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MINUTES OF THE IOSCS MEETING
9 December 1984 — Palmer House, Chicago

Programme

1:00-4:00 Albert Pietersma presiding

Paul E. Dion, University of Toronto
"Early Evidence for the Ritual Significance of the 'Base of the Altar,' Around Deuteronomy 12:27 LXX"

Leonard Greenspoon, Clemson University
"Theodotion and His Community"

Claude Cox, Brandon University
"Hexaplaric Materials Preserved in the Armenian Translation of Exodus"

Robert Hiibert, University of Toronto
"Paul of Tella and the So-called Syro-hexapla of Psalms"

Walter R. Bodine, Dallas Theological Seminary
"'Kaige' Text/Influence in Judges and Ruth"

John R. Abercrombie, University of Pennsylvania
"Manuscript Families in Ruth and the Historical Books"

Business Meeting

The meeting was called to order by the President, Professor Albert Pietersma, at 4:00 P.M.

1. The minutes of the 1983 meeting in Salamanca were read and approved.

2. President's Report
   a. The proceedings of the 1983 Salamanca program are to be published in the Textos y Estudios «Cardenal Cisneros» series by Professor N. Fernández Marcos.
   b. At Salamanca the SBL put some of its sessions at the same time as those already scheduled by the IOSCS. Prof. Pietersma has written to Kent Richards, SBL secretary, to insure that such a scheduling conflict not occur again.
   c. The Executive Committee recommends that the IOSCS continue its current practice of meeting for two years with the SBL/AAR and of meeting in conjunction with the IOSOT every third year.
NEWS AND NOTES

Honors
John Wm. Weyers, President of the IOSCS from 1972-1980, received an honorary doctorate from the University of Leiden on 8 February 1985.

Bonifatius Fischer, founder and until 1972 director of the Vetus Latina Institut at Beuron (cf. his revised edition of L. 115 in BIOSCS 16 [1983] 13-87), was awarded the Burkit Medal by the British Academy in 1983.

Emanuel Tov, Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint in Oxford University for 1982-84, has received an extension of the honor as Grinfield Lecturer until 1988.

Subscription Price Increase for the Bulletin
At the 1985 Business Meeting of the IOSCS in Anaheim on 23 November 1985, the members voted, in light of the Treasurer's Report and the Executive Committee's recommendation, to raise the annual subscription price of the Bulletin to US$5, beginning with volume 19 (1986).

Invitation to make use of the Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS) materials
For several years the CATSS project has been engaged in creating a flexible multi-purpose data base which contains the main types of data needed for the study of the LXX in itself and in relation to the Masoretic Text and to other versions and literatures. Major funding has been received from the Research Tools Division of the NEH, the Packard Foundation, and the Israel Academy of Sciences.

Detailed background material on the project can be found in BIOSCS 14 and 17 as well as in Textus 11 and 12. The state of progress as of 15 October 1985 is as follows:
1. Full morphological analysis of every word in the LXX is scheduled to be completed by the early spring of 1986. This includes grammatical information as well as the dictionary form of the words.
2. The full apparatus of the variants of the Gottingen or Cambridge editions is being scanned optically and reformatted for ease of computer access. The book of Ruth was entered by hand and has been fully verified. Several books have been scanned and reformatted, but manual work is necessary to achieve fully verified results.
3. The Hebrew-Greek parallel alignment of all elements of the MT (BHS) and the LXX (Rahlfs) has been completed with respect to the 'formal equivalents' ('col. a') and is ready for distribution. Information is being added to that alignment relating to the supposed Vorlage of the LXX and to translation technique ('col. b'). About half of the biblical books have been completed.

The tools are being created for use in the scholarly community, which is herewith invited to use the material for research and to become active in testing and verifying and also in bringing some of the materials to completion. Ideas and examples of use of the data in research are provided in the following monographs: J. R. Abercrombie, W. Adler, R. A. Kraft, and E. Tov, Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies: Ruth CATSS 1 (SCS); E. Tov, A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies—The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible CATSS 2 (JNSL Monograph Series). Material can be obtained at cost on standard 9 track tape or on IBM PC diskettes from the Facility for Computer Analysis of Texts at the University of Pennsylvania. CATSS materials are also available from the Oxford University Computing Centre. Correspondence should be directed to one of the directors of the project:
Robert A. Kraft
Department of Religious Studies
Box 36, College Hall, CO
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104 U.S.A.
[BITNET: Kraft @ PNNDRMAX]

Emanuel Tov
Department of Bible
Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel
1985-86 Univ. of Pennsylvania
[BITNET: TOV @ PNNDRMAX]

Minutes of the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins
Volumes 18-19 (1980-82) of the minutes of the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins, which focus on discussion of Marcel Simon's Verus Israel, are available for distribution. Due to increased costs and the fact that these two volumes constitute a unit, the total charge for the double set of minutes will be $4.00. Anyone interested in receiving these volumes should send US$4.00 [please make checks payable to Robert A. Kraft/PSCO, with an address label or 10" x 13" self-addressed envelope to: Robert A. Kraft, PSCO, [see above].

Maredsous Computer Data Base: D.E.B.O.R.A.
The Centre: Informatique et Bible [Maredsous - 85-199 Denée (Anhée) - tél. (32)(0) 82.69.93.97 - telex: via FROBRA 52005-B] has regrouped all its activities under the name of DEBORA (Documentation et Études Bibliques par Ordinateurs et Réseaux Automatisés). DEBORA is now the name of the data
base which includes biblical texts, lexica, dictionaries, encyclopaedias, bibliographies, programs, etc., produced by the C.I.B. *Interface*, an allied letter of information published quarterly, is edited by P. Maskens, Promotion Biblique et Informatique, rue de la Bruyère 13, B-5974 Opprelais, Belgique.

**Schedule of the VI Congress of IOSCS, 21-22 August 1986, Jerusalem**

**Thursday, 21 August 1986**

08.00-10.00: Registration

10.00-13.30: Opening: A. Pietersma (Canada) — President
D. Dimant (Israel): The Problem of a Non-Translated Biblical Greek
P. Cowe (U.S.A.): *Tendenzi* in the Greek Translation of Proverbs
Z. Talshir (Israel): Double Translations in the Septuagint as an Exegetical Technique
R. G. Jenkins (Australia): The Proverbs Text of P. Antinoopolis 8210

14.30-17.00: Symposium: Exegetical Aspects of the Septuagint
C. Cox (Canada) — Chair: Methodological Issues in the Exegesis of LXX-Job
J. Cook (South Africa): Exegesis of the LXX-Genesis
A. van der Kooij (The Netherlands): The Old Greek of Isaiah 19:16-25: Translation and Interpretation
B. Lindars (U.K.): A Commentary on the Greek Judges?

17.30-18.50:
M. K. H. Peters (U.S.A.): The Textual Affiliation of Coptic (Bohairic) Genesis
T. Muraoaka (Australia): Towards a Septuagint Lexicon

18.50-20.15: Supper on campus. During this time, the participants will have the opportunity to view in small groups Prof. Tov's project: "Computer-Assisted Tools for Septuagint Study"

**Friday, 22 August 1986**

08.30-10.30:
P. R. Callaway (U.S.A.): Deuteronomy in the Temple Scroll: Textual Affinities and their Use in Composition
N. Fernández-Marcos (Spain): Literary and Editorial Features of the Lucianic Text in Kings

B. G. Wright (U.S.A.): "Free" or "Literal"? An Examination of Translation Technique in Ben Sira

**The Jewish Language Review**

The Association for the Study of Jewish Languages, founded in 1979, is a nonprofit organization whose purposes are (1) to encourage research into all aspects of the inner and outer linguistic history of the Jewish people and related groups and (2) to facilitate exchange of information in this field through publications and conferences.

The *Jewish Language Review*, published yearly by the Association, consists chiefly of articles (mostly in English), notes, reviews, and responsa. Membership in the Association (which includes a subscription to the journal) is US$15 for individuals and US$20 for institutions per year.

The responsa section contains readers' queries of Jewish linguistic or cultural interest as well as readers' replies to such queries. Any reader may submit a query or reply to one. Over 2000 queries have been published so far. In order to record valuable information which may otherwise become irretrievable, the editors of the *JLR* are establishing a roster of resource people in Jewish languages and culture to whom queries received by the *JLR* may be referred for a reply. If you are acquainted with any Jewish language or culture and would like to serve as a resource person, please write to the Association for the Study of Jewish Languages / 1610 Eshkol Tower / University of Haifa / Mount Carmel / Haifa 31999 / Israel.
New books received


This volume offers an elegantly printed critical edition (299 pp.) with complete apparatus of this text of Theodoret, important both in itself and as a witness to the text history of the Greek Bible. It has a thorough introduction (50 pp.), an index of biblical citations, an index of ancient authors, and a lexical index. It complements the earlier critical edition, by Fernandez Marcos with A. Sánchez-Badillos, of Theodoret's Quaestiones in Octateuchum (Textos y Estudios 17), published by the same press in 1979.


The Fifth Congress of the IOSCS was held in the golden university city of Salamanca in 1983, and Professor Fernández Marcos assumed the task of editing the papers from the congress for publication. The papers are grouped into four sections: (I) a symposium on the use of the versions in textual criticism, with contributions by Wevers on the Septuagint, Cox on the Armenian, Mulder on the Peshitta, Peters on the Coptic, and Ulrich on the Old Latin; (II) analyses of translation technique by Soisalon-Soininen (the partitive 1/), Sollamo (the infinitive absolute with a paronymous finite verb), Aejemelaeus (on-causale), and Segert (poetic parallelism); (III) studies on method and individual books by Silva (internal evidence), Cook (the translator of the Greek Genesis), Cowe (the Armenian of Ruth), Jenkins (the Syriac of Isaiah), and Spottomo y Díaz-Caro (the divine name in Ezekiel papyri 967); and (IV) reports on projects in progress by Tov (the computer-assisted parallel alignment of the MT and the LXX), Dimant (pseudonymity in the Wisdom of Solomon), Busto Saiz (the biblical text of 'Malachias Monachus' to the Book of Wisdom), and Fernández Marcos (the present state of LXX research in Spain). Bibliographic details are listed in the Record of Work.


This volume contains five studies by the pioneer of Vetus Latina studies in this century, selected and republished by Professor Dr. Herrmann Josef Prede, the present director of the VL Institut, to honor the author on his 70th birthday. The studies include: "Codex Amiatinus und Cassiodor" (pp. 9-34), "Bibel-
RECORD OF WORK
PUBLISHED OR IN PROGRESS

Aejmelaeus, A. "70 'causale' in Septuagintal Greek." In La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS), pp. 115-132. [See under Fernández Marcos].


Cook, J. "The Translator of the Greek Genesis." In La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS), pp. 169-182. [See under Fernández Marcos].


Cox, C. "The Use of the Armenian Version for the Textual Criticism of the Septuagint." In La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS), pp. 25-35. [See under Fernández Marcos].

Dimant, D. "Pseudonymity in the Wisdom of Solomon." In La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS), pp. 243-255. [See under Fernández Marcos].


Mulder, M. J. "The Use of the Peshitta in Textual Criticism." In La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS), pp. 37-53. [See under Fernandez Marcos].


Segert, St. "Hebrew Poetic Parallelism as Reflected in the Septuagint." In La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS), pp. 133-148. [See under Fernández Marcos].


Silva, M. "Internal Evidence in the Text-Critical Use of the LXX." In La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS), pp. 151-167. [See under Fernández Marcos].


Sollamo, R. "The LXX Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute Used with a Paronymous Finite Verb in the Pentateuch." In La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS), pp. 101-113. [See under Fernández Marcos].


Wevers, John W. "The Use of Versions for Text Criticism: The Septuagint." In La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: (V Congreso de la IOSCS), pp. 15-24. [See under Fernández Marcos].


AN APOLOGIA FOR SEPTUAGINT STUDIES

John Wm Wevers
University of Toronto

I.

1. I suppose it might not be amiss to date the advent of modern Septuagint studies in 1705; this was the year in which Humphrey Hody's *De bibliorum textibus originalibus* with its *Contra historiam LXX interpretum Aristeas nomine inscriptum* appeared. Prior to 1705 the historicity of the *Letter of Aristeas* had been generally accepted. After Hody's carefully argued demonstration of the fictitious nature of the story on LXX origins as told in the *Letter*, few scholars question the correctness of Hody's statement. The *Letter* is, however, the source of all later traditions on the origins of the LXX, and it continues to intrigue scholars as to its raison d'être. It is certainly a fitting place to begin an apology for modern LXX studies with at least a brief statement on this ancient and first apologia for the LXX.

The story is presented by Aristeas in the guise of a letter to his brother Philocrates in which he details the purpose and outcome of a delegation sent by Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.) to Eleazar the High Priest in Jerusalem. Demetrius of Phalerum, the librarian of the royal library in Alexandria, had reported to his royal patron, Philadelphus, that, although the library already contained 200,000 volumes, there was no copy of the laws of the Jews, which were in a foreign language and needed translation. So the king, having been informed that these books (i.e., the Torah) existed only in Hebrew and that they were carelessly copied, ordered that a letter be addressed to Eleazar requesting elders, six from each tribe, skilled in translating the law, to be sent to Alexandria in order that a proper translation might be made for the king's library. The high priest complied with this request transmitted by Aristeas and his companion Andreas and sent to the Egyptian king 72 such scholars, men who not only had acquired for themselves knowledge of Jewish literature but also had studied that of the Greeks. He also sent along with them precious parchments on which the Pentateuch was inscribed with writing of gold. On their arrival in Alexandria, the king entertained them with banquets on seven successive days. Each scholar was asked a question by the king, and the wisdom and virtue of each was demonstrated successively by their answers.

In due course Demetrius took the learned elders to the island of Pharos where they completed their work in 72 days. This translation by committee was then read out to the Jews, who not only requested a copy of the entire work but also decided that since it had been translated accurately and in pious fashion, it was but right that it should remain as it was and that no revision of any kind might ever take place. The community then pronounced a curse on anyone who might revise the text in any way. The king was also in due course impressed by the work and ordered it properly cared for.

The *Letter* has been the object of a great deal of controversy. No one seriously questions its legendary character, and the general consensus in the scholarly community dates it in the latter half of the second century B.C. But what has exercised many scholars is the actual reason for the creation of the Aristeas legend. Obviously it was not written as a piece of historical research, as a serious attempt at understanding what had taken place more than a century earlier with respect to the translation of the Hebrew Torah into Greek, but rather to meet some crisis in the time of the writer. Since our knowledge of the Jewish community in Alexandria during the second century B.C. is meagre indeed, scholars are left largely to the internal evidence of the *Letter* itself.1

1.1. I have no desire to enter into this controversy, but I would like to make two observations, one on the purported intent of the document, and the other relating to the actual situation. The purported intent of the *Letter* is to detail the origins of the Greek Pentateuch. Under royal orders the entire Pentateuch was translated by a committee of the whole, viz., 72 Palestinian translators on the island of Pharos in the first half of the third century B.C. Since the time of Hody it has been clear that the story was made up out of whole cloth — it is fiction — and there is no good reason to believe any of it; in fact, it would be methodologically sound not to accept anything stated in the *Letter* that cannot be substantiated elsewhere. Accordingly I suggest that there is no good reason to believe either that the work had anything to do with Ptolemy Philadelphus, with the island of Pharos, with Palestinian translators, or with a parent Hebrew text sent from Jerusalem, or that it was a unified work. What should be accepted is that the work was Alexandrian, since on linguistic grounds the Greek

---

1 See, for example, the incisive study of D. W. Gooding, "Aristeas and Septuagint Origins: a Review of Recent Studies," *VT* 13 (1963) 357-379.
vocabulary contains items specifically known to have been current in Egypt. It is also clear that the Torah was translated in the third century B.C. Linguistically, the books of the Greek Pentateuch coincide largely with what is known from papyri to fit third century usage; this contrasts with the character of many of the other books of the Alexandrian canon. Furthermore, it was the Greek text of the Pentateuch rather than the Hebrew that was used by Demetrius the Hellenist who flourished in the last quarter of the third century B.C.²

1.2. The actual Sitz im Leben for the Aristeas legend seems to me betrayed by the Letter itself. Surprisingly little is said about the actual translation of the LXX. The work is divided into 322 sections. The story relating the king's orders, his letter to Eleazar, Eleazar's reply, and the names of the 72 translators are all found in the first 50 sections. The actual work of the translation and its subsequent acceptance by both the Jewish community and the king are found in §§ 301-322. The intervening 250 sections give a laudatory description of the temple, the Holy Land, the banquets provided by the king for the 72 translators, his posing of philosophical and ethical questions to his Palestinian guests, and the wisdom and piety of their responses.

Aristeas is defending the Greek Pentateuch by insisting in lavish tones on its Palestinian origin. Its parent text was not a local Alexandrian Hebrew text but an ornate exemplar sent by the Jerusalem high priest himself. It was not the Alexandrian Jews who made the translation but official representatives: six from each of the twelve tribes, selected by the high priest, not in private but in open assembly — παρὰ ἄντον δὲ τύντον, i.e., "with everyone present." When the translation is finished, it is not only rendered official by the Jewish assembly but rendered canonical; it, like the Hebrew original, might undergo no revision, whether by addition, or deletion, or even by transposition, that it might be preserved imperishable and unchangeable for all times. Anyone revising the work in any way was ordered δὲ τὰ πάντα ἐν θάλασσα ἀτ, i.e., "accursed."

Methinks Aristeas doth protest too much! Was the Greek Pentateuch of Alexandria under attack by Palestinian Jews?³ Why, otherwise, should Aristeas be so insistent on the Palestinian origins of the text, and why should he narrate


Frankel soon discovered that this project was overly ambitious, and so he limited himself to a single volume, *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, which appeared in 1851. The book deals only with the Greek Pentateuch and amply illustrates Frankel’s approach to LXX studies. Each of the five books is separately studied in a similar fashion. Each book is characterized by certain general observations. Genesis, for example, is a free translation, often overly so. There are, however, as in all the books, traces of haste and superficial understanding. Some instances of anthropomorphisms such as the tradition of the divine names and avoidance of anthropomorphisms also occur. A few examples of religious exegesis are then given, i.e., of halachic influence on the translator. The study concludes with successive sections on glosses, revisions, and copyist errors. This same general pattern obtains for each of the five books.

Frankel summarizes his work with a general statement on each book. The Genesis translator knows his Hebrew quite well but translates overly freely. Exodus is translated by someone who knows his Greek better than his Hebrew; he ends his translation at 36:8. Frankel shows particularly high regard for the Leviticus translator, who really knows his Hebrew but is so overwhelmed by the text that, at times, he fails with respect to the target language. Deuteronomy’s translator is gifted and highly knowledgeable but often goes his own way. The Greek Numbers is, according to Frankel, the least satisfactory of all; in fact, it seems to be the product of more than one translator.

In my opinion Zacharias Frankel is in desperate need of rediscovery. I know of no one in the nineteenth century who better understood what LXX studies are all about. He certainly understood LXX studies in a far more profound way than did Lagarde, who is sometimes referred to as the fount of LXX studies. Frankel tacitly rejected the unity of the Pentateuch translation which the *Letter of Aristeas* had fostered and which still seems to govern much of present-day scholarship; he studied each book by itself. He approached each book afresh from the point of view of its translation technique, an approach which is being adopted and practiced only in our own times. He himself says: "Die Übersetzungsweise der LXX tritt zwar zuweilen schon in einzelnen Wörtern scharf markiert hervor."\(^4\)

It is easy for us, almost a century and a half later, to criticize Frankel’s work. No one today would operate with a theory of extensive "Glossatoren und

\(^4\) *Vorstudien*, p. 90.
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Diaskueasta, in order to reconstruct a text which would be original LXX, a LXX text rather close to the received Hebrew text. Frankel had no appreciation for or understanding of text history and of the role which text tradition and MS assessment must play in recovering or reconstructing the LXX text. Witness, for example, his critique of Holmes-Parsons as a collection which "keinen wesentlichen Nutzen darbietet."\(^5\) Granted that Frankel’s approach to the LXX was subjective, nonetheless he approached it not as a source for providing conjectures for restoring a presumably corrupt Hebrew text, but as an illuminating source for understanding how the Jews of Alexandria understood their Bible, as the earliest extant commentary on the Hebrew.

In a sense, it might be said that Frankel’s work was premature; in any event, his work was not only not carried on by others, it was also disregarded. Meanwhile important sources for LXX work were being created. Field’s Hexapla appeared in 1875. Ceriani and Tischendorf produced editions and facsimiles of important new MSS. Hatch and Redpath’s concordance appeared in 1897-1906. The Cambridge Septuagint started publication in the same year that the last part of Hatch-Redpath appeared, and two years later the Septuaginta Unternehmen was formed by the Göttingen Akademie.

3. I trust that I will not be misunderstood when I suggest that the third milestone in LXX studies is the appearance in our day of critical texts of LXX books with full apparatuses. In NT Studies, the central importance of critical texts had been taken for granted for over a century; for the Greek OT, a substantial number of books still lack critical editions. Of course none who have devoted themselves to the preparation of a critical text would be so presumptuous or so arrogant as to claim that such a text was the autographon, but one can say that it constitutes a text as close to the autographon as can possibly be restored given our present range of knowledge and capabilities.

3.1. It might not be amiss to clarify what exactly is meant by a critical text. It is at times mistakenly called an eclectic text. But that is exactly what it purports not to be. Lagarde long ago\(^6\) called attention to the fact that all LXX MSS were eclectic texts. A critical text is basically an attempt to rid the LXX text of all conflations; insofar as it is successful, it is a purer text than the text of any particular MS, that is to say, it is purer than any diplomatic text could be. The use of the term "eclectic" in referring to a critical text is based on a prejudicial


\(^6\) In his *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverben* (Leipzig, 1863).
3.2. One can hardly overstate the importance of working with critical texts. Simply citing a diplomatic text, such as the text of Codex Vaticanus or of Codex Alexandrinus, is basically misleading, since it gives the impression that the LXX is being cited; it may, however, be merely a fourth or fifth century variant within the LXX tradition.

3.2.1. Let me give you an example. The Greek text of Judges is printed in two forms in Rahlfs' text. At the top half of the page is the Alexandrinus text, and the bottom half is that of Vaticanus. Obviously both cannot be the text of the OG. To cite either text as the LXX is misleading. Of the two texts printed neither has any actual Greek text witness earlier than the fourth century A.D. But which of the two is the OG? The fact that Rahlfs printed the A text at the top of the page presumably means that he thought it to be the better text; that is, in any event, a commonly held opinion. But each word, each phrase, each verse must be carefully studied using only the best text-critical methods at one's disposal for determining which text is the earlier. It is quite true that the Greek of Codex A is often better Greek and often seems to represent the MT adequately, but it is equally possible that close study may show that this text was the result of fixing up an unsatisfactory text. Until a critical text is made --- and it will undoubtedly be many years before such appears --- it is the course of wisdom not to use the Greek texts of Judges as pre-Christian texts for text-critical purposes unless one is prepared to establish particular readings as indeed the OG by critical methods.

3.2.2. Nor is it possible without a critical text to understand properly the subsequent text history of the text. That fact underscores the fatal flaw of the large Cambridge LXX. Intentionally, no decision is made by the editors as to a critical text. Rather the text of the oldest uncial, i.e., the text of Vaticanus wherever it is extant, is printed as the diplomatic text; against that text, variants from a large representative group of Greek MSS, as well as from the old versions and selected patristic authors, are cited and systematically placed in the apparatus. All of this is carefully done, but it is nonetheless misleading. The printed text is taken by almost all who use the text as the apparatus. All of this is carefully done, but it is nonetheless misleading. The printed text is itself an eclectic text, it is mixed, it contains secondary as well as original elements. The text may well be that of the oldest MS, it may well be the best MS witness, but it is not, nor did the editors ever pretend that it was, the original text.

I must reiterate that now with the publication of critical texts a new and important era of LXX studies becomes possible. Non-specialists can now use the LXX properly. They can with some assurance use the LXX for textual criticism and exegesis. Now the kind of study that Frankel attempted and envisioned can be done properly. It is no exaggeration to say that now LXX studies without let or hindrance can take place.

3.2.3. If what I have said is valid, the existential question the Biblical scholar faces is, "How can I properly make good use of the LXX in my studies?" Few Biblical scholars can be expected to be experts in the LXX, so how can one reasonably make the LXX a tool for non-experts in their textual and exegetical studies? I should like to make three basic statements in this regard.

4.1. The LXX is a translation document, and in order to use it with profit, not only is knowledge of both the source and target languages presupposed, but also knowledge of the translation process itself. Every language, whether it be Hebrew, Greek, Finnish or English, is a complete communication code. The particulars of the code are themselves arbitrary, the unconscious consensus of the speaking community. What I mean is that there is nothing particularly appropriate in calling a horse horse, or δέινος, or Pferd, or cheval, or equus, or ἐνναυος, or Pferd, except that speakers of English, Finnish, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew respectively use such utterances to designate a horse. So it is with the entire code; it is arbitrary but obeyed by the community, and to violate it is to risk being misunderstood or not understood at all.

This means then that the translation process should involve both a decoding of the source language and an encoding in the target language. Not all translation is equally successful. Accordingly, one translation may be considered literalistic. What this means in terms of the translation process is that the code of the source language is still not fully decoded; the source language is overly prominent in the end result. But another translation may be considered a free or even a periphrastic translation. In such a case the code of the target language is overly prominent in the end result.
To understand a translation document such as the LXX one must fully understand the two coding systems in a contrastive way. One must be able to compare contrastively the nominal systems, the verbal systems, the syntactic patterns, etc., of the two languages involved. One must understand how a morphological class in one language might be reflected in the other, how a syntactic pattern in one appears in the second.7

I have said that one must understand how the language codal systems work contrastively. Let me simplify this by an example which concerns articulation. Everyone knows the opening of the gospel of John: ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν. In English this is "In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God." In the Greek, ἀρχῇ is without an article, but both λόγος and θεόν are articulated. In the English, beginning and word have the article, but God does not. And yet it is an accurate translation; the English is just as idiomatic as the Greek. In English one simply does not say "In beginning" nor "with the God." This contrast becomes even more evident when one adds the Vulgate: "In principio erat Verbum, et Verbum erat apud Deum." Since Latin has no articulation whatsoever, it cannot contrast between the lack of articulation for a ἀρχῇ and the presence of it for λόγος and θεόν. So, too, the Hebrew and Greek codal systems must be understood contrastively in using the LXX.

4.2. The second statement I want to make is that it is imperative that one understand how a translator regards his text and how he translates. Presumably he viewed the parent text as canon. Did he view his own work as word of God on the same canonical level? Is he literastically inclined, or does he translate freely? Is his Greek good Greek or frightfully Hebraic? Does he translate by clichés, or does he prefer variety? Does he view his task primarily as exegetical or as that of a translator without personal opinions over against his task?

It is now obvious that it would be methodologically unsatisfactory to treat the Pentateuch as the work of a single translator (or of a committee of 72 translators producing a commonly agreed-upon work for that matter). Frankel

7The pioneering work of Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen should here be mentioned as an illustration of the kind of painstaking work that should be done in the area of translation technique, beginning with Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta, Annales Acad. Sc. Fennicae, Ser. B., Vol. 132(1) (1965), as well as numerous smaller studies appearing subsequently. Cf. also the works of his former students R. Sellman, Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuaginta, AASP, Dissert. Humanarum Litt. 19 (1979), and A. Aejmelaeus, Parataxis in the LXX, AASP, Dissert. Humanarum Litt. 31 (1982).

was quite right in making five studies of the Pentateuch, one for each book, since it is clear that at least five (if not more) translators are involved.

If one examines the attitudes and the translation technique of the work of a single translator, one often discovers new insights and exegetical considerations which betray the translator's understanding. Let me illustrate this by a few examples taken from the MT of Leviticus 10. In v 9, Aaron is told: "Do not drink wine or strong drink...when you go into the tent of meeting lest you die." The LXX renders the text word for word but adds after "the tent of testimony" (which is the LXX's standard rendering for ἡ ἱπταμένη) the following words taken from Exod 30:20: ἡ προσορευμένων ὡμοίων πρὸς τὰ θυσιαστήρια. It is an awkward construction — in fact it violates the usual rules of Greek as to the use of the genitive absolute, and I would interpret this as an exegetical plus to explain what is actually meant by "priests entering the tent." It might well be fully rendered by "that is to say, when you are approaching the altar." The translator, whose cultic interests are every bit as acute as those of the Hebrew Leviticus, wants to assure the reader that "priests entering the tent" means priests engaging in cultic activity, i.e., approaching the altar.

Also instructive is the Greek rendering of v 13. Reference is there made to the cereal offering left of the fire offerings. V 13 says: "You shall eat it in a holy place because it is ἡ ἱπταμένη τῆς ἱερατείας — your due portion and your sons' due portion — from the fire offerings of Yahweh." The Hebrew phrase recurs in the following verse as well, but there it is "from the peace offerings of the Israelites." In the MT the recurrent phrase refers to the prescribed portion of the sacrifices to be eaten by the priests. The LXX renders the phrase in both verses by νόμιμον σοι καὶ νόμιμον τοῖς υἱῶν σου. By using datives instead of genitives, the word νόμιμον is taken in the sense of "statute, divine order," and it means "a statute to you and a statute to your sons." That this is meant in this way seems to be clear from the fact that the from clauses which follow immediately and explicate the noun, i.e., "from the fire offerings of Yahweh" and "from the peace offerings of the Israelites" are rendered literally with a rather awkward sense.

At times the Hebrew text refers to concepts for which the Greek lexicon of Alexandria provided no good equivalent. Then the translator might well create a circumlocution. A good example is the word נֶהוֹן. The word is used in Hebrew to mean "sin" and is regularly rendered by δυσαρέστησις. But
particularly in Leviticus, 

is also used to indicate a "sin offering." In this sense ἁμάρτια would be quite inadequate, and the translator uses a circumlocution τὸ πέρι τῆς ἁμάρτιας "the thing concerning sin." This is used four times (vv 16, 17, 19 twice) in this chapter as well as throughout the Greek Leviticus.

Let me give one more representative illustration. V 18 has Moses referring to the blood of the sin offering and saying, inter alia, "You really must eat it in the holy place as ἀρτίαν — as I commanded." The translator regards all cultic regulations as divine in origin. That Moses should be presented as the one who ordered this law needed correction, and the LXX substitutes for "as I commanded" διὰ τρόπον μοι συνετάξαν κύριος, i.e., "as the Lord had commanded me."

These random examples give one some understanding of the translator's stance over against his text, his theological prejudices, and how he translates when faced with a lexical problem. More comparisons would add to our understanding, not only of the translator but also of the way in which a Biblical text was understood in Alexandria. It is clearly necessary to study the work of a translator before making textual judgments as well as in order to understand how the Hebrew text was understood by Jews in the third century B.C.8

4.3. A third statement I should like to make is that understanding the role of the LXX text in the history of exegesis involves study of the text history of the LXX. I have stressed the importance of the critical text both for textual criticism and for exegesis, but that original was corrupted by copyists and revised by later editors. The synagogues and especially the Christian Church did not have the autographon but rather later MSS of the LXX. The OT scriptures were alive in the MSS, and what the worshipers read in their MSS was their Bible. The readings of all these "Bibles" are collected and arranged by text families in the apparatuses of the critical editions, and one must indeed study these apparatuses if one wishes to know how the LXX was read in the Church.9

One example must suffice to illustrate this fact. In Gen 15:15 Abram is promised: "You will go to your fathers in peace; you will be buried in a good old age." The LXX text has a slightly different construction in that it has for "you will be buried" (τοῦρ ρού θεού in the MT) an aorist passive participle ταφείς, i.e., "being buried in a good old age." The text is certain, and yet all the Greek MSS as well as all the versions and the Church Fathers read ταφείς instead of ταφεῖς, i.e., an aorist passive participle from ταφέω "to feed or nourish." Obviously a very early copyist erred by adding a rho after the tau, an easy thing to do since the result also made good sense. And so for over a millennium, Christians everywhere read this verse: "You will go to your fathers in peace, being nourished in a good old age." The error is already in Philo and was heavily commented on by the Fathers such as Cyril, Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, as well as by the Latin Fathers, including Ambrose, Augustine, and Quadrivium. Catenas of the Fathers in the catena MSS make fine homiletical statements as to how God cared for Abram by providing nourishment for him in his old age. Obviously their Bibles read ταφείς and not the original ταφεῖς, i.e., "nourished," not "buried."

4.4. In summary then, correct use of the LXX involves at least three things: an understanding of the codal systems of the source language and of the target language in contrastive fashion; an appreciation of how the translator approached his task, of his translation technique, and of his exegetical understanding of the text; and finally, a study of the text history as this is summarized in the apparatuses of critical editions.

II.

5.1. By now it should be obvious that an apologia for LXX studies is quite unnecessary. Its place in the theological encyclopedia is fully assured. It was, after all, the canon for the Jewish diaspora. Philo, for example, believed that when the translators of the Torah were engaged in their task they were as though inspired — ἐν θεοπνευστεῖς — and wrote down each one exactly the same, as though each one was dictated to by some invisible prompter. So perfect was the LXX translation, he maintains, that the Greek words corresponded exactly to the Chaldean, harmonizing precisely to the sense of the

8For a good recent statement on the nature of Septuagint translations and how the translators viewed their work (in contrast to that of the Aramaic Targumim), cf. R. LeDeaut, "La Septuaginte, un Targum?" in Études sur le judaïsme hellénistique, Lecito Divina 119 (Paris, 1984) 147-95.

matters intended. For many in the diaspora, the LXX had canonical status fully equal to that of the Hebrew.

For the emerging Christian Church, particularly after A.D. 70 when it cut its ties with its Jewish home, the LXX was the Bible. Once the Church became fully gentile, its members could neither read nor understand Hebrew, and the Alexandrian canon was the Scriptures. It was the Bible for the writers of the NT; it remained the OT scriptures for most of the Christian Church through the Greek text or through its daughter versions at least until the rebirth of Hebrew studies in the fifteenth century. One cannot understand the Fathers, one cannot fully understand the history and piety of the Christian Church before Reformation times without its Bible, without the LXX.

5.2. Besides its place in the history of interpretation to which reference was made earlier, LXX studies belongs in the theological encyclopedia under OT Textual Criticism and Exegesis, as well as being propaedeutic to NT Studies in general. In practice the LXX has been used, or better said, misused, almost exclusively for textual criticism. The four editions of Biblia Hebraica used by Biblical scholars during this century are filled with conjectural emendations which purport to be based on LXX readings. Many if not most of these need careful reexamination and rejection. The LXX must first be examined for what it says, as our earliest source for Biblical exegesis. As a handbook for understanding the Hebrew Scriptures it is unparalleled, it is unique. And before using the text of the LXX as substantiation for a parent text variant to the MT, one must be certain that this is really so, i.e., one must understand the point of the translator and judge readings in the light of that point of view. Is a particular reading possibly in line with the way in which he understood his text? The LXX translators were themselves members of the Jewish community with a tradition of understanding the canon and reflected the attitudes and beliefs of their own times. They were not machine translators; they were believers with a mission to communicate what they believed their parent Hebrew text to say to Greek-speaking fellow believers.

6. I should like to illustrate the kind of study that must be made before using the LXX as witness to a parent Hebrew text differing from the MT. I shall take a chapter from the Greek Genesis and closely compare it with the Hebrew text of the MT and record any differences that appear. For this comparison I shall exclude from consideration any instance in which the LXX agrees with the SAM over against the MT, since such an instance might well presuppose another parent text. Once all the evidence from such a comparison has been collected, we can see whether there are characteristics of the translation as well as points of view and attitudes betrayed by the translator which can in turn be discounted in weighing the possibility of a variant parent text. In this way, we can determine what readings might be correctly cited as evidence for a possible earlier variant Hebrew text.

At the outset it should be stated that one should make such a comparison with a built-in prejudice towards the MT. After all, except for the SAM, the MT is the only Hebrew text which actually exists. All others are but theoretical reconstructions. Furthermore, the Pentateuch — and I am only concerned with the Pentateuch in this essay — had been accepted as canonical for over a century; it was the word of God, and its form, its verbal dress, was not to be changed lightly. In other words, it is scientifically appropriate to postulate a different parent text only if other reasonable explanations fail.

One further reservation should be made before proceeding with this study. This examination makes no pretension of being a final statement. One chapter is in the nature of the case only an illustration of the kind of complete study that should be made. A full statement would examine the entire book and only afterwards present the results. With this reservation clearly understood, I shall proceed to such a comparison. For if I have arbitrarily chosen Genesis 3.

6.1. The opening verse introduces the snake as being cleverer than all the חיות שדה "wild animals of the open field," i.e., wild animals as opposed to חיות גינה "domesticated cattle." The LXX interprets the phrase "cleverer than all" as a superlative φρονούσι τοις πιο ωστία "the wisest of all," and then universalizes the phrase חיות גינה as "the wild animals which are on the earth" — תִּוְּנֵי שְהֹרָא תְּנֵי אֲדֻמַּה יָדוֹת.

The Hebrew text then goes on to say "... which Yahweh God had made. And he said." To this the LXX adds δέησις "the snake." That it is the snake which carries on the dialogue is fully obvious from the context, although the nearest third sing. noun is "Yahweh God." Any such momentary possible misunderstanding is avoided by specifying "and the snake said."
Reference is also made in the first verse to the μανήν "the tree of the garden," which is rendered by the LXX as δέντα που τύχει παραδείγμα "tree which is in the garden." Since in the next verse the phrase also occurs but is literally rendered by δέντα που τύ σπαραδείγμα, the difference in the renderings is simply a matter of stylistic variation.

Verses 2-5 do not show any notable differences between the LXX and the MT, but in v 6 some striking variants do occur. Here the woman is described as taking note that the tree was good for food as well as καλόν γενετήμεν "it was delightful to the eyes," and the Greek renders "attractive was the tree for making one wise." Two differences between these two nominal clauses should be noted. The second clause contains a marked infinitive ἐπιθέτηρικα. Accordingly the LXX added an infinitive to the first clause as well, reading "it was pleasing to the eyes ἑπιθέτηριν "to see," even though the Hebrew has no such infinitive. Furthermore, the second clause restates the subject as μανήν. The LXX leaves this out. So in double fashion the LXX makes the two clauses more alike stylistically. This type of stylistic improvement is quite common in the Greek Genesis.

In v 8 the MT states "And they heard the sound of Yahweh God walking about in the garden ὑμών τοὺς τοῦτον — at the breezy part of the day." The LXX has the Lord God walking about in the garden τῇ δυσλίμνῃ, i.e., "at even." The interpretation is, of course, quite correct. Once the sun approaches dusk, a slight refreshing breeze often comes up in the lands around the Mediterranean. The LXX shows more interest in clarity than in retaining a picturesque figure of speech.

The MT then continues with "And there hid themselves μανήν and his wife." The LXX transcribes μανήν as a proper noun, i.e., as δ Ναμαν. In the narrative of creation (1:27; 2:7) this articulated noun was translated as τόπον διερχόμενον, but thereafter (beginning with 2:16) μανήν is personified in the Greek, and the noun is transcribed as Ναμαν. In fact, already at 2:20 Ναμαν appears unarticulated, as is also the case in 3:20, 22, in spite of the fact that the noun remains articulated in the MT. Whenever the narrative individuates μανήν, the LXX renders the word as a proper noun. In all cases but the nominative, however, the LXX shows the case by means of an article.

Verses 2-5 do not show any notable differences between the LXX and the MT, but in v 6 some striking variants do occur. Here the woman is described as taking note that the tree was good for food as well as καλόν γενετήμεν "it was delightful to the eyes," and the Greek renders "attractive was the tree for making one wise." Two differences between these two nominal clauses should be noted. The second clause contains a marked infinitive ἐπιθέτηρικα. Accordingly the LXX added an infinitive to the first clause as well, reading "it was pleasing to the eyes ἑπιθέτηριν "to see," even though the Hebrew has no such infinitive. Furthermore, the second clause restates the subject as μανήν. The LXX leaves this out. So in double fashion the LXX makes the two clauses more alike stylistically. This type of stylistic improvement is quite common in the Greek Genesis.

In v 8 the MT states "And they heard the sound of Yahweh God walking about in the garden ὑμών τοὺς τοῦτον — at the breezy part of the day." The LXX has the Lord God walking about in the garden τῇ δυσλίμνῃ, i.e., "at even." The interpretation is, of course, quite correct. Once the sun approaches dusk, a slight refreshing breeze often comes up in the lands around the Mediterranean. The LXX shows more interest in clarity than in retaining a picturesque figure of speech.

The MT then continues with "And there hid themselves μανήν and his wife." The LXX transcribes μανήν as a proper noun, i.e., as δ Ναμαν. In the narrative of creation (1:27; 2:7) this articulated noun was translated as τόπον διερχόμενον, but thereafter (beginning with 2:16) μανήν is personified in the Greek, and the noun is transcribed as Ναμαν. In fact, already at 2:20 Ναμαν appears unarticulated, as is also the case in 3:20, 22, in spite of the fact that the noun remains articulated in the MT. Whenever the narrative individuates μανήν, the LXX renders the word as a proper noun. In all cases but the nominative, however, the LXX shows the case by means of an article.

This individuation becomes particularly apparent in v 9 where Yahweh God calls the man and says to him, ἦν ἀνήρ — Where are you?" The LXX here adds the vocative and has the Lord God saying: "Αδάμ, ποῦ εἶ — Adam, where are you?"

The next two verses begin with ἦν ἀνήρ "and he said." In both cases the LXX adds ἐπαίνων after καὶ ἔφη and he said to him," as in v 9. The LXX of Genesis tends to add either subject or addressee whenever ἔφη occurs, leaving no possible doubt about the identity of the participants in any dialogue. This is not generally done when the participants do not change from the preceding case, nor in terse, highly dramatic interchange as in chapters 18 and 22; but if there is any doubt, the LXX tends to amplify. It will be recalled that at the beginning of the chapter "the snake" was added as speaker even though the context was actually clear.

Verse 10 continues in the Greek with Adam's statement: "I heard the sound of you περιπατοῦντος — walking about — in the garden." This word has no correspondence in the MT but has been added by the translator in order to harmonize with v 8, where exactly the same phrase occurs. This tendency of the Greek Genesis towards harmonization with the context is a particularly prominent one.

In God's response to Adam he asks: "Is it that from the tree from which I commanded you τοῦτον μίσου — of this one alone — not to eat you did eat?" The words τοῦτον μίσου are an exegetical plus in the LXX without counterpart in the MT. On the other hand, the interpretation is not false to the context in that it was already implicit in the text. In vv 2 and 3 the woman said, "From the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat, but from the fruit of the tree which is in the middle of the garden..." As a matter of fact, the text tradition of the catena text in our verse has made the contrast even sharper by adding the word all before the "trees of the garden." What the LXX has done is to make explicit that of all the trees in the garden only one obtained whose fruit was forbidden to them. That this was important to the translator is clear from the fact that the LXX also changes v 17 to conform to this interpretation. There the MT says: "I commanded you saying, Not may you eat from it." The LXX changes this direct speech to an indirect one, i.e., does not render the ἐφη, then adds the phrase τοῦτον μίσου, and changes the direct speech into a complementary infinitival construction. The Greek reads: "I commanded you of this one alone not to eat from it." The Greek, by means of this simple
elaboration, has directed the reader to the contrast between the one tree whose fruit was forbidden and all the others whose fruit might be freely eaten.

In v 12 Adam casts the blame for the disobedience on the woman and says "she gave to me," which the Greek renders by αὐτή μου ἔδωκεν, i.e., places the dative pronoun μου "to me" before the verb instead of after it. In this way the two pronouns are placed next to each other, thereby emphasizing the contrast between "she" and "me." That this is probably not by chance seems clear from v 15 and 16. In v 15 שָׁחַר אָוְהָה אֵלֶּה "he shall bruise you on the head" is translated by αὐτός σου τῇ θεοῦ "he of you will guard the head," with the two pronouns, αὐτός and σου placed together. Similarly in v 16 the final clause "and he will rule over you" is rendered by καὶ αὐτός σου κυριεύσει "and he over you will rule." By preposing the pronominal modifiers before the verbs greater contrast between the pairs involved is secured.

Verse 13 presents the investigator with a difficult problem. The subject of the verb is given as μαθαίνεις γάρ, i.e., the double divine name characteristic of chapters 2 and 3. This double name occurs twenty-three times in the MT of Genesis, but here and in v 22 — as well as six times in chapter 2 — the LXX represents only the second, i.e., it has merely δ θεός. Thus approximately one-third (8 out of 23) of the times a double is not represented. The reverse never obtains.

When one examines the Greek text for the instances of γάρ occurring singly in the book of Genesis (141 times) the problem is simply compounded. One hundred five instances have the expected κύριος. Another 13 have the double name κύριος δ θεός; 1 omits the name entirely, and the other 22 have δ θεός instead of the standard κύριος. To summarize: out of 164 instances of γάρ (or of γάρ κύριος γάρ) only 120 render it in the expected fashion. That the 44 irregular instances are all textually based might seem rather unlikely; on the other hand, there appears to be no obvious exegetical explanation which makes sense out of the seemingly random character of the irregular instances. One thing should be pointed out, however: all of these instances (except for the one instance where the parent text seems to have had no divine name at all) point in the same direction, i.e., away from γάρ and its Greek substitute κύριος and in the direction of δ θεός.

The reverse is attested but only infrequently. The word γάρ κύριος designating "God" and not "gods" occurs 212 times in the MT of Genesis. Of these, 4 have no counterpart in the Greek. In 3 instances (19:29; 21:2, 6) the LXX has κύριος, and in 5 cases (6:12; 22; 8:15; 9:12; 28:20) it has the double name κύριος δ θεός. There seems to be no pattern here of any kind. If this be the case, one can only assume a different parent text (or a careless translator). In other words, variation in the divine name seems to be textual in character.

Verse 14 gives one an interesting insight into the mind of the translator. In the curse on the snake Yahweh God says: "you shall go to the serpent and your conception will greatly increase your pains in childbearing." The translator knew about snakes and was aware that reference to a snake's belly might be ambiguous. Accordingly he uses two phrases to explicate the underside of the snake: Τίπνος ἐλεύθερος καὶ τῇ κολυμβή, i.e., "on your breast and belly"; in other words the whole length of the snake is involved. This same practical awareness of what snakes are like is evident from his rendering of γάρ in the following verse. The MT has two clauses: ὅτι θάμνωμεν ὑμῖν ἐν κύριος καὶ δεσπότης ἐστίν. The translator knew of a practice found in other languages of attaching a possessive pronoun to the name of a person or animal, usually translated as "he shall bruise your head" and "and you shall bruise his heel." The verb γάρ occurs only here in the MT, and its meaning is quite uncertain. The translator relies on his knowledge of snakes and people's relation to them, and so he renders the verb in both cases by the Greek verb τρίτην, i.e., "to watch carefully." What the Greek means is that the seed of the woman will watch the snake anxiously, and so too, the snake will watch over its prey attentively. The Greek is of no help in understanding the difficult Hebrew verb; it does give us an appreciation for the acumen of the translator.

The curse on the woman centers on the pains of childbirth. The MT has: "I shall greatly increase your pain and you will bear children." The first and last words, πόρνη and πόρνη, in עב פור עב, both mean "pain," and the LXX makes no distinction between them; both are rendered by the plural of λυς, i.e., "pains." In fact the first word occurs only three times in the MT, here, in v 17, and in 5:29, and is rendered throughout by the same Greek lexeme. The second word, πόρνη, is a hapax legomenon, but the root is well-known: פור means "to conceive, be pregnant." Presumably your pain and your conception means "your pains in childbearing" as the parallel clause which immediately follows underscores: "with pains you shall bear children." The LXX renders this hapax by τὸν στέναντόν, "sighing, groaning," presumably of the cries of pain accompanying childbirth. That the LXX is
based on a parent text reading "רֵעֵךְ", as BHS maintains, is highly improbable since by now it is abundantly clear that the translator of Genesis was not literalistically minded, but was rather intent on interpreting his Hebrew text accurately, but of course, clothing it in proper Greek dress.

This freedom from literalism is also clear from his rendering of the curse on the man, i.e., on Adam. Earlier in the chapter the word מַרְאָה הָאָדָם had occurred in the phrase וַתַּשְׁמִיעוּ בָהוּ "beasts of the field." There the word מַרְאָה had been rendered by ὀφθαλμὸς. In v 18 it occurs as second element in a bound phrase with πρᾶσμα, i.e., "herbage of the field." But here the translator uses τὸν ἄγρον, which, after χῶρον, makes much better sense and is a much better translation than ὀφθαλμὸς would have been. Similarly in v 19 for the word ἐπί "bread," the LXX idiomatizes ἀρτοὶ έπροσ σου, i.e., "your bread." This does not mean that the parent text had a second masc. sing. suffix, i.e., ἔπνυκτ; it simply means that the LXX translator rendered his text ad sensum.

That is not to say that the parent text of the Genesis LXX was identical with the MT. In v 17 Adam is told: "Cursed be the ground מָרַעך — on your account." For the word מָרַעך, the LXX has εἰς τοὺς ἐργαίς σου "in your works," instead of the expected ἐνεκέν σου. It is obvious that the translator misread the resh of ובנה as a daleth, i.e., a word from the root root "to work."

A comparison of the Greek with the Hebrew of v 19 adds to our understanding of the Greek translator's approach to his task as well as to his attitudes to the material. The verse begins with a παρά προ τοῦ figure in the MT: "In the sweat of thy face — your nostrils," which the translator correctly understood as "in the sweat of your face — τοῦ προσώπου σου," abandoning the figure in favour of its interpretation.

Reference is twice made in the verse to the man's return to the ground. The MT first refers to מַרְאָה מַרְאָה יִהְיֶה "your return to the ground" and later on in the verse it says: "אָלָם מַרְאָה יִהְיֶה — to dust you shall return." The LXX renders both מַרְאָה as "ground" and מַרְאָה as "dust" by the same lexeme, γῆ. (In fact this word occurs three times in the verse, since מַרְאָה "dust" occurs twice in the MT.) The LXX nonetheless makes a distinction between the two, but in the verbs. The verb is the same both times, but the LXX uses two different Greek verbs. In the first case, it uses τὸν ἀποστρέψαι σε "your turning away." For the clause "to dust you shall return," the LXX has εἰς γῆν ἀπελευθεροῦν, i.e., "into earth you shall go away." Though the man's lot is γῆ "earth, ground," and this does not change, the fact that the Hebrew does use different nouns is somehow reflected in the LXX by the choice of different verbs in the two clauses, even though the Hebrew verb used is the same.

But there is still a further point to note. The first of these expressions in the MT, "your returning to the earth," is followed by a מָרַע clause: מַרְאָה מַתַּח, i.e., "because from it (i.e., from the earth) you were taken." For this clause, the LXX has εἰς θείον αἰλήμονες "out of which you were taken." The Greek thus says something quite different from the Hebrew. This is clearly intentional since there is no mistaking what the Hebrew means. But the Hebrew could be taken as a reflection on 2:7 where it is said that "God fashioned the man out of dust from the ground." It could then be understood as saying that the reason for the return of the man to dust at death is that God had fashioned him out of dust. This would then make God directly responsible for his death. The Greek avoids such a possible understanding of this verse by the neutral statement of fact — i.e., the man returns to the ground out of which he was taken rather than because he was taken from it.

One characteristic of the Genesis translator which v 20 illustrates is the tendency to translate names into Greek. The MT states that the man called the name of his wife הָאָדָם; this name the LXX interprets as ζῷον, i.e., "Life," as though the name were derived from the Hebrew קְרֵיתוּת "to live." This is almost certainly due to the explanatory clause which follows: "because she shall be joined unto her husband — the mother of all living things." Incidentally, the Greek renders this clause without attention to the verb רָצוּת; it has διὰ συννόμοιον ματάγων πίστεως "because she is the mother of all living things." The Greek thus emphasizes Eve's position as a timeless truth rather than as a historical given. The name הָאָדָם occurs only one more time in MT. In 4:1 the name is transcribed in the clause "and Adam knew שָׁם his wife."

This tendency to translate Hebrew names into Greek equivalents is also illustrated in vv 23 and 24. In chapter 2, the garden of גן הָאָדָם is transcribed as Εὔσεβος in both v 8 and v 10. In the story of the expulsion from the garden of Eden in our verses, the word is translated in both cases as the garden τῆς νυμφής, i.e., the garden "of delight." That the translator here translates
In this way he calls attention to the delights of the garden which were now forbidden the primeval parents after their fall from grace.

Verse 22 gave the translator some difficulty. It contains a ἐν clause in the MT, but there is no main clause to which it is subordinate. This is faithfully rendered in the Greek by means of a μὴ ποτὲ εἰς ἡμέρας σαλἀνα καὶ ἀπάτησέ τινα "and live forever." This is also part of the ἐν construction, i.e., is part of the ἐξ clause. But the translator rendered it by a future construction: καὶ ζῆσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα "and he shall live forever." The LXX here makes an interesting point, namely, that living forever would be the result of the three verbal ideas governed by μὴ ποτὲ, rather than coordinate with them.

Within the μὴ ποτὲ construction itself, the translator also demonstrates his particular point of view. The MT states: "lest he stretch out (his) hand and should take αὐτὸν αἰῶνα ἐν τῷ δωματίῳ αὐτοῦ "also from the tree of life." The LXX simply has: "of the tree of life." The failure to render the preposition τοῦ is simply good Greek, but not rendering the particle ἐν "also" is probably the translator's way of avoiding any notion that eating of the tree of life was on the same level as eating of the forbidden tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

The final verse of the chapter also shows small differences between the LXX and the MT. The verse reads: "And he drove out the man," after which the MT continues: "And he settled — ἐν — eastward from — ἐν — the garden of Eden the cherubs and the flaming sword." The Hiphil of the verb ἐν normally takes people as objects of the verb; the LXX accordingly avoids making the cherubs and the sword the objects of the verb "settle" by adding the pronoun αὐτοῖν after the verb: "and he settled him," that is, Adam. This leaves the cherubs and the sword hanging in the air without a verb to modify, so the translator gratuitously added καὶ ἔστησεν. The LXX has interpreted the verse as follows: "And he settled him over against (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνάχαρίστων τῆς θείας "over against") the garden of delight and he set the cherubs and the flaming sword...."

6.2. A number of tentative statements concerning the work of the Genesis translator can now be made. It is of course understood that these statements are only tentative and must be checked throughout by examining the entire book.

6.2.1. First of all, it is clear that the translator approached his task with the utmost seriousness. His translation is careful, thoughtfully carried out, and betrays a great deal of exegetical reflection. There is actually surprisingly little carelessness evident in the translation.

6.2.2. The translator exhibits a strong tendency to harmonize the text, in which there would ideally be no apparent inconsistencies or contradictions in the narrative. This trend extends not only to matters of factual or theological import but occasionally even to matters of style.

6.2.3. On the other hand, there is no rigid use of formulaic renderings of repeated expressions; in fact, one may even observe an avoidance at times of exactly the same rendering of a particular phrase.

6.2.4. There is also observable some tendency towards expansion in the dialogue form in order to make certain that speaker and/or addressee is clearly identified to the reader.

6.2.5. When two pronouns occur, one as subject and the other as modifier of a verb, the translator tends to place the modifier before the verb and adjacent to the nominative pronoun, thereby effecting a sharper contrast between subject and object.

6.2.6. The translator is primarily interested in communicating meaning and is less concerned about matters of style. In line with this principle, literary figures may be abandoned for the sake of clarity. Thus "the breezy part of the day" becomes "evening," and "nostrils" becomes "face."

6.2.7. The translator often makes explicit what is only implicit in the parent text. This is strikingly illustrated by the addition of the words τοῦτου μόνου "of this one alone" in two places where the divine prohibition against eating the fruit of a certain tree occurs.

6.2.8. In order to clarify the meaning of an ambiguous word or phrase in a particular context the translator may resort to a Greek doublet, i.e., use two lexemes to translate a single one.

6.2.9. The translator, at times, rendered two different words by the same Greek word, but then indicated that he had done so by rendering a recurring lexeme in the context by two different Greek ones.
6.2.10. The translator shows a predilection for translating certain proper nouns into Greek words; thus רוח becomes Ζωή, and רַע becomes δρόφι.

6.2.11. On the other hand, the primeval man, usually designated as אָדָם in the MT is translated as δ ἀνθρώπος only in the creation narrative. Thereafter it is transcribed as δ Άδμ and eventually even without articulation.

6.2.12. The translator avoids whenever possible any translation which might reflect negatively on God's character or action.

6.2.13. As an overall statement it would be correct to say that the translator tried to interpret his parent text intelligently rather than to resort to a word-for-word literalism.

6.2.14. And finally, there remains a small number of instances which seem to reflect a different parent text. Specifically for this chapter only three passages remain as candidates for a possible different parent text. In two of these (vv 13 and 22), the MT has only אדמ as subject of a clause whereas the LXX has only δ ἀνθρώπος. Since the differences between the MT and the LXX with respect to the divine names אדמ and ἀνθρώπος in the Book of Genesis seem to be random, these differences probably have a textual basis. And in one instance (v 17), בּוֹגֵר is misread as though it were בּוֹג שָׁו עַל י.  

6.3. The conclusion that I want to stress in this essay is this: It is imperative that one have some clear understanding of the mind of the translator and how he operated before drawing textual conclusions which presuppose a different parent text. The LXX is far too important to be treated as a grab bag for conjectures and for rewriting the MT. Indeed at times its parent text was not the same as MT, and consideration to such a variant text must be given. But far more important is the LXX as our earliest commentary on the Hebrew scriptures, as the scriptures used by the writers of the NT, and as the OT scriptures for much of the Christian church — either in original Greek dress or in some translation from the Greek — for the first millennium and a half of its history.
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