut). And the פתי (peti) are vulnerable to the attacks of a personified כסילות (kesilyut) because they inherit אולת (ivelet).

The פתי (peti), however, have a guide that will lead them away from כסילות (kesilyut) and towards חכמה (chachmah). The book of Proverbs acts as a guide for the פתי (peti) (Mosis 167). Proverbs 1:3-4 says that the teachings in the book of Proverbs intend to give ערמה (ormah) to the פתי (peti), which will help them to find חכמה (chachmah). While the פתי (peti) are in a vulnerable position, they are not helpless.

In Hosea 2:16, the Hebrew root פתה (patah) appears as a piel participle in the clause, לכן (lechen) connects Hosea 2:16 with the מפתיה הנה אנכי (‘‘therefore behold, I will allure her’’). לכן (lechen) connects Hosea 2:16 with the previous verse and implies that Yahweh’s actions in Hosea 2:16 are a result of the previous verse, which expresses Yahweh’s desire to punish the city Samaria—personified as a woman (Kelle 266). The adverb לכן (lechen) also functions in a series of clauses that begin with לכן (lechen); each of the clauses that begin with לכן (lechen) introduce a punishment. According to Kelle, the לכן (lechen) in Hosea 2:16 combines with the last clause in verse 15. Kelle then concludes that the לכן (lechen) in 2:16 functions as a hinge that contrasts verse 16 and 15. Instead of introducing a type of punishment, the לכן (lechen) in 2:16 introduces the opposite (Kelle 266). The analysis of the rhetorical-historical situation and the meaning of פתה (patah) will provide the background to an understanding of מפתיה (mepeteha) in Hosea 2:16.

In summary, the rhetorical analysis of Hosea Chapter Two showed that Hosea’s rhetorical historical situation was the Syro-Ephraimitic war. During this war, Pekah ruled Israel from the capital city Samaria and rebelled against Assyria. This rebellion created a divide between Israel and Judah, who remained loyal to the Assyrian empire. Tiglath-Pileser III defeated Rezin of Damascus and other supporters of the rebellion, but he ignored Pekah

because a popular revolt was being organized by the citizens of Samaria who wanted to restore the alliance between Israel and Assyria.


When Hosea wrote Chapter Two, he was addressing the citizens of Samaria. The citizens of Samaria had to make a choice between rebellion against Assyria or alliance with Assyria. If the citizens chose rebellion, they would have remained under the control of Pekah and would have been destroyed by Assyria. Instead the citizens choose to join in an alliance with Assyria. This choice saved Israel from destruction and reunited Israel and Judah. There are parallels between the historical situation and the narrative described in the book of Proverbs. The root פתה (patah) in 2:16, relates the narrative in the book of Proverbs to the historical situation of Hosea 2.

The פתי (peti) are a vulnerable group of people who are positioned between two opposing forces, a personified חכמה (chachmah) and a personified כסילות (kesilyut). In light of the historical situation, the כסילות (kesilyut) becomes associated with the rebellion that Pekah was involved in, the חכמה (chachmah) becomes associated with Assyria, and the פתי (peti) becomes associated with the citizens of Samaria whom Hoshea led in a revolt against Pekah. The combination of the historical background and the linguistic analysis of פתה (patah) are the necessary tools for the development of the verbs profile-base-cognitive domain relationship.

The cognitive domain of the Hebrew root is [WISDOM LITERATURE]. The concepts [כסילות/FOLLY] and [חכמה/WISDOM] are in the root's base. And the root profiles the concepts [NAÏVTY] and [INNOCENCE]. From this profile-base-cognitive domain relationship, a general picture of the Hebrew root develops. Only by understanding the concepts [כסילות/FOLLY] and

[חכמה/WISDOM] within the cognitive domain [WISDOM LITERATURE] does the root gain its full meaning.

When the root is used in Hosea 2:16, it gains specific meanings associated with Hosea's historical background so that another cognitive domain is added. פתה (patah) in Hosea 2:16 has the cognitive domains of [WISDOM LITERATURE] and [POLITICS]. In its base, the root has the concepts [חכמה/WISDOM], [כסילות/FOLLY], [REBELLION] from Assyria, and [OBEDIENCE] to Assyria. While the root פתה (patah) normally operates within the cognitive domain of [WISDOM LITERATURE], its use in Hosea 2:16 places the root within a political context, and the root gains another cognitive domain. This additional cognitive domain influences the roots base by contributing other concepts. I have created a map of the profile-base-cognitive domain relationship for פתה (patah) in Hosea 2:16:






Fig. 1

Rabbi Shlomo ben Issac (Rashi):

In order to exemplify how the word’s meaning can change in the process of interpreting, I will explore the commentary on the book of Hosea by Rabbi Shlomo ben Issac, also known as Rashi. Rashi lived between 1040 C.E. and 1105 C.E. and commented on the Hebrew Bible. Rashi is famous for his concise commentaries, which combine Jewish folklore—Midrash and Talmud—with a historical interpretation of the biblical text (Telushkin 181). He had a preference for the literal or simple interpretation—called *Peshat*. For example, in Hosea 2:11 where it says “Therefore, I will return and take my corn in its time,” Rashi comments on the phrase “in its time.” Rashi explains that the phrase means: “at the time the produce completes its ripening” (Rosenberg 13). Later in the same verse, Rashi briefly discusses the meaning of a Hebrew verb. He explains that the Hebrew verb הצלה (hatsalah) means “to separate,” which

cleared up a misunderstanding of the Hebrew verb (Rosenberg 13). This example shows that Rashi was concerned with a fundamental understanding of the text.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, another commentator who was also interested in the literal meaning of the biblical text, uses many lines of text to interpret the same verse, and he includes many creative additions (Hill 47). Concerning Hosea 2:11, Theodore explains in detail how God will take away the corn by suggesting a sudden catastrophe (Hill 47). Theodore gives his readers a detailed picture of God's actions; Rashi gives his readers a fundamental understanding of the words and phrases of the verse.

Another form of interpretation that Rashi used was the sermonic meaning, which looked deeper into the meaning of the verse; this type of meaning is called *Derash* (Telushkin 181). An example of a *Derash* interpretation is found in Hosea 1:2, which reads: "At the beginning of the Lord's speaking to Hosea." Rashi begins his interpretation by referencing the rabbinic tradition that established an approximate date of Hosea's prophecies. This part connects verse 2 with other biblical texts from the book of Isaiah, Amos, and Micah to establish a date (Rosenberg 3). He then moves on to his *Peshat* interpretation; he explains that verse 2 introduces God's speech to Hosea (Rosenberg 4). When Rashi interprets a verse according to the *Derash* meaning, he usually relies on the rabbinic tradition, which includes the Talmud and Midrash (Pearl 20).

Other features characterize Rashi's commentary on the book of Hosea. Rashi's commentary cannot be read as a separate book. It assumes a familiarity with the Hebrew text that makes the commentary fragmentary without the Hebrew text. For Rashi, the Hebrew text

tells a story with or without his commentary. Therefore, Rashi doesn't provide a description of the overall flow of the book; instead, Rashi provides footnote-like material that explains obscure terms or provides helpful background information. For modern readers, Rashi hides his understanding of the book in his footnote material. Individually, his comments do not provide information about how Rashi understood the book of Hosea, but collectively they do. Rashi does not reveal his understanding of the book of Hosea in a continuous piece of prose; he has sprinkled little bits of knowledge throughout the book.

In chapter 1, Rashi develops a historical background; but he develops it over the course of the whole chapter with some historical facts here and some there. For verse 1, he explains that Jeroboam is the great grandson of Jehu; but this fact does not become important until verse 4 when Rashi explains that God is going to punish the house of Jehu. If Rashi had provided all this information when he discussed verse 1, the connection between the two facts would be clearer. The information about Jehu in verse 1 seems unimportant without knowing that God will punish the house of Jehu.

Another example is in Hosea 1:3 where the mother, Gomer, is introduced. In Chapter Two, Rashi explains that the mother is a representation of the nation of Israel. Rashi does not tell the reader that Gomer is a personification of Israel until Chapter Two, even though Gomer first appears in Hosea 1:3.

Unlike modern commentators who readily divide the book of Hosea into separate units so that the book of Hosea becomes a collection of more or less independent pieces, Rashi believed that the book of Hosea was an organic whole. He obeyed his received version of the

Hebrew text. So, when the text mentioned Gomer in Hosea 1:8, he explained the meaning of her name; and when the text mentions the mother in Chapter Two, he explained that she represents the nation of Israel. In his mind, he wasn't separating important facts that should be placed together; he was placing important facts where he thought they were most appropriate with respect to his Hebrew text.

What follows from this is that Rashi interpreted the book of Hosea as a unified whole. Kelle, on the other hand, separates Chapter Two from the rest of the book of Hosea and interprets it as a separate unit. Modern commentators divide the book of Hosea into more or less independent units because different units were written at different times; therefore, the historical background for one unit will not be the same as the historical background for another unit. A later Hebrew compiler assembled these independent units into a single book; or each unit was added to the book as each was written. With this framework, Kelle can focus on developing the historical background for one unit; Rashi, however, has to provide one historical background for many units that were developed from different historical backgrounds. Because of this fundamental difference, Rashi's interpretation does not focus on specific issues like the rebellion led by Pekah. Instead, Rashi's interpretation develops a general historical background for the entire book, as if the whole book was written in the same time and place.

Rashi recognizes that Hosea 2:1 does not seem to follow from the last verse of Chapter One. Chapter One ends with God denouncing His people, but Chapter Two begins with God praising his people and promising to increase their number. Rashi explains the change in tone—from denouncing to praising—as the result of an excited emotion that quickly moves from angry to happy (Rosenberg 8). As an analogy, Rashi tells the story of a king who was mad with

his wife and summoned a scribe for writing a letter of divorce. But by the time that the scribe arrived, the king had become happy. So, he told the scribe to write a letter expressing the king's desire to stay married. Like the king in the story, God can change from angry to happy. In this way, Rashi explains the apparent disjunction between Chapters One and Two, and he preserves the unity of the book of Hosea.

For Rashi, the book of Hosea describes Israel's rebellion from God, and its eventual restoration. The first chapter warns that Israel is wandering away from God and that it will be destroyed. The rest of the book describes the ways in which Israel has disobeyed God. One way Israel has disobeyed God is by following in the ways of foreign nations—Rashi specifically mentions Egypt and Assyria (Rosenberg 11). Israel's disobedience, however, does not follow a steady path away from God towards other nations because periods of disobedience are often followed by periods of obedience.

For example, the end of chapter 3 describes a time when Israel will repent and return to God. Rashi explains this as the return to two kingdoms and the temple: the Kingdom of Heaven, the kingdom of the House of David, and the Holy Temple (Rosenberg 21). But in the beginning of Chapter Four, Israel is accused of murder, deception, and ignorance. Throughout the book of Hosea, descriptions of Israel's disobedience and obedience follow one another. Because Rashi's commentary tracks the progression of the book, his commentary also mixes descriptions of Israel's disobedience, when Israel follows after foreign nations and their gods; and descriptions of obedience, when Israel follows after God and his teachings.

Rashi's commentary on Chapter Two tracks the Hebrew text. His commentary begins by promising to increase the number of Israel and reunite Israel with Judah; he then describes Israel's disobedience; and ends with a promise of restoration. Rashi begins his interpretation of Hosea 2:16 according to the *Peshat* meaning. Verse 16 begins, לכן הנה אנכי מפתיה ("therefore, behold I will allure her"), which Rashi glosses, "I will persuade her (משדלה, meshadalah) to be drawn after me" (Rosenberg 14). His interpretation restates the basic meaning of the verse, but it does not suggest a deeper meaning; he keeps his *Peshat* at surface level. Rashi explains the next part of verse 16 according to the *Derash* meaning. He associates the desert with the exile, and explains that Israel will see the error of her ways and return to God (Rosenberg 14). A *Peshat* interpretation of this verse would theoretically be explained by Rashi thus: and God persuaded them into the desert where he spoke to them. The *Derash* interpretation moves beyond a fundamental understanding by assigning a theological meaning to the verse.

In the first part of the verse, Rashi translates מפתיה (mepeteha) with the word משדלה (meshadalah). This verb derives from the root שדל (shadal), which does not appear in the Hebrew Old Testament. The root does, however, appear in the Aramaic translations of the Hebrew Old Testament, called the Targums, where it sometimes translates the Hebrew root פתה (patah)—twice in the former and later prophets. שדל (shadal) also translates the Hebrew roots שסע (shasa) "to tear apart," מסח (masach), and שוב (shuv) "to turn."

Of these four Hebrew roots, פתה (patah) and שוב (shuv) provide an insight into the meaning of שדל (shadal). The occurrence of שסע (shasa) that שדל (shadal) translates is probably corrupt (Brown 1042). The Aramaic translator may have wanted to clear up an uncertain text by translating שסע (shasa) with שדל (shadal). מסח (masach) only appears in 1 Kings 11:6 where it is

translated by שדל (shadal); the meaning of מסח (masach) is uncertain, and this text is probably corrupt (Brown 586). The Aramaic translator may have wanted to clear up an uncertain text by translating מסח (masach) with שדל (shadal). The only texts that contribute to our understanding of שדל (shadal) are Judges 14:15 and 16:5 where שדל (shadal) translates פתה (patah), and Ezekiel 38:4 and 39:2 where שדל (shadal) translates שוב (shuv). In the verses in the book of Judges, a woman named Delilah is asked to entice—פתה (patah)/שדל (shadal)—her husband, Samson, to reveal the secret of his strength so that a group of men can take away his strength. In the verses in the book of Ezekiel, God threatens to turn—שוב (shuv)/שדל (shadal)—a king in a different direction.

פתה (patah) should be understood in light of its profile-base-cognitive domain relationship that I developed earlier. שדל (shadal) has a different cognitive background; but שדל (shadal) does not often appear in the Targums, and an attempt to develop its cognitive background from these few occurrences would fail to capture the Aramaic root's meaning. Oftentimes, שדל (shadal) translates an obscure Hebrew root showing that the Aramaic translator was attempting to clarify an obscure verse but that the translator might not have understood the Hebrew verse. These occurrences of שדל (shadal) are not useful. From the other occurrences, a rough understanding of שדל (shadal) develops. שדל (shadal) can refer to the action of persuading or enticing—as in the book of Judges where it translates פתה (patah)—or to the action of redirecting—as in the book of Ezekiel where it translates שוב (shuv). Anything more detailed than this would put too much pressure on the few occurrences of שדל (shadal) in the Targumim.

Rashi was familiar with the Targumim because Rashi often quotes the Targum of Hosea in his commentary (Rosenberg 4). The Targum of Hosea does not translate מפתיה (mepeteha) with משדלה (meshadalah). Instead, it translates מפתיה (mepeteha) with the Aramaic word משעביד (meshaavid), which means “I will enslave her.” When Rashi glosses מפתיה (mepeteha) with משדלה (meshadalah), he is pushing against the Targum’s negative meaning and towards the more positive meaning suggested by פתה (patah).⁴

Rashi, however, does not understand פתה (patah) with the same cognitive background as the one that I developed earlier. The profile-base-cognitive domain relationship for Rashi’s understanding of פתה (patah) looks much like the one that I developed above; however, Rashi does not assume the same historical background. The base concepts [REBELLION] and [OBEDIENCE] are adapted to the historical background that Rashi assumes. In this historical background the base concepts broaden. Instead of [REBELLION] from Assyria and [OBEDIENCE] to Assyria, the base concepts become [REBELLION] from God or [OBEDIENCE] to God; and the cognitive domain [POLITICS] becomes [RELIGION]. Since Rashi relied on the Hebrew text, he was aware of the narrative in the book of Proverbs and its use of פתי (peti), חכמה (chachmah), and כסילות (kesilyut); therefore, the cognitive domain [WISDOM LITERATURE] stays the same. If a concordance to the Midrash and Talmud, and a concordance to the whole Targum were available, a study of the Aramaic word שדל (shadal) could be used to develop a third cognitive domain for Rashi’s understanding of פתה (patah).

⁴ I used the *Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets* by Johannes C. Moor, and the edition of the Targum by Alexander Sperber.

Rashi interprets the book of Hosea as a narrative of the Jewish nation's disobedience to God. In this interpretation, Chapter Two is not a separate unit, but part of the overall structure of the book of Hosea. Rashi interprets Israel's disobedience as religious apostasy, but not as a political issue in the way that Kelle describes. According to Rashi, the political aspects of Israel's disobedience are less important than the religious issues. Both Kelle and Rashi include religious and political aspects in Hosea's historical background; however, Kelle emphasizes the political aspects, and Rashi emphasizes the religious aspects.

Kelle interprets the lovers and Baals in Hosea 2 as metaphors for political alliances; Rashi interprets the lovers as the kingdoms of Assyria and Egypt, and he interprets the Baals as foreign gods. Rashi includes political aspects, but the political aspects are less important than the religious aspects. This shows how Kelle and Rashi developed the historical background for Hosea. Rashi's emphasis on the religious aspects affects how he understands the meaning of Hosea 2:16. For Rashi, God does not פתה (patah)/שדל (shadal) the Israelites away from Pekah and Rezin but away from Baal and other foreign gods; the political aspects are present in Rashi's interpretation but they play a smaller role than the religious aspects.

The Septuagint and $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$

By the time that Rashi was writing his commentaries on the Hebrew Bible, it had already been translated into Greek and Latin. The subject of the next section of my paper will deal with how the Hebrew verb פתה (patah) was translated into Greek. This section will also deal with the

commentator Theodore of Mopsuestia, who commented on the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible.

The history of the use of *πλανω* (*plano*) begins in the Homeric literature with neutral connotations, which are preserved in the Septuagint—some negative connotations begin to sneak into the words meaning. When the word is used in the early Christian period—when Theodore of Mopsueatia was writing—the word’s negative connotations become more obvious.

The Greek translation is called the Septuagint, which is abbreviated LXX. In the LXX, פתח (*patah*) is translated with 11 different Greek words. Eight of the 11 Greek words translate פתח (*patah*) once. Πλατύνω (*platuno*) translates פתח (*patah*) four times, *πλανω* (*plano*) translates פתח (*patah*) five times, and ἀπατω (*apato*) translates פתח (*patah*) 16 times (Muraoka).

When *πλατύνω* (*platuno*) translates פתח, it refers to the act of expanding or widening. This action can be physical or metaphorical. In Genesis 9:27 where God widens the land so that Japheth can live, the Greek verb operates physically. *Πλατύνω* (*platuno*) operates metaphorically in Deuteronomy 11:16 where the Greek verb describes an expanding heart. The verb in Deuteronomy describes a negative action: once the heart expands the person becomes aware of other gods and can potential disobey God. But the metaphorical meaning does not always operate in a negative situation. In Psalm 118:32, an expanded heart causes a person to follow God’s commandments. When the verb operates metaphorically, it can have positive or negative meaning. The verb in Genesis describes a positive action: Japheth’s father promises that God will bless Japheth by widening the land. The physical use usually has a positive

meaning; one time, however, the verb describes the destruction of a city: the walls are widened, and the city is destroyed (Jeremiah 28:58).

When ἀπατω (apato) translates פתה (patah), it refers to the act of deceiving or enticing or persuading. Of all the Greek verbs that translate פתה (patah), ἀπατω (apato) translates פתה (patah) most often—perhaps because the two verbs have similar sounds. This verb has a neutral meaning; by itself, this verb does not have a moral value. But context can shift the meaning to negative; for example, in Judges 14:15, a woman named Delilah deceives her husband, Samson, so that he will reveal information that would make him vulnerable to the attacks of his enemies. This is an example where the verb takes on negative connotations. As a result of Delilah’s deception, Samson is captured by his enemies.

In Jeremiah 20:7, God deceives a prophet and causes the prophet to become ashamed. The verb appears again in 20:10 where evil people try to deceive the prophet so that they can harm him. At first, these two verses seem to equate God with the evil people. But the result of God’s deception is different in quality from the result of the evil people’s deception. God’s deception forces the prophet to speak the words that God will give him. The prophet becomes ashamed because other people mock him for speaking the words that God gives him. The evil people’s deception causes the prophet harm because they have malicious intent. Verse 20:10 describes a deception like the deception that Delilah uses to hurt Samson. Verse 20:7 should not be translated as deception but as persuasion or enticement: God persuades or entices the prophet to speak, but he does not deceive the prophet.

In Psalm 76:3, deception (□πατω/apato) is associated with comfort. This Psalm describes a person who cries out to God for help. But the person's soul is not comforted because it is not deceived. Again in Sirach 30:23, the soul is deceived before the heart can feel comfort. In both of these verses, deception takes on a positive meaning because it allows for the soul or heart to feel comfort. Just as the verb פתה (patah) brings the object to a state where wisdom and folly can effect it, the verb □πατω (apato) brings the object into a state where God can give the soul comfort or where evil people can harm the object. Both verbs bring the object into a state of equipoise between a force of good and a force of evil.

Moreover, the above analysis shows that other Greek verbs can translate פתה (patah). The verb that translates פתה (patah) in Hosea 2:16 is πλανω (plano). This verb appears in classical and Hellenistic literature, the Septuagint, apocalyptic literature, the New Testament, and early Christian literature.⁵ In each of these literary domains, πλανω (plano) behaves differently.

In Classical literature, the verb appears in three different voices, middle, passive, and active. This verb appears more often in the middle and passive voice than in the active voice. The active verb first appears in the works of Aeschylus and Herodotus, but the middle and passive verb first appears in the works of Homer (Braun 229). All forms of the verb can have a literal meaning or a metaphorical meaning.

When used literally, the verb refers to the physical act of wandering. In Aeschylus' play *Prometheus Bound*, a woman named Io wanders over the land (line 573). While this passage

⁵ Braun divides the usage of πλανω into these five categories.

may have a metaphorical sense, its main sense is physical. In Euripides' play *Helen*, a servant says that he has wandered through a foreign land (line 598). This passage describes the servant's physical act of wandering.

The verb can also describe the wandering of blood through the body (Hippocrates *About Nutrition* 31). This use of the verb is both literal and metaphorical, but mostly literal. The meaning assumes an abstract understanding of the circulatory system, but within that abstract understanding the blood physically wanders through the body. In all of the above passages, the verb describes the physical act of wandering, usually over land. But the verb can also refer to other kinds of physical wandering that are not over land, such as the wandering of blood through the body.

When used metaphorically, the verb refers to hesitation or vacillation between two thoughts or ideas. After the hesitation or vacillation, the subject becomes confused (Braun 230). The metaphorical meaning appears in two kinds of statements, epistemological statements and religious statements. In an epistemological statement, the verb describes a situation where someone misleads another person by deception; but this verb can also describe a situation where someone digresses from the main point of a conversation (Braun 230). When used in an epistemological statement, the verb does not place any guilt on the deceived person, but the deceived person is expected to overcome the deception (Braun 231). For example, in Plato's dialogue *The Apology*, Socrates describes his search for wisdom as a wandering (22a). After he wanders, Socrates comes to a conclusion about what true wisdom is—Socrates' search for wisdom required a period of wandering (Braun 232).

In a religious statement, the verb describes a state of madness that has been sent by the gods. When the state of madness passes, the person is redeemed or made better in some way. For example, after king Oedipus realizes that he has married his mother and killed his father, he is driven mad (Euripides *Oedipus the King* line 727). But he eventually finds redemption, and his madness is removed (Euripides *Oedipus at Colonus* line 88). Like the epistemological statement, the religious statement does not place guilt on the mad person. Instead, the religious statement suggests tragedy (Braun 232).

In the Septuagint, the meaning of the verb changes. The literal sense of the verb stays the same, but the metaphorical meaning becomes almost exclusively religious and places guilt on the deceived person (Braun 233). For example, in Hosea 9:17, people become wanderers when they stop listening to God.⁶ The people wander because they choose not to listen to God. Unlike the verb in classical literature, people who wander are guilty and will be judged if they do not return to God (Braun 236).

Πλανω (plano) appears 121 times in the Septuagint. In all, the Greek verb translates 17 different Hebrew verbs. Most often, πλανω (plano) translates the Hebrew verb תעה (taah), which means “to wander, to stray.” תעה (taah) occurs 50 times in the Hebrew Old Testament (Berges 733). Of these 50 occurrences, πλανω (plano) translates תעה (taah) 45 times (Muraoka). Of all the Hebrew verbs that πλανω (plano) translates, תעה (taah) shows the greatest affinity with πλανω (plano) (Berges 736). The semantic range of תעה (taah) does not overlap with פתה

⁶ In Hosea 9:17, the Greek verb does not translate פתה. The Greek verb translates נדד, which means “to move” or “to wander about.”

(patah); instead, תעה (taah) is associated with the acts of walking or straying, and with the concept of sin (Berges 733).

פּתָה (patah) describes a state of being but does not refer to the act of straying; however, once someone has become a פּתִי (peti) or a simple person, they can be lead astray. In Proverbs 7:25, the reader is warned not to wander after a false teacher. The Hebrew verb is תעה (taah), and the Septuagint translates the verb with πλανω (plano). Here the Hebrew describes the act of straying away from God’s teaching. But before people go away from God’s teaching, they must become פּתִי (peti). Once in a state of simplicity or naïveté, the people can be lead astray. When Delilah entices Samson in Judges 14:15, she does not lead him astray but makes him a פּתִי (peti); Delilah doesn’t want to lead Samson astray, but she wants to make him vulnerable. Πλανω (plano) translates תעה (taah) in Isaiah 53:6 where Isaiah says, παντας □ς προβατα □πλανηθημεν, □νθρωπος τ□ □δ□ α□του □πλανηθη (“we all have wandered like sheep; humans have wandered in their own way”). Here πλανω (plano), which translates תעה (taah), describes the act of straying away from God. But the straying happens as a result of a naïve state of being, here represented as sheep-like. The Hebrew understanding of sheep is obliquely related to the Hebrew understanding of פּתִי (peti) because the sheep are vulnerable without guidance (Waschke 207).

In the New Testament, the literal meaning begins to combine with the metaphorical meaning; the act of wandering becomes more negative; and the tragic use that was common in classical literature does not appear (Braun 251). Also, the coming of Jesus Christ and the belief in the resurrection influence the meaning of the verb. When the verb appears in the New Testament, it refers to the act of wandering away from Jesus Christ. In this way, the New

Testament use goes beyond the Septuagint use (Braun 244). For example, in 1 Peter 2:25, Peter describes non-Christians as wandering sheep. When non-Christians become Christians, they stop wandering. And if a Christian wanders from Jesus Christ, the act is judged more harshly than in the LXX (Braun 243).

When early Christian authors use $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano), the verb refers to a wider range of concepts, and the verb's different uses become mixed. As a result of this mixing, the verb gains new synonyms, and it is used in new contexts (Braun 252). *The Epistle to Diognetus* uses $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) to describe the activity of a serpent that deceives people (12.6). And those whom the serpent deceives become the objects of a structured system of pastoral care (Braun 252). Based on this understanding, Jesus Christ is opposed to the act of $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano). In a negative scenario, the Christian soul is surrounded by deception and becomes entangled in it. Christ comes into the world and rescues the soul from the entanglement (Braun 253). This dichotomy between the entanglement of the world and the clarity of Christ placed an emphasis on asceticism. During this period the use of $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) acquires an ascetic connotation—the serpent deceives the soul by pulling it into the world of entanglement, but Christ liberates the soul by pulling it into the world of asceticism (Braun 253).

The history of $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) began with Homer in the classical period, but its meaning was altered by each literary domain that the verb passed through. When the early Christian authors use $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano), they build upon the established usage, but they also adapt the verb for application to new contexts. $\Pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) does not have a simple dictionary definition but a complex web of meaning that stretches through time, and each new literary domain builds upon previous domains.

The use of $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) in each of the literary domains discussed above deserves a separate profile-base-cognitive domain map. I, however, will focus on the literary domain of the Septuagint and the early Christian period. In the Septuagint, $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) has the cognitive domain of [RELIGION]. The verb's base has concepts of [NAIVETE], [JUDGEMENT], and [GUILT]; and the verb profiles the concept [DISOBEDIENCE]. The following is a map of the verbs profile-base-cognitive domain relationship:




Fig. 2

When פתה (patah) was translated with $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) the verb lost the cognitive domain of [WISDOM LITERATURE] because the Greek verb did not have a relationship to the book of Proverbs. The use of $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) in the Septuagint does not have a political background, and so the verb lost the cognitive domain of [POLITICS]. Because the Greek verb had a predominantly religious connotation, it gained the cognitive domain of [RELIGION]. Both פתה (patah) and $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) have the concept of [NAIVETE] in their conceptual background. פתה

(patah) profiles [NAIVETE], and $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) has the concept in its base. This difference shows that $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$'s (plano) profile depends upon the concept of [NAIVETE]. The three concepts [GUILT], [JUDGEMENT], and [NAIVETE] are necessary for a proper understanding of the profile [DISOBEDIENCE].

The verb's use in the early Christian period fits into the profile-base-cognitive domain relationship of the verb's use in the Septuagint. The early Christian authors, however, adapted the same understanding for different applications. $\Pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) gains an association with the deceptive behavior of the serpent. This association increases the negative evaluation of $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) by adding the concept [SERPENT] to the verbs base. In the Septuagint, the verb profiles the act of disobeying God; but, in the early Christian period the verb profiles the act of disobeying Jesus Christ. The verb's meaning in the early Christian period was also influenced by the addition of the concept [ENTANGLEMENT] in the world, which has the concept [ASCETICISM] as a positive opposite.

Theodore of Mopsuestia:

Theodore of Mopsuestia's understanding of $\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega$ (plano) was most similar to the early Christian period because Theodore was writing near that time. Theodore was born in Antioch in 350 C.E. to a wealthy family (McLeod 3). He received an education at one of the elite rhetorical schools at Antioch, probably the school of Libanius (Reventlow 6). The common curriculum in Antioch began with an introduction to reading and writing, which followed the standard set by Homer in his two epic poems the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Next, the student received training

from a qualified teacher about figurative language and poetic literature. Finally, the student received advanced training from a teacher of rhetoric, who used the rhetorical standards established by classical literature (Reventlow 5).

After his early education, Theodore entered a monastery run by Diodore, the founder of the School of Antioch (McLeod 3). Participation in a monastery required celibacy and rigid asceticism (Reventlow 4). Theodore's commitment to these regulations waned. After enrolling in the monastery, he left with the intention of marrying, but his friend persuaded him to return (McLeod 4). Instead of marrying, Theodore continued to study theology at Diodore's monastery until he was ordained a priest; in 392 C.E. he was ordained bishop of Mopsuestia (McLeod 4). Later scholars acknowledge Theodore as a penetrating critic of Origen's allegorical method and a chief representative of the Antiochene method of exegesis (McLeod 3). He died in 428 C.E. as an orthodox protector of the full humanity of Christ (McLeod 4)

In his writings, Theodore shows an appreciation for the narrative framework of the Old Testament. He resisted the tendency to read Christ into the Old Testament and focused on uncovering the author's original intent and the literal meaning of the text. Theodore wrote during the fourth century C.E. when the Alexandrian allegorical method of exegesis still held sway.

The Alexandrian method of exegesis developed from the writings and methods of Philo, a Hellenistic Jew (Grant 52). Steeped in both Greek philosophy and Jewish tradition, Philo attempted to bring the Semitic worldview expressed in the Bible into the Hellenistic worldview (Reventlow 40). In order to achieve this goal Philo adopted the method of allegorical exegesis.

The Platonic distinction between a realm of permanent forms and a changeable reality influenced Philo's allegorical method (Reventlow 41). Using the allegorical method influenced by this Platonic distinction, Philo argued that in order to bring the message of the Bible into the Hellenistic worldview an exegete must first uncover the truth that lies behind the literal meaning of the text (Reventlow 41). In this framework, the literal meaning of the text referred to the Platonic conception of a changeable reality, and the allegorical meaning referred to the Platonic conception of a realm of permanent forms. As applied to the Bible, the literal meaning of the Biblical text referred to physical objects or concepts in a Semitic worldview that did not relate to the Hellenistic worldview. The allegorical meaning captured the deeper meaning of the text, which the literal meaning originally captured as well. Because the Hellenistic and Jewish worldview differed in their particulars, the literal meaning would distract the Hellenistic reader from the true or allegorical meaning of the text.

Origen, a later Alexandrian exegete, adopted the method of exegesis established by Philo, but also developed and systematized the traditional method along strict methodological lines (Simonetti 39). Origen used a body-soul analogy to explain the difference between the literal meaning and the allegorical meaning. The literal meaning corresponds to the body and the allegorical meaning corresponds to the soul (Simonetti 41). In this view, the body or literal meaning hides the soul or allegorical meaning. In order to access the soul of the text the exegete must see through the body. Each passage in the Bible had an allegorical meaning, but not every passage had a literal meaning. Origen denied a passage's literal meaning when the passage described a controversial event (Simonetti 45). Later Christian exegetes criticized Origen's use of allegory (Simonetti 54).

Another method of exegesis developed in the School of Antioch. This method diverged from and opposed the Alexandrian method. The method of exegesis in the School of Antioch emphasized the literal meaning of the text over the allegorical meaning. Criticism of the allegorical method prompted the development of the Antiochene method of exegesis (Simonetti 54). The allegorical method allowed for a purely Christological reading of the text, and undermined the importance of the literal meaning (Simonetti 55). At this time, biblical exegesis shifted from a focus on the allegorical meaning of the text to a focus on the literal meaning. Because of this shift, the Antiochene method of exegesis developed (Simonetti 54).

One of the representatives of the Antiochene method of exegesis was Theodore of Mopsuestia. Theodore of Mopsuestia represents a high point of Antiochene exegesis (Reventlow 7). Unlike his contemporaries, Theodore practiced a primitive form of textual criticism. In his commentary on the psalms Theodore uses other Greek translations of the Old Testament when his Greek version obscures the meaning (Reventlow 7). At this time the Greek speaking world had access to different versions of the Greek translation of the Hebrew Old Testament including the versions by Aquila, Symmachus, and Lucian (Hill 5). Theodore and the other Antiochene exegetes used the Lucianic version (Hill 5). Theodore's use of different versions of the Greek translation is similar to a modern reader of the Bible consulting different English translations of the Bible.

Above all, Theodore wanted to uncover the text's literal or actual meaning. This does not correspond to the modern understanding of history as a series of events established by a critical method. Theodore wanted to uncover the narrative within the text that expresses the

intention of the author (McLeod 19). In this way, Theodore's focus centers on reproducing for his readers the actual or plain meaning of the text.

In addition to the literal or plain meaning of the text, Theodore also allows for a freer interpretation called *theoria*. Theodore understood the relationship between *theoria* and the literal meaning within a framework of two *catastases* or states (Margerie 183). The first *catastasis* refers to the present reality as experienced by the human author of the text. The second *catastasis* refers to a future reality not present to the human author of the text. Theodore understands both *catastases* as a literal sense. The first *catastasis* referred to little "I" literal sense and the second *catastasis* referred to big "L" or true literal sense (Margerie 170).

In some respects the true literal, big "L," sense resembles the allegorical meaning in the Alexandrian school. Like the allegorical meaning, the true literal sense corresponds to a meaning that the human author of the text never intended. Unlike the frequently-used allegorical meaning, the Antiochene exegetes rarely interpreted a passage with a true literal sense. In fact, an exegete could only interpret a passage with a true literal sense if the passage described an event or promise that exceeded the limits of a single person or historical people (Margerie 172). The combination of these two senses, the literal and the true literal, allowed Theodore to believe in the unity of the Old and the New Testaments. Unlike the allegorical meaning, the restrictions on the true literal sense protected Theodore from undermining the literal meaning of the text.

In the prologue to his commentary on the book of Hosea, Theodore calls his commentary an indictment against an unnamed group of interpreters. Here, Theodore

probably means the group of Alexandrian exegetes who interpreted the book of Hosea as pure allegory without any literal or historical referent. For the most part, Theodore keeps to the literal sense; but he does not completely ignore Christological interpretation.

The prophecies in the book of Hosea look back to the prophecies of King David and forward to the coming of Jesus Christ. According to Theodore, King David prophesied all the future events when he wrote the book of Psalms. King David dealt with all the issues so well that there was a prophetic silence after he prophesied (Hill 37). Hosea prophesies because God wants to remind the Jewish nation about the things that King David prophesied. At the same time, Hosea's prophecies point towards the coming of Christ because God wants to comfort his people with a promise of future restoration (Hill 38). Theodore's big-picture understanding places the book of Hosea in the context of a divine plan with the coming of Christ as the climax, with the prophecies of King David as the original prophet, and with the prophecies of Hosea as a reminder of God's plan.

Unlike Rashi, Theodore does not believe that the book of Hosea is a unified whole. Instead, Theodore believes that the book can be divided into individual prophecies that were given to Hosea at different times (Hill 52). In Hosea 1:1, there is a list of four Judean Kings. Theodore explains that Hosea prophesied different prophecies during the reign of each king, and then he gathered the individual prophecies into a single book (Hill 39). He says that chapter three is the beginning of a new prophecy because the chapter begins with the phrase "the lord said to me" (Hill 52). When there is a sudden change in attitude—from angry to happy—Theodore explains the change as a characteristic of prophetic literature, so that this cannot be used as a criteria for dividing the text (Hill 44). This suggests that Theodore believed that

chapter one and two were part of the same prophecy, but that chapter three was a later prophecy.

According to Theodore, chapter two begins with a promise of restoration, but then becomes a warning of punishment. The punishment section begins with a command to pass judgment against the Jewish nation, which is personified as a woman. And the section ends with the first half of Hosea 2:16.⁷ For Theodore, the section of Hosea 2:16 that reads, *δια τουτο* *□δου □γω πλανω α□την και ταξω α□την ε□ς □ρημον...* (“because of this, behold, I will deceive her and I will put her in the wilderness...”), is part of the punishment section. The second half of Hosea 2:16, which reads, *και λαλησω □πι την καρδιαν α□της* (“and I will speak to her heart”), begins a section of promised restoration (Hill 49). Theodore can break up the verse because he believes that the prophets tend suddenly to switch from warnings of punishment to promises of restoration. For Theodore, the part of Hosea 2:16 that has the verb *πλανω* (*plano*) describes a punishment.

This interpretation of the first part of Hosea 2:16 makes sense because of the profile-base-cognitive domain relationship for *πλανω* (*plano*). Unlike *πηפ* (*patah*), *πλανω* (*plano*) does not have positive connotations. Since *πλανω* (*plano*) comes after a series of punishments, Theodore was able to consider the first part of Hosea 2:16 a part of the punishment section. If *πλανω* (*plano*) had a cognitive background that was similar to *πηפ* (*patah*), he might not have considered the first part of Hosea 2:16 a part of the punishment section. Because Rashi was

⁷ Theodore’s version of Hosea has a different versification for Hosea 2 than the Hebrew text does. The Hebrew version of Hosea 2:1-2:25 corresponds to the verses 1:10-2:23 in Theodore’s text. My Revised Standard Version follows the versification that Theodore uses. The Rahlfs-Hanhart edition of the Septuagint, however, follows the Hebrew versification.

familiar with the Hebrew of Hosea 2:16, he knew that the original verb was פתה (patah), and he interpreted the verse positively.

The Vulgate and *lacto*:

Following Rashi and pushing against Theodore, Nicholas of Lyra interprets Hosea 2:16 positively in part because the Latin Vulgate translates פתה (patah) with *lacto*, which has connotations of nourishment and comfort.

When Jerome translated the Hebrew Old Testament into Latin, he translated פתה (patah) with nine verbs.⁸ Five of the Latin verbs translate פתה (patah) one time. The most common Latin equivalents are *decipio* “to deceive,” which translates פתה (patah) 12 times, and *lacto* “to nourish/entice,” which translates פתה (patah) five times. Less common are *dilato* “to broaden,” which translates פתה (patah) two times, and *seduco* “to seduce,” which translates פתה (patah) four times.

Jerome’s use of *dilato* as an equivalent of פתה (patah) shows his familiarity with the Hebrew language. Three times in the Hebrew Old Testament, פתה (patah) means “to broaden” (Brown 834). Of these three occurrences, Jerome translates two of the occurrences with *dilato*. This second meaning of פתה (patah) is rare in the Hebrew Bible, but Jerome’s keen intellect

⁸In Judges 14:15 where Delilah entices Samson, Jerome translated פתה (patah) with two Latin verbs *blandior*, “to coax, soothe,” and *suadeo*, “to persuade.” The Hebrew text reads, “and they said to her, ‘entice your husband...’”; the Latin text reads, “and they said to her, ‘soothe your husband and persuade him...’.” Perhaps Jerome thought that the meaning of the Hebrew text was ambiguous. The addition of a second verb clarifies the meaning.

recognized the obscure meaning. In the third occurrence, Jerome translated פתה (patah) with *lacto* because he wanted to translate the verse loosely rather than literally, and not because he was unaware of the other meaning of פתה (patah).

Decipio, the most common equivalent of פתה (patah), appears in Jeremiah 20:10 where evil people attempt to deceive a prophet of God. In the Hebrew text, the same verb is used to describe the behavior of the evil people and to describe the behavior of God in Jeremiah 20:7. In the Latin text, Jerome translates these verses with different Latin verbs. He uses *decipio* to describe the behavior of the evil people, and he uses *seduco* to describe the behavior of God. The Hebrew text does not need to distinguish between the verses by using different verbs because פתה (patah) has a neutral connotation that is influenced by the context. Jerome, however, uses different verbs because the Latin language does not have a verb that can function like פתה (patah). In order to capture the negative connotation of Jeremiah 20:10, Jerome uses the Latin verb *decipio*; in order to capture the positive connotation of Jeremiah 20:7, Jerome uses the Latin verb *seduco*.

The second most common equivalent of פתה (patah) is *lacto*, which usually means “to nurse/nourish” and less often “to allure/entice.” When the Latin verb means “to nurse/nourish” it almost always translates the Hebrew word ינק (yanaq), and it never translates פתה (patah). The Latin verb is sometimes used substantively, when it can refer to an infant or child. For example, 1 Samuel 15:3 describes the future destruction of a city, during which the children will be killed. Other verses such as Jeremiah 44:7 and Lamentations 2:11 also use *lacto* as a substantive for children. Jerome uses *lacto* to emphasize the children’s vulnerability. In both of these verses, the death of the children is a sign of the disobedience of God’s people.

When *lacto* is used as a verb, it can mean “to nurse/nourish.” For example, in Genesis 21:7, Sara nurses the child that God promised to her. When the compound verb *ablacto* appears, it means “to wean.” For example, in Hosea 1:8, a child is weaned by her mother. The act of nursing is always viewed as a positive act, except for in Job 3:12—and this is truly an exception to the rule because Job is lamenting his existence and hating everything. Even when animals nurse, the act is viewed as positive (Lamentations 4:3).

When *lacto* means “to allure/entice,” it always translates פתה (*patah*), but this does not mean that the Latin verb loses the connotations of nursing and nourishment. Of the five times that *lacto* translates פתה (*patah*), three appear in the book of Proverbs, one appears in Job 31:27, and one in Hosea 2:16. Like פתה (*patah*), the Latin verb—when it means “to allure/entice”—appears often in the Wisdom literature. But *lacto* does not emphasize the establishment of a state; therefore, it does not have a relationship with naïveté or simplicity in the same way that פתה (*patah*) does—remember that פתה (*patah*) emphasizes the establishment of פתי (*peti*) or simplicity. Instead, *lacto* emphasizes an action, the act of alluring or enticing, which has connotations of nourishment and nursing. Proverbs 1:10 reads, *fili mi si te lactaverint peccatores ne adquiescas* (“my son, if sinners would allure you, you should not give in”). In this passage the verb *lactaverint* could be translated not as “would allure you” but as “would give you nourishment.” The second translation captures the verb’s connotations of nourishment. If Jerome wanted to emphasize the deceptive nature of the act in Proverbs 1:10, he could have used *decipio*. By translating פתה (*patah*) with *lacto*, Jerome gives the verse a different connotation.

In another example, Job 31:27 reads, *et lactatum est in abscondito cor meum* (“and my heart was allured in secret”). In this passage the verb *lactatum est* should not be translated as “was allured” but as “was nourished.” In both of the above passages, the idea of nourishing should be understood with the goal of alluring, meaning that the subject of the verb is using nourishment to allure or entice the person. In Proverbs 1:13, the sinners of 1:10 promise that the object of their alluring will receive a reward. This meaning of *lacto* is a variation on the first meaning, to which the second meaning adds the goal of alluring.

When the verb appears in Hosea 2:16, it has a similar meaning. Hosea 2:16 reads, *propter hoc ecce ego lactabo eam et ducam eam in solitudinem* (“because of this, behold, I will allure her [with nourishment] and I will lead her into the desert”). The combination of *lacto* and *duco*, seen here, also appears in Proverbs 16:29. The Proverbs verse describes an unjust man who allures his friend and leads him into a bad way. In Hosea 2:16, the same actions occur; the only difference is that God performs the actions and leads the woman into the desert. According to Jerome, the desert was the ideal place to find God (Jerome 221). Instead of leading into a bad place, God leads into a place where the woman will be able to find God. Later in Jerome’s commentary on 2:16, he says that God’s final promise is a return to fertile land. This promise of fertile land is a reward or nourishment like the one promised by the sinners in Proverbs 1:10; however, unlike the sinners, God has good intentions: the restoration of the woman in 2:16. In Hosea 2:16, God allures the woman with the promise of fertile land, and He leads her into the desert where she will be able to find God.

The following is a map of the profile-base-cognitive domain relationship of *lacto* in Hosea 2:16.




Fig. 3

Both meanings of *lacto* have [CHILD REARING] as a cognitive domain because the second meaning is a variation of the first meaning, and the second meaning does not appear

enough to justify adding another cognitive domain. Imagine that *lacto* has two cognitive domains but that the second cognitive domain is still in its infancy and not yet a mature cognitive domain—the second cognitive domain is still too dependent on the first cognitive domain. The base concepts for the Latin verb are [NOURISHMENT], [NURSING], and [ALLUREMENT]. I include [ALLUREMENT] because the verb does not always focus on the act of nourishing but also on the use of nourishment in the act of alluring. Finally, the verb profiles the concept [ENTICE]. If I were studying the appearance of *lacto* in a verse where the verb meant “to nurse,” the verb would profile [NURSING], and would not have [ALLUREMENT] as a base concept. The second meaning of *lacto* contributes the base concept [ALLUREMENT], moves the profile [NURSING] into its base, and adds the profile [ENTICE]. This discussion lays the foundation for the discussion of Nicholas of Lyra and his interpretation of Hosea 2:16

Nicholas of Lyra:

Nicholas of Lyra, who lived in the fourteenth century, would have been influenced by the meaning of *lacto* when he interpreted Hosea 2:16. But before I address Lyra’s commentary directly, I will provide some information about Lyra’s context. The fourteenth-century landscape was populated by various institutions of learning and worship. The universities represented Scholasticism, which focused on the literal interpretation of the biblical text; and the Orders represented Monasticism, which focused on the spiritual interpretation. Although they represented different methodologies, the universities and monasteries had a positive relationship; and many students attended both. Nicholas of Lyre grew up near Paris and its

large university, and a Franciscan monastery—Nicholas later attended both. In his commentaries, Nicholas combines both literal and spiritual interpretation with a third type of interpretation, which he called the double-literal (Krey 17). Generally speaking, the monasteries emphasized the spiritual senses, and the universities emphasized the literal sense; however, as the medieval age progressed the boundary between spiritual and literal became fluid.

The theory that the Bible has multiple meanings—approximately four—influenced the study of the Bible in the university and monastery. According to this theory, any biblical verse can be interpreted in at least one of four senses: literal, allegorical, moral, and anagogical. The literal sense focused on the narrated events and the etymological or grammatical structure of the text; the other three senses, collectively labelled the spiritual senses, focus on the text's relationship to God and the spiritual realm. The allegorical meaning focuses on the relationship of Christ to the Church; the moral meaning focuses on the relationship of God to the soul; and the anagogical meaning focuses on the end of history and the future life (Mayeski 92). The spiritual senses allowed the exegete to apply the teachings in the Bible to the present. The allegorical meaning explained the Christian creed; the moral meaning explained good Christian behavior; and the anagogical meaning provided hope for a future life, which motivated the Christians to follow the doctrines and beliefs of the Church (Mayeski 93).

The century before Lyre's birth witnessed the rise of the Mendicant Orders, including the Franciscan Order; and the decline of the older Orders that refused to adapt to the thirteenth-century environment (Vauchez 222). A new geographical focus characterized the change in the monastic Orders. Before the thirteenth century the monastic Orders focused on the rural population; but after the thirteenth century, with the rise of the Mendicant Orders,

the focus shifted to the growing urban population (Vauchez 222). Early in its history, the Franciscan Order advocated that absolute poverty was at the core of what it means to imitate Jesus Christ. A vow of absolute poverty attracted the middle-class, particularly students from the universities in the cities—Paris, for example (Lawrence 200). The doctrine of absolute poverty was later interpreted in two contradictory ways, which led to a divide within the Order. The Spirituals held to a strict interpretation of absolute poverty, and the Conventuals held a looser interpretation. At the core of the issue was the question, how can an Order dedicated to poverty afford to support a ministry? (Lawrence 201). Eventually, a group of Conventual university students united the Franciscan Order and began the cultivation of academic study within the Order (Vauchez 240).

The beginnings of Scholasticism can be traced to the twelfth century, the century before the rise of the Mendicant Orders. What later grew into mature universities began as individual schools that local, religious institutions controlled (Verger 258). In the thirteenth century, individual masters—i.e. heads of individual schools—joined together and fought to transfer control from religious institutions to a group of masters. This move towards independence had two motives: protection from local and civil authorities, and standardization of the many schools that had different syllabi and tests (Verger 259). And so in the thirteenth century, individual schools became universities, collections of masters and students that were free from the control of local authorities and free to pursue intellectual study.

Once the universities were established, the growth of the urban population accelerated the university's growth; and, at the same time, the universities encouraged the growth of the urban population by attracting students from foreign countries—the effect was mutual (Verger

262). The Franciscans, recognizing the value of a university education, established convents of study, which were restricted to members of their Order, and which represented a form of theological teaching that opposed the secular teaching of the masters (Verger 271). While the Franciscans saw the potential to combine philosophy and spiritual study, some scholars wanted to separate the study of philosophy from spiritual study; however, this attempt was resisted by the bishop of Paris, whom the Franciscan Order and other secular theologians supported (Verger 274).

Another development at this time was an influx of Aristotle's philosophy, which influenced the university's curriculum and the medieval understanding of verbal meaning (Smalley 293). Aristotle's philosophy flowed into the university curriculum through Latin translations of his philosophy, and his philosophy affected the way medieval exegetes interpreted the meaning of the biblical text. The early period of Scholasticism, before the influx of Aristotle's philosophy, operated under an understanding of verbal meaning called natural signification (Ocker 263). In this view words represented things, which guided the mind to the contemplation of the higher, spiritual senses. Once the exegete understood what things the words represented, she could discard the literal sense and study the spiritual senses—allegorical, moral, and anagogical. For example, the word "Jerusalem" represents the city of Jerusalem in Israel; and the city, the thing, represents the three spiritual senses—in order for the human mind to comprehend the spiritual senses, it must visualize the thing represented by the word, meaning that the word cannot represent the spiritual senses (Ocker 264). This view motivated the study of the literal sense, but the literal sense remained subordinate and

separate from the spiritual senses. This view paved the way for another development in the medieval understanding of verbal meaning: verbal signification.

Influenced by an influx of Aristotle's philosophy, verbal signification challenged the role that things played in the representation of the spiritual senses. This view held that words had the ability to directly represent the spiritual senses (Ocker 266). For example, the word "Jerusalem" does not have to represent a thing but can directly represent the spiritual senses. The literal sense, represented by the word, cannot be separated from the spiritual senses; the literal and spiritual senses are intimately connected (Smalley 293). The change to verbal signification manifested in the almost exclusive study of the literal sense; however, this study operated under the assumption that the literal sense illuminated the spiritual senses. In summary, the thirteenth century was a time of change: the growth of the urban population and university, the rise of the Mendicant Orders, and the introduction of Aristotelian thought; which closed out the thirteenth century, and then began the fourteenth century in which Nicholas of Lyra was born.

Nicholas of Lyra grew up in the village of Lyre near Paris. He began his education at the local Franciscan monastery, but he was soon sent to the university in Paris. At the university Nicholas probably studied in one of the Franciscan convent schools, where he would have witnessed the tension between the theological teaching of the convent and the theological teaching of the secular masters. Nicholas' attempt to navigate this tension can be seen in his commentary on the Bible, especially his use of the double-literal sense.

The double-literal sense is an evolved form of the traditional literal sense (Krey 17). This developed literal sense combines literal and spiritual meaning and exemplifies the influence of verbal signification. The change from natural signification to verbal signification allowed Nicholas to synthesize the spiritual and the literal; Nicholas does not eliminate spiritual meaning in favor of literal meaning, but he views them as inseparable. In his literal commentary on Hosea 1:9, he writes, *voca nomen eius non populus meus, quia negaverunt ipsum ante Pilatum...* (“call his name not my people, because they denied him before Pilate...”). Here Nicholas connects the verse to a scene in the New Testament, instead of connecting it to a more immediate event that would have been in the mind of the original author. Nicholas follows the theory of verbal signification by moving directly from the words of the text to a spiritual interpretation. The use of verbal signification and the double-literal sense suggests that Nicholas was attempting to combine the literal and spiritual senses.

Nevertheless, Henri de Lubac argues that Nicholas played an important role in the separation of the literal and spiritual senses. In his history of medieval exegesis, de Lubac argues that Joachim of Fiore was chiefly responsible for the separation of the spiritual and literal senses, and that Nicholas was the chief distributor of Joachim’s theology (McDermott 124). The Joachite influence, however, was isolated to the Spirituals, a Franciscan sect that supported a strict interpretation of absolute poverty (Froehlich 514). A group of university students resisted the Spirituals’ interpretation and united the Franciscan Order under an opposing view, the Conventual view. In order to argue that Nicholas supported Joachite theology, de Lubac must first prove that Nicholas supported the Spirituals; and there is evidence that Nicholas rejected Joachite theology and the Spirituals (McDermott 128).

Concerning Nicholas' role in the distribution of Joachite theology, de Lubac was mistaken; therefore, Nicholas should not be blamed for the separation of the literal and spiritual senses. The combination of historical developments and his use of the double-literal sense paint a different picture and suggest that Nicholas combined the spiritual and literal senses.

The combination of the literal and spiritual senses appears in Nicholas' commentary on the book of Hosea. Nicholas discusses the literal meaning of chapter one and the anagogical meaning of chapter 2-3 in the section of his commentary devoted to the literal interpretation. He divides the book of Hosea into two sections, a prologue and a treatise. The prologue includes the first verse of chapter one, and the treatise includes the rest of the book. He divides the treatise into two parts, chapters one through three, and chapters four through 14. The first part, chapters one through three, divides into three sections that reveal three messages. The first section reveals the disobedience of the Jews, the second section predicts the salvation of the gentile nations, and the third section predicts the rejection of Jesus Christ by the Jewish nation. Each section corresponds to a chapter in the book of Hosea: section one corresponds to chapter one, section two to chapter two, and section three to chapter three. Nicholas explains the first section according to the literal sense. When Hosea wrote chapter one, he had the disobedience of the Jewish nation in mind. But Nicholas explains the second and third sections according to the spiritual senses—the anagogical sense. When Hosea wrote chapter two and three, he did not have the salvation of the gentile nations or the rejection of Christ in mind. Nicholas explains the anagogical meaning of chapter two and three, which focuses on the ultimate goal of history.

Nicholas further divides Hosea chapter two into two sections.⁹ The first section of Hosea chapter two describes the salvation of the gentiles, and the second section describes the consolations that will be given to the gentiles. The first section begins with verse one of chapter two and ends with verse 15. The second section begins with verse three but does not include verses one and two or four through 15, and ends with verse 25. For the second section, Nicholas adapts the order of the verses because the transition from verse 15 to verse 16 is difficult. In verse 15, God is about to punish the woman; but, in verse 16, God gives the woman consolations of the Holy Spirit. By connecting verse 16 with verse three, Nicholas avoids the difficult transition.

Hosea 2:16 appears in Nicholas' section two, which describes the consolations that will be given to the gentiles. The first part of Hosea 2:16 reads, "*propter hoc ecce ego lactabo eam...* (because of this, behold, I will nourish/allure her...). Nicholas explains that God will nourish/allure the woman with the consolations of the Holy Spirit. This explanation fits with the above description of *lacto*. When *lacto* means to nourish/allure, an object is used to effect the action of the verb. Although Hosea 2:16 does not explicitly describe the object, Nicholas explains the verse by describing the object as the consolations of the Holy Spirit.

Earlier in Hosea 1:8, the verb *ablacto* appears. This verb is the negative form of *lacto*, and it means "to wean." Nicholas divides chapter one into two sections. The first section describes the reasons for Israel's punishment, and the second section describes the punishments. Hosea 1:8 lies in the second section, and Nicholas explains the verse as the removal of consolations. In Nicholas' commentary, *lacto* and *ablacto* relate to consolations;

⁹ Nicholas follows the versification of the Hebrew text.

lacto suggests the giving of consolations, and *ablacto* suggests the removal of consolations. When *lacto* appears in Hosea 2:16, it gives the consolations that were removed in Hosea 1:8; therefore, Hosea 2:16 describes an act of restoration.

Nicholas' understanding of *lacto* looks much like Fig. 3. The function of *ablacto*, however, brings out the base concept [MILK] explicitly. In his commentary on Hosea 1:8, he connects the consolations with milk. This suggests that the concept [MILK] would also be in the base of *lacto*. Also, the concept [ALLUREMENT] could be changed to the concept [CONSOLATION] because Nicholas describes the object of nourishment as a consolation.

In conclusion, Jerome translates the Hebrew verb פתה (*patah*) in Hosea 2:16 with the Latin verb *lacto*, which captures the concept of [ALLUREMENT], rather than the concept [MILK]. But Nicholas of Lyra interprets the Latin verb *lacto* as implying that God lures the woman—the gentiles—into the wilderness in order to provide her with [CONSOLATION]. The concept [CONSOLATION] may be indirectly derived from the concept [MILK] because both provide comfort.

Conclusion:

Each word studied has a different profile-base-cognitive domain relationship, which influenced how the word was interpreted by each commentator. What the above analysis has shown is that the act of translating does not capture the subtle connotations of the original word. These connotations are important for an accurate understanding of the word, and no

two words have exactly the same connotation. פתה (patah), πλανω (plano), and *lacto* all have a unique meaning that is lost in translation.

פתה (patah) has connotations of simplicity and naiveté that operate within the cognitive domain [WISDOM LITERATURE]. These connotations are lost, and new connotations are added when פתה (patah) is translated into Greek. Πλανω (plano) suggests the act of wandering from God and Jesus Christ and can refer to the behavior of serpents who deceive. These connotations are much different than the connotations of פתה (patah). In Latin, the Hebrew verb is translated with *lacto*, which has connotations of nourishment. *Lacto* does not have the negative connotations of πλανω (plano); there are other Latin verbs with these negative connotations. But *lacto* does not have the same positive meaning as פתה (patah) because *lacto* functions in the cognitive domain [CHILD REARING] while פתה (patah) functions in the cognitive domains [WISDOM LITERATURE] and [POLITICS]. In summary, the three verbs have different connotations and different meanings.

The differences in meaning affect the interpretation of the text. Because Rashi was aware of the connotations of פתה (patah) in Wisdom literature, he interpreted Hosea 2:16 in a positive light. Theodore, however, read the Greek version of Hosea 2:16 and was influenced by the negative connotations of πλανω (plano). Nicholas, who read the Latin version of Hosea 2:16, was influenced by the positive connotations of *lacto*. Rashi, Theodore, and Nicholas were influenced by other factors from their historical contexts, but the version of Hosea 2:16 that they read played a significant role.

This cognitive linguistic study of the original Hebrew of Hosea 2:16 and two translations has implications for the future study of the ancient texts. Words have complex meaning that cannot be easily captured with a translation or a dictionary definition. Once a word is translated out of its original language, the word loses important connotations. Any study of an ancient text should emphasize the importance of connotation. In a translation of an ancient text, the translator should emphasize that a translation can only approximate the meaning of the original text but cannot preserve the full and complex meaning.

Works Cited

- Aeschylus. *Prometheus Bound*. Trans. H. Weir Smyth. *Aeschylus*. Ed. G. P. Goold. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983. 211-313. Print.
- Andersen, Francis I., and David Noel Freedman. *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1980. Print.
- Berges, Nijmegen U., Bonn U. Dahmen. “הָעָרָה; הָעָרָה; הָעָרָה; wander about, stray.” *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Ed. G. Johannes Botterweck. Vol. 15.WM. B. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006. Print.
- Braun, Mainz H. “πλαναω, πλαναομαι, □ποπλαναω, □ποπλαναομαι, πλανη, πλανος, πλανητης, πλανης.” *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Ed. Gerhard Friedrich. Vol. 6. Grand Rapids: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964. Print.
- Brown, Francis. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon with an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Ed. S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers Incorporated, 2010. Print.
- Carvalho, Corrine L. *Primer on Biblical Methods*. Winona: Saint Mary’s, 2009. Print.
- Coogan, Michael D., Ed. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible: New Revised Standard Version with the Apocrypha*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. Print.
- Durousseau, Clifford H. “Isaiah 7:14B in New Major Christian Bible Translations.” *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 41.3 (2013): 175-80. *JSTOR*. Web.

- "The Epistle to Diognetus." Trans. Kirsopp Lake. *The Apostolic Fathers*. Ed. G. P. Goold. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. 350-79. Print.
- Euripides. "Helen." Trans. David Kovacs. *Euripides*. Ed. G. P. Goold. Vol. 5. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994. 12-199. Print.
- Froehlich, Karlfried. *Biblical Interpretation from the Church Fathers to the Reformation*. Surrey, England: Ashgate, 2010. Print.
- Grant, Robert M. *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Glenny, W. Edward. "Hebrew Misreading or Free Translation in the Septuagint of Amos?." *Vetus Testamentum* 57 (2007): 524-547. Web.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. Vol. 2-3, K-Ω (698-1497). Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1975. Print.
- Hippocrates. *Nutriments*. Trans. W. H. S. Jones. *Hippocrates*. Ed. G. P. Goold. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984. 342-61. Print.
- The Holy Bible: Translated from the Latin Vulgate*. New York: P. J. Kennedy and Sons, 1914. Print.
- Jerome. *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Ed. Raymond E. Brown. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1990. Print.
- Kelle, Brad E. *Hosea 2: Metaphor and Rhetoric in Historical Perspective*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005. Print.
- Krey, Philip D. "Introduction." *Nicholas of Lyra: The Senses of Scripture*. Ed. Philip D. Krey and Lesley Smith. Leiden: Brill, 2000. Print.
- Langacker, Ronald W. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 1, *Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987.
- Lawrence, C. H. *Medieval Monasticism: Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages*. London: Longman, 1984. Print.
- Margerie, de Bertrand. *An Introduction to the History of Exegesis*. Vol. 1, *the Greek Fathers*. Petersham: Saint Bede's Publications, 1991.
- Mayeski, Mary A. "Early Medieval Exegesis: Gregory the I to the Twelfth Century." *A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. Alan J. Hauser and Duane Frederick Watson. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishers, 2003. Print.
- Mcdermott, Ryan. "Henri De Lubac's Genealogy of Modern Exegesis and Nicholas of Lyra's Literal Sense of Scripture." *Modern Theology* 26.1 (2013): 124-56. Print.

- McLeod, Frederick G. "Theodore of Mopsuestia," in *the Early Church Fathers*, ed. Carol Harrison. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Moor, Johannes C. *A Bilingual Concordance to the Targum of the Prophets*. Vol. 1-21. New York: E. J. Brill, 2005. Print.
- Mopsuestia, Theodore of. "Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets," in *the Fathers of the Church*, ed. Thomas P. Halton, Vol. 108. Translated by Robert C. Hill. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004.
- Mosis, Mainz R. "פתה; פְּתִי; פְּתִיּוֹת simple, fool(ish)." *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Ed. G. Johannes Botterweck. Vol. 12. Grand Rapids: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003. Print.
- Muraoka, T. *A Greek ~ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint*. Leuven: PEETERS, 2010. Print.
- Ocker, Christopher. "Scholastic Interpretation of the Bible." *A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Ed. Alan J. Hauser and Duane Frederick. Watson. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishers, 2003. Print.
- Pearl, Chaim. *Rashi Commentaries on the Pentateuch*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company Incorporated, 1970. Print.
- Pietersma, Albert, Benjmin G. Wright., Ed. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. Print.
- Plato. *Apologia Socratis. Plato's Apology and Crito*. Ed. W. S. Tyler. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1887. 43-81. Print.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, Robert Hanhart, Ed. *Septuaginta*. Revised ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006. Print.
- Rashi. *The book of the Twelve Prophets*. Trans. Rabbi A. J. Rosenberg. Vol. 1. New York: the Judaica Press Incorporated, 1991. Print.
- Reventlow, Henning Graf. *History of Biblical Interpretation*. Vol. 1. Translated by Leo G. Perdue. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009. Print.
- . *History of Biblical Interpretation*. Vol. 2. Translated by James O. Duke. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009. Print.
- Rosel, Martin. "The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31, no. 4 (2007): 411-28. Web.
- Simonetti, Manlio. *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church an Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994. Print.

- Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Philosophical Library, 1952. Print.
- Sophocles. *Oedipus at Colonus*. Trans. F. Storr. *Sophocles*. Ed. E. H Warmington. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912. 141-307. Print.
- . *Oedipus the King*. Trans. F. Storr. *Sophocles*. Ed. E. H. Warmington. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1912. 1-139. Print.
- Sperber, Alexander. *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. Vol. 1-5. New York: E. J. Brill, 1992. Print.
- Telushkin, Rabbi Joseph. *Jewish Literacy: the Most Important Things to Know about the Jewish Religion, its People, and its History*. New York: William Morrow and Company Incorporated, 1991. Print.
- Waschke, Halle am Saale G. "יִצְחָק small livestock." *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Ed. G. Johannes Botterweck. Vol. 12. Grand Rapids: WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003. Print.
- van Wolde, Ellen. *Reframing Biblical Studies: When Language and Text Meet Culture, Cognition, and Context*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009. Print.
- . "The Bow in the Clouds in Genesis 9.12-17: When Cognitive Linguistics Meets Visual Criticism." In *A Critical Engagement: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of J. Cheryl Exum*, ed. David J.A. Clines and Ellen van Wolde, 380-400. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011. Print.
- Vauches, Andre. "The Religious Orders." *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Ed. David Abulafia and Rosamond McKitterick. Vol. 5. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. Print.
- Verger, Jacques. "The Universities and Scholasticism." *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Ed. David Abulafia and Rosamond McKitterick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. N. pag. Print.
- Wurthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the Old Testament*. Translated by Errol F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995. Print.

Integration of Faith and Learning

Translation and My Experience in a Cult

The summer before I came to Seattle Pacific University I had not decided on a major. My plan was to take a few introductory classes and then decide what my major was going to be. Early that summer my mom had begun to buy a lot of books from a book publisher called Easton Press. Easton Press makes ornate leather bound books and sells them at a reasonable price. Anyways she purchased a series on the history of civilization by Will Durant. I first read his book on Greek civilization. I put myself on a schedule that required me to read at least one chapter a day. His book interested me so much that soon I was reading two chapters a day or more. After I finished the book once, I read it again. By the time I had finished reading the book the second time, school had started, and I had decided my major.

Before my first class began I remember wondering what learning another language would be like. I tried to deny the feeling, but I also felt afraid. Scared that I might fail or not be able to learn the language, I spent hours parsing every word in every Latin sentence. By the

time I finished parsing the sentence I could only see parts of speech, declensions and inflections. I had broken the sentence down into tiny pieces, but I could not pull the meaning out of the sentence. No matter how hard I tried the sentence refused to come alive. Instead, the sentence seemed to be so many arbitrary grammatical terms. I remember feeling physical pain while working on each homework assignment. My brain was trying to make the sentence fit nicely into strict grammatical rules, but for all my suffering the sentence refused to be conquered or subdued. The more I tried to understand the sentence the more discouraged I became. Fortunately, I survived Latin; but, God wanted to teach me more than Latin that year.

If you ever run into a member of the Seattle Church of Christ, say something bold and walk calmly away. I wish someone would have given me that advice, but God wanted to teach me a lesson. Instead, I followed a member of the SCC into their Bible cult. They attracted me with promises, saying that they had the answers, the keys to salvation. Soon after my baptism into their church, I began retreating from my family and old friends. The SCC had convinced me that their way was the only way, that I would only find salvation through them. Meanwhile, my mom, ever watchful, had been planning a way to get me out of the SCC. That summer she hired a cult expert to come and talk with me. The man explained how the SCC had limited and controlled my thinking to the point that I could barely think on my own. All their rules had closed my mind so that I could only see them. After three days of talking with the cult expert, I realized that I had to leave the SCC. Once I left, I felt free again.

When the next year began I started studying Greek. All my memories of long nights slaving over Latin translations only to come up with gibberish, rushed into my mind. A powerful dread came over me and again I saw the Greek sentences dissolve into so many grammatical

terms—there was no meaning. As the quarters and years went by, I began to process my experience in the SCC. I realized that what the SCC did to me was similar to what I was doing to my Latin and Greek sentences. Like the SCC, I imposed grammatical rules on sentences too forcefully. Instead of allowing the sentence to come alive, I killed it with grammatical rules. The meaning within the words hid from my tyrannical rule. Before the sentences would give up their meaning I needed to respect their freedom to bend the rules as I understood them. I could not expect the Greek preposition *en* to always mean ‘in’ or ‘on,’ because sometimes it can mean ‘with.’ I could not expect to always translate Latin participles into English participles. Through the study of Latin and Greek, God taught me to respect different forms of expression. Grammatical rules can help understand the sentence, but they cannot bring the sentence to life.

Because of my studies in Classics, specifically Latin and Greek, I was able to better understand what the SCC did to my thinking and personal expression. Without an understanding of Latin and Greek, my recovery would have been slower. My own method of translating Latin and Greek sentences allowed me to see that behavior in the SCC. This insight will help me to respect other forms of communication as I encounter different cultures.