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Introduction

Recently, a robust discussion from various standpoints is being conducted in the field of 'Translation Studies'. Attention is currently focused on the cause which hinders international communications amidst the rapid progression of internationalization.

It should be appreciated that Biblical translation supplies many great materials for 'Translation Studies'. Eugene Nida (b.1914), a Bibliicist and a structural linguist, observed very truly that the history of Biblical translation infinitely outclasses any others. With regard to the problem of translation, the Bible has a rich history where only one common text has been translated into various languages, for various purposes, and using multi-strata references.¹

Regarding 'translation' as 'interpretation', Roland Barthes (1915-1980) cannot be disregarded. In his La mort de l'auteur (1968), he argued that readers should escape from the shackles of the intention of the author in the original text. His thought in 'Death of the Author' is plainly indicated in the last statement: 'The emergence of the reader should be in return for the death of the author.'²

Barthes' theory that reproducing the author's intention is a virtual impossibility has had a critical influence on Biblical interpretation. However, some biblical scholars feel slightly doubtful

¹ Nida (1971) 6-7.
² Barthes 491-5.
about directly applying Barthes’ idea. For example, while partly agreeing with Barthes’ idea, Tsuji (2007) insists that readers should not avoid probing the author’s intention in Biblical interpretation by analyzing information such as ecclesiastical history, philological history, and the reading population. From the perspective of translation studies, Tsuji’s idea is very important. Although it is an indisputable fact that the author’s intention is directly unquestioned in linguistics, the question of lexis is considerable.

However, the ‘Death’ is not valid simply for the intention of the ‘Author’. Possibly, even ‘word’ and ‘language’ die. Especially, the Old Testament contains a large number of obsolete words. And Hebrew itself is a dead language. Therefore it is necessary for translators to fill the ‘blanks’ not with interpretational but with philological analysis in some way. Moreover, the ‘blank’, as a matter of course, creates a new kind of problem for translators. Translators are forced to fill the ‘blanks’ with uncertain information such as etymology, analogy with context, and reference to other versions.

Nida compactly demonstrates a logical model of the translation processes in collaboration with Taber.

Nida and Taber explain their theory as follows:

The first box represents the source (S), who communicates the message (M₁), which is received by an original receptor (R₁). The translator, who is both receptor and source, first

---

3 Tsuji 55.
receives \( M_1 \) as if he were an \( R_1 \), and then produces in a totally different historical-cultural context a new message \( M_2 \), which he hopes will be understood by the final receptor, \( R_2 \). . . . The critic must compare the real or presumed comprehension of \( M_1 \) by \( R_1 \) with the comprehension of \( M_2 \) by the average receptor \( R_2 \), as diagrammatically represented . . . \(^4\) (See Fig.1).

**Fig. 1. Nida’s Model of Translation Process** \(^5\)

In Fig. 1, ‘S’ means ‘source’, ‘R’ means ‘receptors’, and ‘M’ means ‘message’.

The most important point in Nida’s theory is that there are critics who determine the suitability of the translation. Especially, in the history of Biblical translation, these critics themselves often make new translations. The biblical translation history is a hierarchical structure highly complicated by this relationship between a translator and a

---

\(^4\) Nida (1969) 22-3.  
\(^5\) The Taishukan Encyclopaedia of English Linguistics 865-76.; Nida (1969) 22-3.
critic. Therefore we must research what are the translators' estimation and the process of word adoption. These highly complicated structures cause various problems. Given this perspective, it is obvious that translated texts originally come under the influence of a historical process.

Each translating process is 'diachronic' as well as 'synchronic'. From a diachronic standpoint, it may be inevitable that 'translation shift' occurs in each process. Translation shift means 'small linguistic changes occurring in translating' from 'Source Text' to 'Target Text'. The most influential model of all is the theory of Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995). They insist that there are two translation strategies: 'direct translation' includes three subdivisions such as 'Borrowing', 'Calque', and 'Literal translation'. And 'oblique translation' includes four subdivisions such as 'Transposition', 'Modulation', 'Equivalence', and 'Adaptation'. Their model is very useful for evaluation of each version. Because, we can manifest the reasons why the words are either deleted or replaced in each version by their model.

However, there is a possibility that researchers prejudge texts without prior investigation. Their models are merely at the end of reproducing the 'original' meaning. We should research a primary cause of 'putting buttons in the wrong buttonholes', because the variations of each translated word originally stems from transition of the word by each translator. It has to be noted that each translated word has inherent origin in versions of historical records. We should not merely compare

6 Munday 55.; Vinay and Darbelnet 128-37.
these translated words, but research the strategy and reasons why each translator adopted the words they do.

The research is not exactly that simple. We are literally faced with a problem of 'Death of Translators'. However, we can drive a rational approximation from relevant literatures. Based on mutual comparison, we should depend on textual and comparative philology. Thus, we are compelled to debate on how to choose translated words, and what those translators really referred to. That is to say, we must do retrospective investigation on what really happened in each stage, and in each translated word. Therefore subjects of investigation are all texts, such as lexicons or commentaries, which are used by each translator.

However, when we evaluate the 'translation shift' in historical literatures such as Biblical translations with a highly-multiplexed structure of translation, the equivalence of word meaning among versions under study should be always confirmed in some way. At times like this, we have a tendency to be content to just swallow whole the definition of existing dictionaries. Definitions in all dictionaries are somewhat less than perfect. For the sake of comparison among versions, we need to comprehend translated words as 'morphemes' once at least. According to Nida, morphemes mean 'minimal meaningful units of which the languages are composed'.\(^7\) In addition, it is absolutely essential that we trace an etymology of each morpheme in order to define the meaning of translated words.

\(^7\) Nida (1946) 6.
This thesis deals with the origin of the well-known phrase ‘the rose of Sharon’ in Canticles 2:1. As noted in Chap. 1, this phrase is originally in The Authorized Version (abbr. A.V.), which is the most famous version in English. The word ‘rose’ is frequently cited as an example in such obsolete words in Hebrew original text. Moreover, most scholars regard the translated word ‘rose’ as irrelevant. However, little attention has been given to the primary cause of ‘putting buttons in the wrong buttonholes’ in this irrelevant ‘rose’.

The purpose of this thesis is to attempt to trace back to the origin of the translated word ‘rose’ while referring to relevant literatures textual-philologically and reevaluating translated words etymologically in each version. Therefore, to begin with, we compare English and non-English versions referenced by translators of A.V., and then point to the problem of survey results (Chap. 1.). Next, we explore potential links between the modern interpretations of pioneers such as Luther or Reuchlin and Medieval and Ancient interpretations in Semitic and Latin (Chap. 2 and 3.). Furthermore, we frame a hypothesis on the origin of the translated word ‘rose’ by examining early Christian interpretations under the influence of a Greek version and the linage of Greek Lexicons (Chap. 4 and 5.). Finally, we reconstruct the original meaning of Cant. 2:1 in Hebrew (Chap. 6.). In the Conclusion, we demonstrate the pedigree of translations on the word ‘rose’ by the hypothesis.
Chapter I

Re-Examination of Word Selection in the Authorized Version

1.1. The Authorized Version of the Bible and ‘Canticles’

The Authorized Version of the Bible (abbr. A.V.) is the very famous English Bible translation published in 1611 by royal decree of King James I (Admin. 1603-1625). It seems that the king was concerned to achieve one common translation of the Bible. The A.V. considerably affected the subsequent growth of English prose and vocabulary, because the style is simple and sophisticated. Not only that, the version has influenced subsequent biblical translations all over the world.

![Fig. 2. The Title Page and Cant. Chap. 2 in the A.V. (1611)](image)

---

8 Butterworth 219.
9 A.V. The Title Page and Cant. Chap. 2.
Canticles (i.e. Song of Songs / Song of Solomon) denotes one book in the Old Testament. The content of Canticles is a love song of a couple. The tradition handed down from old times has regarded the author as the Lord's Anointed King Solomon (10th Century B.C.). However many modern scholars question the tradition.\(^{10}\)

The phrase ‘the rose of Sharon’ in Cant. 2:1 of The A.V. is familiar to English native speakers. For example, the name of the hero’s sister in John Steinbeck’s classic ‘The Grapes of Wrath (First Edition: 1939)’ is based on this expression of the A.V. (i.e. Rosasharn).\(^{11}\) The original Hebrew word for ‘rose’ is habatseleth. The word habatseleth is obsolete words in original Hebrew. There are only two sites containing this word in the Old Testament, i.e. Cant. 2:1 and Isa.35:1. Most modern scholars do not regard this habatseleth as being a ‘rose’.\(^{12}\) This thesis tries to track back to the origin of the translated word ‘rose’ in the A.V. (See Fig. 2).

1.2. The Formation of the A.V. and the Rules

The A.V. is a crystallization of the wisdom of the biblical scholars and linguists of the early 17th Century. The following two resources on the formation of the A.V. have survived.

The first is a document left by a physician and historian. The document shows the nominal list of all translators and their

\(^{10}\) Meek 96-7.

\(^{11}\) Benét 948. s.v. ‘rose of Sharon’

\(^{12}\) *The Temple Dictionary of the Bible* 680. s.v. ‘ROSE’.; Meek 112.
assignments. The translators were divided into six groups, i.e. two
groups respectively of Westminster, Cambridge, and Oxford. And the
book of Canticles was one of eight books translated by the group of
Edward Lively (c.1545-1605) in Cambridge. In addition, this document
contains a 15-point resolution (i.e. ‘The Rules to be observed in the
Translation of the Bible’). Especially, the following articles in this rule
are connected with our question.

1. The ordinary Bible read in the church, commonly called
the Bishops Bible, to be followed, and as little altered as
the Truth of the original will permit.

4. When a Word hath divers Significations; that to be kept
witch hath been most commonly used by the most Ancient
Fathers, being agreeable to the Propriety of the Place, and
the Analogy of the Faith.

14. These translations to be used when they agree better
with the Text than the Bishops Bible. [i.e.] Tindoll’s[sic.].
Matthews[sic.]. Coverdale’s. Whitchurch’s. Geneva.\textsuperscript{13}

Secondly, a manuscript named as ‘Add.34218’ in the British
Library. What is written in the manuscript is largely similar to Bolase’s
Document. The particular thing in the manuscript is the date of the
manuscript, that is to say, ‘Anno secundi [sic.] regis Iacobi 1604’ (i.e.
\textsuperscript{13} Terasawa 8-9.; Alfred W. Pollard, ‘Bibliographical Introduction’.
\textit{A.V.} 39.
‘In the second year of the reign of King James, 1604’). That means the rule of translation and the list of translators was determined in 1604. However Butterworth says, for many reasons, the actual beginning translation year is later than 1604.

1.3. The Reference and Choice of Words by the A.V.’s Translators

Based on the forward by ‘The translators to the Readers’, i.e. the translators of the A.V., Butterworth said that the translators referred to versions and commentaries in the following languages. ‘Hebrewe, Greeke, Latine, Syrian, Chaldee, Spanish, French, Italian, Dutch.’ (See Fig. 3)

Based on this testimony, B. F. Westcott lists the publications that were thought to have been used by the translators. The content adherent to the Old Testament is tabulated in Table 1, and the texts of

---

14 Alfred W. Pollard, ‘Bibliographical Introduction’. A.V. 35. Now the Manuscript ‘Add.34218’ is reserved in the British Library as the following title: [BIBLES. BIBLIOGRAPHY. Order for translation of the Bible, with translators' names 1604.]
15 Butterworth 222.
17 A.V. ‘The Translators to the Readers’
18 Westcott 255-7.
each version in Cant. 2:1 are tabulated in Table 2. Some versions could not be referred to because no library in Japan has them.

A close look at Table 1 and 2 will reveal the following.

(1) It turns out that the translators used modern versions after Luther.

(2) The translators adopted the expression of ‘the rose of Sharon’ directly based on the last versions, i.e. Bertram, Diodati, and Cipriano.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Translator/ Editor</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1525</td>
<td>Old Testament Trans.</td>
<td>Martin Luther</td>
<td>German trans. from Originl Hebrew Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1545</td>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Luther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cipriano de Valera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572</td>
<td>Antwerp Polyglot Bible</td>
<td>Arias Montanus</td>
<td>Rev. ed. of Pagninus; Heb.; LXX; Vulgate; Aramaic; Syriac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607</td>
<td>Old Testament Trans.</td>
<td>Giovanni Diodati</td>
<td>Italian trans. from Originl Hebrew Text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: The Passages of the Versions used by the Translators of the A.V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(BHS: 1977/Heb.)</td>
<td>'ani habatseleth hasharon, shoshanah ha'amaqim:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(LXX /Gk.)</td>
<td>Ἠγὼ ἀνθως τοῦ πεδίου, κρίνων τῶν κοιλαδων.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The Vulgate /Lat.)</td>
<td>ego flos campi et lilium convalium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Luther: 1524 /Ger.)</td>
<td>Jch byn eyne blume zu Saron, und eyn rose im tal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pagninus: 1528 /Lat.)</td>
<td>Ego rosa campi, &amp; lilium cvallium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tyndale. Sup.: 1534 /Eng.)</td>
<td>I am the floure of the felde, and lylyes of the valeyes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Coverdale: 1535 /Eng.)</td>
<td>I am the floure of the felde, and lylie of the valleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The Great Bible: 1539/Eng.)</td>
<td>I am the lylie of the felde, and rose ye valeyes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Luther: 1545 /Ger.)</td>
<td>Jch bin ein Blumen zu Saron, und ein Rose im tal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Matthew: 1549 /Eng.)</td>
<td>I am the floure of the felde, and Lylye of the valeyes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Geneva: 1560 /Eng.)</td>
<td>I am the rose of the field, &amp; the lilie of the valleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bishop's Bible: 1568/Eng.)</td>
<td>I am the rose of the feldie, and lillie of the valleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cassiodoro: 1569/Sp.)</td>
<td>Yo soy el Lirio del campo*, y la rosa de los valles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* (de Sarón)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Antwerp Polyglot: 1572)</td>
<td>(Not Found in Japanese Libraries.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bertram: 1587-8/ Fr.)</td>
<td>Ie svis la rose de Scaron, &amp; le muguet des valees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cipriano: 1602 /Sp.)</td>
<td>Yo soy la rosa de Sarón, y el lirio de los valles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Diodati: 1607 /Ita.)</td>
<td>Io son la rosa di Saron, il giglio delle valli.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) The translators obey Bishops' Bible with ‘rose’ in Cant 2:1a. They went by ‘The Rules to be observed in the Translation of the Bible’.

(4) In the ancient versions and the early English versions, translators regarded original Hebrew habatseleth as words including ἄ νθως and ‘flos’ which merely mean ‘flower’. However the Authorized Version’s translators rejected traditional translated word that merely means ‘flower’, and make allowances for Pagninus’ Latin version in 1528.
(5) However, although the translators regard *habatseleth* as rose, they reject Luther’s interpretation that *shoshanah* was regarded as rose.

1.4. Discrepancies in the definition of the A. V. and Smith’s Dictionary

Discrepancies in the definition between the A.V.’s words and the original Hebrew words have been acknowledged as a problem for a long time. We can be right in thinking that one monument on this problem is *A Dictionary of the Bible* edited by Sir William Smith (1813-1893). Smith’s *A Dictionary of the Bible* does not also regard *habatseleth* as being a rose (See Fig. 4.).

![Fig. 4. The Item of ‘ROSE’ in Smith’s Dictionary (1863)](image)

Whereas Smith’s dictionary compares translated words of many versions, it is nothing more than a mere comparison with these versions and definitions of the original Hebrew word. Subsequent research is loosely based on the dictionary and never interested in the process of these translations.

---

19 Smith, vol.3. 1061.
1.5. Etymological Re-Examination of the word ‘Rose’ and ‘Lily’ in Hebrew

Thus, the problem whether habatseleth or shoshanah should be regarded as ‘rose’ lies behind this difference. It is obvious that translated words have no positional correspondence to original Hebrew words in biblical translation history. We must recognize that assumption of the original Hebrew meaning based on translated words is clearly misguided.

Wilhelm Gesenius (1786-1842), a famous Hebraist, once explained that this word habatseleth is composed of two roots: hamets (acid or acrid) and betsel (bulb). Gesenius says this explanation is favored by the etymology. In addition, Benjamin Davidson (d. 1871) explains that the guttural h- is prefixed to betsel as in hashemannim from shaman. Most scholars broadly accept this ‘bulb’ plant theory, and regard the habatseleth as ‘crocus’ or ‘narcissus’. This theory seems to be considered the most reasonable and proper. In any case, there can be little doubt that the habatseleth etymologically indicates something with the meaning of ‘bulb’.

As to dissenting opinions, it may be noted that Julius Fürst (1805-73), a German Orientalist, suggests that habatsel derives from habats (i.e. hamats) which means ‘to have a pungent fragrance’ or ‘to be bright, splendid’. However, even if Fürst’s idea is true, we cannot

---

20 Gesenius 292-3 s.v. ‘habatselet’.
21 Davidson 246. s.v. ‘habatselet’.
22 Meek 112.
23 Davidson 246. s.v. ‘habatselet’.
regard the word *habatseleth* as being a ‘rose’ at all.

Meanwhile, there can be little doubt that the Hebrew *shoshanah* or *shoshan* means the kind of ‘lily’.

Gesenius insists that *shoshanah* etymologically stemmed from the word *shush* ‘to be white’ or ‘to be bright’.24 According to Davidson, the *shoshanah* etymologically stemmed from the word *shush* ‘to be white’ or ‘to be bright’ though he regards the word *shush* as an obsolete root.25 However, we should not jump to the conclusion that the white color represents a certain kind of flower such as ‘lily’. In order to reexamine the root from the standpoint of comparative linguistics, we must refer to the usage of the root in the modern Arabic.

Hans Wehr (1909-1981) regards the modern Arabic سوسُنُ (or سُسان) as ‘lily of the valley’ in his modern Arabic dictionary.26 Although Wehr is suspected of comparing the modern Arabic bible to the *A.V.*, we must think that the سوسُنُ means ‘lily’ in modern Arabic because we can find many Arabic websites which regard the سوسُنُ as kinds of ‘lily’.

P. C. Johnston says that the Arabic سُسان has a relationship with the Hebrew ְשׁוֹשָׁן and has a possibility of a loanword from Egyptian. Additionally, Johnston says that an Arabic translator of Dioscorides’ *De Materia Medica* (the first Century A.D.) translates the Greek ἰρίς into the Arabic یریسَا and regards it as a ‘type’ of سُسان. According to Johnston, Ibn al-Baytar (1197 - 1248) classifies the Arabic سُسان into

---

24 Gesenius 1047. s.v. ‘shush’.
25 Davidson 707-8. s.v. ‘shush’.
26 Wehr 515. s.v. ‘سوسُن’.
three varieties: white (or azād), wild, and cultivated. In Arabic, it is just conceivable that the سوسرن is traditionally regarded as ‘lily’ until now.

Although James P. Mallory insists that the word susan and Susannah derived from the Persian capital Susa (today’s Shush in Khuzistan of Iran), he probably believes in false etymology. His idea is diametrically opposed. Gesenius correctly writes, ‘the name, if Semitic, signifies only lily’. (cf. Neh. 1:1, Esth. 1:2 etc.)

Because the Semitic root шwш has survived in modern Arabic, the Hebrew shoshanah is virtually assured to be regarded as ‘lily’. For your information, in English, the Hebrew word shoshanah is used as a popular personal name ‘Susannah’ through the Bible.

---

27 The Encyclopedia of Islam 902. s.v. ‘SUSTAN’.
28 Hahn 475-6.
29 Gesenius 1047-8. s.v. ‘sushan’.
Chapter II
Martin Luther and Johannes Reuchlin

2.1. Luther's Inverted Choice of Translated Words

James P. Mallory says, 'English readers will remember that their Bible changes “rose” every time into “lily” though its “rose of Sharon” is a blunder similar to Luther's'.\textsuperscript{31} Especially, about this Luther's interpretation, Victor Hehn (1813-1890) says 'Luther, following the Rabbinical interpretation, has wrongly translated the Hebrew susan, susannah, by rose'.\textsuperscript{32} However, Hern's theory is not well-researched. Therefore, let us reexamine Luther's inverted choice of translated words.

There is an anecdote about Martin Luther (1483-1546)'s having completed the translation of the New Testament within only 11 weeks.\textsuperscript{33} We can find that his Greek ability was superior. However it took about twelve years for Luther slowly to translate the Old Testament and even then his translation in the early stages was published in installments.\textsuperscript{34}

While his translation manuscripts of the New Testament have been lost, those of the Old Testament survive. His initial translation is written in black ink on the manuscripts, and then was corrected in red ink. His manuscripts of Canticles is contained in ‘Berliner Handschrift’, and published as the Weimar Edition.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{31} Hehn 188-9.
\textsuperscript{32} Hehn 188-9.
\textsuperscript{33} Kooiman 134.
\textsuperscript{34} Kooiman 191-2.
As can be seen from the Luther’s Canticles manuscript, he does not correct Cant. 2:1-3a at all. (See Fig. 5).

Fig. 5. WA edition Luther’s ‘Berliner Handschrift’ (Cant. Chap. 2)

Moreover, in addition to the ‘Handschrift’, there is no change of translated word in Cant. 2:1 in both the 1524 and 1545 version. We can understand Luther had been firmly confident about his translated words until his death in 1546.

(Luther: Handschrift 1523-4) Ich byn eyne blüme zu Saron und eyn rose ym tal.

(Luther: 1524) Ich byn eyne blume zu Saron, und eyn rose im tal.

(Luther: 1545) Ich bin ein Blumen zu Saron, und ein Rose im tal.

We should ask where Luther got the idea of translation. In other words, we must inquire why Luther did not regard habatseleth but shoshanah as rose. Therefore we must search Luther’s works other than his translation to know his perception of these flower names in Hebrew.

There is little possibility that German versions before Luther influenced him. In Canticles, in the 11th Century, the first German
version is by Williram (1010-1085). In 1466, Johannes Mentelin (1410-1478) had already translated and published the Canticles. However, as follows, it seems unlikely that those Pre-Reformation versions influenced Luther. For those versions follow the Vulgate quite well closely regarding the flower names.

(The Vulgate /Lat.)    ego flos campi et lilium convalium.
(Williram: c.1000)    Íh bín uéltblúoma unte lília déro télero.36
(Mentelin: 1466)      Ich bin ein plum des feldes: vnd ein lilig der teller.37
(Luther: Handschrift 1523-4) Ich byn eyne blüme zu Saron und eyn rose ym tal.

2.2. The Analysis of Translated Words Inverted by Luther

Perhaps this problem has a relationship not with the Canticle 2:1 but with 2:2 in the Hebrew word shoshanah. For Luther seems to understand Cant.2:2 as the obedience to patience and effort, and favor the verse. For your information, Hebrew text and A.V. version in Cant.2:2 go as follow.

(BHS: 1977/Heb.)    Keshoshannah ben hahohim, ken raguyatsy ben habanots.
(A.V.: 1611/Eng.)    As the lilie among thrones, so is my loue among the daughters.

In the letter on April 8, 1516, Luther warmly counsels patience and effort to George Spenlein, a monk who incurred considerable

---

36 Willirams 9.
37 Kurrelmeyer 118.
monetary debts.

Igitur si es lilium et rosa Christi, scito, quoniam inter spinas conversatio tua erit; \(^{38}\)

If you are a lily and a rose of Christ, therefore, know that you will live among thorns. \(^{39}\)

We need to recall that Luther nailed the 95 Theses to the door of the Castle Church in Wittenberg on October 31, 1517. For this very reason, it seems reasonable to say that Luther already regarded shoshanah in Cant 2:2 as ‘rose’ in the year before Luther began his ‘Reformation’. Luther did not regard shoshanah as ‘lily’ or ‘rose’ yet. However it is important that, at that time, he thought a probability that shoshanah was ‘rose’. This Cant. 2:2 is translated in part in an open letter dated March in 1521 to Hieronymus Emser (1477-1527), an opponent of Luther.

Doch es musz also sein, wie geschrieben Cantic.2. ‘wie die rosen unter den dornen, also meyne freundynn unter den tochternn’. \(^{40}\)

However it should be the same that Cant.2 says, ‘just like

\(^{38}\) WA, Brief Band. I. 33-6.

\(^{39}\) Luther’s Works on CD-ROM, ‘To George Spenlein’.

\(^{40}\) WA, Schriften Band.VII. 615ff.
the rose among the thorns, my lover is among the daughters’.

Therefore, most importantly, Luther already intended to translate *shoshanah* into ‘rose’ long before he began his translation. It was in 1523 or 24 that Luther began to translate Canticles.

These can be summarized as follows.

(1) We can infer *a priori* that Luther, who was familiar with Latin and the Vulgate, clearly recognized that the Vulgate had translated the word *shoshanah* into ‘lilium’ in Cant.2:2.

(2) As of his writing the letter to George Spenlein in 1516, though Luther vacillated between lily and rose, he thought that the word *shoshanah* of Cant.2:2 could be interpreted as ‘rose’.

(3) In an open letter in 1521, Luther had determined the translation that interpreted the word *shoshanah* of Cant.2:2 as ‘rose’.

(4) When Luther translated the whole of Canticles in 1523 or 24, based on the translation of Cant.2:2 determined in advance, he interpreted ‘*shoshanaha’amaqim*’ in Cant.2:1 as ‘und eyn rose ym tal’.

### 2.3. Luther and Medieval Interpretations

We must search for the materials to which Luther referred. It is important that Luther chose ‘rose’ as the translated word of *shoshanah*.

According to James George Kiecker, Luther referred frequently to the *Postilla* of Nicholas of Lyra (1270-1349), a Franciscan teacher who fully mastered Hebrew in the Middle Ages. Kiecker insists that
similarities of interpretation between Luther and Lyra are especially prominent in chapter 6 of Canticles. However, in the disputed verse of chapter 2,

Ego flos campi, id est, modo habito pura et munda extra vilitatem Aegypti. Et lilium convallium, quasi diceret, quando eram in Aegypto, eram quasi lilium in monte, cuius color obfuscatur solis ardore, sicut dixit supra. Decoloravit me sol. Sed modo sum sicui lilium in valle, quod habet colorem recentem ex vallis humore, et quia Deo placet sponsae gratitudo, ideo subdit eam commendando.42

[Ch.2:1] I am the flower of the field, that is, I now live purified and cleansed, away from the vileness of Egypt, and the lily of the valleys, as if she would say: When I was in Egypt, I was like a lily on the mountain, whose color has been faded by the harshness of the sun. As the bride said earlier, The sun hath altered my color [Ch. 1:5]. But now I am like a lily in the valley, which has received color from the valley’s moisture. Because the thanks which the bride offers pleases God, he praises her, saying. [Trans. J.G. Kiecker]43

41 Kiecker 19-22.
42 Kiecker 47.
43 Kiecker 47.
Based on the quotation of ‘The sun hath altered my color’ in 1:5, one might regard the flower as rose. However a colored flower is neither necessary nor a sufficient condition for rose. We must avoid this kind of identification in academic argument as far as possible.

It is unlikely that medieval works in Latin, having an indirect connection with Hebrew, had an influence on Luther.

2.4. Reuchlin and Luther

In 1509, Luther acquired De Rudimentis Hebraicis (1506). The first Hebrew primer was compiled by Johannes Reuchlin (1455-1522). Luther wrote extracts from this primer in the margin of his Vulgate version. This primer has a Hebrew-Latin glossary. Based on this glossary, Luther may have searched the Hebrew meanings in his early days.

The glossary of this primer does not have an entry for the word shoshanah. However, it defines the Hebrew word habatseleth (Fig.6.).

\[\text{habatseleth} \quad \text{Rosa. flos. Canticorum secundo. Ego flos campi.}\]

\[\text{habatseleth} \quad \text{Rose. Flower. Canticles Chapter two. I am the flower of the field. [Trans. Mizota]}\]

---

44 Kooiman 102-5.
45 Reuchlin, De Rudimentis Hebraicis 161. s.v. ‘habatselet’.
Hirsch says that the glossary of the primer is a close imitation of Sefer Hahorashim edited by a Rabbi in the Middle Ages, David Kimchi (1160-1235). The first edition was printed in 1480. However, there is no entry of the word habatseleth in Sefer Hahorashim.

It is an undeniable fact that Luther used Reuchlin's De Rudimentis Hebraicis. It is true that this lexicon does not have an important influence on Luther's biblical interpretation. However, it makes no sense at all that Luther directly referred to Reuchlin's Lexicon for interpretation of shoshanah in Cant 2:2.

For your information, the definition of words in lexicons in those days was varied. As an example, Biblia Complutensis (1514-1517) is given here (Fig. 7).

Fig. 6. The item of habatseleth in De Rudimentis Hebraicis

Fig. 7. The item of habatseleth in Biblia Complutensis

---

46 Hirsch 460-1
48 Biblia Complutensis, vol. 6 s.v. “habatselet”.
2.5. Relationship between Reuchlin’s Gutachten and Luther’s translation

Originally, Johannes Reuchlin was a capable Greek scholar. Reuchlin met Pico della Mirandla in 1490, and then he began to be interested in Kabbalah of Jewish commentaries. In 1496, Reuchlin visited the famous library of Johannes Trithemius (1462-1516), which contained many books relevant to Hebrew. Taking this opportunity, Reuchlin compiled De Rudimentis Hebraicis. For this reason Reuchlin became the famous Hebraist. He defended the advantage of Jewish knowledge over against Johann Pfefferkorn who asserted strongly that Jewish books should be destroyed.\footnote{Encyclopaedia Judaica, vol.14. 108-11 s.v. ‘Reuchlin’.
} \footnote{Johannes Reuchlin, ‘Gutachten über das Jüdische Schrifttum’ 61.}

At 6 October 1510 in the next year of publication of De Rudimentis Hebraicis, Reuchlin himself sent the famous letter for the defense addressed to Uriel who was the archbishop of Maintz, Gutachten über das Jüdische Schriften (The certificate about Jewish works).

Uß disem text nemmen wir, das wir mögen böß und guts durchainander lessen und lernen, das böß mit vernünftigen worten zu straffen und das gut, so darunder wie die roßen in ’n dornen gefunden wirt, in den gebrauch der hailigen lere zu bewenden.\footnote{Johannes Reuchlin, ‘Gutachten über das Jüdische Schrifttum’ 61.}

We may read good and evil writings side by side and
examine them; evil writings to rectify them with prudent words, and good writings, which can be found like roses among thorns, to use them and apply them to sacred teaching. [Trans. Erika Rummel] 51

At least, there is no doubt that Reuchlin regarded both habatseleth and shoshanah as ‘rose’ before he wrote this Gutachten über das Jüdische Schriften back in 1510.

Meanwhile, Luther, who was a theologian at that time, observed the development of the controversy between Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn with great interest. In 1514 before his ‘Reformation’, Luther wrote to George Spalatin (1484-1545) that Luther himself believed that Reuchlin was innocent and recommended praying for Reuchlin. 52 It is very likely that Luther adopted the interpretation of ‘rose’ directly from some of Reuchlin’s letters, because he firstly was interested in ‘rose unter den dornen’ in Cant. 2:2.

2.6. The Possibility of Reuchlin’s References

We shall discuss in detail what Reuchlin himself referred to.

Firstly, any Hebrew or Aramaic work should be given. Just after the extract cited above in Gutachten, there is an interesting statement.

For it [=Talmud] contains many good medical prescriptions

51 Johann Reuchlin, ‘Report about the books of the Jews’ 92.
and information about plants and roots, as well as good legal verdicts collected from all over the world by experienced Jews . . . . This can be seen from the bishop of Burgos's [sic.] books concerning the Bible, which he has written in a praiseworthy and Christian manner, and in the Scrutinium, in which he clearly protects our faith on the basis of the Talmud. [Trans. Erika Rummel] 53

Although Reuchlin was interested in the Talmud for information about 'plants and roots', Reuchlin himself confesses he could not directly refer to the Talmud at the time of writing Gutachten. 54 As he says, he indirectly knew about the Talmud thorough Scrutinium Scripturarum of Pablo de Santa Maria (1351-1435). Although I cannot say for certain because I cannot refer to Scrutinium Scripturarum, I think that it is unlikely. This is because there is no reference to Cant. 2:2 in the Talmud.

Based on Karl Christ, Stephen G. Burnett says that Reuchlin had the following materials in his library.

B. Sanhedrin (MS).

Biblia rabbinica (Bomberg, 1517)

Pentateuch with Tg. Onqelos (Bologna, 1482)

Prophets of Targum Jonathan (MS) 55

53 Reuchlin, ‘Report about the books of the Jews’ 92.
54 Reuchlin, ‘Report about the books of the Jews’ 89.
55 Burnett 435.
As noted above, Reuchlin could not directly refer to the *Talmud*. Therefore it is at a later date that Reuchlin got the manuscript of *Talmud Sanhedrin*. Moreover *Biblia rabbinica* had not yet been published in 1511. There is a possibility that Reuchlin refers to Aramaic works such as *Targum*.

Secondly, *Commentariorum Isaiam* of St. Jerome (Eusebius Hieronymus: c.342-420) should be given because Reuchlin was a Greek scholar because St. Jerome’s *Commentariorum Isaiam* regards *habatseleth* as ‘rose’ as described later. Since ancient times, St. Jerome’s works have been well known in the field of theology and linguistic throughout Western Europe. From the standpoint that Reuchlin gives an example as Cant. 2:1 in *De Rudimentis Hebraicis* though he does not regard *habatseleth* but *shoshannah* as ‘rose’ in *Gutachten*, it is apparent that Reuchlin adopted both interpretations. In this case, Reuchlin defined the meaning of *shoshannah* by analogy with *habatseleth* as ‘rose’. However, if Reuchlin conformed to St. Jerome’s *Commentariorum Isaiam*, it would appear that Reuchlin did not use the expression ‘like roses among thorns’.

Eventually, we can hardly avoid the discussion about St. Jerome’s commentary. The contents of St. Jerome’s works will be given in Chapter IV in detail.
Chapter III

The Targum Canticles

3.1. The Word ‘Warda’ in the Targum Canticles 2:2

The works called the Targum are given as a generic name of translational commentaries in Aramaic of the Old Testament. According to Ezra 4:7, the tradition of translation in Aramaic goes back to the era of the Second Temple. The verb ‘Aramit’ in Ezra 4:7 was used in the broadest sense of translating from Hebrew into other languages. In contrast, the word ‘targum’ quite definitely has been used as the meaning of the Aramaic translation of Biblical text.\(^{56}\)

The Targum Canticles is different from the other tradition of interpretation in Cant.2:1-2. Although most ancient versions regard shoshanah as ‘lily’, the Targum Canticles interprets it as ‘rose’.

The Targum Canticles in 2:1 is as follow.

Targum:

The Congregation of Israel says: ‘When the Master of World causes His Shekinah to dwell in the midst of me I may be compared to a fresh narcissus [narqis] from the Garden of Eden, and my deeds are as fair as the rose [warda] that is in the plain of the Garden of Eden.’\(^{57}\)[Trans. P. S. Alexander]

\(^{56}\) The Jewish encyclopedia, vol. 2. 34 s.v. ‘Aquila’.

\(^{57}\) Alexander 42, 96.
3.2. Etymological Relationship Between ‘warda’ and ‘rosa’

There is sufficient evidence to prove that the Aramaic ‘warda’ has the same meaning as the Latin ‘rosa’ or the Greek ‘ῥόδον’. That is to say, the two words have an etymological relationship. The equivalence of meaning among languages under study must be always confirmed in some way.

The etymological relationship between the Aramaic ‘warda’ and the Latin ‘rosa’ has often been noted.

Walter W. Skeat, philologist, (1835-1912) says that the Latin word ‘rose’ is a loan-word from Greek, i.e. ῥόδον. He assumes the Latin ‘rosa’ was borrowed from *ῥοξα, one of the Aeolian forms. Additionally, Skeat says, the Greek ‘ῥόδον’ is borrowed from the Old Persian vartā (a rose), whence also the Armenian and Arabic ward.\(^{58}\)

Now, a similar assumption that the Semitic languages borrowed the word for rose from the Old Persian seems to be widely accepted by Western etymologists.

Meanwhile, Ernest Klein (1899-1983), a Canadian linguist, said that the Aramaic wardā comes from the Old Persian as well. He insists that the Old Persian *wrda- (a rose) can be traced back to the Proto-Indo-European *wrdho-(thorn, bramble) and adduces the Old English word (bramble) and the Norwegian ör, öl (for *ord).\(^{59}\)

However his theory that the *wrda- can be traced back to the

\(^{58}\) Skeat 524. s.v. ‘ROSE’.

\(^{59}\) Klein 1537. s.v. ‘rose’.
Proto-Indo-European root is far from accepted widely. Calvert Watkins said that the word is not common and the origin is not known.\(^{60}\)

Recently, Edward Lipiński insisted on a new theory. He said that Semitic words for ‘rose’ is a common Mediterranean or Near Eastern noun which is already attested to in Mycenaean dialect \(\ast\)F\(\rho\delta\o\)\(\mathrm{[sic.]}\), a variant of \(\ast\)F\(\rho\delta\o\)\([sic.\)]\) that appears as \(\beta\rho\delta\o\nu\) in the Aeolian of 7th Century B.C. He apparently suspects that the Semitic noun originated from Persian speaking area, based on the element \(wrd\) with ‘rose’ concept in ancient personal names in North Arabian cultures such as Nabatean, Palmyrene, and Safaitic.\(^{61}\) Probably the 7th Century B.C. authority referred to by Lipiński is Sappho’s poem.\(^{62}\) Justly, Gray A. Rendsburg regards Lipiński’s theory as ‘a wealth of evidence to suggest otherwise’ and brings academia’s attention to the new theory.\(^{63}\)

In any case, it is right to think that most scholars acknowledge some sort of etymological relationship between the Aramaic \(\mathit{warda}\) and the Latin \(\textit{rosa}\).

### 3.3. The Author’s intention

The translator of the Targm Canticles translates \(\textit{habatseleth}\) as \(\textit{narqis}\).\(^{64}\) This Aramaic \(\textit{narqis}\) seems to be cognate with Greek \(\nu\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\iota\sigma\sigma\varsigma\) (narcissus). According to Philip S. Alexander, the Targum Canticles have a lot of words of Greek origin. Some examples

\(^{60}\) Watkins 78-9 s.v.’wrod’.

\(^{61}\) Lipiński 560-1.

\(^{62}\) 

\(^{63}\) Rendsburg 437-38.

\(^{64}\) Alexander 42.
follow; 'rkwn = archōn ‘ruler’ [4:3], dwrwn = dōron ‘gift’ [4:8], nymws = nomos ‘law’ [1:6], plty’ = plateia ‘street’ [3:2] and so on. Alexander insists, however that most of these words are early loanwords of Jewish Aramaic.\textsuperscript{65} The word narqis seems to be one of the loanwords of that nature. In any case, it is clear that the intended meaning by the author of the Targum Canticles is a ‘bulb’ plant. The Modern Arabic narjūs, which has a meaning of ‘narcissus’,\textsuperscript{66} is an indirect proof that the Aramaic narqis has the meaning of ‘narcissus’.

Alexander insists that the rendering habatseleth into narqis in Cant. 2:1 comes no problem because the Targum Canticles regard habatseleth as a ‘parallelism’ with shoshanah.\textsuperscript{67} In this case, it is likely that the author of the Targum Canticles regarded habatseleth as synonymous with shoshanah. There is warda as the equivalent of shoshanah else in Targum Canticles 2:13 and 6:2.

3.4. Relationship of Targum with Aquila’s version among Jews

Next let us explore the material referred to by the author of the Targum Canticles.

Martin Hengel (b.1926), a famous Biblicist, said that the Septuaginta which had been composed and used originally by Jewish people in origin became gradually the authoritative version for early Christians, while the version of Aquila of Sinope (the second Century) was chosen as the new authoritative version by Jewish communities.

\textsuperscript{65} Alexander 12.
\textsuperscript{66} The Temple Dictionary of the Bible 680. s.v. ‘ROSE’.
\textsuperscript{67} Alexander 42.
Hengel brings forward interesting testimony. The testimony contains a document *the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* written in the 5th or 6th Century. In the document, a Christian character complains that Jewish people use the divine scriptures falsified by Aquila the translator. Hengel insists that the testimony shows that Aquila’s version was dominantly used in Jewish synagogues in those days. Eventually, Jewish people kept their distance from the *Septuaginta*.

It is just conceivable that the authority of Aquila’s version was established in Jewish communities when the *Targum Canticles* was written.

And then, when the Greek language as the *linga franca* of Egypt and the Levant began to decline with the conquest of Muslim-led forces, Aquila’s version translated into Greek was neglected in Jewish communities. The fact that we have little remaining manuscript directly based on Aquila ensures it.

Moreover, in the Babylonian Talmud and the Tsefta, the translator of the *Targum Onkelos* which only contains the Five Books of Moses was identified with Aquila. Of course, it is confusion from a misunderstanding. Most scholars consider the name ‘Targum of Onkelos’ as applied to the *Targum* of the Pentateuch.

We should notice that Aquila’s version had been authorized among Jewish communities by the time the *Targum Canticles* was

---

68 Hengel 21-34.
69 *The Jewish encyclopedia*, vol. 9, 34 s.v. ‘Aquila’.
70 *The Jewish encyclopedia*, vol. 9, 36 s.v. ‘Aquila: Relation to Onkelos’.
written.
Chapter IV
Aquila's Greek Version and St. Jerome

4.1. Aquila's identification of habatseleth with καλύκωσις

Aquila (Ἀκύλας) was originally a non-Jewish person from Pontus. According to Epiphanius, about the year 128, Aquila was appointed to an office concerned with the rebuilding of Jerusalem as 'Ælia Capitolina' by the emperor Hadrian (76 A.D. - 138 A.D.). It is thought that Aquila originally was interested in the Christians, but later he converted to Judaism. St. Jerome says that Aquila was a disciple of Akiba ben Joseph (Rabbi Akiba: 50 A.D.–135 A.D.), and the Talmud reported that he accomplished his translation under the influence of Akiba. Now Aquila's version remains in Origen's Hexapla except some fragments.71

The Hexapla was edited by Origen (Origenes: c.185-c.254), who was a typical theologian of the Alexandrian School. In the Hexapla, Origenes paralleled six texts as follows:

(1) the original text of the Hebrew,
(2) the transliteration of Hebrew,
(3) the Septuagint,
(4) Greek translation by Aquila,
(5) Greek translation by Symmachus,
(6) Greek translation by Theodotion.

Origen intended to show the difference between each version in

71 The Jewish encyclopedia, vol. 2, 34 s.v. 'Aquila'.
the Hexapla. The Hexapla belonged to the library of Caesarea. However, it is thought that most original manuscripts were scattered and lost in the 7th Century when Muslims destroyed the library of Caesarea. The Hexapla would have been far too huge to have made a complete transcription.  

Surviving fragments of the Hexapla are edited and published. Here are the appropriate verses in the edition by Fridericus Field. Field abbreviates Septuagint’s texts used by Origen to ‘Ο’, and Aquila-written version to ‘Α’.

(Cant. 2:1.)

**habatseleth hasharon.** Rosa (aliis liliun; aliis narcissus; aliis colchicum autumunale) Saronis. Ο’. ά νθος τοῦ πεδίου. ‘Α. καλύκωσις τοῦ Σαρών.**

(Isa. 35:1.)

**habatseleth.** Rosa. Ο’. κρίνον. ‘Α. καλύκωσις.

It is clear that Aquila identifies habatseleth with καλύκωσις.

4.2. Etymological Meaning of καλύκωσις and Aquila’s Intention

So as to clarify the core meaning of the word καλύκωσις, and to trace these translators’ motives of adoption of the translated words, we

---

72 The Jewish encyclopedia, vol. 9, 433-434 s.v. ‘Origen’
73 Origenis Hexaplorum, Tomus.2. 413.
74 Origenis Hexaplorum, Tomus.2. 499.
shall reexamine the etymological origin of the word in detail.

The root in the Greek word καλύκωστις is evidently καλυξ, and then suffixes –ωστίς.

Regarding this καλυξ, Walter William Skeat (1835-1912), an English philologist, insists that the Greek καλυξ cognates with the Sanskrit kalikā (a bud). Skeat traces the roots of these words to the Proto-Indo-European KĒL meaning ‘to cover, hide, conceal’. Moreover Skeat supposes that the Proto-Indo-European KĒL creates the following words of European languages, i.e. Latin cel-la (a hut); Anglo-Saxon hel-an (to hide), hel-m (a covering), heal-l (a hole), hell-e (hell); Gothic hul-jan (to hide); Anglo-Saxon hol (a hole). It is striking that Skeat regards the Greek καλύπτειν as a derivative word from the Proto-Indo-European KĒL.76

 Appropriately, The Oxford English Dictionary directly regards the Greek καλυξ as a derivation of the verb καλύπτειν (to cover) and means ‘outer covering of a fruit, flower, or bud; shell, husk, pod, pericarp’.77 Judging from the above, even if there are strong doubts about whether the Greek καλυξ originates in the Proto-Indo-European, this does not affect the validity that the Greek καλυξ originally means ‘a covering of something’.

As above, while there is a convincing assumption that the Greek καλυξ is cognate with the Sanskrit kalikā (bud of flower),78 Manfred

---

75 Skeat 87. s.v. ‘CALYX’.
76 Skeat 754. s.v. ‘KEL(HEL)’.
77 OED, vol.2. 964 s.v. ‘-osis’.
78 Chantraine, vol. 1-2. 487.
Mayrhofer (b. 1926), an Indo-Europeanist of Indo-Iranian languages, says the Sanskrit *kalikā* may be transferred meaning of ‘*kalikā*’ (sixteenth part), or ‘*kalā*’ (small part, sixteenth part). However, it is just conceivable that the original meaning of the καλυξ in the inner Greek remains unchanged.

Meanwhile, The Greek suffix –ωστς originates in the addition of the general suffix –στς. The suffix –στς form is used of verbal nouns of ‘an action, process or result’ specified by the combining root. These words also were formed directly from the substantives or adjectives themselves, or their compounds, without the intervention of a verb in -όω (e.g. α νθόκωςτς malignant ulcer, anthracosis, from α νθόξ, α νθοκο- coal, carbuncle).

In any case, we can be fairly certain that the Greek καλύκωστς clearly originally never had the concept of ‘rose’. With all the above considered, the word καλύκωστς used by Aquila seems etymologically to mean ‘some sort of action to cover something’, ‘some sort of process to cover something’, or ‘some sort of result due to covering something’. We must find out when and how the concept of ‘rose’ was added to the word καλυξ.

If the Greek καλύκωστς means ‘something which is just about opening or shooting’ (i.e. an opening bud, a shooting bulb, &c.), even though the Hebrew *habatseleth* has the meaning of ‘bulb’, Aquila could regard the Hebrew *habatseleth* as the Greek καλύκωστς.

---

79 Mayrhofer 180-1.
80 *Suffixes and Other Word-Final Elements of English* 231. s.v. ‘-osis’; *OED*, vol. 10. 964 s.v. ‘-osis’.
According to the supplement of *A Greek-English Lexicon*, E. A. Barber, the editor of this supplement, defines the word καλύκωσις as follows.

* καλύκωσις [v], εως, η, a flower, perh. meadow-saffron or polyanthus narcissus, Aq. Is.35.1, Ca.2.1.

It is doubtful that this lexicon is original in Greek language because this editor gives two examples of Aquila (i.e. Isaiah and Canticles) in his Bible translation. If we work on the presupposition that Biblical scholars regard the Hebrew word habatseleth as a flower name such as ‘saffron’ or ‘narcissus’, it is felt that the editor’s identification of the word καλύκωσις with ‘meadow-saffron’ or ‘polyanthus narcissus’ has roots in an assumption about habatseleth made by Hebrew scholars. Because it is felt that there is no example of the word καλύκωσις except these two examples of Aquila, it is likely that Aquila coined the word from καλυξ and ωσις as a ‘nonce word’ for his translation.

4.3. St. Jerome’s identification of καλύκωσις with rosa

It is in 383 that St. Jerome (Eusebius Hieronymus: c.342-420), began to edit the Vulgate of Latin translation under the orders of Pope Damasus (c.304-84). Immediately after Damasus’ death, in 385, St. Jerome emigrated to Bethlehem in the Holy Land. He studied under the

---

81 *A Greek-English Lexicon*, ‘A Supplement’ 78. s.v. ‘καλύκωσις’.
Jews on the spot, and then finished the translation of the Vulgate. \(^{82}\) St. Jerome, in his *Commentariorum Isaiam*, regards the meaning of *habetselet* as the following quotation from the translation by Aquila.

> Haec erat prius sitiens siue inuia non habens uietales aquas, et dominus non ingrediebatur per eam, quae nunc florebit ut lilium siue, ut significantius expressit Aquila, ΚΑΛΥΚΩΣΙΣ, quam nos tumentem rosam et necdum folis dilatatis possumus dicere. \(^{83}\)

This is previously arid or a back-country not having vital water, and the Lord did not go through it, which now flourishes like a ‘lilium’, or like the meaning expressed by Aquila, ΚΑΛΥΚΩΣΙΣ, which we can call a blossoming rose with still not opening ‘folium’. [Trans. Mizota]

Probably, from the context in Jerome’s translation, the Latin word ‘folium’ means the English ‘calyx’. For calyxes look like green leaves in general, and those calyxes wrap young petals in bud. It is important whether Aquila regarded the translated word ΚΑΛΥΚΩΣΙΣ as a blossoming ‘rose’ whose calyx still has not opened. This interpretation would certainly contain the concept of ‘rosa’ clearly in Latin.

\(^{82}\) *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol.7, 115-8 s.v. ‘Jerome’.

We should notice that, in Jerome’s text, the following clause of the relative pronoun ‘quam’ has a lexicographical feature just like giving a definition of the word ‘καὶ λύκωσις’. That is to say, it is likely that St. Jerome referred to some lexicon or glossary.

4.4. Saint Jerome’s Attitude to Aquila’s translated word

St. Jerome clearly had a high opinion of Aquila’s definition in Commentariorum Isaiah. However it seems not to be denied that Jerome thought that Aquila inclined toward etymology too much.

Aquila’s translation can be dated to a time before 177 A.D. based on Adversus Haereses (Against Heresies) of St. Irenaeus of Lyon.⁸⁴

God, then, was made man, and the Lord did Himself save us, giving us the token of the Virgin. But not as some allege, among those now presuming to expound the Scripture, [thus:] ‘Behold, a young woman shall conceive, and bring forth a son,’ as Theodotion the Ephesian has interpreted, and Aquila of Pontus, both Jewish proselytes. The Ebionites, following these, assert that He was begotten by Joseph; thus destroying, as far as in them lies, such a marvelous dispensation of God, and setting aside the testimony of the prophets which proceeded from God. ⁸⁵

---

⁸⁴ The Jewish encyclopedia, vol. 9, 34 s.v. ‘Aquila’.
⁸⁵ Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses III.21.
Like this St. Irenaeus’ testimony, Aquila’s translation was generally underestimated by Christian Fathers of those days. The reason comes from the fact that Aquila tried to translate the Hebrew into Greek equivalently as far as possible. However the equivalence aimed by Aquila seems to be not only ‘word for word’ but also ‘original sense for original sense’.

In this respect, St. Jerome himself says as follows.

However, we rightly reject Aquila, a proselyte and a contentious translator [interpres], who attempts to transfer not just single words, but their etymology. Who can accept or comprehend for ‘corn and wine and oil’ his χεῦμα, ὄπορισμόν, στινοτητα or, as we would say, ‘profusion, fruitfulness, and brightness’? . . . For so much that is beautifully expressed by the Greeks does not, if transferred literally, resound in Latin; and conversely, what sounds pleasing to us, if converted by strict word order, would displease them! [Trans. Kathleen Davis]86

St. Jerome clearly referred to the original Hebrew text and the Septuaginta, which had been an anonymous Greek translation since the 3rd Century BC. St. Jerome introduces the possibility of interpretation that the Hebrew word habatseleth could mean ‘tumentem rosam’ as Aquila’s interpretation. However, St. Jerome avoids the idea of

86 Hiero. Pammachius XI.
’tumentem rosam’ in the Vulgate. Based on the Septuagint, he regards the 
habatseleth as ‘flos’ in Cant. 2:1 and as ‘lilium’ in Isa. 35:1. Jerome may have rejected Aquilla for his tendency for excessive etymology for reasons best known to Christians.

As we have already discussed, it will be shown that this definition of καλύκωσις in St. Jerome’s Commentariorum Isaiam has a lexicographical feature (See 5.3.). We have to inquire into the lineage of Greek glossaries or lexicons.
Chapter V

The Re-Examination of κάλυξ in the Linage of Greek Lexicons

5.1. Existence or Non-existence of the Concept of ‘Rose’

Perhaps researchers have a prejudice about the lexical meaning given by famous and influential Greek dictionaries. We must distrust our own eyes. Therefore, let us reexamine the definition of the most famous dictionary.

According to A Greek-English Lexicon which was compiled by Liddell and Scott, the Greek word κάλυξ is defined as ‘covering, used only of flowers and fruits’. Then the definition is subdivided as follows.

1. seed-vessel, husk, shell or pod, of the water-lily.

2. cup or calyx of a flower. (See Fig. 8).

Fig. 8. The Item κάλυξ in A Greek-English Lexicon

Additionally, in section 2, the dictionary cites an example of

87 A Greek-English Lexicon 871 s.v. ‘κάλυξ’.
88 A Greek-English Lexicon 871 s.v. ‘κάλυξ’.
ρόδον καλυξ written by Philosophus Theophrastus (370 B.C. - 285 B.C.), who was a philosopher studying with Aristotle. By Theophrastus, the plant σιδη indigenous to the Orchomenos region in his περὶ φυτῶν ιστορία (Historia Plantarum: Enquiry into Plants) is explained as follow.

άδρυνεται δέ του θέρους, μίσχον δέ εἰ χει μακρόν. 
τό δέ ἄνθος ὁμοίον ρόδου καλυκί, μείζον δέ και σχεδόν διπλάσιον τῷ μεγέθει.  

It ripens in summer and has a long stalk. The flower is like a rose-bud, but larger, almost twice as large. [trans. Arthur Hort]  

And, on the strength of the Theophrastus’ example, the dictionary explains that the Greek word is regarded as rose-bud by Poets, such as Homeric Hymns to Demeter (Hymni Homericici: hymnus ad Cererem. 427), and Musa Puerilis 12:8 composed by Strato of Lampsacus (340 B.C.-268 B.C.). However, it is to be noted that the single word καλυξ does not contain the concept of rose. It has tremendous significance.  

First, let us examine the appropriate portions of Homeric Hymns to Demeter.

---

89 Theophr. HP IV, x, 3.  
90 Theophr. HP IV, x, 3.
a mixture of gentle saffron and iris and hyacinth and rosebuds and lilies,\(^92\)

On this testimony, James P. Mallory notes that 'The rose is called from ancient times ῥόδεα κάλυξ, rosy cup already in the Hymn to Demeter.'\(^93\) However, we cannot say that the word κάλυξ has the concept of 'rose'. Because the word κάλυκας is simply modified by ῥόδεας, the very word κάλυξ in this text does not have the meaning of rose at all. We can question Mallory's idea that 'It was so common, that even κάλυξ by itself was understood to mean rose'.\(^94\)

Secondly, let us examine the appropriate portions of Musa Puerilis by Strato.

Εἴ δον ἐγὼ τινα παίδα ἐπανθοπλοκοῦντα κόρυμβον, 
ἀρτι παρερχόμενος τὰ στεφανηλόκια·
οὐδ' ἀ τρωτα παρῆλθον· ἐπιστὰς δ' ἡ συχος αὐτῷ
φημὶ 'Πόσου πωλεῖς τὸν σὸν ἐμοὶ στέφανον;' μᾶλλον τῶν καλύκων δ' ἐρυθαίνετο, καὶ κατακύψας
φησί 'μακράν χωρει, μὴ σε πατήρ ἐσι δῆ'. . . \(^95\)

\(^{91}\) *h. Cer. 425.*
\(^{92}\) *h. Cer. 425.*
\(^{93}\) Hehn 475-6.
\(^{94}\) Hehn 475-6.
\(^{95}\) Musa Puerilis 8.
Just now, as I was passing the place where they make garlands, I saw a boy interweaving flowers with a bunch of berries. Nor did I pass by unwounded, but standing by him I said quietly, ‘For how much will you sell me your garland?’ He grew redder than his roses, and turning down his head said, ‘Go right away in case my father sees you’... [Trans. W. R. Paton]

In this translation of the Loeb edition, W. R. Paton, the translator, regards the word καλύκων as ‘of roses’. This definition by him is doubtful. Maybe his reason for regarding this as rose is that the color of καλυξ is red. However the red καλυξ does not automatically mean a rose. Perhaps the red καλυξ means other kinds of flowers. Especially in the poem of this text, a boy of lead character was interweaving something regarded as ‘flowers with a bunch of berries (κόρυμβος)’ by W. R. Paton. From the context, the καλυξ in this poem has clearly something to do with the flowers being compared to the ‘red’ face of a boy. Pierre Chantraine etymologically regards κόρυμβος as ‘umbelliform’. We cannot directly regard the καλυξ as rose.

Therefore it is not entirely fair to say that this Greek Lexicon explains that the Greek word καλυξ is regarded as rose-bud in Poets.

Of course, research has shown that there is traditionally some

---

96 Musa Puerlis 8.
97 Chantraine, vol. 1-2. 569 s.v. ‘κόρυμβος’.
sort of faint linkage between καλυξ and ῥόδον. However the linkage is not so much strong as 'classicism'. Perhaps the ῥόδον is a representative plant expressed as καλυξ in Classical Greek because the expression of ῥόδον καλυξ, as previously mentioned, is survived in some Greek texts such as Historia Plantarum and Homeric Hymns to Demeter. Therefore the expression might be used as a lexical example.

We have to inquire into the linage of ancient Greek Lexicons about the definition καλυξ.

5.2. The definition of the Latin 'calyx' as a loanword from Greek

It would appear that the examination about the Latin 'calyx' as a loanword from Greek serves as corroborative evidence.

Pliny the Elder (Gaius Plinius Secundus: 23 A.D.-79 A.D.) The Naturalis Historia of his work contains the word 'calyx' in Latin. According to A Latin Dictionary, Lewis and Short cite a few examples of the Latin 'calyx' in Pliny. We can find that Pliny regards the word 'calyx' as follows (ad libitum numbering).

(1) The bud, cup, or calyx of a flower.
(2) The shell of fruits.
(3) An egg-shell.
(4) The covering of shell-fish, etc., the shell.
(5) A covering of wax around fruit to preserve it.98

98 Lewis 274. s.v. 'calyx'.
Let us validate some of his terms. To begin with, we put some thought into the definition of an egg-shell.

defigi quidem diris deprecationibus nemo non metuit. hoc pertinet ovorum quae exobuerit quisque calices coclearumque protinus frangi aut isdem coclearibus perforari.\textsuperscript{99}

There is indeed nobody who does not fear to be spell-bound by imprecations. A similar feeling makes everybody break the shells of eggs or snails immediately after eating them, or else pierce them with the spoon that they have used. [Trans. W.H.S. Jones]\textsuperscript{100}

Here, the word ‘calyx’ is clearly considered within the context of ‘the shells of eggs or snails’. In this context, the ‘calyx’ never contains the concept of ‘rose’.

Next we put some thought into the definition of the shell of sea-creatures.

Ex eodem genere sunt echni quibus spinae pro pedibus. ingredi est his in orbem volvi, itaque detritos saepe aculeis inveniuntur. ex his echinometrae appellantur quorum spinae

\textsuperscript{100} Plin. Hist. N. XXVIII, iv, 19.
longissimae, calyces minimi.\textsuperscript{101}

The sea-urchin, which has spines instead of feet belongs to the same genus. These creatures can only go forward by rolling over and over, and consequently they are often found with their prickles worn off. Those of them with the longest spines are called cups.\textsuperscript{102}

We make two points. First, the word ‘calyx’ in this testimony is clearly about the figuration of the sea-urchin. Although there is some question as to the translation of ‘cup’ by W.H.S. Jones, it is less of a problem now. Secondly, the word ‘calyx’ does not have the concept of ‘rose’ at all.

5.3. Problems of the Item \textit{καλυξ} in Hesychius’ Lexicon

In the 5th Century, Hesychius of Alexandria, a grammarian of Alexandria, compiled the first large and comprehensive Greek lexicon for that time. His lexicon, entitled \textit{Synagōgē pasōn lexecōn kata stoicheion} (Alphabetical Collection of All Words), became a model of subsequent lexicons. However, there is only one manuscript in the 15th Century left for us.\textsuperscript{103}

The lexicon of Hesychius contains the item ‘καλυξ’. Nowadays,

\textsuperscript{101} Plin. \textit{Hist. N.} IX, li, 100.
\textsuperscript{102} Plin. \textit{Hist. N.} IX, li, 100.
\textsuperscript{103} \textit{The New Encyclopædia Britannica}, vol.5, 901. s.v. ‘Hesychius OF ALEXANDRIA’.
some editions of Hesychius’ lexicon have been published. Among them, it would seem that the edition of Kurt Latte is the best critical one. The edition of Latte incorporates detailed narratives against each item with some marks and abbreviations, in order to illustrate supposed relationships with other lexicons referred to by Hesychius.

Hesychius himself says that he enlarged Diogenian’s lexicon with Aristarchus, Apion, and Heliodorus. If that helps, Hesychius does not leave a clear trail of the word in the lexicon of Diogenian. About these reference relationships, Kurt Latte’s full investigation through all items provides an authoritative analysis.

κάλυξ: *τὸ ἀνθος τοῦ ρόδου ASg, τὸ μὴ ἐκπετασθὲν ἀνθος. Sgn. ή νύμφη. καὶ τὸ ἐνωτιον. καὶ ἡ χρυσῆ σύριγξ ἡ τοῦς πλοκάμους περιέχουσα (Σ401). ἐνοὶ ἐμβρα αποδιδόσι κάλυκας, οἱ δὲ βλαστήματα. σημαίνει δὲ καὶ τὴν θαλασσίαν πορφύραν.

κάλυξ: *The flower of the rose ASg, the not-opened flower, the bride. Sgn. The ear-ring. And the golden pipe

104 Lloyd-Jones 50-51.
106 Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, vol. 2. 404 s.v. ‘καλυξ’.
which binds the curling-hair (Σ401). Some people render embryos into καλυξ, on the other hand, the other people render [them] into βλαστήμα. In addition, [they] indicate the sea-snail. [Trans. Mizota]

Latte marks the text with asterisk (*) in this καλυξ item. Latte uses the mark as in the sense that this definition is written in texts of Cyril’s Lexicon. Moreover Latte annotates this item as ‘Κ + Hom.’ on a margin. According to him, it means ‘glossa Cyrilliana’ (Cyril’s lexicon) and ‘Homeri scholia vulgata et paraphrasis’ (Homer’s general ‘scholia’ and interpretation).107

5.4. Identification of καλυξ with ρόδου in Cyril’s Lexicon

In contrast to Hesychius, many manuscripts of a lexicon named after St. Cyril of Alexandria (378-444) have survived all over Europe. According to Henry Stuart Jones (1867-1939) who was also an editor of the famous A Greek-English Lexicon, the original text dates back to the early 5th Century of the same era with Cyril, though whether the lexicon derives from Cyril himself remained an open question.108

I cannot refer to the best edition of Cyril’s lexicon by Anders Bjørn Drachmann (1860-1935), because it is not in the possession of Japanese libraries (Die Überlieferung des Cyrillglossars, Copenhagen: 1936). I can refer to only an edition of Manuscript E (Codex Bremensis

---

107 Index Compendiorum. Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, vol.1. LII.
108 Jones 3-4.
According to Hagedorn, Manuscript E is one of the oldest manuscripts and dates back to the 9-10th Century.\footnote{Hagedorn ‘Die Handschrifte (Codex Bremensis G 11)’}

The item καλυξ in Manuscript E is described as follows.

\begin{align*}
\text{K71} & \quad \text{καλυξ :} \quad \alpha \nu\theta\omicron\varsigma \rho\omicron\delta\omicron\upsilon \mu\eta\pi\omicron \alpha \nu\omicron\chi\theta\epsilon \nu \quad \text{[Trans. Mizota]} \\
\text{K71} & \quad \text{καλυξ : A flower of rose not-having opened yet.}
\end{align*}

Moreover, a lexicon of Joannes Zonaras, a theologian in the 12th Century, used exactly the same as the definition used by Manuscript E of Cyril’s lexicon though Johannes Tittmann who is the editor says that his own Cyril’s edition does not include the entry ‘καλυξ’ (See Fig.9.). It is likely that Zonaras’ lexicon was a scion of the same family with Manuscript E of Cyril’s lexicon.

We cannot ignore the similarity in the definition between St Jerome’s Commentariorum Isaiam and this Cyril’s lexicon. Here we should recall St. Jerome’s definition of the derivative word καλυκωσις of καλυξ. As I have already stated, St. Jerome identified the word καλυκωσις of καλυξ as ‘a blossoming rose with still not opening folium’. Moreover it was observed that the suffix -σις forms verbal nouns having ‘an action, process or result’ specified by the

\footnote{Hagedorn 167 s.v. k71 καλυξ}
5.5. Origin of the similarity between St Jerome and Cyril’s lexicon

As we have already discussed, it will be shown that this definition of κάλυκωσίς in St. Jerome’s Commentariorum Isaiam has a lexicographical feature (See. 5.3.). St. Jerome refers to the Commentariorum Isaiam of Eusebius of Caesarea (275-339) in order to write his Commentariorum Isaiam. However Eusebius regards habatseleth as κρινον. Because, he interprets the word habatseleth based on the Septuaginta. Eusebius’ interpretation of the word habatseleth of Isa 35:1 is as follows:

verum memoratis de causis laetari et exsultare, itemque sicut lilium [κρινον] florere jubetur;

---

111 Iohannis Zonarae Lexicon 1150. s.v. ‘κάλυκώσις’.
112 Russell 70-1.
truly by mean of the stated causes for rejoicing and exaltation, and also as if in order for a lily [κρινον] to flourish; [Trans. Mizota]

Norman Russell argues in detail that Cyril employed translators because he could not understand Latin, based on testimonies such as a letter in 430 from Cyril to Pope Celetine. Additionally, Russell insists that Cyril directly refers to Jerome’s Commentariorum Isaiam, particularly with regard to linguistic knowledge and Jewish interpretation.\textsuperscript{114}

Although Jerome’s Commentariorum Isaiam might have had an influence Cyril himself or his colleagues who compiled Cyril’s lexicon, there are some questions that most of the terms in the Commentariorum Isaiam are not items found in Cyril’s lexicon. All in all, it seems reasonable to suppose that St. Jerome and St. Cyril (or his colleagues) referred to some common materials.

As for the reasons for commingling of the concept of ‘rose’ with the definition of κάλυξ in the Greek lexika, we can assume a mistake of ‘annotation’ for ‘definition’. In the Homeri Scholia referred by the editors of the Hesychius’ lexicon (see 5.3), we can find the expression of ‘κάλυκας: ἐμφερή ῥόδος. (buds: like roses)’.\textsuperscript{115}

The account is not a ‘definition’ but rather an ‘annotation’ for reading a specific text of the Iliad by Homer. The appropriate verses in

\textsuperscript{114} Russell 70-1.

\textsuperscript{115} Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iriadem Σ 401b.
the *Iliad* are as follows:

> τῆσι παρ᾽ εἰνάετες χάλκευνον δαιδαλα πολλα, πόρπας τε γναμπτάς θ᾽ ἐλικας καλυκάς τε καὶ ὀρμοῦς ἐν σπηὶ γραφυρῶ. περὶ δὲ ρός Ἡ Ὀκεανοῖο ἀφρῶ μορμύρων ῥέειν ἀσπετος.  

With them then for nine years I forged much cunning handiwork, brooches, and spiral armbands, and *rosettes* and necklaces, inside their hollow cave; and round about me flowed [*sic.*] the stream of Oceanus, seething with foam, a flood unspeakable. [Trans. A. T. Murray]  

Murray’s interpretation on the Greek καλυκάς is very questionable. It is better that the original καλυκάς should be simply regarded as ‘buds’. It is just conceivable that the concept gradually shifted from ‘annotation’ to ‘definition’ in the history of compiling *lexika*.

117 Homer. *Il.*, XVIII.400-3.
Chapter VI

The meaning of habatseleth and The Septuagint

6.1. The feature of the Septuagint

The Septuagint is the most famous version in the Koine of ancient Greek and the oldest translation of the Old Testament. Any translator gives priority consideration for the Septuagint.

These days, many scholars question whether all documents assembled as the Septuagint was translated by ‘seventy-two scholars’ of legend. Hengel says that we can only infer the formation process of each translation from slight surviving testimonies. Hengel insists that Isaiah was translated in the middle of the second Century B.C. for reasons such as reflecting situations in the Ptolemaic dynasty in Is.19:18-21. Meanwhile, Hengel supposes that Canticles was translated much later, that is to say, in around the same period that 2 Esdras was translated in the ‘Koine’. Dorival, Harl and Munnich insist that Isaiah was translated between 170 and 132 B.C. And they think that the translation of Canticles was done by the ‘Kaige Group’ in the former part of the first Century A.D. (See Table 3) In any case, Isaiah’s translation precedes Canticle’s translation.

Therefore, if we reexamine how translators of the Septuagint interpreted the meaning of habatseleth, the first thing to do is the
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118 Hengel 100.
119 Hengel 102.
120 Hengel 102.
121 Dorival, Harl, and Munnich 96-8.
investigation of *habateleth* in Isa. 35:1.

Table 3. The Date of the Septuagint  
(Dorival, Harl and Munnich: 1988)\(^{122}\)

In the Septuagint, the translators of Isaiah regarded the Hebrew *habateleth* as *α' νθος* which merely mean ‘flower’. Isa. 35:1b, the translators of the Septuagint translate it as follows.

\(^{122}\) Dorival, Harl, and Munnich 111.
First, we must research the way of using *tipherath* (KAL. fut. fem. 3 pres. sg.) which governs the *habatseleth* in Isa. 35:1 in order to define the meaning of the *habatseleth*.

6.2. The Government by the Hebrew *pharath* in Isa. 35:1

The infinitive form of the verb *tipherath* is *pharath*. Gesenius insisted that this *pharath* can be regarded as ‘to break out or forth’ in relation to the Arabian root فَرَخُ (f-r-x) with the image ‘from the womb’.\(^{123}\) Hans Wehr regards the word فَرَخُ as the following meaning in his modern Arabic dictionary as follows:

1. ‘to have young ones (bird),’
2. ‘to hatch (said of eggs)’
3. ‘to hatch, incubate, to germinate, sprout, put out new shoots (of a tree)’
4. ‘to spread, gain ground’.\(^{124}\)

In addition, Hans Wehr explains that a modern derivative word

\(^{123}\) Gesenius 866. s.v. ‘*pharat*’.  
\(^{124}\) Wehr 823. s.v. ‘فَرَخُ’. 
with a meaning ‘incubator’ stems from this root ﻓﺮخ. In other words, the original image of ‘shooting’ of Semitic root ph-r-h (or f-r-x) survives in Modern Arabic to this day.

Actually Genesis provides an appropriate example for regarding the word *pharath* as the meaning of ‘to bud’ or ‘(a bud) to be shooting’:

> And in the vine were three branches: and it was as though it *budded* [inf. *pharath*], and her blossoms *shot forth* [inf. *alah*]; and the clusters thereof *brought forth* [inf. *bashal*] ripe grapes: [*the A.V.: Gen.40:10*]

It is likely that the verb *pharath* originally means ‘to have the potential to become something’ as if ‘the egg hatches’ or ‘to bud’.

### 6.3. The ‘Collocation’ Formed by the *pharath* and the *habatsaleth*

In addition, when discussing the meaning of *ka-habatsaleth* in Isa.35:1, it must be noted that the verb *pharath* has a tendency to be often combined with the preposition Kaf (כ). According to Gesenius, the preposition *Kaf* has the meaning such as ‘as’, ‘like’, and ‘as if’. We should not overlook ‘collocation’. M. Joos explains the concept of ‘collocation’ as ‘a word-combination which throws light on the
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125 Wehr 823. s.v. ‘فَرَخ’.
126 Gesenius 439-2. s.v. ‘Caph’. 
meanings of the words involved'.

We should analyze the common nature of these objects compared by *pharath* with *Kaf*. Therefore, we miss the point if we regard the word *pharath* merely as well-known meanings such as ‘to flourish’.

The verb *pharath* appears 38 times in the Old Testament. Five of them co-occur with the preposition *Kaf* as follows:

When the wicked *spring as* the grass (*eseb*), [Ps. 92:7]

The righteous shall *flourish like* the palm tree (*tamar*): he shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon. [Ps. 92:12]

and *blossom as* *(the rose ?)* (*habatseleth*). [Is. 35:1]

and your bones shall *flourish like* an herb(*deshe*) [Is. 66:14]

He that trusteth in his riches shall fall; but the righteous shall *flourish as* a branch (*aleh*). [Prov. 11:28]

Reflection on some of these will make clear that these *pharath* (except the ‘rose’) have something in common, especially in the meaning. Each Hebrew word is explained in Gesenius’ dictionary as follows. Accordingly, some relationship between the verb *pharath* and *Kaf* can be considered from the collocational point of view.

---

127 Yasui 119-27.
eseb: green herb, plant, collect. green herbs, growing in the field,\textsuperscript{128}
tamar: a palm-tree, phœnix, dactylifera, date-palm, a tree always green, tall, and slender,\textsuperscript{129}
deshe: the first shoots from the earth, tender grass, young herbage,\textsuperscript{130}
aleh: A leaf, green and flourishing, is the emblem of prosperity,\textsuperscript{131}

It is determined that one common feature of words governed by the preposition Kaf along with the verb pharath is that it is fresh, green, and in the process of growing. Therefore, we can formulate this collocation as [(Kaf (ד) + something which is fresh, green, and in the process of growing) + pharath]. Similarly, the word habatseleth in Is. 35:1 also seems to be ‘something which is fresh, green, and in the process of growing’.

6.4. The Septuagint and the Original meaning of the habatseleth

Meanwhile, we are unable to disregard the succinct conclusion that the guttural h- is prefixed to betsel by Benjamin Davidson (See. 1.5.). If we eliminate the preconception that the habatseleth is a kind of

\textsuperscript{128} Gesenius 820. s.v. ese
\textsuperscript{129} Gesenius 1137. s.v. tamar
\textsuperscript{130} Gesenius 237. s.v. deshe
\textsuperscript{131} Gesenius 785. s.v. aleh
flower, Davidson's theory is understandable.

In addition, given the fact noted in 6.3, it is highly possible that the *habatseleth* has the meaning of 'something which is fresh, green, and in the process of growing'.

As it is now, we cannot accurately define the original meaning of the Hebrew *habatseleth* regarded as 'rose' in *A.V.* However, with all things considered, it is considered reasonable and proper that the Hebrew *habatseleth* means 'a shooting bulb'.

It is likely that the translators of *the Septuagint* have some etymological consciousness about the Hebrew *habatseleth*. Therefore, they seem to directly translate the Hebrew *habatseleth* as *κρί νοῦ* 'lily', and then to translate the Hebrew *pharath* as the Greek verb *α νθέω* 'to blossom'. Translation such as this is presumably intended to regard the *κρί νοῦ* as the representative of bulbous plants. The fact that there is not the word *βολβός* 'bulb' in *the Septuagint* supports this assumption.

\[(BHS: 1977/Heb.) \quad \text{ve-tipherath ka-habatsaleth.}\]

\[(LXX/ Gk.) \quad \text{καὶ α νθεῖ τω ω̣ς κρί νοῦ}\]

That is to say, the translators regard the phrase as equivalent in whole. We can take this Isaiah's phrase as a starting point that the *habatseleth* is regarded as a flower.

It should be appreciated that the deverbal noun of the *α νθέω* is the very *α νθοζ*. Perhaps the translators of Canticles which was subsequently translated were conscious of the translated phrase in Isa.
Moreover, they seem to have had to accept the identification of *shoshanah* in latter half of the verse with κρίνον preceding Canticle’s translation (i.e. 2Ch. 4:5, Hos. 14:6).

(BHS: 1977/Heb.)  
\[ 'ani \text{habatseleth} \text{hasharon, shoshanah ha'amaqim} : \]

(LXX/ Gk.)  
\[ Εγώ \ άνθρωπος του πεδιου, κρινον των κοιλάδων. \]

We cannot know whether the translators of Canticles have some etymological consciousness about the Hebrew *habatseleth*. Even if they had some etymological consciousness, it is more than probable that they gave priority to regarding *shoshanah* as traditionally-based κρίνον, and to leaving the image of ‘to have the potential to become something’ in the *habatseleth* on the άνθρωπος as the deverbal noun of the άνθρωπος.

Therefore, the original meaning is thought of as follows.

\[ \{ ( 'ani) \text{(habatseleth)} \text{(hasharon)} , (shoshanah) \text{(ha'amaqim)} \} \]

\begin{array}{cccccc}
A & B & C & D & E \\
\{ (I am) \text{(a shooting bulb)} \text{(of the field)} , (a lily) \text{(of the valleys)} \} \\
A' & B' & C' & D' & E'
\end{array}
Conclusion

Based on these research results, let us reconstruct the supposed process from the beginning of this problem to the A.V. for all of these analyses.

Probably, the Hebrew habatseleth which is interpreted as 'rose' in A.V. means 'a shooting bulb'. The reason comes from the facts that the word has the root which means 'bulb' by the theory of Benjamin Davidson and is in the collocation of [(Kaf (כ) + something which is fresh, green, and in the process of growing) + pharath] in Isa. 35:1. The original writer of Isaiah used the word habatseleth by way of 'a shooting bulb' with the potential to green the wilderness, the solitary place, and the desert (cf. 35:1). And, the original writer of Canticles used the word by way of budding not artificial but natural love (cf. 2:7) and of 'a shooting bulb' of lily longing for spring (cf. 2:11-2).

The first turning point is that the ve-tipherath ka-habatsaleth (and will bud like a shooting bulb) of Isa. 35:1 was translated into και ἀνθέετο ὦς κρίνον (and will flourish like a lily) in the Septuagint. This allowed the translators of Canticles translated later to translate the word habatseleth as ἀνθός 'flower' of the deverbal noun of the ἀνθέω. As a result, in the Septuagint, the word habatseleth was translated both as κρίνον in Isaiah and as ἀνθός in Canticles. Based on these interpretations in the Septuagint, subsequent scholars have a tendency to regard the habatseleth as a kind of flower.
In the second Century, Aquila of Sinope etymologically translated the Hebrew habatseleth into καλύκωσις. It would appear that Aquila coined the word from καλύξ and ωσις as a 'nonce word' for his translation. Originally, the word καλύξ is a derivation of the verb καλύπτειν (to cover) and means 'a covering of something', and the suffix -ωσις had a meaning of 'an action, process or result'. Aquila might intend to use the nonce word καλύκωσις in the sense of 'something which is just about shooting' (i.e. an opening bud, a shooting bulb, &c.).

Meanwhile, in Greek classics, the kind of rose was a representative of the flower. Therefore, the expressions with some relationship between 'rose' and 'bud' were used in a number of Greek classics. (For example, ρόδον καλύξ (rose bud) in Theophrastus' Historia Plantarum IV, x, 3). It is supposed that the repeated use of the expression in Greek classics induced some of the Greek lexicons or glossaries to regard the Greek καλύξ as 'a rose bud'. The Glossa Cyrilliana from as far back as the early 5th Century of the same era with St. Cyril regards καλύξ as ἄνθος ρόδου μήπω ἀνοιχέν (A flower of rose not-having opened yet).

It seems reasonable to suppose that the identification of καλύξ with 'rose' in the lineage of Greek lexicons changed the understanding of the concept of καλύκωσις in Aquila's version. St Jerome interprets the word καλύκωσις in Aquila's version as meaning of 'tumentem rosam et necccum folis dilatatis' (a blossoming rose with still not opening folium.) in his Commentariorum Isaiam. It is likely that the
likeness in the definition between St. Jerome’s *Commentariorum Isaiam* and this Cyril’s lexicon is derived from some common material. Given that the common material was some glossary or lexicon, we can explain the similarities.

It can be easily imagined that the identification of καλυξ with ‘rose’ in glossaries immediately caused the identification of the original Hebrew *habatseleth* with ‘rose’. Furthermore, in the *Targum Canticles* translated in Aramaic, the Hebrew *shoshanah* was identified with *warda* cognate with Indo-European ‘rose’. It is just conceivable that the Targum translator deduced the interpretation from ‘parallelism’ between *habatseleth* and *shoshanah* in Cant. 2:1. The identification of the *shoshanah* with rose naturally cause the translator to change the concept of ‘lily’ into ‘rose’ in the phrase ‘As the *shoshanah* among thorns’ of Cant. 2:2.

It is likely that Johannes Reuchlin referred to either St. Jerome’s *Commentariorum Isaiam* or the *Targum Canticles* in the 16th Century. In *De Rudimentis Hebraicis*, Reuchlin interpreted the word *habatseleth* as rose in Cant.2:1(1506). However, Reuchlin used the expression ‘like roses among thorns’ from Cant.2:2 in his work (1510). Later, Martin Luther translated *shoshanah* into rose (1524/45). Although Martin Luther got Reuchlin’s *De Rudimentis hebraicis* in 1509, it did not influence his translation. Because he regarded *shoshanah* as rose in his letter (1516), it is believed that Reuchlin’s work influenced Luther’s interpretation. In 1528, Sanctes Pagninus translated Cant.2:1 into ‘Ego rosa campi, & lilium cōvallium’. Under the influence of Pagninus,
Bertram (1587/8), Cipriano (1602) and Diodati (1607) translated habatseleth hasharon into ‘rose of Sharon’. After 1604 when translation of the A.V. began, the translators referred and conformed to these versions.

In this research, we could not refer to some versions, especially it is only regrettable that the Biblia Polyglotta (Antwerp Polyglot Bible) compiled in 1572. Additionally, we are forced to leave off the problem of relationship between ‘rose of Sharon’ in Cant. 2:1 and ‘lily of the field’ of Solomon in Mt. 6:28. If we deal with the problem, we must touch upon the tricky question of the hypothetical ‘Q document’. Although to look at the Q from a viewpoint of lineage of Biblical translation is a very interesting question, it was too involved a subject to be treated here.

Let us take these into future consideration.
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