ierend ließe. Jenseits der drei Rezensionen liegt... die Welt des wilden Textes einer...
im Dienst des synagogalen Gottesdienstes ursprünglich in reichster Mannigfaltigkeit des Wortlautes erwachsenen unliterarischen Dolmetschertradition.\footnote{See: Baumstark (above, n. 59) p. 98; specially: G. Bertram, "Zur LXX-Forschung," ThR NF 10 (1938) 159.}

The endeavor to reconstruct, or even only come close to an Urtext of the LXX is, so we fear, no more than an illusion.

IV: The Septuagint and the Hebrew Text.

1. Translation technique of the LXX

In what has been said so far we have already touched upon questions of the skills and methods of the various translators. These issues form a necessary transition to our next topic: the relation between the Greek and the Hebrew texts. Actually, as an introduction it would be desirable to sketch and analyze the peculiarities of each translator. Instead we have to confine ourselves to several general remarks. The character of the Greek language inadvertently compelled syntactical changes vis-à-vis the Hebrew. Instead of the Hebrew coordinate constructions the Greek demands subordinate ones; especially, participial constructions are frequently used. Hebrew concreta are replaced by Greek abstraca; surprisingly, we also encounter examples of the reverse phenomenon: cases in which abstraca are translated by concreta.\footnote{M. L. Margolis, "Complete Induction for the Identification of the Vocabulary in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament with its Semitic Equivalents," JAOS 30 (1910) 301-312.} The tendency to paraphrase entailed great liberty of rendition; the great number of pleonastic constructions testify to this. Not infrequently the freedom of translation should be explained by the inability of the translator on being confronted with a Hebrew text too difficult for him. Connected with this is the preference of the LXX to cover up their difficulties with a stock of favorite idioms. Ziegler exposed these with great clarity in the books of Isaiah and Job. The fact that the translators often harmonized difficult Bible verses with others only very superficially connected, should also be attributed to their attempt to find at least some way to reproduce those parts of the text which were
actually beyond their comprehension. As against this, less obvious is the tendency of some translators on the one hand to reproduce the Hebrew terms by means of corresponding concepts from their own milieu, or on the other hand consciously to follow the Hebrew, trying to give a verbatim translation and, when possible, even one which is etymologically justified. It is therefore impossible to account for the many differing renderings of one Hebrew word or of the same Hebrew idiom.

2. Retroversion from the Greek

It is exceedingly hard to give general criteria for the translation technique of the LXX. This means quite substantial damage to an interesting side-aspect in this field of research, which should be mentioned in passing before turning to the interrelation between the Greek and Hebrew text, where both have been preserved. A rather essential part of the Greek Bible of the LXX has come down to us in Greek only. Hebraisms and translation errors point to the fact that at least a number of the books in question most certainly had a Hebrew original. Reconstructions of such Hebrew texts have been attempted again and again. Such endeavors can be considered accountable only if based on a meticulous study of the translation technique of the LXX. Here Margolis’ remark is very much to the point: "As a matter of fact, in passages wanting in the Hebrew all attempts at retroversion are unscientific".

In this context the famous, and much debated issue of a possible Aramaic original of the Greek text of the Gospels should be mentioned. On this point Van-nutelli made a remarkable observation which so far, in my opinion, has not re-

---

77 See Ziegler, *Isiias* (above, n. 54) 1-31; *idem* (above, n. 72) 280-290.
79 *ibid.* 302-303. For an announcement of a retroversion of I Mac prepared according to the translation technique of the LXX see: M. Schwabe and E. Z. Melamed, "Zum Text der Seroneepisode in I Mac. und bei Josephus," *MGW* 72 (1928) 202. An example of discernment and philological skill is still the enjoyable study of F. Perles, "Zur Erklärung der Psalmen Salomons" *OLZ* 5 (1902) 269-282, 335-342, 365-372, which was also published separately in Berlin in 1902. Recently see also: F. Zimmermann, "Aids for the Recovery of the Hebrew Original of Judith," *JBL* 57 (1938) 67-74 (this study is not everywhere convincing).
ceived due attention. He established that the minor mutual discrepancies found in the parallel reports of the synoptic Gospels are amazingly analogous to one of the two: either to differences obtaining in the various Greek translations (LXX, Theodotion, Aquila, Symmachus) of a certain Hebrew Bible reading, or to differences which show more than once in the LXX in the rendition of parallel readings, for example in the books of Kingdoms or Chronicles. Here too, the very desirable further research is impeded by the many inconsistencies in the translation technique of the LXX.

3. The LXX and the history of the Hebrew language

For the scope of vision of the nineteenth century the problem of the interrelation between the wording of the LXX and the Hebrew text was limited to the question whether the LXX could contribute towards the reconstruction of a Hebrew text older and more original than the MT. As we shall presently see, modern research has somewhat shifted this query, while adding a number of new questions. These should be dealt with before going into an evaluation of the LXX for textual criticism. In which script and according to which orthography were the copies of the Hebrew Bible text at the disposal of the Alexandrian translators? What was the pronunciation of the Hebrew reflected in the transliterations in the LXX? What are the conclusions that can be drawn from the grammatical and lexicographical conceptions of the translators concerning the morphology and vocabulary of the idiom of their day?

a. Scholars interested in the history of the Hebrew script endeavored to follow the nature of the permutations of letters revealed in the translation in order to determine the type of script of the Hebrew Bible circulating in Alexandria in the days of the translators: was it the ancient Phoenician script or the younger Aramaic one? A new and sound research of all the material in the Pentateuch con-

vinced J. Fischer that the new Aramaic alphabet had been used. At about the
time of Fischer’s study, Franz Wutz advanced the thesis – which had already
been postulated and defended in the eighteenth century by Tychsen – that the
first translators who prepared a written translation no longer had a Hebrew text
in Hebrew script at their disposal but worked from copies containing the Hebrew
text transcribed into Greek characters, as in the second column of Origen’s
Hexapla. Wutz presented his arguments with great acumen but with little system-
tics. His main arguments are that the transliterations found in the LXX are
of two types: proper names and terms which the reader could better understand
when transcribed and not translated. Beside these there were many transliteration
of Hebrew words which remained untranslated because the translators did
not understand them. The second category quite often pertains to very common
words which were corrupted in the Greek transcription. It may well be that the
helplessness of the translators is rooted in the fact that they used corrupted
Greek transliterations and not the original Hebrew lettering. Besides, when
translating sibilants and gutturals, between which there is no clear distinction in
Greek, permutations often occurred. As one of the great many examples Wutz
brings we would like to mention Ps. 10:8 (9:29). The word בְּרִית הָגִּרְשָׁיָה was transliterated
as ἄσπερεν (ἀσπερεμα), consequently understood as ἀσπερεμα and translated as μετά
πλοῦσιον. A number of translation errors can, so Wutz maintains, only be ex-
plained as a misreading of an original in Greek characters. Besides, Wutz finds
support for his theory in an interpretation of Herzog who claims that in the Let-
ter of Aristeas mention is made of a transliteration into Greek characters. Gins-
burger professed somewhat later that rabbinic sources as well relate that Jewish
sages transcribed the Torah into Greek characters for King Ptolemy. The
attention drawn to Wutz’s thesis was massive; it gave rise to a comprehensive liter-
ature which, after the initial shock of surprise, in general, dissented from the

81J. Fischer, Das Alphabet der LXX-Vorlage im Pentateuch , AA X 2 (Münster 1924). In the
introduction previous literature on the subject is mentioned.

82See: F. Wutz, "Die ursprüngliche Septuaginta," ThBL 2 (1923) 111-116; later, among
others: idem, Die Transkriptionen, usw., Lieferung I, BWAT NF 9 (1925) 1-176, cf. also: A.

83See the polemic between M. Ginsburger and L. Blau, "La transcription de l’Ancien
allegedly innovative theory.\textsuperscript{84} The majority of permutations can be better explained when assuming an original in Aramaic script rather than one in Greek characters. In many instances, according to Wutz, the textual corruptions, doublets and the like originated in slips of the pen in the Greek uncials, though other explanations are more obvious. Moreover - so in his later writings as well - he depicts the activities of the translators as almost purely mechanical; he fails to consider their free paraphrasing, their conscious or subconscious introducing of Jewish Hellenistic theoeloumena. Thus, Haupert accounted for the above mentioned example from Ps. 9:29 as an acoustic error; Margolis regarded it as a mis-reading: הָדָרְיָה > הָדָרְיָה (cf. Symmachus' translation ad Prov. 12:24); Bertram saw it as the inserting of a Jewish-Hellenistic tenet concerning the rich, although there is no actual basis for this in the text. As a result of the numerous studies to which Wutz and his writing gave an impetus, as well as from what can be gleaned from rabbinic literature, we may conclude that in the milieu of the Hellenized Jews, both in and outside Palestine, such transliterated copies of the Hebrew Bible did indeed circulate (though there is no mention of the fact in the places in question in the Letter of Aristeas). We do have Sumerian-Accadian texts transcribed into Greek from the second or first century BCE which were preserved in Babylonia. It is highly plausible that such ancient transcriptions lie at the root of the much later one by Origen.\textsuperscript{85} Wutz did not prove that the

\textsuperscript{84} I will mention here only those reviews which seem especially important to me: 'the first shock of surprise' - R. Kittel DLZ 46 (1925) 657-664; M. Plessner, "Neue Arbeiten zur Septuaginta Forschung," MGGW 70 (1926) 237-250. The studies of Bertram, the first on transcriptions, the second and third on history of religion, the fourth on textual criticism and history of language: G. Bertram, OLZ 30 (1927) 266-270; OLZ 38 (1935) 33-39; 'Das Problem der Umschrift und die religionsgeschichtliche Erforschung der LXX,' BAZAW 66; (Giessen 1936) 97-109; ThR NS 10 (1938) 69-80, 133-159. Unfavourably see: J. Fischer, Zur Septuaginta Vorlage im Pentateuch (BAZAW 42; Giessen 1926) 22-42 and later publications by the same author which are methodically exemplary. See also: M. L. Margolis, "Transliterations in the Greek Old Testament," JQR NS 16 (1925) 117-125. A. Barrois, "Une nouvelle theorie des LXX," RB 39 (1930) 323-361, Ch. Heller, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta I (Berlin 1932). R. S. Haupert, "The Transcription Theory of the Septuagint," JBL 53 (1934) 251-255.

\textsuperscript{85} This was already postulated by Halévy (above, n. 14); previously Blau had written regarding the existence of such transcribed texts: L. Blau, Zur Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift (Budapest 1894) 80-84. Barrois quotes studies by Pinches and by Schilleiko of Sume-
translators used such transliterations exclusively or even mainly for their work. However, even Wutz’s opponents allow that a number of readings are explained more to the point and more convincingly by his theory, than by presuming that the translators worked from a Hebrew or Aramaic script. Such instances should be explained by assuming that words in Greek transcription were introduced into the original translation as glosses which came to criticize, correct or confirm the translation.

b. In addition to the value of the LXX for the history of the Hebrew script it greatly contributes to our knowledge of the pre-massoretic pronunciation of the Hebrew. Thus the transcription of proper names often reflects a pronunciation closer to the Assyrian inscriptions than to the MT! Unfortunately, research here is thwarted and results are reduced, due to the great lack of consistency with

rian-Accadian texts in Greek transcription, see: A. Barrois, RB 39 (1930) 346. About these texts see now: E. van der Meer, “Topographical Texts of Babylon,” AJO 13 (1940) 124ff.

86For a specially keen formulation see Orlinsky: “This theory has been subjected to such thoroughgoing criticism that ere long it will be remembered as nothing more than a curiosity”: H. M. Orlinsky, “The Columnar Order of the Hexapla,” JQR NS 27 (1936) 141.


87a[See now: E. Brönnø, “Some Nominal Types in the Septuagint,” Classica et Mediaevalia III (1940); “Einige Namentypen der Septuaginta,” Acta Orientalia XIX (1941). Brönnø criticizes at length the methods and conclusions of his predecessors, especially the studies of Staples and Sperber (see n. 88). According to Brönnø the starting point of any study in this field should always be the search for the most frequent rendering of a certain nominal type in the Massoretic pronunciation through its transcription in the LXX. In addition to this there are deviating transcriptions obtaining sporadically which must be explained as variants in the Hebrew or as orthographical mistakes in the Greek and merit no conclusions for the pre-massoretic pronunciation. On the basis of the research of proper names in the tradition of codex Vaticanus, Brönnø arrives at the conclusion that most types of nomina known to Massoretic Hebrew, correspond in the LXX with a fixed type, running parallel with the Tiberian system both in pronunciation and quality of vocals. In certain cases the LXX deviates from the Massora in the allotting of the segolates to a fixed type, in the treatment of the laryngeals. Brönnø’s studies constitute a methodically founded protest against modern theories regarding the arbitrariness and un-pruned variety in the pre-Massoretic pronunciation of Hebrew. It is to be regretted that Brönnø does not verify his results by what is known to us about the pre-massoretic pronunciation of Hebrew from sources other than the LXX].
which the various codices of the LXX spelled proper names or transcribed them. On the other hand these very inconsistencies pointed the keen eyes of Wutz and Sperber toward the various systems of transliteration of the Hebrew into the Greek; for example the reproducing of gutturals and the doubling of consonants. These systems, aided by material from Origen and Jerome, could be placed in chronological relation to each other and assist in disclosing a chapter in the history of the Hebrew pronunciation. It goes without saying that the results of this research allow important conclusions for the pre-massoretic grammar as well. We learn that in the declination of the segolates the strict uniformity of the later qatil, qatil, qatil patterns were still often disrupted. In combination with phenomena obtaining in old texts vocalized according to the pre-massoretic system found in the Cairo Geniza, as well as with the inconsistencies in the Tiberian system betraying a diversity of old systems, it is clear that the study of transliterations may contribute to the reconstruction of the still untouched morphology of a living Hebrew language, perhaps even of different dialects.  

An important contribution to the study of pre-massoretic phonology and morphology was made by Rahlfis and Fischer. They traced the orthography of the Hebrew MSS used by the translators of the LXX as evident from peculiarities in their translation. Fischer concluded that in these MSS matres lectionis appear at the end of words, whereas in their middle they obtain less frequently and inconsistently. In addition, the LXX in many instances still reflects the habit of the copyists of Hebrew MSS to write identical final and opening letters only once. S.

D. Luzzatto was the first to postulate this phenomenon. This habit is feasible only in manuscripts showing no, or hardly any, space between words or verses.\textsuperscript{90} I think that this fruitful field of research into the orthographic character of MSS used by the LXX has not yet been fully exhausted. It would certainly be worthwhile to look into the question which was the form of the plural prevalent in the Hebrew texts of the translators: whether it was the Aramaic יִלע or the purer Hebrew יָלַע. The unintelligible reading יֵלע of the MT in Ps 106:7 goes back to יָלַע as in Ps 78:17 and 56. Could it be that ἀναβαίνωντες of LXX is an intermediate stage, if we read יָלַע vocalized as יֵלע, which was later corrected to יָלַע and then in turn became יֵלע? Aquila translates Ezek 2:10 יָלַע by κτίσις = יָלַע. It is quite probable that he read יָלַע in his Vorlage.

It would certainly be desirable to attempt an analysis of the grammatical knowledge the LXX evinces. Most of the material Frankel brings in the relevant chapter of his justly renowned Vorstudien, would better reside under the heading translation-technique. It would be instructive for our evaluation of the grammatical knowledge of the translators if, among other things, we succeeded in establishing to what extent they were able to distinguish between similar verbal roots belonging to different classes. Their ability, in general, seems limited; it is therefore doubtful whether we may conclude much from the confusion between verbs tertiae infirmae and tertiae aleph, a situation in itself remarkable (see for example Isa 11:11). In rabbinic Hebrew the two classes interchanged.\textsuperscript{91}

Recently, much attention has been paid to the interesting question of whether the LXX regarded certain words and conjunctions in their Hebrew text as Aramaisms. Already in J. G. Eichhorn’s Einleitung, in the edition of 1823, there is a list of translations which prove how strongly the interpretation of the LXX depends on their being familiar with the Aramaic idiom of their times. Nestle tersely and pointedly formulates the situation: "dass wir in ihr (der LXX) auch...

\textsuperscript{90}See: Fischer (above, n. 84) 1-21, specially 11-16.

\textsuperscript{91}Z. Frankel, Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta (Leipzig 1841) 132ff. [Actually this paragraph about the grammatical knowledge of the translators is not explicit enough as to how scanty this knowledge was. I should have stressed the many misunderstandings which resulted from their faulty etymologies.]
das älteste Wörterbuch zum A.T. besitzen. In this matter Franz Wutz certainly went too far. His theory, according to which the LXX is a "Zeuge eines verloren gegangenen hebräischen Sprachschatzes", actually results from an insufficient command of the Semitic languages which he believed he could reconstruct from the lexica available to him at Eichstatt. Kahle clearly expounded this in a discourse on Wutz's last book, a review which with all its decisive criticism, honors both the late author and the reviewer. This does not obviate the fact that many of the translations in the LXX should be elucidated with the help of Aramaic or even Arabic. Out of tens of examples we mention Ps 59 (60): 10 דָּבָר = ἐλάσσε; Mi.1:11 שֶׁם = κλαλός (Aram.); Ps 83 (84):7 שֶׁר = διδόνα (Arab.); and probably also Job 14:12 לאו סָפַרְתֶּה מִן הָבְלוֹ הַלֶּדֶת = αὐτῷ συναγαφή from the 'Arabism' מְדָה, "to break" (cf. Isa 7:6), 14:12כ דָּבָר שֵׁם כְּ "when the heavens are no more", is missing in the pre-hexaplaric texts, and is probably secondary in the MT. Naturally, the translators' etymologies are not always reliable; however, often do they offer valuable suggestions as to other readings. When, for example, in the first verse of Obadiah, the translators find in the Hebrew word בְּנִבְנֵיה as an 'Arabism' for 'sheepfold', this is certainly a wrong interpretation. Yet, it supports the conjecture made by Nowack that in Micah 2:12 we should read בְּנִבְנֵיה "in its sheepfold", an example to which many the like can be added.

---

90a In connection with the explanation of the word פָּרִישֵי = Pharisees, it is important to note that the root שִׁמְרָא = 'separate' nowhere obtains in the Bible; the oldest witness to the root is found in the (double) translation of מְבָשָׁר in the LXX ad Ezek 34:12 as διὸπεκαρημο-πάνος.

91 For a list of Aramaisms see: J. G. Eichhorn, Einleitung in das Alte Testament I (Göttingen 1823) 469ff. As to the exposition of the problem see: E. Nestle, Septuagintstudien IV (Maulbronn 1911) 14. For Wutz' books and studies, in which his theories regarding the lexicography of the translators have been re-worked, see the summarizing essay by: G. Bertram, ThK NF 10 (1938) specially 150ff. About the commentary to Psalms see also: W. Rudolph, ThKZ 51 (1926), 267-272. Concerning Systematische Wege von der Septuaginta zum hebräischen Urtext I (Stuttgart 1937) see the review of P. Kahle, ZDMG 92 (1938) 276ff.

92 See Orlinsky's fine study of Job 14:12: H. M. Orlinsky, "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Job 14:12," JQR NS 28 (1937) 57-68. On Isa 7:6 see: I. Elhanan, HUCA 12-13 (1938) 57-58. See Driver's words proposing to show: "that the LXX exhibits a number of translations which are explicable only from the cognate Semitic, especially the Arabic, languages," G. R. Driver, "Supposed Arabisms in the Old Testament," JBL 55 (1936) 101-120. In the same di-
4. The LXX and the history of the Hebrew text

Through the last examples we reach the point where scientific interest in the LXX in fact started: the query as to the value of the LXX for the reconstruction of the original Hebrew text. This value was certainly over-estimated in the research of the nineteenth century. Did not Ferdinand Hitzig open his course in Old Testament text criticism with the sally: "Meine Herren! Haben sie eine Septuaginta? Wenn nicht, so verkaufen Sie Alles, was Sie haben und kaufen Sie eine Septuaginta!"93 Scholars thought they found in the Septuagint a witness of a Hebrew text centuries older than the Massoretic text, which thus would be much closer to the original. This prejudice in favor of the Septuagint was strengthened by the fact that the codices of the LXX were much older than those of the MT. A text-critical way of viewing the situation revises this presentation. Quotations from the Greek Bible in Cyril and Theodoret show that in the fifth century the recensions of the LXX still greatly diverged from each other. As opposed to this the divergencies of Aquila and Theodotion from what we know as the MT are minimal – it seems that in the second century C.E. the process of uniformization and canonization of the MT had been entirely completed. The way in which, in the second century, Rabbi Aqiba's exegetical system drew far-reaching conclusions from subtle orthographic details in the MT justifies the supposition that the canonization of this text-form had taken place some considerable time earlier.94 Indeed, the contrast between the clarity with which the later

93 See J. J. Kneucker's introduction to: F. Hitzig, Vorlesungen über die biblische Theologie usw. des Alten Testaments (Karlsruhe 1880) 19, n. 1.

translations reflect the MT on the one hand, and the striking divergencies existing between the LXX and the MT on the other, offers one of the most important indications that the LXX still goes back to one of the pre-massoretic forms of the Hebrew text. However, the impediments connected with the reconstruction of this text-form are much larger than was assumed in the nineteenth century; moreover, the import of the reconstruction is of an entirely different and much more relative quality. From the previous paragraphs it has become clear how difficult it is to utilize the LXX for the restitution of a Hebrew text used by the translators. The many uncertainties as to the original text-form of the LXX itself; the differing translation techniques obtaining in the various books, the paraphrasing character inherent in great parts of the translation, the divergencies from the original which the translators allowed themselves as a result either of lack of insight into the Hebrew text, or of conscious dogmatic corrections – these many factors constitute just as many impediments when using the LXX as an expedient in Old Testament text criticism. Each attempt at determining which was the Hebrew text the translators reproduced has to be preceded by a careful analysis of the context, style and tendency of the LXX reading in question. But even in those cases in which we might succeed in such a reconstruction, it would still be limited to one, or several biblical readings; in these we would have recovered a text-form about which there is no certainty at all as to how it related to the original text. In order to form a clear idea of this relation, the merits of a Hebrew text retroverted from the LXX should in each case be weighed most carefully as against those of the MT. Besides, each such reading must be regarded in the light of a broader, general Fragestellung: to what extent can we determine the textual nature and value of the copies of the

\[\text{\textsuperscript{94a}}\,\text{Cf. J. Wellhausen, \textit{Der Text der Bücher Samuelis} (Göttingen 1871) 4-13. The comparison between the clarity by which younger translations reproduce the MT and the strong disparities which reveal themselves between the LXX and the MT lies at the foundation of Wellhausen's argument (especially p. 5). The great change which had taken place since the nineteenth century in the evaluation of the LXX for the reconstruction of the MT is obvious when comparing Wellhausen's arguments with those of Allgeier whose consequent, at times slightly forced, try to demonstrate that: "dass LXX und Massora im Psalter... im Grund identisch sind"; see A. Allgeier, \textit{Die Psalmen der Vulgata} (Paderborn 1940) 72-95. Of fundamental import is Allgeier's exposition that the significance of the LXX is more in its conception of the text which they produced than in the text-form which they perhaps reflected.}\]
Hebrew Bible circulating in Alexandria in the last centuries before the turn of the era? Just as in the above-discussed issue regarding the pre-massoretic pronunciation and grammar, so here also Orlinsky's words apply: "[T]hey have been made possible largely through a new attitude developed by Kahle and his numerous disciples."95

It goes without saying that these most complicated queries, only touched upon here, cannot be dealt with profoundly in this context. Still, some points of a general nature must be looked into:

a. In those cases where the LXX offers a rendering which at first sight does not make any logical sense, but which on closer examination appears to be an erroneous translation of a Hebrew text diverging from the MT, we may assume with certainty that the translators did read a text differing from that of the MT since, in those instances in which a translation is founded upon an error, any conscious freedom or tendentious correction of the original is out of the question. A number of instructive examples will clarify this. Ps 103 (104):17 בְּרֵאשִׁית, הָיֹתָהּ אֹתוֹן does not make sense but is, as appears from Micah 2:13, an erroneous translation of בְּרֵאשִׁית which may have been spelled בְּרֵאשִׁית. 1 Sam 1:15 יִשָּׁמֶר בְּרֵאשִׁית וּלְךָ = יִנָּמֵת לְךָ. Cf. Job 30:25 where מֵאִם means 'breath', 'wind', and cf. Zeph 2:2; Job 17:11; Cant 2:17; 4:6 – the correct explicatory gloss מַעַל penetrated into the MT. When making evaluatory comparisons of independent differences between MT and the LXX the rule of the eighteenth century theologian and text critic J.A. Bengel should not be forgotten: section pro clivi praestat ardua – when one of the compared texts shows or assumes a frequently obtaining root and the other an unusual one, we have to take into consideration that "Allerweltsworte gelegentlich weniger gebräuchliche Begriffe verdrängen". In 1 Sam 9:25 the MT reads יִרְבּוּד; the LXX renders διότεραν = יִרְבּוּד. In cases such as this the reading of the translation has a claim to a certain credibility.96


96On faulty translations as positive traces leading back to the Hebrew text used by the translators see: A. B. Ehrlich, Die Psalmen (Berlin 1905) ad Ps. 104:17; cf. also: M. L. Margolis, "Complete Induction for the Identification of the Vocabulary of the Greek Versions of the OT with Its Semitic Equivalents: Its Necessity and the Means of Obtaining
b. When comparing the translation of the LXX with MT there is another methodological principle which will not only aid in determining which text the translators used for a particular reading; it may, up to a certain degree, also help in answering the question of the character of the biblical texts circulating in Alexandria in the days of the translators.

In those instances in which the LXX conforms with a divergence known to us from other sources, either from a varia lectio preserved in Masoretic notes or from citations or interpretations of Bible verses in the Apocrypha or Rabbinical literature, the variant shows us the way to a text-form which indeed circulated. In 1 Sam 12:3 the LXX renders: ἐκ χειρὸς τινὸς ἐληφθεὶς ἤξισαμοι καὶ ὑπόδημα; ἀποκρίθητε κατ’ ἐμοῦ representing a text which differs from the MT; this reading, however, is reflected in a quotation in Sir. 46:19. On Gen. 26:32, "and they said to him, 'we have found water', Gen. Rabbah (ad loc.) comments: 'We do not know whether they did or did not find water.'

One may assume that the uncertainty expressed here is whether the text should be read ריקד or ריקד מים as in the MT, or ריקד מים as in the LXX. This assumption is confirmed by the translation of the LXX: ως εὑρομεν ὁδόν. The varia lectio of the Ketib in Isa 63:9, כבלי ראתה לא יד, remains unintelligible until the version of the LXX: καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸς εἰς σωτηριαν ἐκ πάσης θλίψεως. οὐ πρέσβῳς οὐδὲ ἠγγέλως ἄλλο λύεται, αὐτὸς κύριος ἐσώσεν αὐτούς reveals a Hebrew text: יהי יד למשיח (cf. Exod 33:14, 15; 2 Sam 17:11).

When the LXX conforms with one or more of the Palestinian Targumim, at variance with the MT, the drawing of conclusions is hampered by the paraphrastic character of the various Targumim as well as of the LXX; the special complications in the genesis of these Targumim, in their transmission and in their mutual relation, constitute an additional impediment.97 Whether or not at the root of parts of the

---

LXX there was an Aramaic Targum, or a Hebrew text with Aramaic glosses, as Vannutelli supposed, is not easy to decide in spite of instances such as Job 24:14, ישנא, which is Targum: לָחָשְׁךָ יָשָׁעַי. Divergences from MT common to the LXX and later translations, such as the Peshitta in particular, can be explained as due to influence of the LXX on the younger translation, but also by the fact that both translations may go back to a Hebrew text differing from the MT.

In this context special attention should be paid to the relation between the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch; this topic has indeed been studied. In hundreds of cases in which the LXX of the Pentateuch differs from MT, it converges with the Hebrew text of the Samaritans. Gaster’s adventurous theory that the LXX was the product of Samaritan translators seems even less justifiable since the find in Antinoopolis of fragments of a Greek Bible translation prepared by Samaritans in Egypt. Though this translation shows traces of influence of the LXX – which apparently was of an almost inter-confessional authority – it entirely follows its own path. Kahle’s theory that the LXX used an older form of the Hebrew text which was closer to the Samaritan text than the text later to be authorized by the Palestinian Rabbis, certainly deserves a more serious discussion, as a matter of fact, this theory was proposed, in a more primitive form, more than a century ago by Eichhorn. Recently, Sperber has tried to go back even further, aided by a series of interesting hypotheses. Still earlier he had endeavored to trace back the differences in morphology of the Hebrew between the Tiberian system and the transliterations in Origen, etc., to the original difference between the Judaean and Northern-Israelite dialects of biblical times. His starting point was

98Vannutelli (above, n. 80) 28ff.
99See Sperber (above, n. 35) 59, for a review of J. Hänel, Die Aussermosaoretischen Übereinstimmungen zwischen der Septuaginta und der Peschiota in der Genesis (BZAW 20; Giessen 1911).
101See the arguments of P. Glaue and A. Rahlf in: Fragmente einer Griechischen Übersetzung des samaritanischen Pentateuchs (MSU I:2; Berlin 1911).
102See Kahle (above, n. 59) and cf. J. G. Eichhorn (above, n. 91) 458.
that the MT represents a Judaean text-recension and the Samaritan Pentateuch a Northern-Israelite one; in the differences which obtain in parallel texts within the MT, he also found new vestiges of Northern-Israelite and Judaean text-forms. Recently, a study of Origen’s Hexapla and citations in the church fathers, led him to postulate two Greek translations in the days of Origen: one originating in Syria, following a Judaean Hebrew text, the other originating in Alexandria following a Samaritan-Israelite text. The theories of Kahle and Sperber may find a certain degree of support in the impressive study of Vincent, claiming that the oldest diaspora in Egypt was of North-Israelite stock, though much of the history of this settlement and of the connections between South and North Egypt are as yet unknown to us.

We have reached the point at which fascinating though nebulous vistas open up over the pre-massoretic forms of the Bible text, but where the greatest caution is also imperative. Our starting point, the conformity of the LXX and the Samaritan text, is striking; still, the extent to which this justifies a reconstruction of the text-type used by the translators merits a closer investigation. Such a reconstruction should take into account a variety of cross-contaminations which happened in the Alexandrian text-type (and which are presumed by the information in the Epistle of Aristeas); another circumstance to be taken into account is that the form in which the Samaritan Pentateuch has been transmitted is, at least in certain aspects, secondary to the MT; apart from that it by no means gives the impression of great authenticity. For that matter, the direction in which the present research steers may well lead to the confirmation of a conclusion drawn by Nyberg some years ago on grounds of a comparison of the MT of Hosea with the LXX and the Peshitta:


105Ch. Heller, הומר הספירות של תורתו (Berlin 1924); several of Heller’s arguments as to the secondary character of the Samaritan Pentateuch are impressive indeed.
G und S gehen auf alte Vulgärerezensionen zurück, die unter den Diasporajuden in Umlauf waren, M bietet dagegen eine sorgfältige auf gute alte Tradition zurückgehende Rezension, die sich zu den Diasporatexte etwa so verhält, wie die Klassikertexte der grossen alexandrinischen Philologen zu den Vulgärtexen der klassischen Autoren, die uns jetzt die ägyptischen Papyrusfunde zugänglich gemacht haben.\footnote{H. S. Nyberg, "Das Textkritische Problem des AT," ZAW 52 (1934) 254.}

Does not the Epistle of Aristeas as well, in paragraph 30 and elsewhere, betray the awareness that the value of the Hebrew texts circulating in Alexandria was inferior to that of the Palestinian texts, even though the Epistle praises the standard of the LXX and the Hebrew manuscripts it used?

\textit{V. The Language of the Septuagint}\footnote{Cf. now: J. Ros, \textit{De studie van het Bijbelgrieks van Hugo Grotius tot Adolf Deissmann} (Nijmegen-Utrecht 1940). The conclusion of this erudite and absorbing study is that the language of the New Testament, and \textit{a fortiori} that of the LXX, reflects, in spite of its affinity with the \textit{koinê}, an entirely particular character due to Hebrew influence. The characterization of Deissmann on p. 44, though rather strongly phrased, evinces a personal view of the essence of learning and philosophy of history.}

At this point, after accounting for the text-history of the LXX, its genesis and the nature of the translators' \textit{Vorlage}, the way seems open to an investigation of the recasting and reproducing of the Hebrew Bible into Greek of the LXX. By means of transition we will touch upon a question much debated several decades ago: the language of the LXX.

Thackery has pointed out – as mentioned above – that this question as well actually demands a separate discussion for each portion of the translation. As this is not feasible here, only general problems can be adumbrated.

a. At the end of the previous century, still under the influence of the doctrine of inspiration, a very special character was attached to biblical texts. On the other hand, each Greek text was strictly measured by the rod of pure Atticism. The \textit{communis opinio} among theologians who studied the NT was that the Greek of the Bible presents an idiosyncratic idiom, teeming with Hebraisms, distinct from any other Greek. When, as a result of finds of numerous papyri the \textit{koinê} spoken in Hellenistic Egypt became better known, this opinion changed. Deissmann proved that the vocabulary of the language of the LXX and the NT is no more
than *koine* Greek; Thumb demonstrated the same regarding grammatical and syntactical phenomena. Both succeeded in finding, in the papyri as well as in post-*koine* Greek, parallels for phrases which had once been considered typical Hebrewisms. This endeavor has not yet come to a standstill altogether; Hesseling proved the pure Greek origin of certain expressions which had been deemed to belong to the domain of Bible-Greek.107 It will become evident from a single example that this attitude may be fruitful with regard to points discussed above. In Ps. 127(128):2 the LXX offers two versions for יָדִעֲךָ נֵסֶר. At first glance the reading of $G^V$ τοὺς πόνους τῶν καρπῶν σου seems correct, that of $G^B$ τοὺς καρποὺς τῶν πόνων σου a senseless transposition. A look into Preisigke’s dictionary of the papyri will disclose at once that καρποῦ obtains in twenty or more instances in the papyri designating ‘palm, hand’, cf. LXX 1 Sam 5:4, Prov 3:20 – thus the reading of $G^B$ is a word-for-word, original translation of נֵסֶר יָדִעֲךָ which as a result of a misunderstanding was deformed to the reading of $G^V$.108

b. As against this, the LXX shows quite a number of Hebrewisms and Aramaisms. These were in part inherent in the language which was spoken by the translators and in their surroundings. Additional research has demonstrated that elements of the native language penetrated the *koine* wherever it was spoken. In this respect the language of the Jews as spoken in Egypt is no exception, a fact reflected in the lexical Hebrewisms of the LXX; thus גֶּר is repeatedly rendered γεώργας, a corruption of the Aramaic גֶּר; and similarly word formations such as θυσιαστήριον, ‘altar’, and σαλαγχίζειν, ‘to take pity on’, as literal translation of


"to be inwardly moved," seem to be of Jewish Hellenistic origin. Besides, we cannot disregard the impression that typical formulations "von den LXX oft ohne Rücksicht auf das gesprochene Griechisch dem Original nachgebildet sind". This led to syntactical, phraseological and stylistic Hebraisms, as for example: ἐγένοτο or καὶ ἐγένοτο rendering a very common sentence opening; the use of προστάθεναι for the adverbial ηὐποροῦσα constructed with an additional verb – to do a thing again; διδόναι meaning τιθέναι in phrases as δόθω σε ὑπέρθω are typical biblical constructions which in turn influence the idiom of the Hellenistic Jewry. Hebraisms such as μετὰ δόθω ἔτη ἴμηρον in 1 Macc 1:29 and Jud 4:2 are one of the traces which, in books such as Judith and 1 Maccabees, point toward the lost Hebrew original.

Deissmann and Thumb never went as far as altogether denying the presence of Semitisms in the LXX. However, since their conception came into being as a reaction, they aimed at minimizing the scope of the Semitic element. And indeed, he who becomes engrossed in their and their followers’ studies is liable to underestimate the influence of the Hebrew on the Greek of the LXX. Modern research has certainly brought to light that numerous expressions previously considered as Hebraisms or Aramaisms can be explained as a coinage of the commonly spoken Greek or products of an inner-Greek development. One should keep in mind that a great number of constructions particular to the Greek Bible, may still be considered Semitic even if they sporadically show up in extra-biblical texts as well.

109J. Psichari, “Essai sur le grec de la Septante,” REJ 55 (1908) 161-208. Psichari examines elements from post-koine Greek as well as Hebraisms in the language of the LXX – a recommendable study due to its full command of the material as well as its impartiality. On Greek and non-Greek elements in the koine see: Thackeray (above, n. 32) 25-55. For a summary see: F. M. Abel, "Coup d’œil sur la Koiné," RB 35 (1926) 5-26. Auerbach lists manifold realia reproduced in old Greek words or in new words of non-Greek origin extant in the Greek Bible. See: M. Auerbach, De vocibus peregrinitis in Vetere et Novo Testamento greco obsitis (Eos Supplemeta, 7; Lvov 1930).

110The citation is taken from Dibelius’ interesting review of: M. Johannessen, Das biblische καὶ ἐγένοτο (Göttingen 1926); see: M. Dibelius, Gnomon 3 (1927) 646ff.; see Helbing on syntactic, phrasiological and stylistic Hebraisms: R. Helbing, Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta (Göttingen 1928). Helbing is most cautious in recognizing Semitic influences, see the introduction, p. VII. As proof of the Hebrew character of the translation of Ben Sira, the differences between the grandson’s prologue and the translation proper are pointed out.
Even if a papyrus occasionally does show the construction εἰναὶ εἰς, its manifold occurrence in the Bible must certainly be explained as influenced by ... הֵיהוּדָה; so may the numerous examples of οό followed by a futurum as a prohibitive be considered a Hebraism.\(^{111}\)

c. The difficulties which the oldest attempts at reproducing a Semitic book in a Western language entailed, often forced the translators to give a new meaning to Greek words. Lately, Bolkenstein has pointed out the phenomenon of the influence of the Hebrew on Greek when he posed the question of to what extent in the LXX "griechische Worte zu einer Bedeutung umgebogen wurden, die von ihrer ursprünglichen wesentlich abwich."\(^{112}\) He examined this process of shift of meaning for terms in the realms of philanthropy, charity and care for the needy. He may occasionally not have altogether escaped an overly clever interpretation, nevertheless his interesting investigation certainly merits a continuation for additional terms in the fields of human and especially religious life and thought.

To point out one particularly well-known example: δόξα in Greek means opinio; subjectively this is: 'an opinion I have', whereas objectively it stands for 'the opinion others hold of me', the latter usually in bonam partem: 'the good name, fame'. Through this last meaning it becomes the equivalent of דכָּה in the LXX, which never stands for opinio but denotes either that which gives a man glory, or the magnificence of the Lord as revealed in his creation and deeds. "Ein Begriff des Denkens und Meinens, zu dessen Inhalt alle Schwankungen menschlichen Denkens und Vermutens gehört, ist die Aussage des Objektivums schlechthin geworden der Gotteswirklichkeit".\(^{113}\) Here we get a glimpse of the immense gap between a belief in the absolute of the Semitic mind and the intellectual rationalizing thought of the Greek, a gap which had to be bridged when translating the Bible into Greek. But herewith we have already crossed the bounds: from history of language into history of culture.

\(^{111}\) Support for this formulation I found, retrospectively, in Thackeray's valuable exposition (above, n. 32) 29, brought partly in name of Moulton.

\(^{112}\) H. Bolkenstein, Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum (Utrecht 1939) 426ff.

\(^{113}\) On δόξα see: G. Kittel, in: Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament II (Stuttgart 1935) 245ff. See also studies quoted there: Schneider and G. Kittel and especially H. Kittel.
VI. Hellenization and Actualization of the Bible in the Septuagint

1. Forms of Hellenization in the LXX

So far, an attempt has been made at surveying the philological problems in the LXX; it remains to examine the religious-historical issue, very much in the center of modern LXX research. As a document of life in the Alexandrian Jewish community of the Hellenistic period the LXX is of very special value. By means of the translation the word of the Bible was transposed into an entirely different world of concepts and notions. The modern scholar is intrigued by the question in how far the Greek text aroused associations for the authors of the LXX, and its first readers-hearers differing from those which the legislator, prophets, psalmists and wise men wanted to kindle in the mind of their contemporaries through the original Hebrew word.\(^{114}\)

Dealing with this problem involves two unknown factors. On the one hand we have to remember – a fact too often lost sight of – that what we nowadays designate as the basic meaning or the association of the original Hebrew word is in many instances no more than the outcome of modern philological and begriffsgeschichtliche methods of research, by no means beyond doubt or above the transitoriness of any given stage of research.\(^{115}\) On the other hand, the degrees of awareness at work during the process of reproducing the Hebrew text in a Greek version are very different; thus, the modern researcher aided by the whole apparatus of historical philology, on coming to outline the world of concepts of the translators, is at the risk of reading into the translation more than it actually contains.

In many cases it is, of course, possible to delineate the differences between the associations of the Greek translation and those pertaining to the original Hebrew text. On trying to classify these differences in a global way, progressing from
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\(^{114}\)See: A. Deissmann, "Die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus," NfB 17 (1903) 161-177, which appeared in Leipzig in the same year as a separate study. It should be reckoned as a classic in the field of the history of religion, even if over-estimating the process of Hellenization.

\(^{115}\)Even van Leeuwen's beautiful study (above, n. 2) did not, in my opinion, escape the danger of overrating the measure of associations a Hebrew word evokes in someone living in biblical and Hellenistic times.
lower to higher degrees of awareness during the process of translation, we would end up with three categories: semantic, sociological and dogmatic.

a. The translator whose mother tongue was the abstractive Greek often failed to understand the hyper-concrete Hebrew text; or in other cases he attained a greater refinement and subtlety in his Greek rendering. A few examples out of a multitude: In Hebrew the concept of iniquity and punishment are fused into one. The moment the sin has been committed, it towers over the sinner in the shape of threatening disaster. Thus Num 32:23 reads: "and know your sin that will overtake you". The translation into Greek necessitated a change: γνώσεσθε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἡμῶν ἐπὶ ἡμᾶς καταλήψῃ τὰ κακά. The Hebrew root יַעַבַּד designates to "become accustomed to." "So that they will get accustomed to fear me" (Deut 4:10) reads in translation: "so that they will learn (ὅπως μάθωσιν) to fear me"; the specific Greek problem whether virtue is learnable (μάθησις) unwittingly comes to mind. The Hebrew יָבָנ as a construct before a collective noun denotes the belonging to a certain genus. άνθρωπος, mankind, characterizes man in general, as well as the single man, the insignificant creature as opposed to all that is godly; when translated into Greek as θεός ἄνθρωπον the son of man, we witness a process of individualization, the like of which, in scope and time, is unimaginable in Hebrew.\footnote{See: L. Baeck, "Der Menschensohn," MGWJ 81 (1937) 12-24; also published in: Aus drei Jahrtausenden (Berlin 1938).}

b. Deissmann pointed out that many of the terms used by the translators are not only frequent in the papyri, but do have a specific technical meaning. By using these technical terms the translators attained, more or less consciously, a transposition from the ancient biblical into the Hellenistic atmosphere. Isa 19:2 relates the inner strife among the cities and kingdoms of Egypt; in the LXX we are transferred into the sphere of the Ptolemaic division into districts by means of: πόλις ἐπὶ πόλιν καὶ νόμος ἐπὶ νόμου. The taskmasters of Exod 5:6, 10 and 13 are transformed into the ἐργοδόται, those in charge of the forced labor of Hellenistic Egypt; it may even be that their function was similar to that of their ancient Egyptian example. The impact of the word ἀντιλήμπτορ, a favorite with the LXX when rendering images and words denoting God as a 'refuge' – mainly in the Psalms – is fully realized on reading in a papyrus that the supplicants address the king and queen καταφυγή and ἀντιλήμπτορ. Recently, Ziegler has
collected from the LXX of Isaiah a series of terms borrowed from the realms of agriculture, handicraft, and mainly of the judiciary, commenting "Viele Ausdrücke und Wiedergaben sind erst vom alexandrinischen Hintergrunde aus recht verständlich und enthalten dadurch eine schärfere begriffliche Bestimmung".\textsuperscript{117}

c. In not a few cases, however, it was not merely the more or less inadvertent factors of semantic and sociological nature which led the translators, but conscious dogmatic considerations, some of these bearing an apologetical character. A noteworthy sample of apologetics are the Alexandrian additions to the Palestinian translation of the book of Esther. Haman as the prosecutor of the Jews is οἱ Μαχαδάν. The insertion, after 3:13, of the edict prepared by the Persian king aiming at the extinction of the Jews, includes a justification of all the Hellenistic accusations against the Jews: separatism, misanthropy, and political infidelity – each of these is withdrawn in the second inserted letter of the king (after 8:12), siding with the Jews against Haman.\textsuperscript{118} The Jews living in the Hellenistic milieu were constantly accused of disregard of the Greek gods. The translator who rendered Exod 22:27, "you shall not revile God" by θεος οὐ κατολογήσεις, intended to ward off such an accusation.\textsuperscript{118a} His tendency gains clarity on reading in Prov 27:13: "take it as a pledge [for he stood surely] for an unfamiliar woman"

\textsuperscript{117} A. Deissmann, 
Bibelstudien (Marburg 1895); idem, Neue Bibelstudien (Marburg 1897); idem, Licht vom Osten (Tübingen 1923); J. Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Isaias (AA XII:3; Münster 1934) 175ff. (the quotation is on p. 178).


\textsuperscript{118a} Josephus, Antiquitates IV 8:10, 14 (ed. Niese §§201, 215) offers a twofold commentary on Exod 22:27: the prohibition against cursing deities of other poliēs and the prohibition of cursing people who are οἱ δικαστες λαχώντες τας πόλεις. In general, more could be said about the echo of the Alexandrian midrash in Josephus and Philo - who inspite of Belkin did not seem to have known Hebrew - and about the way Philo drew theological conclusions from the text of the LXX. Here we shall only remark that Philo (De Spec. Leg. I 199) in concurrence with the LXX ad Lev 1:5 mentions the halakah by which the sacrifices are made by priests. The faulty rendering in the LXX of I Sam 1:15 (above, p. 212) by γυνὴ δὲ σκληρά ἡμέρα ἐγὼ εἶμι (in which ἡμέρα = θν = πν) induces Philo (De Ebrietate XXXVI) to introduce a typical Hellenistic digression on virtue, the beginnings of which are rough and painful but which ends in meekness – he does not fail to quote Hesiodus!}
translated as ἴδρυσθήσθαι τὰ ἄλλατρα λαμβάνεται. A similar motivation is at
the root of using δαίμονιν when indicating evil spirits etc., avoiding the use of
the ancient Greek δαιμόνιον, which was too imbued with positive religious content,
especially in the Alexandrian surroundings where the Ἄγιον δαίμονιν was
revered. At times the considerations are not of a direct, apologetic nature, the
reason for a change being the translator’s monotheistic scruples at using religious
terms taken from pagan surroundings to denote biblical concepts. Thus the temple
is never designated ἱερὸν, but always ἅγιον; an altar consecrated to the Lord is
θυσιαστήριον and not βύσμος.

2. Hellenistic theology of the LXX

Herewith we reach the question of whether it is possible to reconstruct a theology
of the LXX. In the nature of things we touch here upon great difficulties. A
deductive method cannot be followed, as for the centuries in which the LXX came
into being we have no external witnesses of Jewish Hellenistic life and thought.
The LXX itself is a conglomeration of translations by many and varied an author.
Its commitment to the Vorlage, which no translation can ever completely repudiate,
will always, somewhat, disqualify it as a document of an independent theology.
Moreover, many of the high-standard discourses about the theology of the
LXX have not entirely escaped the danger of finding in the translation more than
the translators intended. Most of these studies were written by New Testament
scholars, their main interest being the question of to what degree the LXX paved
the way for early Christian thought. However, when the translators theo-
logized, theirs was a Jewish theology. This is why the impressive, almost inex-
hauisable monographic treatments in the Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen
Testament dealing with the transition of meaning from Hebrew imagery to Hel-
lenistic, often tend to ascribe to the translators theologoumena of which these
were certainly unaware. This is the case with the studies, excellent in many re-
spects, of Georg Bertram. Modern scholars have constructed these theologoumena
from the point of view of the ancient Christian sphere of thought. Flashar, who
regrettably died young, pointed out years ago that “was (die Übersetzer) in der
Übersetzung zum Ausdruck bringen wollten etwas ganz Anderes gewesen sein kann

119 A more or less programmatic study is: G. Bertram, “Septuaginta und Urchristentum,”
ThBI 4 (1925) 208-213.
als das was heidnische und später christliche Griechen aus ihr herauslasen".\footnote{A study of special value is: M. Flashar, "Exegetische Studien zum Septuaginta-psalter," ZAW 32 (1912) 90.}

This endeavor at culling that which the authors of the translation had in mind from that which later Jewish, pagan or Christian thought read into it, should be accepted as the only basis on which a reconstruction of the theology of the LXX is at all feasible. The representation of the theology of the translators has to be classified – as should any Jewish theology – around the concepts: God, Israel, comprising the Messianic idea as a national redemptive force, and the Torah.\footnote{On God, Israel and Torah, as the three fundamental concepts inherent to Jewish theology see: M. Kadushin, The Theology of Seder Eliyahu (New York 1932); idem, Organic Thinking (New York 1938).}

Due to limitations of space I can do no more than select few issues out of the material collected around those notions.

a. God – The chasm between the one and only God and any idolatry is as deep and unbridgeable in the Greek text of the LXX as in the Hebrew original. For no less than fourteen concepts denoting idol-worship the LXX chooses εἰδείκεν as translation, which already in early Greek was used as synonymous to νεῦδος. Plato consciously sets it as against εἰδέα and παράδειγμα designating the unreal, the non-existing.

Still, the concrete biblical concept of God undergoes a certain philosophizing abstraction. The rendering of the divine name by ὁ ὄν prepares the ground for the later Hellenistic discourse in Sap. Sal. 13:1ff.\footnote{am not certain that it is right to eliminate ὁ ὄν in Jer 1:6; 14:13; 39:17 (MT 32:17) per consectutam as done by Rahlfis. The question remains whether Rahlfis' constitution textus, though based on a command of the entire text-critical material which compels admiration, sufficiently takes into account religio-historical factors in all cases; this with reference to his selection of variants in Jer 3:19 (see infra).}

The avoidance of anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms is also characteristic of the LXX. The frequent metaphor of God as rock or stone is nowhere translated verbatim; this may be partly rooted in the apologetic endeavor to shun even the semblance of approval of stone worship.\footnote{See: M. Flashar, "Exegetische Studien zum LXX-Psalter," ZAW 32 (1912) 81-116, 161-189, 241-268; G. Bertram, "Der Sprachschatz der Septuaginta und der des hebräischen Alten Testaments," ZAW 57 (1939) 85-101.} The daring metaphor in Isa 8:14 calling God "a stone men
strike against, a rock men stumble over” for the apostate Israel, has a negation added to it in the LXX, besides which the verse has been drastically restated. In Job 14:15, “You would set your heart on your handiwork” was rendered: “do not disdain your handiwork”. In the tremendous struggle between the image of a God who is exalted and the God who is nearby and familiar, interweaving Jewish history from the Bible through Hassidism, the transformations in the LXX enhance the remoteness. As a result of this the bond between God and history, so characteristic of biblical thought, is somewhat undermined in the LXX. For the prophet and the psalmist “the deeds of the Lord” are nothing else but His intervention in history; not so for the Hellenistic translator. In Ps 90(89):16 the LXX transposed: “Let your deeds be seen by your servants” into: “Look onto your deeds and your servants”. In the Hebrew text of Isa 41:11f. the Lord of history calls upon Cyrus who strikes down the kings of the earth; in the LXX ad loc. God calls upon righteousness and sets it before the nations so that the astonished kings throw down their weapons.

Hence, we attend some insight into the shift in the concept of revelation in the LXX. In the Bible the concept was of an absolute theocentric nature; in Hellenistic Judaism, under the influence of the Greek mind, the concept almost unwittingly takes on an additional, anthropocentric facet. When rendering biblical concepts denoting any form of divine revelation the LXX occasionally uses παιδεία; a characteristic example is Am 3:7 where God reveals his παιδεία to his servants the prophets. In other cases the LXX uses terms which reflect the religious experience of man. Certain ethical terms, ἀλήθεια, ἔλεος, δικαιοσύνη attain a more or less religious significance. The rendition of Ps 83(84):12 in the LXX as ὧτι ἔλεον καὶ ἀλήθειαν ἀγαπᾷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς differs greatly from the Hebrew text! Side by side with this ethical notion of religion stands the numinous, for which the terms φόβος, θεόμα and ἔκστασις are used. This last term obtains twenty four times, rendering eleven Hebrew words; ἔξιστανεi sixty-five times for thirty Hebrew

124 See: J. Hempel, Gott und Mensch im Alten Testament (BWAT III.22; Stuttgart 1936); as against this cf. the fine argumentation of: O. Wolfsberg, Zur Zeit- und Geistesgeschichte des Judentums (Zürich 1938) 132ff.
words. This clearly reflects the creative power of the theology of the translators.\footnote{125 G. Bertram, "Der Begriff Religion in der Septuaginta," ZDMG 87 (1934) 1-5; \textit{idem}, "Der Begriff Erziehung in der Griechischen Bibel," in: \textit{Imago Dei} (Giessen 1932) 33-51; \textit{idem}, "Die religiöse Umdeutung altorientalischer Lebensweisheit in der griechischen Übersetzung des Alten Testaments," ZAW 54 (1936) 153-167.}

\textit{b. Israel –} The self-consciousness of the Alexandrian Jews in their foreign surroundings found its scriptural conformation in the translation \textit{λαὸς} which obtains somewhat more frequently than the corresponding \textit{םע} in the MT; \textit{λαὸς} is used to indicate God’s people as opposed to \textit{יִשְׂרָאֵל}. \textit{λαὸς} had a lofty, almost sacred connotation, reminiscent of the \textit{ἔος}. It is noteworthy that in non-religious usage \textit{Ἰουδαῖος}, denoting the nation, is superseded by \textit{Ἰουδαῖοι}; a comparison between the Alexandrian II Maccabees and the Palestinian I Maccabees brings this to light most clearly.\footnote{126 H. Strathmann, in: \textit{Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament}, IV (Stuttgart 1938) 35 s.v. \textit{λαὸς}; K. G. Kuhn, \textit{ibid.}, III (1938) 361ff, s.v. \textit{Ἰουδαῖος}.}

The new associations which the LXX introduced into the concept Israel is mainly due to the translators’ awareness of being in the diaspora. A number of Hebrew words expressing calamity and divine judgement are replaced in the LXX by the concept diaspora: "So hat die LXX den furchtbaren Ernst aller hebräischen Ausdrücke die das göttliche Strafgericht über Israel schonungslos aufdecken mit dem Schleier des Wortes Diaspora verhüllt".\footnote{127 \textit{יוֹדֵד יִבְשַׂש תַּלְדֵּט מֵאָדָּת רְקָמִיָּה סְאוֹתִיסְטַא}} It may well be that this tendency is expressed in the rendition of Isa 1:27: \textit{זֶרֶד יבשׂש תַלְדֵּט רְקָמִיָּה סְאוֹתִיסְטַא}. The awareness of mission of the diaspora Jewry is so forceful, that it may almost be conceived of as a Messianic ideal of Hellenistic piety. Bertram has on various occasions collected readings in which the LXX expresses this ideal without there being as much as a hint of it in the MT;\footnote{128 G. Bertram, in G. Rosen, ed., \textit{Juden und Phönikier} (Tübingen 1929); for a summary see: "Zur Bedeutung der Septuaginta usw.," \textit{Klio} 21 (1927) 444ff.} however, he omitted to mention some other such readings. At times, the feeling of Israel’s apostolate among the nations is expressed as for example in Jer 3:19 \textit{τάξον σε εἰς Θεόν} (the \textit{εἰς τέκνα} of codex A would be a correction following the MT); cf Isa 49:6; Mal 2:9. On other occasions the expectation that the pagans will seek out the Jewish nation and their God is interpolated; as, for example, in
Am 9:12 and Isa 54:15, ἰδοὺ προσήλυτοι προσελέφυγονταί σοι δὲ ἐμὸν καὶ ἐπὶ σὲ καταφεύγονται. Possibly even more striking is Isa 41:25: in the MT we read that Cyrus is roused to invoke God's name. The LXX translates: "From North and East I rouse those who will be called by my name". Besides this awareness of mission we find touching expressions of longings for Zion: the rendition of Isa 18:4 is: "Confidence will be in my city" and Ps 55(56):1, where the LXX reads "for the nation that dwells away from the shrine", may be quoted as a sounding witness. Both national and universal elements of biblical eschatology are independently elaborated upon by the LXX. In Isa 43:15 the LXX, deviating from the Hebrew text, speaks about the dominion of Israel over the nations. Lately, van Leeuwen has shown, in an engaging way, how the LXX in instances such as Exod 15:3 and Isa 42:13 inserts into the text visions of συντριβένον πόλειον, God's stopping all wars in a gigantic struggle at the end of the days – without any support of, or even in direct contradiction with, the Hebrew text.129

c. Torah – An inter-crossing between universalism and nationalism similar to the one we found in the interpretation of the concept Israel is perceptible in the notion Torah. Dan 9:6 serves a good example of how, by means of very minor shifts in the translation, a universal meaning was attained. In the MT the prophets spoke ἵνα εἴη ἡ λαοῦ τῆς γῆς; Theodotion renders: πρὸς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τῆς γῆς; the LXX reads: παντί ἔθει οἱ τῆς γῆς.

The significance of Torah for the Jewish community is obvious from another phenomenon of immense import, namely that Torah has become νόμος throughout the LXX: that which is learned turns law. Noteworthy is the fact that in Psalms about fifteen expressions for wickedness and impiety are translated by ἀνομία; the criterion of devoutness is obedience to God's revealed will.130

3. Actualization of the Bible in the LXX

The LXX itself, as a whole, is an impressive witness of this phenomenon, itself originating out of the very need to make the revealed word of God accessible to the post-biblical Jewish community. And hereby we have reached an aspect of

129 Van Leeuwen (above, n. 2) 24-29.
the LXX of which we want to give a brief sketch as continuation and completion of the discussion about the Hellenization of Jewish theology in the LXX. As we have seen, this Hellenization often was an actualization: Biblical concepts of an originally different nuance were assimilated by the sphere of Hellenism. Such an actualization did not relate to general tenets and theological views alone, but foremost to the religious praxis and the homilies of Judaism. The Targumic character which the LXX evinces (as discussed in section II) enables us to trace to what extent the LXX mirrors certain stages in religious praxis and homiletic sermons. Besides, through comparison with the oldest Palestinian exegesis the nature and degree of hellenization in the LXX may be established with greater exactitude than was possible in the previous paragraph.

In section III we have already seen that the Targumim originated out of the oldest homilies in the synagogues. They were most certainly imbued with the awe due to the Holy writ. At the same time, however, they tried to actualize it. This was done by commenting on the scripture, as well as by the application of the precepts obtaining in the text to practical day-to-day life (halakham midrash) and through theological reflections on the significance of biblical thought for modern times (aggadic midrash).

The LXX, indeed, offers a great deal of proof for both: the actualization of the commands in the Torah, as well as of theological historic cogitations interwoven into the translation bearing upon it. The problem which presents itself at this point is: Is there any theological or historical cohesion between the Palestinian halakhah and aggada and that of Alexandria? In other words: May we expect to find the mode of life and thought which is reflected in the Palestinian midrash in the paraphrases of the LXX?

A positive answer to this question has been offered by Zacharias Frankel. In innovative writings, he claimed to have detected a far-reaching agreement between Palestinian and Alexandrian exegesis. His views have been followed by a number of scholars. Against Frankel's view, J. Freudenthal postulated the existence of an independent Hellenistic midrash, developed in Alexandria, not at

---

all or hardly influenced by Palestine, but rather expressing the adaptation of the commands of the Torah to the Jewish-Hellenistic thought of the Diaspora. Freudenthal's views were also taken up by later authors.\footnote{J. Freudenthal, Hellenistische Studien I-II (Breslau 1875). Braun opens perspectives for a continuation of this fine pioneering study in the larger context of the Hellenistic history of literature, see: M. Braun, History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature (Oxford 1938) 26-31. In conscious reaction to the views of Ritter (cf. previous note), see: I. Heinemann, Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung (Breslau 1932); idem, "Die Lehre vom ungeschriebenen Gesetz im jüdischen Schrifttum," HUCA 4 (1927) 149-171; L. Baeck, Griechische und jüdische Predigt (Berlin 1914), published also in: Aus drei Jahrtausenden (Berlin 1938); see specially p. 147. Baeck points out that in the comparison of the Palestinian and Alexandrian traditions Hellenization of the Palestinian tradition should be taken into account. I think that he overrates this Hellenisation. [See also: J. Freudenthal, Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft (Breslau 1869); E. Stein, "Ein Jüdisch-hellenistischer Midrach über den Auszug aus Ägypten," MGWJ 78 (1934) 558-575; G. Allon, "בלק" אל ההלכות של פיסוק תרביץ 5 (1934) 28-36; 241-246; 6 (1935) 30-37, 452-459.]}\footnote{See lately: M. Weinberg, מتحضيرים למדרש (Berlin 1937/8) 65-68. Several of the examples are taken from Frankel's studies.} Although certain parallels between Palestinian and Alexandrian exegesis can be indicated, I incline towards the suggestions offered by Freudenthal. Such an attitude is, in my opinion, supported in the first place by the total un-Palestinian midrash which we encounter in its latest and most developed form in the writings of Philo, secondly by the remarkable typical Alexandrian, midrashic preaching which Sapiensia Salomonis links up with the biblical narration, and finally by the very nature of midrash actualization in the LXX itself. A number of examples of such actualizing digressions were hinted at in section III 3 c, where we indicated that the origin of the synagogal homilies – in both Alexandria and Palestine – is to be looked for in a comparison of Bible verses. A few more examples will be adduced here. The LXX of Exod 22:4,\footnote{Braun provides an important insight into the actualization of the word of the Torah: the very same danger which the cult prostitution of the} dealing with the law of restitution for a grazed field or vineyard, reflects a ruling diverging from the Palestinian halakhah but is in agreement with the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Deut 23:18 states the prohibition of cult prostitution; the LXX ad loc. adds a warning against initiation into mysteries; this addition is a typical Hellenistic halakhah as well as a magnificent example of actualization of the word of the Torah: the very same danger which the cult prostitution of the
fertility rites had once represented for Israel in Canaan is now for the Jews of Alexandria constituted by the Hellenistic mysteries. This is most obvious in Sap Sal 14:15 and 23. When Lev 21:13, as the result of a corrupt translation, prescribes that a priest can only marry the daughter of a priestly family, this is a halakhah that has no pendant, at least not in Palestinian halakhic literature. The Palestinian tradition by which a layman (a non-priest) who brings a sacrifice may slaughter it himself, is excluded as a result of a grammatical construction in the translation of Lev 1:15 (cf. already 1 Chron 15:26 as parallel to 2 Sam 6:13). Examples taken from the realms of philosophy and historiography are perhaps even more interesting. The translation of Exod 24:11 יָאָה אֲדָלִילוֹ בָּנִי נוֹרַי אֲלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הָלַחְיָה וַיְהִֽוֹ אֱלֹהִֽים׃ - כִּי כִּי הַקָּרָאָה הַיְּהוָה, הָגֲרַנְחֵה שָׁם הָגֲרַנָּה לָשׁוֹנָה וְיֶשִּׂרְאֵל הָלַחְיָה וַיְהִֽוֹ אֱלֹהִֽים׃ 134 obviously derives from a sermon in the Alexandrian synagogue aiming at glorifying the inspired origin of the LXX. Occasionally, detailed discourses are echoed in the translation through a single word: Gen 5:24 describing Enoch's demise - וַיִּהְדָּעֵת אֱלֹהִים כִּי לֹא לְקָח אֱלֹהִים אֶלְוָיָה, - יָרֵא הֶהָדָא אֱלֹהִים - betrays speculations as to Enoch's migration through heaven and earth.

In Jer 38(31):8 the future redemption of the Jewish people is removed to the feast of deliverance from Egypt, Passover - a notion known in Palestine as well. The Messianic prophecy of Isa 11:16: "Thus there shall be a highway for the rest of his people out of Assyria" is actualized in a touching way in the LXX rendition: "And there shall be a road to the remainder of my people out of Egypt". Isa 19:25 reads: "Blessed be my people Egypt, my handiwork Assyria and my own Israel"; the LXX renders: "Blessed be my people who is in Egypt and who is in Assyria". It would certainly be worthwhile to examine whether and to what extent the translators, when freely reproducing the Messianic prophecies by an idyllic model, as for example in Am 9:13, were influenced by Alexandrian-Hellenistic poetry. It may well be that the difficult and very unusual reading of Isa 14:19-20 can be explained as a midrashic attempt towards actualization: הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִים לֵא הָיוָה אָנָן בּוֹכָה מְעָנָה - צִוֵּהּ הַמּוֹרְכָּא מַכְרִם - 134See: H. St. J. Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship (London 1921) 12.
The translation of the second part discloses a striking example of actualization. The obvious similarity with Dan 9:2; 11:30, 36, 40 and Isa 8:8; 10:13-15, 23, 25; [17:12]; 37:22ff and Num 24:24, points to the fact that the Seleucid King Antiochus Epiphanes – who held himself king of Asia, Assyria and Babylon – when he conquered Jerusalem and became oppressor of the Jews, was identified with the ancient kings of Assyria and Babylon against whom classical prophecies were aimed. Similarly, in I Macc 7:41 and II Macc 8:19 he is likened to Sennacherib. From II Macc 15:22ff we learn that the Jews of the diaspora were familiar with this comparison and I assume that in the LXX on Isa 14:20 we have an allusion to Antiochus Epiphanes. Support for this assumption I find in the conspicuous fact that יִמְלָכָה, in all other instances in which it stands for earth or world, is always translated as γή; however, in Isa 10, 13, 14 and 37 (and so in 23-24), which refer to the world-embracing dominion of the Assyrian-Babylonian king, the rendition is always actualized into οἰκουμένη; not so in Jer 50 which lacks the midrash motif; besides these cases the rendering is found only once more, in another instance depicting an ideal ruler of the world: Ps 71(72):8!

In the above we have mentioned in passing Rost’s theory according to which the term εἰκάζει in the Pentateuch had been consistently replaced by συναγωγή. The religious Jewish community which called itself συναγωγή, wanted – as Rost writes – to proclaim itself as “Empfängerin des Gesetzes...die magna charta des Spätjudentums für die Existenz als selbständige Religionsge-

135See: W. Kolbe, Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte (Stuttgart 1926) 148. Kolbe concludes from the correspondence between I Macc 7:40 and II Macc 15:22ff. that Jason of Cyrene influenced I Macc. This conclusion is incorrect, since we are dealing with a midrashic tradition which, as appears from Daniel, came into existence during the religious persecutions. For a midrashic tradition about Antiochus Epiphanes (though in a different context) see: L. Finkelstein, “The Oldest Midrash,” HTkr 31 (1938) 299ff. For an entirely different exegesis of Isa 14:20, see: Ziegler, Untersuchungen (above, n. 54) 94-95. [In my discussion of Isa 14:19-20 I failed to adduce the strongest argument: in the MT v. 19 we read about the King of Babylon: מִלָּכָה תֶּשֶׁלֶם; the LXX renders: μυσή έν τοίς δρέαν, an inexplicable reading were it not for II Macc 9:28, which says about Antiochus Epiphanes: ὁ μὲν οὖν ἀνδροφόνος καὶ βλάσφημος τὰ χειρὶστα παθῶν... εἰς δρέας έν τοίς δρέαν οἰκίστε μόρφ καταστρεφον τὸν βιον. From this it appears that death έν τοίς δρέασιν was a standard motif in the current paranletic meditations about the end of the ἀνδροφόνος καὶ βλάσφημος Antiochus Epiphanes.]
meinschaft". It seems to me that my exposition supports Rost's hypothesis. The origin of the LXX was in the synagogue, and its uses in synagogal homilies and sermons allows us to qualify it as a Targum; its exegesis is that of the midrash and the very essence of true midrash is actualization. The LXX is a testimony to the awareness which obviously was alive in Alexandrian Jewry: the covenant which God established with the Fathers is daily renewed with him who devotedly studies His word. From the Bible the voice of God is daily perceivable anew.

Amsterdam, 30 Oct. 1940