I

The present article is an attempt to throw some light on the perennial discussion, whether the minor deviations\textsuperscript{1} of the Septuagint from the Massoretic Text are due mainly to a different Vorlage or to imperfections in the translation technique, by examining the work of the Septuagint translators against the background of the practice of translation familiar to them.

It is a well-known fact that at one and the same time different practices of translation may be in vogue, each tied to a definite sphere of social activity. Thus quite different standards of correlation between source text and receptor text obtain in our time in business correspondence, scientific translation, artistic translation of prose, and artistic translation of poetry, to name only a few translating activities now current. In other periods of history and in other cultures, not only some of these activities may be absent, or others added, but the standards expected of the translator vary absolutely and relatively between the different activities. These activities thus form a system parallel in some ways to the system of the different uses of speech, each of which has a form of language, as well as other, secondary features, appropriate to that use and inappropriate to others.\textsuperscript{2} I have at one time suggested for this conglomerate of sub-languages and their relative positions the term “Language World” of a community;\textsuperscript{3} it might be appropriate to describe the conglomerate of socially-conditioned translation standards as the “Translation World” of a given society. This is a synchronic view, viewing the system. More current, as in most

\textsuperscript{1} “Minor deviations” are those within the compass of a single verse, as opposed to omitted or added verses, changes of order, etc. The term “deviations” excludes interpretations of words or phrases different from ours, but which may be presumed to have been taken at the time as the true meaning.

\textsuperscript{2} See, for instance, M. A. K. Halliday, “The Users and Uses of Language”, in M. A. K. Halliday–A. McIntosh–P. Strevens, The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching (London 1964) 75–110. H. calls these different uses “registers”.

\textsuperscript{3} אוציקלאים לוחמי המדהות, ed. D. Kena’ani, III (Menjaviah 1967) 96. Perhaps “Language Universe” would have been more elegant, but it is essential to avoid any confusion with “Universe of Discourse”, which frequently occurs in discussions on related problems.
other fields of human studies, is the diachronic view, which investigates the changes in the practice and standards of a single translation activity, e.g. of artistic literary translation, at different periods and in different cultures, comparing the changes of taste and of demands on performance.

The possibility of such widely varying standards of correlation between source and receptor text is due to the same reason which accounts for the existence of such widely varying forms of what we call one language. While true synonymy, in the sense of two words or phrases interchangeable in any context without change of meaning or tone, is extremely rare, natural languages provide often different ways for expressing the same phenomenon, desire, attitude, etc., and these different ways are by the practice and consent of the speech community at a given moment of time distributed as “markers” of different speech uses: “high” and “low” language, social class, writing and speaking, poetry and prose, normal speech and slang, non-emotive and affective, direct and polite, etc., according as these uses are recognized socially in each speech community. Since the language into which the text is translated has a “Language World” of its own, which will necessarily in some ways be different from that of the language and period in which the original is written (or spoken), there cannot be a perfect fit of “register”, with the result that there is a choice — and choice is the essence of “style”—allowing for alternative but not equivalent ways of expression, subject to varying degrees of regulation by social forces such as fashion.

The heart of the matter is that translation is a sort of speech, and subject to the same kind of social conditioning as all living use of a language. In fact, translation is nothing but speech itself, it is a use of the receptor language in the same sense that writing or speaking are uses of that particular language. But it differs from other uses of language in this respect: while the communica-

4 As in all diachronic studies, the items compared at different points in time are of course only roughly equivalent. Their place within the overall synchronic system, and therefore also their nature, is different. Also the same text may be translated into the same language and at the same time as part of quite different activities. Compare, for instance, one of the new English official Bible translations with a “Bible translated as literature”, or a philological Qur’an translation with one by an orthodox Muslim (such as Muhammad Ali, or Marmaduke Pickthall).

5 Good examples will be found in the anthology by H. J. Stoeig, Das Problem des Uebersetzens (Stuttgart 1963). For the Bible, see W. Schwarz, Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation (Cambridge 1955).

6 This statement does not take into account the more extreme case of “diglossia”, in which the slots for the various speech uses are filled by distinct languages. Cp. C. A. Ferguson, “Diglossia”, Word 15 (1959) 325–40.

tive aspect of other language uses is at least theoretically "expressing" some underlying reality, and the connotative aspects are expressing feelings, attitudes, social factors, etc., that are normally assumed to be actually present in the given speech act (unless they are pretended), translation does not express a reality or a connotative situation actually underlying the act of translation, but "expresses" an underlying linguistic reality, viz. the piece of speech or writing in the source-text, which itself—if it is original and not translated—is supposed to express some reality or real connotations. In terms of Communication Theory, the translator is simultaneously Receiver (Hearer) and Sender (Speaker) of the same message. He does not encode the message, but recodes it. The study of translation is largely concerned with the question: how does the recoding affect the message, or differently put: how does the final, recoded message differ both from the original message and from an original message of the same import in the receptor language?

With regard to the purely communicative aspect of language, the most widely accepted view today is still that of C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, that between the referent (the piece of reality underlying the use of the word) and the symbol (the word) there intervenes a linguistic entity called the reference; in other words, the infinite variety of things is for speech purposes classified under a finite number of classes with each of which is co-ordinated a word, or a number of words mutually delimited by belonging to different registers.

8 Note that this definition does not exclude reported speech in the same language, such as summaries, précis, indirect speech, rewritings of poetry into prose, of dialect or popular speech into standard language, or of works from earlier periods into the modern form of the same language (e.g. Chaucer in modern English). Indeed, the last-named activity is often called "translation"; on its problems cp. F. Saran, Das Übersetzen aus dem Mittelhochdeutschen (Halle 1930). It may be argued that inter-language translation is only an extreme case of what we might call "secondary speech".

9 Some translations do get round the recoding problem and achieve a perfect receptor-language "look". Significantly, this happens mainly in highly formalized language uses, as scientific discussion, commercial and diplomatic correspondence, or legal documents. It is largely achieved by substituting not words or phrases, but entire formalized units conveying exactly the same message.

10 The Meaning of Meaning (London 1923) 11.

11 Though the larger dictionaries contain very large numbers of words — the latest Webster 550,000, the biggest Modern Hebrew dictionary over 60,000 — it is clear that not all these items belong to the same set. Some are obsolete, others are restricted to various groups of users. The Bible has between 7000 and 8000 different words. Though this represents doubtless only a small part of the words in use at any point of time during the Biblical period, this modest number contains many register synonyms. We may assume that the number of referents in any language is significantly smaller than the number of words.
Since the work of Trier,\textsuperscript{12} the idea is widely accepted that these references can be arranged within a "field", and that most of these fields are highly structured and their internal structure is different from language to language and from one period of a language to the other. The school of L. Weisgerber\textsuperscript{13} elaborated the concept of fields into the linguistic \textit{Weltbild}, the structure which each individual language imposes on reality in order to enable its speakers to symbolize it effectively. Recent research has eloquently shown how deeply these "pictures of the world" differ from language to language, and how even apparently natural categories, such as the distinction between substantive and verb, are merely conventional and form part of the internal, arbitrary structure of each language.\textsuperscript{14} Modern linguistic science stresses the non-commensurability of languages, both on the lexical and the grammatical level.\textsuperscript{15}

This directly affects our view of translation. Recoding presupposes a predictable relation, however involved, between the structures of the two code systems; when the structures bear no relation whatever to each other, individual items cannot be "mapped" into the receptor system without losing their place in the structure relative to other items, that is losing their meaning or function.\textsuperscript{16} Thus the old saying \textit{traduttore traditore} acquires a new and more sinister significance. In fact, many linguists deny the possibility of translation.

The above strictures refer to matters of vocabulary and grammar where the two languages normally cover the same areas of experience. In addition, it happens that a language is not equipped at all to deal with an area of experience which is adequately symbolized in another. The reasons may be of various types. One is geographical: natural phenomena, animals, plants, kinds of husband-


\textsuperscript{13} L. Weisgerber, \textit{Die volkhaften Kraefte der Muttersprache} (Frankfurt a/M 1943), and later writings, especially \textit{Sprachliche Gestaltung der Welt}\textsuperscript{3} (Duesseldorf 1962); S. Oehman \textit{Wortinhalt und Weltbild} (Stockholm 1951); H. Gipper, ed. \textit{Sprache, Schlussel zur Welt}, Festschrift fuer L. Weisgerber (Duesseldorf 1959); H. Gipper–H. Schwarz, \textit{Bibliographisches Handbuch zur Sprachinhaltsforschung}, Einleitung (Koeln 1962).

\textsuperscript{14} Note in this connection especially the writings of Edward Sapir (relevant essays conveniently collected in \textit{Culture, Language and Personality} [Berkeley 1956]), B. L. Whorf, \textit{Language, Thought, and Reality} (M. I. T. 1956); and cp. the criticism in H. Hoijer, ed., \textit{Language in Culture} (Chicago 1954).

\textsuperscript{15} Though the syntactical theories of N. Chomsky do in fact minimize the syntactical incommensurability of languages by showing up agreements in "deep structure".

\textsuperscript{16} In structural linguistics meaning or function is established by "oppositions", i.e. the fact of being distinct in a given way from other items within the same linguistic structure.
dry are lacking in the area where the language is spoken\textsuperscript{17} (and the concepts are not known by hearsay or instruction). Another is social, and is exemplified by the case of peoples not yet in touch with modern technique and science, or by the European unfamiliar with oriental religious concepts. A very common case is diglossia: where two languages have within the same society different uses apportioned to them, each may be equipped to deal only with the subjects involved in those uses.\textsuperscript{18} The restrictions in adequacy observable in diglossic situations may often not be features of the language in question, but of the speaker in question, while in other areas, where the same language is used for all purposes, a much more adequate vocabulary may be in use.\textsuperscript{19} This brings us to a feature of translation that is mostly ignored: while we are familiar with the idea that the translator’s understanding of the source language may be imperfect,\textsuperscript{20} we tend to measure the performance in the target language against the standard dictionary and grammar of the period, \textit{i.e.} against an optimum performance in fact never achieved, and not against what must be assumed to have been the individual linguistic limitations of the translator (or his group). This does not necessarily imply only the case of the uneducated translator, or the person translating into a language which is not his native one: it also applies to a townsman having to deal with incidental references to agriculture,\textsuperscript{21} or the university professor translating a vulgar description. Such limitations may well be self-imposed, \textit{e.g.} by the desire to translate into a dignified form of language, or by the belief that words in the original have hidden religious or scientific implications which cannot be adequately expressed by words which on the surface correspond to them in the target language.\textsuperscript{22}

\textsuperscript{17} For an amusing instance, see C. Naish–G. Story, "The Lord is my Goat-Hunter", \textit{Bible Translator} 14 (1963) 91.
\textsuperscript{19} Ib., 61.
\textsuperscript{20} This topic, of course, plays an important role in discussions on ancient Bible versions. Its importance is probably exaggerated.
\textsuperscript{21} An interesting case are the early translators of medical literature into Arabic, who invented new words for various anatomical features although such terms were available in bedouin speech (cp. C. Rabin, “Ibn Jam‘ on the Skeleton”, in the Charles Singer Festschrift [Oxford 1953] 177–202). Some of the dryness of the Peshitta vocabulary, for instance, may be due to the social background of the translators.
\textsuperscript{22} Cp. D. Tabachowitz, \textit{Die Septuaginta und das N. T.} (Lund 1956) 10. In 1552, Bishop Gardiner of Winchester drew up a list of 99 words in the Bible that were “sacred” and considered untranslatable, cp. J. Lewis, \textit{History of English Translations of the Bible} (London 1818) 148.
II

In spite all these formidable difficulties, men have translated since times immemorial, and their work has been successful, in the sense that it has effectively communicated to its public the ideas or purposes of the original texts. The criticism of translation, and its systematization in pre-modern theories of translation, on the whole concentrated on the aspect of acceptability, or in other words, the need to make a translation pleasant reading for the speaker of the target language, and not on the purely communicative aspect of getting the message across. 23 This, and the justified insistence on a small number of communicative failures, tends to obscure the fact that the vast bulk of both literary and non-literary translation has been and is successful in getting people to do the things the author of the source text wants them to do.

I would suggest that this success of a seemingly hopeless activity can be better understood if we view translation not from its finished result — i.e. by comparing source-text and receptor-text — but as a process of encoding, the way things work out in the actual handling by the translator. We have said above that translation is a sort of speech which has as its referent not reality, but words of another language; 24 and we have shown what stress modern linguistics lays upon the fact that the semantic structure of a language's vocabulary is imposed by that language upon reality, and not necessarily correlated to any structure that reality may possess. This, however, is just the relationship of the translation process to its Vorlage. The translator is concerned with the rendering of a concrete piece of language, with langage in De Saussure's sense, and not with langue, and essentially unaware of any difference or similarity in the structure of his two languages. Although understanding (the source text) and speaking or writing (the receptor text) are functions of his insight into both structures, this insight is instinctive, and the language user remains unconscious of it. Should the translator, as an educated person, have had formal grammar teaching, this would in practice only be likely to confuse the issue, or to give him a false sense of similarity of the two systems. What he does in the translation process, it appears, is to impose the semantic and categorical (grammatical)

23 The more acceptable or idiomatized translation is not necessarily the more effective one. A good example are the two translations of Maimonides' Guide of the Perplexed, by Samuel Ibn Tibbon and Judah al-Ḥarizi. Though Harizi's style resembled more the way in which educated Hebrew was written in Spain at the time, and was no less correct in rendition, it fell into oblivion, while the rugged Tibbonid translation exercised a profound influence for many centuries, and set the standard for all subsequent translation from the Arabic.

24 I shall not attempt to argue here whether this is (as I believe) a real parallel or a metaphor (as many serviceable linguistic terms have been shown to be).
structure of his receptor language upon that part of the source language which is visible in the text, or rather upon the way he understands it. The individual items of that string of words or morphemes thus are prised loose of their place in the original system, and individually represented by equivalents of the receptor language, each of which naturally continues to have, to the reader, the place it holds in the receptor language’s structure, different as this position may be from that of its original equivalent.

It will therefore further our understanding of the translation process if we know how such equivalents come to be selected. The translator is a bilingual.25 That is, he can refer to the same reality in both codes. He will, therefore, choose the word or phrase in the receptor language which expresses the picture or idea that the word of the source text calls up in his mind. Since a large percentage of words in a given language are polysemic, this will in practice mean the recall of one of the meanings of that word, and its replacement by the receptor-language word which possesses — inter alia — that same meaning. Which meaning of the source word will come into play, is difficult to predict. There is little point in operating here with the doubtful concept of “principal” or “basic” meanings. The main factor will no doubt be the translator’s experience or interests; and this may include his experience in school or university, where a certain meaning of the source word was stressed.26 He may also be ignorant of some of the meanings of the word, since in most cases a translator would tend to translate into his stronger language, and from his weaker one. If he is well enough versed in the context (as would be a scientific translator, or one familiar with the literature of the source language), the correct meaning may be suggested to him by the context. However, be the choice of meaning decided as it may, the choice of the receptor-language word will be determined by one meaning only of the source word. Only at a very high degree of sophistication will a translator arrive at the choice of a word because it represents something of the gamut of meaning of the source word in its native structure. This is in

25 For definition of the term, see Macnamara (note 18) 59–60.
26 Thus, for a later LXX translator, the passages where he had found the word in the Pentateuch (see below, note 81). Another aspect is shown by P. Churgin, “The Targum and the Septuagint”, AJSL 50 (1933/4) 41–65: some Hebrew words are in Aramaic, in Greek, and at times in Syriac, translated by different receptor words according to whether they apply to God or man, to the good or the wicked. Another case of this, with regard to Jewish and heathen “altar”, in S. Daniel, Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante (Paris 1966) 26 sq. This suggests that the school-teaching of the Hebrew Bible at the time distinguished such uses of the word as if they were homonyms. The fact of having encountered synonyms under different circumstances leads to unjustified distinction between them in the receptor language, cp. H. J. Cadbury, “The Danger of Overtranslation”, Bible Translator 5 (1954) 137–8.
any case a useless exercise, as the effect is lost on the reader, unless he happens to be also an expert in the source language.

However, the choice is in actual fact not made anew every time, any more than a normal person would think out anew in each everyday situation how to phrase what he is going to say. Just as a large part of our sentences are practically automatic responses to certain recurring stimuli, so the translator soon uses words and phrases as responses to verbal stimuli rather than as acts of conscious choice. Practical experience shows that translators tend to render words mechanically by the receptor-language term on which they hit first, to transfer renderings of phrases which they feel to be happy, to any further occurrence of the same phrase, and even to repeat the renderings of whole sentences without regard for small differences within the phrasing of the source text.27

One of the sources for such automatic response translations, of course, is the way in which the translator has been taught either of his two languages. Until a short time ago, languages were almost entirely taught by the translation method. The equivalents offered in this teaching were the sediment, so to say, of generations of translating activity.28 There is thus not merely an individual accumulation of conditioned translation reflexes, but also a corporate one. In many ways, earlier translations can be seen to affect the choice of words in later ones. What we have said here about words and phrases applies also to grammatical and syntactical constructions, except that with the greater frequency of these, the force of habit is even stronger, and school teaching even more influential.

We may call this automatic connection between source items and receptor items of all kinds “verbal linkage”.29 Such verbal linkage may be on the level of the phrase, of the individual word, or even of parts of words (e.g. malkh-üşth basil-eia: king-dom), of part of speech (a noun translated as a noun, etc.), or of grammatical construction. If the equivalents are fairly well selected (i.e. not

27 Biblical Hebrew likes to introduce subtle changes into repetitions of the same phrase, e.g. Gen. 23 : 5–15 (“pray, sir, listen to me”); 39: 12–18 (“he left his garment… and got out of the house”). These differences are frequently flattened out by the Versions. But such flattening-out also can and often does take place between similar verses removed by several chapters.

28 See on this (for mediæval Latin) E. Jacobsen, Translation, a Traditional Craft (Copenhagen 1958). In Jewish elementary instruction, the rendering of each individual word was fixed by tradition. When, in the 12th cent., Jews in Southern France began to translate from the Arabic, they chose not infrequently rare Biblical words to represent in their receptor text those Arabic source words which stood opposite them in Saadiah’s Bible versions.

29 This term covers about the same as R. R. Ottley’s “representative principle” (Handbook to the Septuagint [London 1920] 130) and J. M. Rife’s “systematic representation” (JBL 52 [1933] 246).
too restricted meanings of the words), rendering by verbal linkage alone can serve as a fairly effective translation method, and has done so in interlinear translations ("glosses") and in some traditional, mainly oral, Bible translations, to name only some instances. One reason why verbal linkage is not a fully satisfactory method of translation is, of course, that the meaning areas of words and the function areas of grammatical elements do not coincide in any given pair of languages. As a result, the receptor-language word will appear where the receptor language normally has another word, and will be either meaningless or misleading. 30 Another is the idiomatic character of natural languages, which demands certain words (or constructions) in certain contexts, and not others that might in theory do equally well (Hebrew "incline your ear": Engl. "lend me your ear"), or gives words in certain combinations meanings not otherwise found ("that's not my cup of tea"). Here "literal" renderings will be meaningless or ridiculous. A third reason is the fact, already mentioned, that the source language may have words, or whole semantic fields, to which there is no equivalent at all in the receptor language. 31 Ideally, when the translator comes up against such cases, he should abandon verbal linkage, return to the consideration of the underlying reality, and come up with a new, and in the circumstances more suitable equivalent.

Ideally, yes, but if we examine actual translations, we find even in highly-approved literary translations quite an amount of "wrong" verbal linkage, of various degrees. In the mass of less excellent translations of our day the percentage of words, etc., used in ways that would not normally occur in original texts of the receptor language, is often quite high, without the reader getting seriously perturbed. The reason is, of course, that meanings in the abstract are vague, and the exact shade of meaning out of the many possible ones is determined by the context. The force of the context is such that even some degree of deviation from the meanings with which the reader or listener is familiar will not spoil the sense; on the contrary, if it is noticed at all, it may add spice to an otherwise routine context, or open new insights — a matter sufficiently known from literature. We may call this ability of the context to absorb semantic deviation "semantic tolerance". I am not aware of any systematic study of this feature, but it appears that the degree of tolerance is considerable; it varies, naturally, with the purpose of the text. We may assume it to be small in a

31 Though this is not always possible to establish objectively. What may seem to us, from afar, a perfectly good equivalence, may be two completely different meanings to the native. This case must be distinguished from the one where the obvious equivalent is not used because of undesirable associations (e.g. the existing receptor word for "god" for the Biblical God); but here, too, susceptibilities vary surprisingly.
scientific treatise, but particularly large in the translation of a religious text. It is this semantic tolerance which to a large extent enables the translator to overcome objectively the difficulties of the incommensurability of languages. It makes it possible to rectify the effects of verbal linkage without abandoning its practical advantages for the translator’s working methods, by having if necessary two or three renderings for a source-language word, but not separate renderings for every possible shade of meaning; it allows a considerable adherence to fixed renderings of the source’s grammar and syntax; translation of idioms in many cases, etc. In particular, it creates a possibility for solving the question of words to which the receptor language has no previous equivalent. As far as such words have a transparent structure, the combination of elements can be translated into a corresponding structure of the receptor language: these are the loan translations (calques), which make up such a considerable portion of vocabulary increase in most languages. Even the source-language words themselves (where the script is the same) or their transliterations can be taken over in context without in most cases requiring explanations.

Language is formed by its uses. In the receptor language, the translated text is a piece of literature like any other — and let us not forget that in former

32 This, in fact, is the point at issue in the discussion between A. Deissmann and his opponents as to whether Greek words used in the LXX to render Hebrew words with a sense different from the normal one of the Greek word, should be understood in that context in their Greek meaning or in that of the Hebrew word (cp. the summary in Ottley, Handbook 167–71). It is, of course, essential to distinguish between what the translator meant the word to signify in that context and what later readers, often ignoring the context, sometimes read into it, cp. Ottley 168: “It is, indeed, probable, that when the translation was made, many of its readers understood its renderings as in the light of Greek; and this increasingly as time went on.” We ought to add: in the light of their own, later, Greek. Words that have meanwhile changed their meanings may, of course, be misunderstood in context in a translation as much as in any original work.


34 It will be seen that the present author believes that loanwords and loan-translations mostly come into being through translations of texts; those which are borrowed in isolation through travellers’ tales, commerce, and in our days through reports on technical advances, are a minority. With regard to Greek loanwords from Latin, where written translations of texts hardly exist (see below, note 68), the origin is almost certainly oral translation of court proceedings, proclamations, etc., see note 77.
times only works of some importance were translated — and its particular usages, due to semantic tolerance, have the average chance of becoming part of the language. This creates further semantic tolerance, and better reception for translations. In the process of translation, source language and receptor language become more similar to each other, and translation increasingly easier. In languages that are constantly being translated into each other, or constantly translate from a common source language, the semantic fields become coordi-
ted, words are built up in parallel ways, and idioms come to resemble each other. This happened with the West and Central European languages as a result of common translation from Latin, and with Indian languages through common translation from Sanskrit. Today new languages, such as Modern Hebrew and Arabic, are rapidly joining the European semantic community.

However, a translation which renders every word and construction of the source, even with rectified verbal linkage, will still not sound anything like an original piece in the receptor language because it does not follow the stylistic habits of that language. It may be too paratactic, or too hypotactic, link sentences too much or too little, be too emphatic or too "flat”, too rhetorical or too artless, too forthright in matters that are taboo in society,\textsuperscript{35} and so forth. Or it may correspond more or less to a style in the receptor language, but to the wrong style, and therefore make the wrong effect. All this falls under the heading of what is now called "acceptability". In this respect, however, matters are far from simple. The difference from acceptable native literature may be considered part of the charm of the translated work (as in translations from the Chinese); or the respect for the culture represented by the source work may be such that a close adherence to its stylistic features is thought to be educational;\textsuperscript{36} in the case of the Bible, the very dignity of the book made it at certain periods undesirable that it should sound like any other book in the language. Taste changes a great deal, partly as a function of translation activity (number and type of works translated). While today a lot of thought is given to ways of making Bible translations read like traditional native stories,\textsuperscript{37} and New Testaments are provided in simplified language,\textsuperscript{38} the British public steadfastly refuses to accept modernized versions instead of the archaic and hebraizing Authorized (King James) Version. The degree of acceptability expected from a translated

\textsuperscript{35} For an extreme case, see C. M. Churchward, "Honorific Language in Tongan", \textit{Bible Translator} 14 (1963) 192-6.

\textsuperscript{36} There was a school of thought in 18th-cent. Germany which took that attitude towards translation from the classical languages.


\textsuperscript{38} See \textit{Bible Translator} Vol. 12, no. 4 (Oct. 1961); 18 (Oct. 1967) 155.
work is thus a matter of fashion and literary practice of the moment. Thus it is also the main theme of the voluminous literature on literary translation, and that which lends interest to the history of translation as an art.

An important aspect of the acceptability complex is the deviation of the translator from average word frequency. It is well known that the words of a language differ very sharply in the frequency of their use. In English, 50 words make up about half of the items in any written text of sufficient length, 1,000 words almost 90%, 5,000 words over 99%. In modern Hebrew the rise is initially somewhat slower (50 words 30%, 1,000 85%), because it is an inflected language and has less grammatical words; in this respect it probably resembles Greek and Latin. At 2,000 words, however, it behaves like English. In Biblical Hebrew we have on the one hand words of up to 5,000 occurrences, on the other hand one quarter of the total vocabulary consists of *hapax legomena*. While the number of words an average person has in active use is estimated at 24,000, dictionaries show that the number of words available in a language at one time is nearer 100,000. There are thus, even with the average person, about 20,000 words he knows, but uses very rarely. Comparison of word lists in several modern European languages shows that even comparatively frequent concepts occur at very different levels of frequency in them; hence a translation will in any case be “foreign” by deviating from accustomed frequencies, probably to a greater degree than the variation in individual style by writers in the receptor language in the same genre. However, the translator, in his search for equiva-

30 The above discussion, from the point of view of the translator’s attitude to his work, is in a way supplementary to the classic book by E. A. Nida, *Towards a Science of Translating* (Leiden 1964), which is written from the point of view of the translation and aims at the perfect translator; see especially the chapter “The Role of the Translator”, pp. 145–55.
44 H. S. Eaton, *Semantic Frequency List for English, French, German, and Spanish* (Chicago 1940).
lents, will often hit upon rare or even obsolescent or obsolete words of the receptor language, which thus will be raised to noticeable frequencies. The same is likely to happen with rare grammatical constructions.\textsuperscript{46}

Thus, by continued translation from the same source language, a sub-language adapted to this translation is bound to develop in the reception language. Some of the factors, especially the statistical one just mentioned, are completely beyond the control of translators. In our time, and in the theoretical statements of translators since Cicero and St. Jerome, “translation language” is considered a major crime. The translator is supposed to produce an output fitting the “genius” of the receptor language. However, it seems that “translation language” is not only an unavoidable outcome of the translation process, but it is the main help for the translator in accomplishing his task efficiently. First translations from a source language are in most cases clumsy and inexact\textsuperscript{47} or over-literal, and the technique improves after some works have been translated. If it is difficult to understand how the experience of one translator can benefit another, it may suffice to point out that this phenomenon is of the same kind as the gradual enrichment of a literary language, the simultaneous adoption of new words, or of a whole new style, by large numbers of writers, and other features of linguistic development and fashion. None of these are as yet sufficiently understood. Note should also be taken of the fact that translation activity has


\textsuperscript{47} The early modern translations from European languages into Hebrew and Arabic were mere retellings of the story. The first translation from Arabic into Hebrew, of Saadiah’s philosophical work, made probably before 1100, is a paraphrase. While translations from Arabic into Latin were generally made with Jewish help via a vernacular, and are on the whole efficient, the first direct translation of the Qur’an, by Robert of Chester, is a most imperfect piece of work.
very often in the past been tied up with major religious, political, or cultural movements. The translated works thus commanded a wide and attentive circle of readers (or hearers) and among them those who themselves took up the work of translation. We might almost say that the very success of translated works encourages subsequent translators to pay heed to their technique and develop it, without embarking on experiments. The best instance of this is perhaps the Septuagint itself: different translators over a number of centuries followed a very similar technique, perfecting it mainly in the direction of closeness to the spirit of the Hebrew language. The only LXX translator of whom we possess a piece of non-translated writing, the grandson of Ben Sira, "writes his prologue in the literary style of the Alexandrian Jews of the time of Euergetes, but in the body of the work he drops into the Biblical manner, and his translation differs little in general character from that of the Greek version of Proverbs".46 The sub-language is here fully established. For this reason, no doubt, also the revised Greek translations (Aq, Sy, Th.) do not break with the character of the LXX and do not replace it by rendering in strict idiomatic Greek, but merely stress one principle or another, further exploring the possibilities of the established technique.

There is no doubt a certain transfer from translation from one source language to translation from another within the same culture, just as an experienced translator can turn his hand to a new language, and may well be better in translating from a language he has just learned than someone who has long been expert in that language but has had no translation experience. The result of a long and manifold translation activity can be seen in the ease and elegance with which high-quality translations are accomplished between European languages, helped by the extensive stock of parallel expressions and closely-fitting semantic areas resulting from the absorption of earlier "translation language" into general parlance.

III

Having outlined a theory which views translation as a human activity against the background of changing social attitudes, we may now try to apply it to the understanding of the differences between the ancient VSS of the Old Testament.

Let us start with the clearest case, that of the Vulgate. Roman civilization was steeped in translation activity. At least since its first meeting with Greek culture, translations of Greek literary and technical works abound. The educated Roman, "throughout looked upon translating as an indispensable ingredient of

46 Swete-Otley, Introduction 300. Note that he stresses the fact that he made a thorough study of Greek, and that he criticizes earlier parts of the LXX for being "rather different from the original", i.e. presumably not faithful enough.
language training and as a preparatory step to original literary creation”.49 The standards of quality were high, as regards both adequacy and the acceptability of the finished receptor text.

The attachment to translation is all the more remarkable as among those whose education enabled them to read such works, a knowledge of Greek was almost universal, and they were thus able to read the original works. Educated writers had no hesitation, for instance, in inserting Greek words or even quotations into their writings. Even among the less educated, Greek speech was widespread. The highly-polished translations were thus something of a luxury.

Where Greek was not understood, mainly in North-West Africa, and translation was thus a necessity, much lower standards were readily accepted in the case of the Vetus Latina, with its prevalence of verbal linkage and un-Latin style. That the language of the VL was felt by many to be unsatisfactory, is shown by the very way in which Augustine50 defends it: true, the language is bad, but what matters is the message, not the style. Thus he contends that a translation need not necessarily conform to the standards expected of original writing; translation Latin is recognized as a legitimate sub-language. The excuse is not the difficulty of translating from the Hebrew, since the whole of the VL was translated from Greek, and the criticism applies also to its NT part. The reason for the difference is that the VL was produced by a different type of person, outside the narrow circle of litterati, and possibly unaware of the attitude to translation of the latter. The VL also differs in another respect. While the literary translations were balanced, finished products, unalterable except in the way of the usual scribal accidents, the VL was a “living translation” varying in each MS and quotation source. It was constantly being recomposed to the Greek text for closeness (as that demand was understood at the time), and on the other hand its Latin style was being improved.51

As Christians moved higher up in the social scale, they began to identify themselves with the literary standards of the Roman world, including its attitude to translations. As Augustine’s arguments show, the objections to the style of the VL came from circles who identified religious dignity of a text with literary dignity and elegance. Against this background we have to understand Jerome’s activities. Whether we view his work as an independent translation with constant reference to earlier versions, or as a revision of the VL according to different standards of translation quality, Jerome’s literary preoccupations are unmis-

---

49 H. Homeyer in Lexikon der Alten Welt (Zuerich 1965) 3155. The young Cicero translated a work on natural phenomena, mainly as an exercise in elegant variation, cp. C. Atzert, De Cicerone interprete Graecorum (Goettingen 1908) 7–9.
50 Cp. note 39. The chapter is entitled “Interpretationis vitium unde emendari potest”.
takable, especially in the direction of idiomacy and of elegant variation (μεταφοράς). At the same time the principle of hebraica veritas, i.e. of changing the source language, brought in its wake a new awareness of the importance of meaning. This was the first time a Roman had to make the decision from which language to translate. It was also the first time in the history of Roman writing that a translation was made from a language other than Greek. Here was an intellectual challenge, of which Jerome was fully conscious. He is also, to our knowledge, the first translator who ever set out systematically his method of work; it matters little in this connection that, like many practising theoreticians of translation after him, he was not consistent in carrying out his own precepts. He met the challenge only gradually. If, as I think, B. Kedar is right in placing the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Esther at the end of Jerome’s translation series, we can observe how with time he overcame the difficulties of the Hebrew manner of presentation and sentence structure and found ways to recast the material into acceptable Latin without loss of information content. The important thing, however, is not the detailed method, but that he should at all have laid stress on acceptability, in other words, transferred a principle or rather ideal of which hitherto the Sitz im Leben had been the literary exercise, into the practical production of a widely-read religious text. With this went another literary luxury hitherto practiced only by a coterie of litterati: the minute attention to the meaning of the source words. This, too, appears to have developed with him only gradually, and is more prominent in his commentaries, written long after the completion of the Vulgate. The tone in which he there discusses those meanings suggests, further, that the concern over exact significations was at least partly engendered by controversies with the partisans of the VL. It is to be noted, however, that such arguments are by no means restricted to words of theological importance, but sometimes concern matters of even purely stylistic interest.

52 For the term cp. M. Flashar, ZAW 32 (1912) 103; G. Gerber, Die Sprache als Kunst (Berlin 1885) II, 242; to be distinguished from the rhetorical figure of that name, the heaping of synonyms in coordination.
53 Unless there were translations from the Etruscan. The Etruscans certainly practised translation, as is shown by their bilingual inscriptions, and now also by the Etruscan-Punic (or Phoenician) texts from Pyrgoi (dated variously about 500 or in the 4th century). It is not impossible that the Romans learnt from them about translation. On the other hand it is remarkable that we know nothing of Roman translations from Punic (the bilingual inscriptions were of course put up by Punic speakers), which once more demonstrates the narrow cultural basis of Roman translation activity.
54 Cicero (whom Jerome quotes in De optimo genere interpretandi) 5 only has scattered and brief remarks on the subject.
55 In an unpublished thesis on The Vulgate as a Translation (Jerusalem 1967).
IV

It is not possible to reconstruct the background of the Aramaic Targums as fully as we can with the Vulgate. To start with, there is as yet no agreement between scholars as to whether the interpretative translations to the Pentateuch (Ps.-Jonathan and Palestinian) are earlier or later than the more textual translation of Onqelos. This is hardly the place to discuss this thorny problem. The interpretative translations, whatever their period, constitute a most unusual phenomenon in the history of translation, with few known parallels\(^{57}\) and no likely model in translation in the Near East: possibly we ought to seek their origin in monolingual hermeneutics.\(^{58}\) On the other hand, we can follow the path of the idea of translation, and the forms it took, in the Near East from more ancient times. It begins with the adaptation of Sumerian materials, including major literary works, by Semitic Akkadians, a natural result of the bilingualism, and later diglossia, of Mesopotamia. To the extent of this activity, and its integration into intellectual life, the glossaries bear eloquent witness. Akkadian civilization employed translation to an extent few others have done before early modern Europe. Moreover, it generated translation activity as part of its cultural influence, as in the Hittite area, where translation was carried on both from Akkadian and from other languages, and may have had a place in cultic recitation. In the 8th(?) cent. inscription from Karatepe we have the first example of a long bilingual proclamation, such as were to become typical later for Babylon’s other daughter culture, the Achaemenid empire.

Translation, of course, is the basis of the use of Akkadian as an international written language in the 2nd millennium, from Ugarit to the borders of Egypt, except that here the source text had no independent existence, being probably oral, or at any rate a temporary draft. We know even less of the second translation process no doubt associated with the functioning of such letters: the decoding of the message in the language of the recipient by a scribe reading it out aloud.\(^{58a}\) The Tell Amarna glosses perhaps allow us some glimpse into the scribes’ translation methods. Besides, the quotations from what seem to be

---

57 One is Cicero’s translation of Aratos’ Phainomena (mentioned in note 49), into which he worked material from the commentaries, cp. Atzert, op. cit. pp. 4-6.

58 A translation of the type of the Targum to the Prophets makes little sense unless the listener also understood the source text without its help, as otherwise all the ingenious allusions would be so much wasted effort. This view seems to me to be supported by the fact that the most extended Targums of all, those to Psalms and to the Megillah, date to a period when Hebrew was already better known than Aramaic. It might be argued that the nearest literary form to the interpretative Targumim is the Qumran peshar.

58a Cp. M. Noth, ZDPV 65 (1942) 146, note 5.
snatches of Canaanite religious poetry\textsuperscript{59} afford us small samples of literary translation proper.

This peculiar use of translation may be termed "diglossic translation", to denote the neat diglossic supplementation of speaking medium and writing medium. It deserves more study from the socio-linguistic and psycho-linguistic angles. Today it can conveniently be studied in the same area in the practice of the illiterate dialect speaker dictating a letter to a scribe, who writes it down in literary Arabic, possibly to be read to the recipient by another scribe in a different dialect. The practice persisted in the employment of Aramaic in the Achaemenid empire, as analysed by Schaeder.\textsuperscript{60} With the almost universal diglossia situations of that period,\textsuperscript{61} translation was then perhaps quantitatively more important than original writing.

The Targums originated as a diglossic translation. As we are informed,\textsuperscript{62} they were delivered orally during the recitation of the Hebrew text, verse by verse, or in groups of no more than three verses. They were read off from the Hebrew scroll in the same way as a letter that was read out in another language than that in which it was written. On certain occasions, it seems, the Aramaic or other translation could be read off without previous formal recitation of the original.\textsuperscript{63} The written Targum text was thus no more than an \textit{aide-memoire}, not a literary work. As Targums developed, however, they were probably composed in writing the same as other translations.

The Targums betray their origin from oral instantaneous translation by their literalness and inclination to verbal linkage,\textsuperscript{64} a necessity for one translating orally. Yet this is not a naive literalness, but on the contrary, a sophisticated, workmanlike technique with involved rules as regards, for instance, anthropomorphic expressions. We know little about the aspect of acceptability. In its

\textsuperscript{59} Cp. A. Jirku, JBL 52 (1933) 108–20. W. F. Albright, JEA 23 (1937) 196–201 holds that the main examples are translated from Egyptian.

\textsuperscript{60} H. H. Schaeder, \textit{Iranische Beitraege} I (Schriften der Koenigsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswiss. Kl., VI, 5 [Halle 1930]) 199–205.

\textsuperscript{61} Cp. C. Rabin, \textit{חָרָם הַמַּעֲרָשִׁים תַּהֲפֹלָה הָלָשִׂים לַשְׂדָאִים} (New York 1967) 6. To mention just a few instances: the use of Aramaic by Nabataeans and Arabs; of Akkadian in Mesopotamia down to the first cent. BCE; of Greek by various non-Greek communities; and of Biblical Hebrew by Judeaans speaking Mishnaic Hebrew.

\textsuperscript{62} Mishnah Megillah 4:4; see the explanations in J. Rabinowitz, \textit{Mishnah Megillah} (Oxford 1931) 122–3.

\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Ibid.} 2:2. The Palestinian Talmud \textit{ib.} (f. 72a) discusses whether this means that the Scroll was written in Greek, or whether translation from a Hebrew (\textit{ashurith}) Scroll of Esther is meant.

\textsuperscript{64} Of course the interpretative Targumim are not to be taken as an attempt at getting rid of verbal linkage or writing more idiomatic Aramaic. They are literal where they translate, and do not translate where they are not literal.
sentence structure, Targumic Aramaic is unlike the original texts or even the translated texts of Imperial and Biblical Aramaic. But it is highly doubtful whether there was any idiomatic standard for the Targumic translators to follow. In all probability the spoken language by the end of the Second Commonwealth was already Middle Aramaic, a language which its use in the Palestinian Talmud and some Midrashim shows to have been rich and expressive. Literary convention, however, at that time still prevented the Targumists from using the popular dialect in its pure form. They were in the same situation as Martin Luther, who also translated the Bible into a dry Chancellery language, but one wonders whether they possessed his gift "den gemeinen man auff das mau[ [zu] sehen".65

The Peshitta, in contrast, is one of the first major literary efforts in any spoken Middle-Aramaic dialect. Syriac had fixed idiomatic usages, which could readily be checked by reference to actual speech. Hence the Peshitta, though practising verbal linkage, is a good deal further removed from Hebrew idiom, semantic structure, and syntax than the Targums. Its comparatively small vocabulary — resulting in the obliteraton of many finer semantic differentiations of the Hebrew source66 — and rigidity of syntax are features of the Syriac language, exhibited likewise in early original texts.

V

The situation in the Greek world was utterly different. In spite of its ample contacts with, and interest in other cultures, Greek society did not go in for translation, but for independent rewriting of information. In this respect it resembles the Sanskritic civilization of India.67 We have no research as to what factors may be responsible for some civilizations being impervious to translation. In the case of Greek, it is remarkable that the long and close contact

65 Sendbrief von Dolmetschen, end of A iv b. The full context of this much-quoted passage is: "one must ask about it the mother in the house, the children in the street, and the ordinary man in the market place, and look them upon their mouths, how they speak, and translate accordingly, so that they understand it and feel that one is speaking German to them."

66 Compare, however, the striking evidence of such obliteraton in the Septuagint, assembled by A. Deissmann, Neue Jahrbucher fuer das klassische Altertum 11 (1903) 169. A widely-based comparison of the chief versions in this respect would probably be an eye-opener. It should be done according to semantic fields, as was suggested by G. Bertram, "Der Sprachschatz der Septuaginta und der des hebräischen A. T.", ZAW 57 (1939) 85-101.

67 To be exact, much of Sanskrit literature was composed by people who spoke other languages in daily life, but this is diglossia, not translation. Real translation, until fairly recent times, seems to have taken place only in the Dravidian countries of South India, and from Sanskrit.
with Rome, which resulted in thousands of Latin loanwords in later Greek,\(^{67a}\) produced very few actual translations from Latin.\(^{68}\) A specialist, writing in 1965,\(^{69}\) can only state that “there must have been some early translations for practical and literary purposes”, but cannot cite any. The only ones that come to mind are the bilingual inscriptions from Asia Minor. Somewhat later bilingual inscriptions are also found in Egypt, especially the famous Rosetta Stone,\(^{70}\) but in view of the people who set up the later inscriptions, we must ask whether the Greek text in these is not the original. Although the worship of Egyptian gods was widespread in the Hellenistic world, no religious texts connected with them seem to have been available.

The Septuagint was thus an innovation in the Greek milieu.\(^{71}\) As there was no Greek model, it is strange that the question seems never to have arisen from where its originators got the idea.\(^{72}\) Since they were Jews, it seems probable that their inspiration was the Targumic activity as practised in Palestine, though not the Targum as a literary work. Some of the Egyptian Jews visiting Jerusalem\(^{73}\) may still have understood Aramaic,\(^{74}\) but in any case even someone

\(^{67a}\) See note 34.

\(^{68}\) Cp. Christ-Schmid-Staeelin (note 46) II, 665, 945. Their list is not quite complete. There is, e.g., Sophronios’s contemporary translation of Jerome’s Viri illustres (cp. G. Wentzel, Texte und Untersuchungen z. Gesch. d. altchristlichen Literatur, XIII, 3 [Leipzig 1895]).

As to the compiler Dionysios of Halicarnassus, it is not clear whether in his Roman Archaeology (7 BCE) he translated excerpts from his sources or summarized and reworked.

I have not seen V. Reichmann, Roemische Literatur in griechischen Ubersetzungen (Philologus Suppl. 34, 1943).

\(^{69}\) H. Homeyer, loc. cit. (note 49).

\(^{70}\) Mentioned in this connection by E. A. Nida, Towards a Science of Translating (note 40), p. 11. For a list of other bilingual and trilingual inscriptions, see F. Daumas, Les moyens d’expression du grec et de l’égyptien comparés dans les décrets de Canope et de Memphis (Suppl. aux Annales du Service d’Antiquités 16, Cairo 1952) xii-xiv.

\(^{71}\) A. F. Kirkpatrick, Expositor V, iii, p. 268, quoted by Swete-Ottley, Introduction to the Septuagint (Cambridge 1914) 318; Christ-Schmid-Staeelin (note 46) II, 545 even claim that “except for the translations of Sumerian hymns into Babylonian, this is the first major attempt to translate from one language into another.”

\(^{72}\) The question may have been in the minds of later Alexandrian Jews: perhaps the Letter of Aristeas is their attempt to provide an answer of the romantic type, attributing to the whim of a mighty ruler an action so much out of keeping with their gentile surroundings.

\(^{73}\) The importance of visits to Jerusalem is stressed by P. Churgin, AJSL 50 (1933-4) 42, though he only thinks it led to emendation of an existing Septuagint, not that it may have anything to do with its beginnings.

\(^{74}\) The existence of LXX renderings intelligible only on the assumption of recourse to Aramaic was noted by E. Nestle, Septuaginta-Studien VI (Stuttgart 1911) 14-15, cp. Swete-Ottley, Introduction 319, note 3 (with added examples). Since then many further cases have been discovered, especially by G. R. Driver, M. Flaschar, ZAW 32 (1912) 251 suggests that recourse to Aramaic was a way out when the translator could not understand
ignoreant of the language could hardly fail to be struck by the phenomenon of
public translation, and see in it a solution for the Egyptian Jews' own
problem of mass ignorance of Hebrew. As D. Barthélemy has shown,75 one
strand of Greek Bible translation, later typified by Aquila, was carrying out to
the letter the theories of Palestinian midrashic schools. We may surmise that
these contacts did not begin all of a sudden after the completion of the original
Septuagint, but some links were there all the time. These account for the appear-
ance in the Pentateuch of renderings incorporating midrashic and halakhic
teachings.76 But it should be realized quite clearly that such phenomena as
Aquila's translations show familiarity with Midrash, not with Targums, as no
Targum applies such principles consistently, and on the other hand the features
that characterize Targumim of either type are absent. Thus the very consistency
illustrates rather the essentially alien character of Hellenistic Judaism, receiving
isolated principles, but without the attendant intellectual atmosphere.

The LXX translators of the Pentateuch thus lacked both a Greek and a
Jewish model or tradition of how to accomplish the work of translation. If we
search in their own surroundings for a model they had to go on, we find it in
the day-to-day oral translation activity of the commercial and court dragoman
(δρομηστής),77 with which, as middle-class78 inhabitants of a large port,
they must have been familiar.79 As early as the third century BCE, Jews would
certainly not have had access to the schools which catered to the upper-class
citizens, and thus had no practice in writing educated Greek; the fact that
Philo did, centuries later, does not entitle us to assume the same for the time
of the translation of the Pentateuch. On the other hand, being literate, they had

his text, or was averse to rendering the plain sense — note that this credits the LXX
translators with a procedure often used in the Midrash. There is also a similar employment
of Mishnaic Hebrew meanings, but this may be involuntary, due to an insufficient
ability to distinguish between two forms of an acquired language.
75 Les devanciers d'Aquila (Leiden 1963), especially pp. 3-30.
76 Cp. M. H. Segal, מַשְׁכֹּת הַכְּסָדִים (Jerusalem 1960) 933; Z. Frankel, Ueber den Einfluss
der palästinischen Exegese etc. (Leipzig 1851); L. Prijs, Juedische Tradition in der LXX
(Leiden 1948); I. L. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah (Leiden 1948); S. Daniel,
77 The word occurs in papyri (Preisigke I, 599-60; Oxford Lexicon), and in Aq. and Sy.
Isaiah 43: 27 for μέλι (LXX "rulers"); the LXX at Gen. 42:23 has ἔρημηστής. It is of
course very probable that some Jews served in Alexandria as interpreters for Aramaic,
etc.
79 We might also consider the thought that the "image" of the Targum translator next to
the Reader, and having his say each time after the latter read a verse, reminded an
Alexandrian Jew of the dragoman standing next to the merchant and speaking after each
remark of the latter.
acquired practical experience through reading legal documents, and perhaps fiction. An important part in their linguistic education was played no doubt by listening to the effusions of political and forensic orators. These Jews were thus semi-educated, a fact which probably accounts for their liking for long and full-sounding words and their hesitating use of recherché syntactical constructions.

Any attempt to analyse the method of the LXX from their surroundings applies properly speaking only to the Pentateuch, since all signs point to the style of the Pentateuch having become subsequently a recognized sub-language for biblical translation and indeed the book itself a source of verbal linkage for the later translators. Thus even when the cultural and educational integration of Egyptian Jewry had progressed, this did not necessarily express itself in changes of translation style. We shall not err, therefore, if we follow the usual practice of taking the technique of all books as being essentially one and the same for purposes of description; but any explanation, on the other hand, must refer to the period of the LXX Pentateuch alone.

The background we have outlined accounts, first of all, for what Ottley has called "the flat bald surface of the Greek" of the Bible, and the failure "to shape a telling sentence which may strike the ear and linger in the memory," their

80 S. W. Baron, op. cit. I, 379 points out that the prayers inserted in III Macc. are in LXX style, different from the rest of the book. Blass-Debrunner, Grammatik des neuestamentlichen Griechisch (Goettingen 1921) 4 state the same about the two hymns in Luke 1: 46–55, 68–79. The NT authors employed the LXX as a linguistic inspiration much in the way that the Judaean Desert Scrolls employ the Hebrew Bible; cp. D. Tabachovitz, op. cit. (note 22).

81 Cp. F. W. Mozley, The Psalter of the Church (Cambridge 1905) xiii (quoted from Flashar, ZAW32 (1912) 182); Flashar, op. cit. pp. 186–9. points out that at times the later translator selects not the usual rendering in the Pent., but some isolated deviant case, and that there are cases of misapplying earlier correct equivalents by unthinking verbal linkage (ib. 100). With regard to syntax, however, I. Soisalon-Soininen, Die Infinitive in der Sept., (Helsinki 1965) 13, claims that differences between different LXX books are "sehr gross", though he admits this may largely be due to the underlying Hebrew. Ibid, p. 14–15 states that Greek constructions without obvious equivalents in Hebrew (participial constructions, gen. abs.) translate in different books different Hebrew constructions.

82 It is probable that those who knew enough Hebrew to translate, were also at all times the least integrated amongst Alexandrian Jews. Note, however, that the translator of Job was found by modern scholars to be "familiar with Greek pagan literature", cp. Schwee-Ottley, Introduction 316.


84 Though this may only be the impression of a modern reader. Against this A. Deissmann (note 66) 171, quoting H. W. J. Thiersch, De Pentateuchi versione alexandrina (Erlangen 1841) 52, 59, 61, states that the LXX achieves "nicht selten eine Art griechischer Eleganz".


non-appreciation of poetic diction,\textsuperscript{85} and tendency to replace metaphors by plain statements\textsuperscript{86} — though the last is a tendency also of Targums, Peshitta, and Saadiah, and may be due to similar religious scruples as led to the avoidance of anthropomorphisms. Appreciation on their part of the terse and "nervous" style of the Hebrew Bible was precluded by the current fashion of "diffuse smoothness with constant repetition of standing phrases",\textsuperscript{87} and they could hardly help introducing into their work some concessions to the prevailing style of their own days, nor need we assume that their literary taste was of the best, even measured against their own surroundings.

Another feature which I would suggest finds its explanation in the model of dragoman technique, is the omission of parts of the text, be they words or phrases. In a translation which in other respects treats the source with such holy awe, this is seemingly strange; but it is not out of keeping with a tradition of oral business translation, the main purpose of which is to get the message across. This can often be done more efficiently by condensing and omitting phraseology and stylistic ornamentation of the source. W. R. Smith gives an example from Jeremiah\textsuperscript{88} in which the LXX, owing to a number of omissions, has a style "simpler, more natural, and more forcible". Where the present writer does not agree with Robertson Smith is, of course, his conclusion that therefore the text of the LXX must represent an original, unexpanded Hebrew Vorlage. Even in the Pentateuch, there are many more omissions in the LXX than additions.\textsuperscript{89} Every practising translator knows how often his fingers itch to cut unnecessary prolixities of the source, but he is restrained from doing so by his education; the LXX translators were not.

To the same factors we may ascribe the occasional appearance of literal translations which make no sense in Greek. M. Flashar, with fine perception, stated\textsuperscript{90} that such cases of literal rendering occur where the translator did not understand his source or did not want to understand what the plain sense

---

\textsuperscript{85} "Überhaupt der dichterischen Rede abhold", M. Flashar, ZAW 32 (1912) 242.

\textsuperscript{86} Swete-Ottley, \textit{Introduction} 325, 329. The statement, \textit{ibid.}, that they also introduced metaphors where there were none in the Hebrew text, is not supported by examples.

\textsuperscript{87} W. Robertson Smith, \textit{The O. T. in the Jewish Church} (Edinburgh 1881) 90; the descriptions in inverted commas are Smith's. For the process of adaptation in course of translation to a different stylistic ideal, cp. M. Luecker, \textit{Die französischen Psalmübersetzungen des XVIII. Jahrhunderts als Ausdruck der geistigen Stroemungen der Zeit} (Bonn 1933); S. J. Lenselink, \textit{De Nederlandse Psalmberijningen... met hun voorgangers in Duitsland en Frankrijk} (1959); L. W. Kahn, "Buergerlicher Stil und buergerliche Uebersetzung" in his book \textit{Shakespeare's Sonette in Deutschland} (Bern 1935) 64–88 (reprinted in H. J. Stoerig, \textit{Das Problem des Uebersetzens} [Stuttgart 1963] 299–321).

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{Op. cir.} p. 113–4.

\textsuperscript{89} Such additions as there are, are generally explanatory, not new information.

\textsuperscript{90} ZAW 32 (1912) 94–5. Cp. also note 74.
suggested, and therefore put down "a purely mechanical translation of embar-
rassment (Verlegenheitsübersetzung)", leaving it to the reader to discover a
meaning in the words. Now the Hebrew Bible has many cruces even for today's
translator, with all the achievements of recent scholarship behind him, but he
has been taught that a sense must be given to everything, even if he has to take
recourse to emendation. Had the LXX translators really had close and living
contacts with the Targum, they would no doubt have adopted midrashic solu-
tions to the lexical or theological difficulties. But putting down the words, even
if they make no sense, is exactly what the commercial translator will do, who
can count upon his reader being better acquainted with the circumstances than
the translator himself.

The most extreme case of such "translations of embarrassment" are of course
the transliterated words,91 which in a way lend parts of the LXX the appearance
of a rough draft, with words pencilled in for later reconsideration. The interesting
feature is that the revisors of the LXX, who were apparently so much closer to
the headwaters of Palestinian tradition, did not eliminate this feature, but on
the contrary increased its quantity.

It is in the same line that the LXX translators are so careful and consistent in
rendering terms of theological importance, but pay little attention to consistency
in detail not directly relevant to the message. A survey undertaken by the present
writer of the way the different versions render the names of precious stones,
metals, etc., shows that the LXX are definitely less consistent than any of the
others.

Possibly our theory also provides at least a partial explanation for that most dis-
turbing of all LXX features, the semitisms of its syntax. A dragoman was trained
to translate word for word, phrase for phrase, and his skill was to have ready-
made renderings for syntactical constructions which could be applied without
much thinking, above all keeping the order of elements in the receptor phrase as
parallel as possible with that of the source phrase. We are in our case not
restricted to theoretical reasoning. Accident has preserved for us fragments of
a translator's training manual, a set of everyday conversations in Latin with
translation into Greek and colloquial Egyptian.92 The system is to translate
every word separately into the other two languages, without regard for the
idiom and word order of the latter. The same system is suggested by the preserved
glossaries.93 The experienced dragoman would, of course, learn when to deviate
from the mechanical reproduction of the syntax of his source language in order

93 H. I. Bell-W. E. Crum, "A Greek-Coptic Glossary", *Aegyptus* 6 (1925) 177-226; cp. also
to avoid misunderstandings. However, not being understood is a relative matter: in certain situations the native listener expects, and puts up with, a form of language that would normally disturb him. Thus in telephone conversations we hardly become aware of the obliteration of many phonetic distinctions, and in some languages, such as Japanese, there is a different syntax for the telephone; in discussing the English of Japanese women in America a sociolinguist has recently pointed out the amazing ability of listeners to make out a form of speech only vaguely resembling their own. It may thus not be unreasonable to assume that even before the creation of the Septuagint Pentateuch members of the Jewish community and others in Alexandria were used to make sense out of translation language resembling that found in our LXX. The question of intelligibility (as distinct from that of a specific “Judaic-Greek”) seems to have been raised only by H. S. Gehman, who from the view expressed in 1951, that “there was a Greek with a pronounced Hebrew cast that was used and understood in religious circles”, advanced in 1953 to thinking that “for the most part it (the LXX) could be understood by one whose native language was Hellenistic Greek... there was a Greek with a decided Hebrew cast that was understood in religious circles”, but specifically rejects the need to assume that second and third generation Alexandrian Jews “spoke Greek influenced by Semitic idioms as that found in the LXX”. I fully agree with this latter statement, and would like to stress its logical limitation: the facts, as we have tried to explain them above, do not necessitate the assumption of a specific Judaic-Greek, but of course they do not militate against such an assumption either; they simply have no direct bearing on that matter, any more than Philo’s excellent Greek is a cogent proof that he could not at home and with his friends have spoken the quaintest Judaic-Greek imaginable. As is well known, Goethe spoke in daily life his native Frankfurt dialect.

On the other hand, it seems to me that the “dragoman” theory here advanced raises the importance of LXX syntax for the reconstruction of the Hebrew Vorlage, at least for the Pentateuch. With regard to other biblical books, translated later, the question arises whether the by then typical LXX Greek constructions could not have been applied indiscriminately to more or less synonymous Hebrew constructions. As against this, our theory diminishes the critical value of LXX additions and omissions, or rather shifts to the very origin of the LXX text (whatever view we take of that origin) doubts that

96 VT 1 (1951) 90.
97 VT 3 (1953) 148.
could also be raised on grounds of vicissitudes of the internal textual history of the version.

Translation from Hebrew into Greek did not cease with the completion of the Hebrew canon. The Greek translations of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha closely follow the technique of the canonical books, and probably were partly contemporary with the latter, and at least in part not distinguished from them by the community for which they were translated. But an entirely different standard of translation can be observed in Josephus’ Jewish War, towards the end of the 1st cent. CE.98 While this may be an effect of his writing for a Roman public, and may show that he knew something of the standards of translation observed at Rome for versions into Latin, the same does not apply to the New Testament. If parts of the Gospels are translated from Aramaic (or from some type of Hebrew), the distance between their language and the syntax and semantic structure of the assumed Semitic source is a great deal wider than in the LXX, and that in spite of the extensive use of LXX allusions. There evidently had been a change in attitude, towards a greater insistence on acceptability. Indeed, such a change may already exist in the translation of part of the Wisdom of Solomon: the doubts and difficulty experienced in deciding whether any and which part is translated99 show that this is a rather different type of “Translation Greek”.

98 BJ i, i. Josephus uses the verb μεταβάλλων “to change”, but the context clearly shows that translation is meant. Should the avoidance of the more usual terms, such as the LXX’s ἔργησις, be meant as a hint that he, Josephus, was engaged in some more artistic form of translation?

99 Cp. C. E. Purinton, “Translation Greek in the Wisdom of Solomon”, JBL 47 (1928) 276-304. On the theory just propounded, it is quite permissible to assume that also the rest of Wisdom was translated, only by another translator who handled his Greek even more skillfully.