
BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS THROUGH ANTHROPNOMS. ITS CHANCES “AFTER BABEL”

HERMENÊUTICA BÍBLICA EM ANTROPÔNIMOS. POSSIBILIDADES “DEPOIS DE BABEL”



Adina CHIRILĂ*
West University of Timișoara
Timișoara, Timiș, Romania

Abstract: Quite often (especially with the Old Testament), biblical anthroponyms may be described as dynamic names, since they contribute to the construction of a text’s content, and are active elements in the process of transmitting that meaning towards a different cultural space or cultural time. Consequently, the way in which translators of the Bible deal with them, intentionally or accidentally, affects a target-reader’s chances to grasp the originally intended message of the text. The present paper follows the avatars of Job’s daughter’s names (cf. Job 42: 14) from Hebrew, to Greek and Latin, and, late on, to vernaculars such as Romanian, and suggests that – while equally explainable contextually and/or pragmatically – different translating options achieve different levels of relevance, or representativeness, relative to the original text, and, in fact, to the multileveled and intricate translative intentions.

Keywords: Traductology. Textology. Biblical Hermeneutics. Anthroponymy.

Resumo: Muitas vezes (especialmente com o Antigo Testamento), antropônimos bíblicos podem ser descritos como nomes dinâmicos, pois contribuem para a construção do conteúdo de um texto e são elementos ativos no processo de transmissão desse significado para um espaço cultural ou tempo cultural diferentes. Consequentemente, o modo com o qual os tradutores da Bíblia lidam com eles, intencional ou acidentalmente, afetam as chances do leitor-alvo de captar a mensagem originalmente pretendida no texto. O presente trabalho segue os avatares dos nomes da filha de Jó (cf. Jó 42:14) do hebraico, ao grego e ao latim e, em seguida, aos vernáculos, como o romeno, e sugere que – embora igualmente explicáveis contextualmente e/ou pragmaticamente – diferentes opções de tradução atingem diferentes níveis de relevância, ou representatividade, em relação ao texto original e, de fato, às intenções tradutórias complexas e em múltiplos níveis.

Palavras-chave: Tradutologia. Textologia. Hermenêutica bíblica. Antropônimos.

RECEBIDO EM: 10 de julho de 2019

ACEITO EM: 20 de agosto de 2019

PUBLICADO EM: abril 2020

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances “after Babel”*. Belas Infieis, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

Introduction

Depending on the circumstances in which they are created or used, biblical anthroponyms may be divided in two categories. There is, on one hand, the category of *passive* names: these are anthroponyms whose etymological meanings have not played an important role in choosing them for a child; or names that, being perpetuated by family tradition, no longer carry the semantic weight (see *infra*) present in the circumstances of their first appearance (e.g., John the Prophet should have been called *Zacharias* < Gr. Ζαχαρίας, ου, ό < Hebr. “whom Jehovah remembered” – Thayer, s.v. –, simply because his father had been called so).

On the other hand, there is the category of *dynamic* names, which are chosen or constructed by parents in order to mark the special circumstances of a child’s birth – either personal, or, less often, social or historical –, or to express their gratitude and/or their hopes concerning a child’s destiny (Ryken *et al.*, s.v.; Ballard). This is the case of many names present in the first books of the Bible, like *Ben-Oni* (cf. Gr. Υιός ὀδύνης μου < Hebr. “son of my sorrow” – Strong, s.v. 1126) – the name Rachel gives to her son, on her death-bed, vs. *Benjamin* (< Gr. Βενιαμίν < Hebr. “son of the right hand, i.e. of good fortune” – Thayer, s.v.; see Gafton 170) – the name that the same child receives later from his father.¹ Also, the appellatives received by God’s command (sometimes replacing the original birth names), with a strong prophetic content, belong to the same category (see *Gen.* 17: 5: “Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee.”²). Names as such contribute to the construction of a text’s meaning, and are active elements in the process of transmitting that meaning towards a new and different cultural space or cultural time.

With some exceptions (*Benjamin*, e.g., is not explained in *Gen.* 35: 18), these dynamic names are followed by some sort of etymological note, in the Greek version of the Old Testament, which justifies their existence in the text and whose utility to the profound and complete understanding of the biblical text is seen especially in the case of recaptioning the Holy Scripture through a translation. We have in mind the primary translations, in Greek and Latin, as well as the later translations, in various vernacular languages. When they translated the Torah and the other books of the Old Testament into Greek, and then the whole Bible into Latin, and several modern languages after that, the translators usually transliterated the anthroponyms, they did not translate them: thus, the only link between the new reader, who was not aware of the original language of the text, with the etymological meaning of a person’s

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances “after Babel”*. Belas Infiéis, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

name was (and still is) the explanatory paraphrase that accompanies, as metatext, a certain anthroponym.

To the extent that a proper name stems from a common name with a certain meaning, we believe that a proper name has an intrinsic informative function;³ however, the relevance of this function in the relational field of (1) *namer* – (2) *name* – (3) *namee* – (4) *observer* is variable. It may be major, in cultures such as the Semitic, the Amerindian, and the Mongolic ones,⁴ but minimum or even null in other cultures, as well as in contemporary societies.⁵

There are situations in which the translator does not operate a report of the proper name, but translates it. The actual result of this operation is, first, a new conventional index of an individual who used to be designated by a different index;⁶ second, it is an indicator of the intellectual and affective individuality of the translator.

Analysing the outcomes of such translating manoeuvres, one may see that the translator found himself in one of the following situations: a) they either comprehended the etymological meaning of the dynamic name from the source-text, and they translated it as to preserve the semantic equivalence between the initial anthroponym and the newly obtained anthroponym in the target-language; b) or they, again, comprehended the semantic content of the initial name, but, for some reason, ignored it and opted instead for a linguistic sign with a different etymological meaning; c) or, finally, they did not comprehend it at all and translated the name improperly, thus creating a name from which the original meaning was completely absent.

In the last two cases, the new index is equivalent to the initial index solely in what they designate by convention – a certain person –, and not in respect to their connotations. This doesn't have any bigger consequence when the object of translation is a passive biblical anthroponym; however, when the object of translation is a dynamic proper name, the translation operated under the conditions of b) and c) is incongruent (in different degrees) with the holistic message of the text, as intended by the original writer.

1 The case of *Job* 42: 14

The names of Job's daughters represent a very interesting triple-case of "handling" proper names in a translated version of a text. Do the names of these women contribute to the message of the story of Job? – is a question one may ask nowadays, prior to pondering over the best translative solutions in order to minimize the loss of meaning in the process of cross-cultural communication. Whether this kind of pondering preceded the actual translation effort of many an ancient or modern translator remains however unclear, although their solutions

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances "after Babel"*. Belas Infieis, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

range from literally translation and report to new creations that uncover pragmatic attitudes or hasty behaviours.

Job was a righteous, pious man, who had lost his family, fortunes and friends, but, in spite of his multi-levelled sufferings, had remained faithful to God. It is said that, later on, God came to reward this unbroken faith, and among the blessings he enjoyed during his later years was the descendance of another ten children: seven⁷ sons and three daughters.

The names of Job's first children are unknown, as well as the names of the later sons. However, the biblical text provides the names of the later three daughters. The asymmetry regarding these narrative details, as well as the addition that "their father gave them inheritance among their brethren"⁸ (*Job* 42: 15) – in a society which, without neglecting the daughters of one's family, was in fact favouring, juridically speaking, the sons⁹ – argue for the idea that the names Job gave to his later daughters were not simple passive names, and that these particular names convey a meaning beyond the mere description of the three daughters' beauty (see *infra*). In the Hebrew text, the girls' names are: [yə·mî·māh], [qə·šî·'ō·wt] and [qeren hap·pūk].

14

The etymological meaning of the three anthroponyms are not perfectly clear, but the different interpretations given by the Hebraists persist, for each case, in an area in which one can grasp certain connections (metaphorical or metonymical) among them. The name of the first daughter seems to denote a 'dove', but dictionaries relate it also to Hebr. [yowm] 'light, day' (Strong, s.v. 3224). The name of the second one, means 'cinnamon; parfum of cinnamon' (Swanson s.v. 7904). The name of the youngest may be literally rendered as 'a horn of antimony' (< [qeren] 'horn' and [hap·pūk] 'antimony, stibium' – Strong, s.v. 7163; see also s.v. 7161, and s.v. 6320), 'a box for cosmetics'.¹⁰ It is highly possible that these three anthroponyms were not onomastic neologisms; although they are *hapax legomena* in the Old Testament, they are created on a linguistic model seen time and again: source-domains like those used for the names of Job's daughters are active with *Hadassah* (< Hebr. [hă·das·sāh]) 'myrtle' (Strong, s.v. 1919; see *Esther* 2: 7), *Elon* (< Hebr. [ʿê·lōn]) 'terebinth' (Strong, s.v. 356; see *Jud.* 12: 11), *Deborah* (< Hebr. [də·bō·rāh]) 'bee' (Strong, s.v. 1683; see *Gen.* 35: 8, *Jud.* 4: 4), etc. It is, in fact, quite unimportant whether Job (or the narrator of *Job*) constructed these anthroponyms himself, using common nouns, or simply took them from the onomastic tradition of a certain cultural area. Crucial for us is to comprehend, by means of contextualized reading, if there is a valid reason for which Job's three girls received *these particular names*, and not others, given the relation that exists between the literal meaning of the source-nouns, and the evocatively associated meaning of the anthroponymic-nouns (Geeraerts 272 *et seqq.*).

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances "after Babel"*. Belas Infiéis, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

Alone and ill, Job asks God a question in, 10: 2: “I will say unto God, Do not condemn me; shew me *wherefore thou contendest with me.*” (e.a., see also 13: 24: “Wherefore hidest thou thy face, and holdest me for thine enemy?”). To the end of the text, Job does not receive either the metaphysical answer – which would have repealed, quite early in the course of history, the humankind’s concerns about the meaning of the innocents’ suffering –, or the simple, concrete answer, in relation to the exposition of the story – an answer Job does not know he can expect and that would disclose the wager between God and, then, his courtier Satan (see 1: 8-12 and 2: 3-6).

God does, however, give him an indirect answer, in 38: 2-41, 39: 1-30, 40: 2, 7-24, and 41: 1-34 – a speech sprinkled with rhetorical questions hinting at the *right* of a mortal Job, whose power and wisdom cannot be but weak and limited, to ask the eternal, the almighty and the omniscient God for the reason of his actions (Geeraerts 331-333): “Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding.” (38: 4); “Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?” (38: 31); “Hast thou an arm like God? or canst thou thunder with a voice like him?” (40: 9); etc. The divine discourse’s idea is not new to Job, as far as it regards the human being, in general.¹¹ However, the answer is now given to a Job who, having declared, in 9: 2-3, that “I know it is so of a truth: but how should man be just with God? If he will contend with him, he cannot answer him one of a thousand.”, calls God to account for his acts with the audacity justified by suffering, and by his confidence that he has done nothing to deserve that horrible a treatment (Joosten, *Sermon*). The actual revelation of Job – which makes him renounce the struggle to penetrate God’s reason (see 40: 4-5 and 42: 2-6) – regards *his own* position in the eyes of the Lord, and is formulated somehow sarcastically: “therefore have I uttered that I understood not; *things too wonderful for me*, which I knew not.” (42: 3; e.a.).

Not having access to God’s reason, Job, as any other mortal, is left to rejoice in what has been ordained by God, and to be thankful for it... Nevertheless, the names of Job’s daughters may provide the biblical hermeneut with a different key towards the interpretation of Job’s story beyond the all-too-well-known lecture.

Semasiologically, each of the daughters’ names calls forth one or several meanings included in the concept of *beauty*: [yə·mî·māh] → ‘light’, ‘delicacy’, ‘purity’; [qə·şî·ō·wt] → ‘fragrance’; [qeren hap·pūk] → ‘perfect physical appearance’, ‘pulchritude’, ‘plenary beauty’. Our interpretation is that, by choosing these names, Job transgresses the fatalistic condition of humanity: after everything he suffers, and at the end of all the divine or earthy discourses that

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances “after Babel”*. Belas Infieis, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

he hears, be them rather ethical or philosophical, Job sees beauty, and he praises it, he rejoices in it and allows himself to be fascinated by it¹². It's an attitude recurrent in writings compiled in a cultural context similar to that which produced the book of *Job*;¹³ but, while in other places it stems from an external observations of facts, in Job's case it is the consequence of a personal experience: "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: *but now mine eye seeth thee.*" (42: 5). Job's dramatic experience rightfully puts him in the position to mark the outcome of his misfortunes as a philosophy of human existence, through his daughters' names – dynamic anthroponyms that are essential for the transmission of the message¹⁴ of the text which includes them.

Given these facts, it is clear that any translating solution would not serve the original text, and that some of these possible solutions would be in fact detrimental to the multileveled and intricate translative intentions: psychological, contextual, semantical, cultural, and ideological (Lungu-Badea 262).

2 The primary translations

16

In the *Septuagint*, the daughters of the exemplary Jew are called: Ἡμέραν, Κασίαν and Ἀμαλθείας κέρας (see LXT, *Job* 42: 14), and in *Vulgate*: *Diem*, *Cassia* and *Cornu stibii* (see VUL, *loc. cit.*).

The first two anthroponyms represent, in both texts, the Greek and Latin equivalents, respectively, of the original Hebrew names: Ἡμέραν (< Gr. ἡμέρα, ας, ἡ 'day, daytime, sunlight') / *Diem* (< Lat. *dīēs*, *ēi*); Κασίαν (< Gr. κασία, -ίη, ἡ 'cassia, an Arabian spice like cinnamon') / *Cassia* (< Lat. *cāsīa*, *æ* / *cassia*). This particular solution has the advantage of preserving (though partially, sometimes) the etymological meanings of the names present the source-text; on the other hand, in Greek and in Latin as well, the acclimatisation of the characters through names, to the new linguistic environment, disturbs the text's homogeneity and consistency.

In respect to the name of the third daughter, the *Septuagint* and the *Vulgate* follow different patterns of translation.

The author of the Greek version of *Job* (probably a Jew from Alexandria's Ptolemaic milieu, around 100 B.C.¹⁵) retains solely the first element of the structure he has to operate upon: Hebr. [qeren] – Gr. κέρας, ατος, τό 'horn'. The second element of the compound anthroponym appears as Ἀμαλθεία, -εῖη or -ῖη, ἡ – the name of the goat or of the nymph that, according to Greek mythology, has nourished Zeus. It is indeed a bizarre apparition in the

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances "after Babel"*. Belas Infiéis, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

cultural and religious context of *Job*! Could it be a simple error of translation? To us, it seems unlikely that the translator did not possess a satisfactory knowledge of the source-text's language, and thus he did not comprehend the denotative content of the word [hap·pūk].¹⁶ Rather, his linguistic choice may be perceived as a concession to the Greek civilization,¹⁷ in the sense that it aims at re-producing the superlative meaning recognizable in the source-culture through a linguistic construction whose superlative meaning is recognizable in the target-culture; the whole process would be based on some common element, which, in this case, is the 'horn'. Such Greek construction would be κέρας Ἀμαλθείας 'horn of plenty', attested with this meaning at Anacreon and Phocylides (6th century B.C.), Aristophanes (5th/6th century B.C.), Lucian of Samosata (2nd century A.D.), etc.¹⁸ In Eugen Nida's terms, this is a case of translation through dynamic or functional equivalence, by which "the receptors of a translation should comprehend the translated text to such an extent that they can understand how the original receptors must have understood the original text" (Waard and Nida 36).

Hieronimus, on the other hand, re-compounds the girl's name in Latin, by the literal translation of the two elements that form the original name: *Cornu stibii* < Lat. *cornu*, *cornūs* + the Genitive sg. of *stībium*, *īi* 'antimoine; cosmétique noir tiré de l'antimoine, pour teindre les sourcils, les ciles" (Gaffiot, s.v. *stībium*, *īi*).

17

3 The vernacular translations. The Romanian case

Romanian versions of *Job* mirror the Greek and Latin translators' options regarding the names of Job's daughters, in a way far from being monotonous.

The first anthroponym appears as direct and simple translation of Gr. Ἠμέραν: *Zio* (B 1688 and B 1795) or of Lat. *Diem*: *Zio* (B 1760), in versions that follow the *Septuagint*, and the *Vulgate*, respectively.

With regard to the second anthroponym, its form in different Romanian biblical versions seems to be the outcome of distinct cognitive and traductological processes. In B 1688 and B 1795 – whose source-text is the *Septuagint* –, the form *Casia* (Gr. Κασία) represents the solution resulted from a cognitive process identical with that involved in a translation, with, first, the understanding the etymological meaning of the name, and, second, the finding of a word with a similar denotation in the target-language. In Romanian, this word would be *casia* [n.f. "Cannelle – (A neologism borrowed by the first translators of the Psalms)" (DLR, s.v., translation mine), < Old Sl. *kasia*, Gr. κασσία (DLR, s.v.) / κασία (TDRG₂, s.v.)], employed

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances "after Babel"*. Belas Infieis, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

with this particular morphological statute in many a place in the Old Testament, in B 1688,¹⁹ as well as in B 1795.²⁰

On the other hand, the form *Cassia*, in B 1760 – whose source-text is the *Vulgate* –, is the outcome of a report of Lat. anthroponym *Cassia*, although the common noun *casie* was perfectly known²¹, and used in the same version of the Bible, in *Ps.* 44: 9: „Smirnă și stactii și *casii* din vejmintele Tale”.²²

The third daughter is identified in B 1688 and in B 1795 by a binary construction whose first element represents the simple translation of Gr. κέρας: *Cornul*, while the second element represents the borrowing and adaptation of the Greek proper name, Ἀμαλθείας, into Romanian, Genitive case: *Amalthiei* and *Amaltiei*, respectively. It remains unclear whether Nicolae Milescu (the translator of the Old Testament incorporated in B 1688), and Samuil Micu (the translator of B 1795) recognized themselves the meaning of the Greek expression κέρας Ἀμαλθείας ‘horn of plenty’, or they perceived simply a proper name made of two words, with no idiomatic content derived from a mythological reading, since there aren’t any other occurrences of the expression in other contexts at Milescu or Micu. Nevertheless, regardless of their comprehension or lack of it, their translative option for *Cornul Amalt(h)iei* represents, linguistically, the first appearing of a construction which carries the idea ‘horn of plenty’ in Romanian, before other three forms with exactly the same meaning: *cornul îmbelșugării* (attested in Iancu Văcărescu’s *Colecție din poeziile d-lui marelui logofăt I. Văcărescul*, 1848: “*Cornu’mbelșugării* adune îndată!”), apud DLR, s.v.), *cornucopie*, and *cornul îndestulării* (attested in T. Stamatii’s *Disionărașu românescu de cuvinte tehnice și altele greu de înțelesu*, Iași, 152).

Finally, in B 1760, the youngest daughter is called *Cornul Fluierului* – a solution which reveals a reading mistake upon the Latin source-text. The translator confused the term *stībium*, *ii* with the term *tībīa*, *æ* “os antérieur de la jambe; flût” (Gaffiot, s.v.) and consequently perceived the existence there of a construction **cornu tibiae*, which he then translated as such.

The modern translations of the Bible into Romanian (and into many other languages, in fact, including those translation that are of protestant nature) do not offer any surprises concerning the rendering of the names of Job’s three daughters. They are transfers of the original anthroponyms into the target-language, with some formal variations (due to various factors):

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances “after Babel”*. Belas Infiéis, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

“Celei dintâiu i-au pus numele *Iemima*, celei de a doua *Keția*, și celei de a treia *Keren-Hapuc*.” (B 1936);

“Și a numit-o pe cea dintâi *Iemima*, și pe a doua a numit-o *Cheția*, și pe a treia a numit-o *Cheren-Hapuc*.” (B 1938);

“Celei dintâi i-a pus numele *Iemima*, celei de-a doua, *Cheția* și celei de-a treia, *Cheren Hapuc*.” (B 1997);

“Celei dintâi i-a pus numele *Iemima*, celei de a doua, *Cheția*, iar celei de a treia, *Cheren-Hapuc*.” (Anania);

“Și a pus primei, numele *Iemima*; și celei de a doua, numele *Cheția*; și celei de a treia, numele *Cherenhapuc*.” (Fidela); etc.

Cf.:

“And he called the name of the first, *Jemimah*; and the name of the second, *Keziah*; and the name of the third, *Keren-happuch*.” (ERV);

“Jó chamou sua primeira filha de *Ieminá*, à segunda de *Ketsiá* e à terceira de *Keren Hapuh*.” (BKJA);

“E chamou o nome da primeira *Jemima*, e o nome da segunda *Quezia*, e o nome da terceira *Quéren-Hapuque*.” (JFAA); etc.

In all such cases, the translators’ choices agree or coincide with the principle that “the etymological sense of proper names is of no value at all; again, the names pass from one language to another without being translated” (Bréal 176).

Conclusions

Like in the case of many a biblical anthroponym, the lexical meanings of the Hebrew names [yə·mî·māh], [qə·șî·‘ō·wt] and [qeren hap·pūk] played a considerable role in choosing them as designators of Job’s beautiful daughters. We consider them to be dynamic names, whose presence add to the general message of the text. By translating them into Greek and Latin, the translators re-actualize their etymological meaning and rich connotations; consequently, the names presented as such provide the new receptor (especially the Greek one) with the possibility to make more profound connections between v. 14 and 15 of *Iov* 42 (cf.

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances “after Babel”*. Belas Infieis, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

KJV, *loc. cit.*: “¹⁴And he called the name of the first, Jemima; and the name of the second, Kezia; and the name of the third, Kerenhappuch. ¹⁵And in all the land *were no women found so fair as the daughters of Job...*” e.a.).

The modern solutions, on the other hand, ignore the lexical origin of these names, but has the advantage of not perturbing the cultural homogeneity of the ancient writings.

SOURCES

ANANIA 2001. *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptura*, Ediție Jubiliară a Sfântului Sinod (...), redactată și adnotată de Bartolomeu Valeriu Anania, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 2001.

B 1688. *Biblia 1688*, I-II. Text stabilit și îngrijire editorială de Vasile Arvinte și Ioan Caproșu, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2001, 2002.

B 1760. *Biblia Vulgata, Blaj, 1760-1761*, Cuvânt înainte de Eugen Simion, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.

B 1795. *Biblia de la Blaj, 1795*, Ediție jubiliară, cu binecuvântarea Î.P.S. Lucian Mureșan mitropolitul Bisericii Române Unite, Roma, 2000.

B 1936. *Sfânta Scriptură* tradusă după textul grecesc al *Septuagintei* confruntat cu cel ebraic, din îndemnul și purtarea de grijă a Înalț Prea Sfințitului Dr. Miron Cristea, cu aprobarea Sfântului Sinod, București, Tipografia Cărților Bisericești.

B 1938. **Biblia adică Dumnezeiasca Scriptură**, tradusă după textele originale ebraice și grecești de Vasile Radu și Gala Galaction, București, 1938.

B 1997. **Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptură**, tipărită sub îndrumarea și purtarea de grijă a Prea Fericitului Părinte Iustinian, cu aprobarea Sfântului Sinod, București, Institutul Biblic și de Misiune Ortodoxă al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1997.

BKJA. *Bíblia Português: Jing James Atualizada*, online: <https://bibliaportugues.com/kja/htm>.

ERV. *English Bible: English Revised Versiona*, online: <https://biblehub.com/erv/htm>.

FIDELA. *Biblia*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Fidela, 2011.

JFAA. *Bíblia Português: João Ferreira De Almeida Atualizada*, online: <https://bibliaportugues.com/jfa/htm>.

LXT. *Septuaginta* (Old Greek Jewish Scriptures). Edited by Alfred Rahlfs.

VUL. *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (Vulgate Latin Bible). Edited by R. Weber, B. Fischer, J. Gribomont, H.F.D. Sparks, and W. Thiele [at Beuron and Tuebingen].

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances “after Babel”*. *Belas Infiéis*, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADLER, C. et al. (Editorial Board). *Jewish Encyclopaedia, 1901-1906*.
<http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/>.

Anthologie grecque. Première partie, *Anthologie palatine*. Tome X (Livre XI). Texte établi et traduit par Robert Aubreton, Paris: Société d'Édition « Les Belles Lettres », 1972.

BAILLY, A. *Dictionnaire Grecque-Français*, Paris: Hachette, [s.a.].

BALLARD, M. *Le nom propre en traduction*, Gap, Paris: Ophrys, 2001.

BRÉAL, M. *Semantics. Studies in the Science of Meaning* (Translated by Henry Cust), New York, 1900.

BROWN, F. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon. With an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.

CORBEA, T. *Dictiones latinae cum valachica interpretatione*. Ediție de Alin Mihai Gherman, Cluj, 2001.

WAARD, de, J., NIDA, E.A. *From One Language to Another. Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, [1986].

DLR. *Dicționarul limbii române*, Tomul I, Partea II, C, București, 1940.

GAFFIOT, F. *Dictionnaire latin-français*, Paris: Hachette [s.a.].

GAFTON, A. *Numele în Biblie*, in AUI, IIIe. Lingvistică, t. LI, 2005, pp. 165-179.

GEERAERTS, D. *Words and Other Wonders. Papers on Lexical and Semantic Topics*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Guyter, 2006.

HUMPHREY, C. “On Being Named and Not Named: Authority, Persons, and Their Names in Mongolia”. *The Anthropology of Names and Naming*, edited by Gabriele vom Bruck, Barbara Bodenhorn, Cambridge UP, 2006, pp. 158-176.

JOOSTEN, J. *Sermon on Job, Holocaust Memorial Sunday, 2019*, Oriel college, Oxford, 27 Jan. 2019.
https://www.academia.edu/38903344/Sermon_on_Job_Holocaust_Memorial_Sunday_2019.

JOOSTEN, J. “Translating the Untranslatable: Septuagint Renderings of Hebrew Idioms”. *Translation Is Required”: The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, edited by R. Hiebert, Leiden: Brill / Atlanta: SBL, 2010. pp. 59-70.

LAYNE, L. “‘Your Child Deserves a Name’: Possessive Individualism and the Politics of Memory in Pregnancy Loss”. *The Anthropology of Names and Naming*, edited by Gabriele vom Bruck, Barbara Bodenhorn, Cambridge UP, 2006, pp. 31-50.

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances “after Babel”*. *Belas Infieis*, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

- LIDDELL-SCOTT. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Compiled by Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, A New Edition Revised and Augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones, Oxford, [s.a.].
- LUNGU-BADEA, G. “Note cu privier la traducerea numelor proprii literare”. *Studii de traductologie românească. I. Discurs traductiv, discurs metatraductiv*, coord. Georgiana Lungu-Badea, Nadia Obrocea, Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest, 2017, pp. 251-266.
- PEIRCE, C.S. *The Essential Peirce*, vol. 2, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1998.
- PLATO, “Symposium”. *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, Vol. 9. Translated by Harold N. Fowler. Cambridge: MA, Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd. 1925.
- ROSEN, M. *Eseuri biblice*, București: Hasefer, 1992.
- RYKEN, L. *et al. Dictionary of Biblical Imagery* (electronic ed.), Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Septuaginta 4/II. Septuaginta. Iov, Înțelepciunea lui Solomon, Înțelepciunea lui Sirah, Psalmii lui Solomon*. Volum coordonat de: Cristian Bădiliță, Francisca Băltăceanu, Monica Broșteanu, [s.l.], Polirom, 2006.
- STAMATI, T. *Disionărașu românescu de cuvinte tehnice și altele greu de înțelesu*, Iași, 1851.
- STRONG. *Strong’s Concordance*. <http://concordances.org/hebrew/1126.htm>
- SWANSON, J. *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Hebrew (Old Testament)* (electronic ed.). Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997.
- TDRG₂. TIKTIN, H. *Rumänisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, ed. a II-a, überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von Paul Miron, Band I-III, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1986, 1988, 1989.
- Testamentul lui Iov, in Trei apocrife ale Vechiului Testament: Iosif și Aseneth, Testamentul lui Iov, Testamentul lui Avraam*, Iași, Polirom, 2000.
- THAYER. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Being Grimm’s Wilke’s Clavis Novi Testamenti*, Translated, Revised and Enlarged by Joseph Henry Thayer, D.D., 1889.
- TRASK, R.L. *Language and Linguistics. The Key Concepts*, Routledge, 2007.

* Adina CHIRILĂ – Associate Professor at the West University of Timișoara, Romania. Bachelor’s degree in Romanian/English (2000), West University of Timișoara, Roumania. Master’s degree with specialization “Romanian language in synchrony and diachrony. Controversial issues” (2002), West University of Timișoara, Romania. PhD in Humanities – Philology (2008), West University of Timișoara, Romania. Linguist and philologist, whose work’s pillars are observation, proof and reasoning. Author of two books and over fifty articles and reviews concerning the history of the Romanian language, textology, Romanian philology, and diachronic

linguistics; author of a critical edition of a 17th century Romanian text; translator of works in the fields of evolutionism, genetics and the philosophy and history of science; member of the Editorial board of *Diacronia* (www.diacronia.ro); member of German Cognitive Linguistics Association, and of *Répertoire des historiens de la traduction*, Ottawa. West University of Timisoara, Department of Romanian Languages. Timișoara, Romania.
Academic curriculum: <https://uvt-ro.academia.edu/AdinaChirila/CurriculumVitae>
Google Scholar: <https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=HPsRw2sAAAAJ&hl=en>
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4979-0675>
E-mail: adina.chirila@e-uvt.ro

¹ *Gen.* 35: 18: “And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she died) that she called his name Benoni: but his father called him Benjamin.” (KJV).

² See also Rosen (97): “In the beginning, his name was Av-ram, ‘the lofty father’, which meant the leader who stood on a higher ground, isolated from the masses. His deeds however make him be named Avraham, namely, as explained by the biblical text, ‘Av-Hamon-Goim’ (*Genesis* 17,5), ‘the Father of many nations’. Not only to a single national group, not only to a single people did he belong, but to everyone, equally, for his life philosophy embraced the whole world with equal love and equal parental care.” (translation mine).

³ Cf. Trask (245): “**Proper names** may also refer and, indeed, they hardly do anything else; *Abraham Lincoln*, the *Golden Gate Bridge*, *Spain* – these really have no intrinsic meaning at all, and they merely point to particular entities.”

⁴ See, for the nature of proper names in Mongolian society, Humphrey (161 *et seqq.*).

⁵ Cf. Layne (41): “Interest in the meaning of given names is a common aspect of popular American consumer culture. A range of goods such as wall plaques, mugs, and decorative plastic thermal glasses are proffered for sale, which describe the meaning and qualities associated with a person’s name. The meanings of personal names (along with origin, and «famous namesakes») are also a standard feature of the plethora of inexpensive, mass-marketed, baby name books published and sold in the United States. Many people now consult one or more name books when choosing the name for their child.”

⁶ See Peirce (307): “[a proper name is a conventional index] which denotes a single individual well known to exist by the utterer and interpreter”.

⁷ Cf. Adler *et al.* (Editorial Board), *Jewish Encyclopaedia, 1901-1906*, at <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com>, s.v. *Job*: “Finally, God restored Job to his former state, giving him twice as much as he had before, even *fourteen sons* (e.a.). The daughters, however, born to him after his restoration were only three in number.”

⁸ For these details, I refer to the canonical text, as seen in the *Septuaginta* (see *Septuaginta* 4/II 21), and also in the *Vulgate* (see *idem*, 22). Cf. the apocryphal *Testamentul lui Iov*, in *Trei apocrife ale Vechiului Testament: Iosif și Aseneth, Testamentul lui Iov, Testamentul lui Avraam*, Iași, Polirom, 2000.

⁹ In special circumstances, when in a family there aren’t any male descendants, the heritage passes to the daughters. See *Num.* 27: 1-11, especially 27: 7: “The daughters of Zelophehad speak right: thou shalt surely give them a possession of an inheritance among their father’s brethren; and thou shalt cause the inheritance of their father to pass unto them.”

¹⁰ Antimony was one of the substances used in ancient cosmetics. See Brown (s.v. 8743).

¹¹ God’s answer includes several elements that were previously iterated by Job and his three friends, during their conversations.

¹² Cf. Beauty’s rich repertoire from the Old Testament, in Ryken *et al.*, s.v. *Beauty*.

¹³ See *Eccl.* 5: 18: “Behold that which I have seen: it is good and comely for one to eat and to drink, and to enjoy the good of all his labour that he taketh under the sun all the days of his life, which God giveth him: for it is his portion.”

See also in this respect, Plato, *Symposium*, 210a-213!

¹⁴ Cf. Geeraerts (323): “the impossibility of arriving at an ultimate meaning is the meaning of the text” (i.e. *Job*); see also p. 339. Cf. Joosten: “The story of Job can only be described as far-fetched. [...] I would like to propose a somewhat daring interpretation of God’s reply to Job. In this reply there is no answer to Job’s question, but there is something else: a suggestion that God suffers with humanity. More than what God says, the fact itself that God responds seems relevant. Although God does not give an explanation for human suffering, he does turn up. He shows concern. In fact, and this is the daring part of my interpretation: it almost seems as if God’s speech is bit rambling. God is taken aback, profoundly disturbed by Job’s words and the situation in which they are spoken.”

¹⁵ *Septuaginta* 4/II 21.

¹⁶ On the contrary, extensive studies have shown that the position of the Seventy in relation both to the source-language, and to the target-language was remarkable; in Jan Joosten’s words, “on the whole, the Greek translators’ grasp of the source language was excellent” (see “Translating the Untranslatable: Septuagint Renderings of Hebrew Idioms”, in Hiebert 66).

CHIRILĂ, Adina. *Biblical Hermeneutics through Anthroponyms. Its Chances “after Babel”*. Belas Infieis, v. 9, n. 3, p. 11-24, Brasília, 2020.

¹⁷ *Septuaginta* 4/II 21; see here also the observation concerning the translator's option for *Hades*, as the Greek equivalent for Hebr. [sh'ol].

¹⁸ Liddell-Scott, s.v. Ἀμαλθεία, and Bailly, s.v. Ἀμαλθεία. See, e.g.: Ὅστις ἔσω πυροῦς καταλαμβάνει οὐκ ἀγοράζων, / κείνου Ἀμαλθείας ἅ γυνά ἐστι κέρασ. [Pour l'homme qui, chez lui, trouve son blé sans l'acheter, la femme est une « corne d'Amalthée » !], in *Anthologie grecque*. Première partie, *Anthologie palatine*. Tome X (Livre XI). Texte établi et traduit par Robert Aubreton, Paris, Société d'Édition « Les Belles Lettres », 1972, p. 73; see also note 4, p. 229.

¹⁹ E.g., in *Psaltirea* 44: 10: “Zmirnă și stacti și casie, de la hainele tale, den turnuri de pil, dentru carele te-au bucurat featele împăraților întru cinstea ta.”; see also *Iezechil* 27: 17.

²⁰ In *Ezek.* 27: 17: “Iuda și fiii lui Israil, aceștia sânt neguțitorii tăi, carii vindea grâu și miruri și casie, și miiare de frunte și untdelemn și rășină au adus la târgul tău.”

²¹ The Latin term appears in Corbea (483): *casia* g.f. „coajă de lemn strein în chipul ținamonului”.

²² Cf. “murra et gutta et cassia a vestimentis tuis” (VUL, *Ps.* 44: 9). See also B 1760, *Cartea Ieșirii* 30: 24, cf. VUL, *Ex.* 30: 24.