

Bible and Computer. The Stellenbosch AIBI-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique "From Alpha to Byte". University of Stellenbosch 17-21 July, 2000. Johann Cook (ed.). Brill, Leiden/Boston: 2002 pp. 337-364.

A NEW PARADIGM FOR ADDRESSING OLD QUESTIONS:
THE RELEVANCE OF THE INTERLINEAR MODEL FOR THE STUDY
OF THE SEPTUAGINT

Albert Pietersma (Toronto)¹

ABSTRACT:

It is argued in this essay that the interlinear paradigm for Septuagint origins (1) articulates wide-spread practice in the discipline, (2) fully accounts for the linguistic character of the vast majority of translated texts, (3) can be seen to be firmly rooted in Hellenistic educational practice, and (4) strongly suggests a Jewish educational rather than a liturgical origin for most of the translated corpus.

1. INTRODUCTION

When Professor Cook invited me to give the present address, my initial response was that since this conference has been convened for the purpose of focusing on "The Bible and *Computers*," and since I cannot claim to have special expertise in computers, I told him that I could not in good conscience accept his invitation. When he, however, pointed out that the theme of the conference is "The *Bible* and Computers" and that I do claim some expertise at least in the Greek Bible, I happily relented, the more since it is my understanding that computers have not yet declared their independence from human direction. As a result, before one can give such direction one needs to know *what* one wants to know.

2. THE NETS TRANSLATION PARADIGM

The first fascicle of *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS) is about to come off the press. A project which had been on the mind of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (IOSCS) virtually since its inception was finally begun in earnest in 1995 and its first-

¹ This contribution is the result of my stay at the Department of Ancient Studies of the University of Stellenbosch as Visiting Professor and guest of Prof. Johann Cook. I thank the National Research Foundation for the research fellowship that made the visit possible.

fruit is about to appear. A sequel to NETS, namely a commentary series on the entire corpus, was formally sponsored by the IOSCS in 1999. It is not my purpose in this paper to give a detailed account of these two projects. For that I can refer you to the websites of the IOSCS as well as of NETS, and to items in a number of recent issues of the Bulletin of the IOSCS. Rather, it is my present purpose to discuss the *translational paradigm* that undergirds both projects, and which, I believe, has some important ramifications for the discipline as a whole. I am referring to what is becoming known as the *interlinear paradigm* of Septuagint origins. I should add that this model or paradigm was not something with which the project(s) started, though its ingredients were in place from the beginning, but which seemed to emerge as, especially my students and I, discussed and debated the thorny issues of translating an ancient translation into a modern language.²

2.1 Why a paradigm?

One might, of course, begin by asking a very simple and basic question: Why should one have a paradigm or model at all? While it is true that both the hard sciences and the social sciences routinely construct explanatory models that can accommodate the data under study, the so-called humanities (or *human* in distinction from *natural* sciences), it seems to me, have been less inclined to do so.³ If that is indeed the case, the reason may be that many of the humanities disciplines we as students of the Bible are engaged in, for instance text criticism and translation work, are typically viewed as a not infelicitous hybrid of both science and art. I myself, I confess, have used this description of my own work as a Septuagintalist. Recently, however, Gideon Toury in a book in which he argues for the full-fledged scientific status of translation studies, has had this to say,

Sciences *qua* sciences are characterized by an incessant quest for laws, i.e. theoretical formulations purporting to state the relations between all variables which have been found relevant to a particular domain. In fact, "while the nature of these 'laws', their status and the norms for their formulation, accessibility and acceptability may well have changed throughout history, getting them in the first place has remained an unchanged goal. No scientific activity, indeed no 'theory', is conceivable without them" (Even-Zohar 1986: 75).⁴

While I am not—at least, not yet—prepared to give up describing what I do as both science *and* art, particularly because it allows me to be both scientist

² I am especially indebted to Cameron Boyd-Taylor, without whose help the model might never have emerged. See now his article (1998:71-105).

³ As Even-Zohar (1986:75) points out (see next note) the marked contrast between "the sciences" and "the humanities" is an especially Anglo-American phenomenon and is not made in most other languages.

⁴ Gideon Toury (1995:229) and Itamar Even-Zohar (1986:75-79).

and artist, I am increasingly inclined to think that Septuagint studies, like translation studies might benefit not only from the formulation of 'laws', something more than mere rules of thumb, but also from a more fully articulated paradigm or model as an explanatory framework for the nature of the text, and by extension its likely origin. I am quite aware, of course, that in constructing such an explanatory model one necessarily works in opposite directions at the same time. That is to say, one works deductively from the hypothesized paradigm and one works inductively from the details of the text, with the overall aim to make the two mutually complementary. As I mentioned earlier, that is exactly how the interlinear paradigm emerged in the process of the NETS translation.

2.2 *Implicit versus explicit paradigm*

If it be true, as I believe, that scientific study occurs within an explanatory frame, i.e. a paradigm of some sort, it follows that in Septuagint studies, as in other disciplines, one can essentially speak of only two kinds of paradigm, namely, the articulated variety and the unarticulated variety, with of course several degrees of both in between.⁵

2.3 *Origins versus reception history*

But before I turn to the text-linguistic nature of the Septuagint and then move on to posing the socio-linguistic question as to its likely origins, I must signal a distinction which is fundamental to the interlinear paradigm, the NETS translation, as well as to the projected commentary series. The distinction is that between the *Sitz im Leben* or the constitutive character of the Septuagint, on the one hand, and its reception history, or history of interpretation, on the other hand. It is this distinction, as I see it, that underlies Barr's argumentation in his book *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (1983) and which he more explicitly states in his response to David Hill's criticism of his book. Barr there writes,

He [Hill] does not make the obvious and necessary distinction between two sets of mental processes, those of the translators themselves, whose decisions about meaning were reached from the Hebrew text, and those of later readers, most of whom did not know the original⁶

Or to cite the general introduction to the NETS translation,

. . . just as the [textual] *form* of the original text differed [in principle] from its later textual descendants, so what the original

⁵ Cf. A Aejmelaeus (1996). What she notes there about the importance of a mental image one has of a translator applies equally to a paradigm. See also A van der Kooij (1998:214-29). See also Van der Kooij (2000:369).

⁶ James Barr (1968:379). See also Jonathan Smith (1990:79)

translator thought his text to *mean* differed [in principle] from what later interpreters thought the text to mean (Pietersma 2000:x).

3. A NEW PARADIGM FOR SEPTUAGINT ORIGINS

It should, therefore, be clear from the outset that, when I speak of the interlinear paradigm, I am speaking of the birth of the Septuagint, i.e. its original *Sitz im Leben*, and not about subsequent history and subsequent *Sitze im Leben* assigned to this body of literature. I should also like to make it clear that, in my judgment, the central thrust of the Letter of Aristeas, namely, the independence of the Septuagint *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew, is not a statement about its origins but about its subsequent history. More particularly, Aristeas claims an authoritative status for the Septuagint on a par with the Hebrew original.

3.1 *The Septuagint and NT studies*

James Barr and more recently Jonathan Smith in his book *Drudgery Divine*⁷ complain that much of New Testament scholarship which seeks to demonstrate the distinctiveness and even uniqueness of biblical thought does so by linguistic abuse of the Septuagint. The basic argument to which both take strong exception runs something like this: New Testament religious terminology derives not from contemporary Graeco-Roman usage but from the Septuagint, which in turn derives its own uniqueness from the Hebrew parent text rather than from the Hellenistic world in general. Though it is not my purpose directly to join this debate, I do think that the paradigm I am proposing sets out some important parameters.

3.2 *The nature of Septuagint Greek*

The linguistic nature of the Septuagint has been variously assessed, though all assessments, apart from occasionally suggestive terminology to the contrary,⁸ derive from one and the same paradigm, namely, the paradigm of the Septuagint as an independent, free-standing text, to whatever degree that particular paradigm might be articulated. In other words, no matter what its apparent deficiencies for such an independent purpose might be admitted to be, it was nevertheless *intended* to stand in for the original Hebrew, hence to take its place, as the letter of Aristeas argues.

⁷ See note 6.

⁸ See for example Hatch (1889:15) where he speaks of the Septuagint as "a targum or paraphrase" rather than a translation *per se*. One might similarly cite the famous Lagarde—Kahle controversy about Septuagint origins, though it is important to note that Kahle's targum-theory, while seeking to elucidate the LXX's reputed origins, effectively ignores the text as we have it. Furthermore, a liturgical origin is presupposed.

3.2.1. Assessments of early scholars

Even though there is broadly-based scholarly consensus on the linguistic nature of the Septuagint, attempts at explaining why Septuagint Greek is what it is show interesting diversity. Swete (1902) comments,

. . . the student can discern at a glance the gulf which divides its simple manner, half Semitic, half colloquial, from the easy command of idiomatic Greek manifested by the Alexandrian [Philo] exegete.⁹

Conybeare-Stock (1905:21) note that especially in its syntax the Greek of the Septuagint is often "hardly Greek at all, but rather Hebrew in disguise." Ottley (1920:174-176) comments upon "the flat bald surface of the Greek" of the Septuagint and the failure "to shape a telling sentence which may strike the ear and linger in the memory." To be sure, in recognition of work done by Deissmann and Moulton, Thackeray (1909) could write:

The old controversy between the Hebraist School who discovered Hebraisms in colloquial expressions, and the Purists who, endeavoured to bring every peculiarity under the strict rules of Attic grammar, has given way to a general recognition that the basis of the language of the Greek Bible is the vernacular employed throughout the whole Greek-speaking world since the time of Alexander the Great.¹⁰

Yet a few pages later he concludes,

Notwithstanding that certain so-called 'Hebraisms' have been removed from that category or that their claim to the title has become open to question, it is impossible to deny the existence of a strong Semitic influence in the Greek of the LXX.¹¹

3.2.2 More recent assessments

More recently Chaim Rabin (1968:1-26) in support of his dragoman theory of Septuagint origins, focuses on the Septuagint's word-for-word manner of translating, its penchant for transliteration and other such items, and then states,

⁹ H.B. Swete (1902:298). Though on the surface Swete is correct, linguists might rightly object that the difference is a matter of register rather than one of "dialect."

¹⁰ H.St.J. Thackeray (1909:26). For this controversy, begun in the Renaissance, see G.H.R. Horsley (1989:38), and more fully J Ros (1940).

¹¹ *Ibid.* Thackeray (*op. cit.*:29). It is, therefore, clear that Thackeray in no way denies the presence of Hebraisms in Septuagint Greek, but as Horsley (*op. cit.*:31) notes "Semitisms do not establish the existence of Jewish Greek".

Possibly our theory also provides at least a partial explanation for the most disturbing of all LXX features, the semitisms of its syntax.¹²

Still more recently (1995) Geoffrey Horrocks writes,

It was once thought that the considerable differences between the Greek of the Septuagint and the literary Greek of the mainstream tradition were due to Semitic substrate and translation effects, but while it is undeniable that, as a close translation of a sacred text, it embodies Hebraisms (especially where the obscurity or formulaic language of the original led to literalness), the analysis of the language of contemporary documents from Egypt has demonstrated conclusively that its general grammatical and lexical make-up is that of the ordinary, everyday written Greek of the times. It therefore constitutes an important source of information for the development of the language in the Hellenistic period, with the translation of the Pentateuch, for example, reflecting a very natural contemporary Koine [here H. makes reference to Thackeray (*op. cit.*:13)]. Certain other books, however, display a mechanical literalness (e.g. Lamentations), while others exemplify a spread ranging from near-vernacular (e.g. Tobit, from the Apocrypha) to consciously 'literary' (e.g. Esther, with 4 Maccabees being positively Atticizing)(Horrocks 1997:57).

Horrocks then cites an abridged version of 3 Rgns 18:17-21 as an example of 'normal' Koine style, and in his subsequent analysis of grammar and lexicon finds no phenomena that cannot be paralleled from non-translation Greek, with the possible exception of redundant *καί*. I can find no fault with Horrocks' conclusion, as far as it goes, and as far as he himself, I believe, intends it to go. That is to say, the vast majority of the lexical stock of the Septuagint is Koine stock, and the same, *mutatis mutandis*, is true for its grammar. Therefore, it must indeed be said that "[the] general grammatical and lexical make-up [of Septuagint Greek] is that of the ordinary, everyday written Greek of the times." And to the extent, that Horrocks registers opposition to the notion that the Septuagint was written in Jewish-Greek dialect, I would fully agree. But that conclusion scarcely takes us beyond what the earlier scholars I have cited were fully aware of. And even if we were to ignore the many transliterations of Hebrew (and Aramaic) words featured in the LXX, even if we were to set aside what Flashar called *Verlegenheitsübersetzungen*, i.e. purely mechanical translations of embarrassment, which presumably made no more contextual sense to the translator than they did to the reader, even if we were to overlook patently unidiomatic uses of prepositions and other structure words, we would still have to

¹² See also J Lust (1992:viii-xv).

account for its literal, formal-correspondence type of translation, as well as for what Thackeray, following J.H. Moulton, refers to as *over-working*. That is to say, the most prominent 'Hebraism' of the LXX consists in the excessive use of and "the special prominence given to certain correct, though unidiomatic, modes of speech, because they happen to coincide with Hebrew idioms." (Thackeray *op. cit.*:29) To be sure, as Gideon Toury argues, interference from the parent text is what one expects to find in translations, and in recognition of that likelihood he has formulated what he terms the law of interference.¹³ Since he insists that interference is a kind of default, the chief question to be answered is not *whether* interference has occurred in the process of translation but *what kind* of interference has occurred, and *how much* of it. Toury delineates two kinds of transfer that can be distinguished: (a) negative transfer, i.e. deviations from normal, codified practices of the target system, and (b) positive transfer, i.e. greater likelihood of selecting features which do exist and are used in any case. Precisely which kind of transfer or interference predominates in the Septuagint and just how much of both kinds can be identified is not a crucial question. That it occurs and that it occurs with sufficient frequency to call for an explanation remains the scholarly consensus, as I read it.

3.3 Theories of Septuagint origins

A number of theories have been offered to account for what may be called the residue of linguistic strangeness of Septuagint Greek. Thus Swete (*op. cit.*:299) already suggested that "the translators wr[o]te Greek largely as they doubtless spoke it," and Gehman developed this notion into a theory that the Septuagint had been written in the Jewish Greek dialect of Alexandria.¹⁴ The strangeness of the translated literature is consequently attributed not to the method of translating but to the *patois* spoken by Alexandrian Jews. Gehman's theory on Septuagint Greek has found little favour with scholars, which is not to say that the general existence of a Jewish Greek dialect has not attracted followers.

3.3.1. Rabin

Chaim Rabin believes that the mode of translation of the Septuagint can best be explained on the assumption that it was done by dragomen, known professional, literal, translators of business and legal documents. Though this theory, also endorsed recently by Arie van der Kooij,¹⁵ accounts for the

¹³ Gideon Toury (1995:275) "in translation, phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text".

¹⁴ Gehman (1951:81-90). For a critique see Brock (1967:31-32). The existence of Jewish Greek as a special dialect of Koine has been well discussed (and refuted) by Horsley (1989:5-40).

¹⁵ See note 5 above. Van der Kooij, however, believes that the translators were scribes and scholars, and thus associated with the academy.

so-called literalness of the LXX, and possibly in part (as Rabin himself states) for the semitisms of its syntax, it explains less easily the mechanical translations of embarrassment (Flashar's *Verlegensheitsübersetzungen*) and transliterations from the source language, particularly since, according to Rabin (1968:23-25), at least the oral dragoman tradition was not averse to omitting words or phrases, seeing that the main purpose was to get the message across. Yet in the end Rabin is forced to admit that "the experienced dragoman would of course learn when to deviate from the mechanical reproduction of the syntax of his source language in order to avoid misunderstandings." Since Septuagint translators show themselves as not having learned that lesson and hence would have to be labeled as inexperienced, and since intelligibility is in any case a relative matter, Rabin closes his argument with a favourable reference to Gehman's theory of a Jewish Alexandrian Greek, to the extent that the Jewish community must have been very tolerant of Hebraic Greek.¹⁶ Thus, as it would seem, the inexperienced LXX dragoman translator was made into an experienced one by Rabin's appeal to Jewish Greek.

3.3.2. Brock

In a series of articles over a period of more than ten years Sebastian Brock has developed the most elaborate and convincing theory accounting for the linguistic nature of the (translated) Septuagint, and at the same time has pointed in the direction of its likely origin, namely, education (Brock 1969; 1972; 1978 & 1992). Since I regard Brock's studies as propaedeutic to the interlinear paradigm and aim to show that he was more correct about Septuagint origins than he himself may have thought, I propose to deal with his views at some length, with a primary focus on his most recent article.

3.3.2.1. Antiquity's two modes of translation

As Brock shows from Cicero¹⁷ and Horace,¹⁸ Graeco-Roman antiquity was familiar with essentially two modes of translation, the practitioners of which took a widely differing approach to their text. The literary translator (Cicero's *orator*) translated his text as a piece of literature without being overly concerned with all the linguistic minutiae and intricacies of the source text, whereas the hack translator (Cicero's *interpres* and Horace's *fidus interpres*) produced slavish renderings of legal and business documents.

¹⁶ It should be emphasized, however, that such tolerance does not mean the existence of a Jewish Greek dialect. See also Brock (1972). One should also note that van der Kooij's view that the translators were, as Aristeas says, biblical scholars skilled in reading (the Hebrew), interpreting it, and in translating it (Van der Kooij 1999:376-77), though accounting well for what is felicitous and unproblematic in the Greek, falls short of explaining its infelicities, problems, conundra, and unintelligibilities. Yet a model must surely be able to accommodate *both* aspects. See also Barr's caution to which reference is made in footnote 5 above.

¹⁷ De optimo genere oratorum §14 and De finibus 3.15

¹⁸ Ars poetica 133.

Though both Cicero and Horace endorsed the *sensus de sensu* (i.e. literary) mode, as opposed to the literal *verbum e verbo* approach to translation, and some four centuries later Jerome¹⁹ does the same, Jerome does make a striking exception for the holy scriptures, since in the latter, says he, even the word order is a mystery. And so it happened, according to Brock, that the Ciceronian ideal of the translator as *orator* was replaced with the translator as *interpretes*. Why and when did the reversal of ideal come about? Brock argues that it began with the advent of biblical translation, hence as early as the third century BCE with the translation of the Pentateuch.

3.3.2.2. The two modes and the Greek Pentateuch

As proof that Cicero's radical distinction between literary and non-literary translation was already operative in the Hellenistic world, Brock refers, on the one hand, to the Aramaic-Greek Asoka edicts (from III BCE Kandahar)(Pugliese Carratelli and Garbini 1964) and the Demotic-Greek story of Tefnut (P. Lond. inv. 274)²⁰ and, on the other, to the word-for-word translations of legal documents in Egypt and government documents originating from Republican Rome (Sherk 1969). Brock then suggests that since the Pentateuch was both a legal and a literary text, the initial translators found themselves in a dilemma as to the appropriate style of translation to adopt. Essentially they decided in favour of the legal, literal mode (rather than the literary), and in so doing registered a deliberate choice in its favour, embarked on a task without precedent, and in turn established a precedent for future Bible translating. Brock then delineates two further motives for the translators' having taken the path they did. Astutely he notes the *raison d'être* of literal translations, namely, that of, as he phrases it, bringing the reader to the (original) text in distinction from bringing the (original) text to the reader (Brock 1978:73 & 1972:17). Inherent in this approach is the relative prestige of source and receptor languages. Thus, according to Brock, the translators were fully conscious of the fact that they were translating a sacred text, and it was to this sacred text that they set out to bring their readers. One might wonder, however, whether the question of prestige is not of a religious nature rather than linguistic. Brock sounds yet a further important note. In addition to citing legal and government documents as examples of the literal mode of translation, practiced already in Hellenistic times, he also refers to the bilingual (Latin>Greek) texts of Vergil, Cicero and others, known from the third to sixth centuries CE. That these schooltexts should have used a literal mode of translation, Brock deems self-evident. He writes,

¹⁹ Letter (57) to Pammachius.

²⁰ West (1969:161-83). For another possible example see Jerker Blomquist (1982:11-20), though the author sees some evidence of Lycian's influence on the Greek.

The bilingual Vergil papyri served the same purpose as schoolboy cribs and the more sophisticated, highly literal Latin translations employed today by some orientalist.²¹

But even though he rightly associates literal texts with the school-room and already in his second article suggests that an educational origin for the Septuagint might be more appropriate than a liturgical one and in spite of the fact that he writes,

despite the complete lack of any evidence about Jewish education in Egypt in this period [III BCE], it would seem only likely that the Pentateuch would have played a very similar role in Jewish education to that of Homer in Greek, and one can reverse the old aphorism that Homer was the Bible of the Greeks and say, probably with a considerably greater element of truth in fact, that the Bible . . . was the Homer of the Jews.²²

he stops short of arguing that the Septuagint originated in the school. Similarly, he duly notes the existence of the Latin>Greek bilingual educational texts. As I see it, Brock's reluctance to make an explicit connection between the school and Septuagint origins is due, in the main, to two considerations: (a) the Latin>Greek educational texts do not begin to appear earlier than the third century CE, and thus postdate the inception of the Pentateuch by some five centuries, and (b) the Septuagint as a religious document, yet translated in a 'legal' manner, is without precedent in an Egyptian context. Perhaps a third consideration played a role: in spite of Brock's observation that literal texts aim to bring the reader to the text, and thus play a patently subservient role *vis-à-vis* the source text, he nevertheless believes that both as to its original function and as to its later role the Septuagint was a free-standing text that took the place of the original, precisely as Aristeas maintains, and thus in complete accord with modern mainstream translations of the Bible.

4. BILINGUAL TEXTS AND THEIR EDUCATIONAL VALUE

Whatever Brock's reason for stopping short, I can see no warrant for it. Not only does Robert Gaebel in his article on the Vergil and Cicero papyri²³

²¹ Brock (1978:73); cf. Brock (1972:16-17). Gaebel (1969/70:284)(see note 34 below) states that the running Latin text on the left has not more than three words per line with the Greek word-for-word translation on the right arranged in similar manner. For examples see Robert Cavenaile (1958).

²² Brock (1972:16). See also the endorsement of Brock by Boyd-Taylor (1998:73), especially note 5.

²³ R.E. Gaebel (1969/70:284-325). Gaebel (*op. cit.*:284) also notes that bilingual school-texts "seem to have occupied an official and integral place in the Latin school syllabus in Greek-speaking Egypt." The following authors are thus far represented: Vergil, Cicero, Sallust, Terence, Livy, Juvenal and Lucan (Gaebel *op. cit.*:287).

make a direct link between them and the teaching of Homer in the Hellenistic school, but Marrou (1964) had already done so long before. In commenting on the so-called *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* (Goetz), bilingual Greek>Latin school manuals from iii CE onward which, like the Vergil papyri, feature a literal translation, Marrou makes explicit reference to these bilinguals and writes,

Greek boys in Egypt were taught to 'prepare word by word'; and thus the method used in Hellenistic schools for Homer and the other poets was simply adapted to a foreign [i.e. Latin] language: the work was set out in two columns, with the text on the left and its translation into colloquial Greek on the right.²⁴

4.1. General Hellenistic practice

As Marrou makes abundantly clear throughout his book, the rather painful step-by-step method of education was fundamental to the Greek educational system from the III BCE to at least the III CE. In both reading and writing pupils were first taught the names of the letters of the alphabet (and the sounds and shapes they represented), then they progressed to syllables, then words (starting with monosyllables and working up to polysyllables), then sentences (usually lines of poetry).²⁵ Even recitation of the text, Marrou (*op. cit.*:211-215) suggests, was done syllable by syllable in a sing-song manner. Thus the synthetic method of learning was basic. At the secondary level began the work of the γραμματικός whose task was divided into literal explanation and literary explanation. It was first of all necessary to understand what the text meant, and in the case of the poets, particularly Homer, that was not easy, since Greek poetry had its own vocabulary, and thus effectively was written in a foreign language. So the pupil's first task was to give the equivalents in his own language, i.e. Homer on the left and on the right the modern equivalent. Since such translations were from Greek to Greek, they need not be complete but they often were. A partial approach would clearly not be an option if one were dealing with a text in a foreign language. Since the study of Homer presupposed considerable skill in both reading and writing, it is obvious that it would take place at a rather advanced level of education, and it stands to reason that the study of the

²⁴ *Ibid.* Goetz (1888:357). In fact the direct link between the Homeric and the Vergilian school-texts goes at least as far back as 1931, the publication of *Papyri Osloenses*, Fasc. II, no. 12, page 15.

²⁵ Also of interest is that at the sentence-stage "the school-master wrote the words to be copied, and then drew parallel lines underneath, between which his pupil was to copy them," (Harvey 1978:68). Cribiore (1996:137) argues that learning to write and learning to read did not run quite as parallel as hitherto supposed, but her distinction are not of direct relevance in the present context.

Hebrew bible will have been pursued at a similarly advanced level. In fact, one may perhaps speculate that such students were graduates of the Greek school, and thus familiar with its approach to Homer.

4.1.1. A Homeric example

Though the schooltexts that have survived come in a variety of forms, e.g. glosses on certain lemmata of Homer, and continuous translation into the colloquial, with the two texts in parallel columns (both at times with minor scholia), there is at least one running translation, arranged as an interlinear with the parent text. The manuscript is PSI 12.1276 (Pack2 1172) of the first century BCE and containing *Iliad* ii 617-638, 639-670. Each hexameter line was treated as a unit and the colloquial version was indented to mark it off from the chief text. Here is a sample (with restorations unmarked).

Epic: Οἳ δ' ἐκ Δουλιχίου Ἐχρινάων θ' ἱεράων

Coll.: Οἵτινες δὲ τοῦ Δουλιχίου καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν
Ἐχρινάων

Epic: νήσων, αἶ ναίουσι πέρην ἁλὸς Ἥλιδος ἄντα,

Coll.: νήσων, αἶ οἰκοῦσι πέραν θαλάσσης Ἥλιδος,

Epic: τῶν αὐθ' ἡγεμόνευε Μέγης ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηϊ

Coll.: τούτων ἡγείτο ὁ ἴσος τῷ Ἄρει Φυλέως υἱός,

Epic: Φυλείδης, ὃν τίκτε δίφιλος ἱππότη Φυλεὺς

Coll.: Μέγης, ὃν Φυλεὺς ἐγέννησεν ὁ προσφιλῆς

τῷ Διὶ καὶ ἱππότης,

Epic: ὅς ποτε Δουλίχιόνδ' ἀπενάσσατο πατρὶ χολωθείς.

Coll.: ὅς ποτε εἰς Δουλίχιον ἀπῶκησε τῷ πατρὶ μηνείσας.

Epic: τῷ δ' ἅμα τεσσαράκοντα μέλαινα νῆες ἔποντο.

Coll.: σὺν αὐτῷ δὲ τεσσαράκοντα μέλαινα νῆες ἐπορεύοντο.

(And those from Dulichium and the Echinae, the holy
 isles, that lie across the sea, over against Elis,
 these again had as leader Meges, the peer of Ares,
 even the son of Phyleus, whom the horseman Phyleus, dear to
 Zeus, begat—
 he that of old had gone to dwell in Dulichium in wrath against his
 father.
 And with Meges there followed forty black ships. [AT Murray,
 Loeb])

4.1.2. Homer and the Pentateuch

Two concluding observations before we move on to the interlinear paradigm. First, if Homer was indeed studied the way our evidence indicates, Brock's emphasis (especially strong in "Phenomenon of the Septuagint") on the unprecedented nature of the Pentateuchal translators' work cannot be maintained—which is not to say that their achievement was not considerable. What was unprecedented was that their source text was in Hebrew rather than in Homeric Greek. Second, given the fact that literalness played the fundamental role it did in Hellenistic education, it would have been surprising if they had *not* used it—and in fact some LXX translators *did* not use it, as we will see later.²⁶

5. SUMMARY

In the ground I have covered thus far I have tried to show (in reverse order);

- (a) that there is evidence to suggest that the socio-linguistic place of origin of the Septuagint may have been the school;
- (b) that though the explanation per se may vary, there is a consensus that the Hebraic dimension of the LXX needs to be accounted for;
- (c) though scholars may differ on what belongs to the category of 'Hebraisms' and just how many of these can be found in the

²⁶ See also Brock (1972:19 note 1). Though I am quite aware of the pitfalls of the term "literal," I use to cover a variety of formal correspondence modes of translating including both Aquila and the LXX Pentateuch.

(translated) Septuagint, there is nevertheless a consensus that linguistically the LXX is Hebraic;

(d) whether or not a model or paradigm is fully articulated, the reigning assumption among scholars is that the Septuagint, from its very beginning, was linguistically a free-standing text—even though Sebastian Brock comes excitingly close to denying it; and lastly

(e) I have suggested that it is important to have an articulated paradigm as an explanatory frame for the details of the text. I have already indicated that the paradigm that underlies both NETS and the IOSCS Commentary Series is the interlinear paradigm. That now needs to be explained, after which I will suggest that interlinearity and a school environment are mutually supportive.

6. THE INTERLINEAR PARADIGM: AN EXPOSÉ

I begin with noting what the interlinear paradigm does *not* imply. The paradigm does not imply that once upon a time, as early as the third century BCE, there existed a manuscript which featured an alternating arrangement of a Hebrew line of text followed by its Greek translation. By the same token, however, it should not be inferred that some such diglot could not have existed. After all we do have bi-columnar manuscripts of Homeric schooltexts (and even an interlinear one), of Greek>Latin as well as Latin>Greek manuscripts from the educational milieu, and there was after all Origen's Hexapla. Instead, the interlinear paradigm is meant to signal a perceived *linguistic* relationship between two texts, one in Hebrew and the other in Greek, and even though that relationship in purely linguistic terms might simply be called one of metaphrasm,²⁷ the term "interlinear" is meant to signal a relationship of subservience and dependence of the Greek translation *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew parent text. What is meant by subservience and dependence is *not* that every linguistic item in the Greek can only be understood by reference to the parent text, nor that the translation has an isomorphic relationship to its source, but that the Greek text *qua* text has a dimension of unintelligibility. Though, according to Toury's first law of translation, interference from the parent text is a default, "interlinearity" in addition signals that, for some *essential* linguistic information, the parent text needs to be consulted, since the text as we have it cannot stand on its own feet. A few haphazard examples will show what I have in mind. When in Reigns the Hebrew particle of entreaty ׀ is translated by ἐγὼ ἐμοὶ, the

²⁷See Boyd-Taylor (*op. cit.*:74-75). "The term metaphrastic captures the isomorphic verbal relationship between the translation and its *Vorlage*" (note 8).

Greek text is very difficult to say the least; when in Ruth the first sg Hebrew pronoun אָנֹכִי + finite verb is rendered by ἐγὼ εἶμι followed by a finite verb, the Greek is rather peculiar; when at various points in Jeremiah a Hebrew word is simply transcribed in Greek letters the results can be bewildering; when in Psalms a Hebrew word is translated via an assumed etymology the result on the level of the Greek can be befuddling. Etc. etc. It is this dimension of the Septuagint text I refer to The interlinear model and the Septuagint 357 as the aspect of unintelligibility, a phenomenon recognized to exist by all Septuagintalists of my acquaintance. And as noted above, it is the aspect of unintelligibility as well as that of intelligibility (even literary beauty) that an explanatory model has to be able to accommodate.

6.1. A two-dimensional text

I would further argue that "interlinear" is meant to convey that the text in question is two-dimensional, that is to say, it has a vertical as well as a horizontal dimension. On the horizontal plane morphemes are knit together into syntactic units to convey information, on the vertical plane the parent text forms the *de facto* context for units of meaning, and as a result of excessive one-for-one dependence on the source text the receptor text may be rendered disjointed or worse. That is to say, in an interlinear text one can expect that the vertical dimension interferes with the horizontal to such an extent that the text lacks semantic coherence. One can perhaps liken the two dimensions of an interlinear text to the characterization of the literary genre "sentimental romance" as given by the well-known literary critic Northrop Frye. Frye compares the romance with the modern novel. In the novel as a realistic narrative—Frye argues—the writer attempts to keep the action horizontal, using the technique of causality to keep the narrative moving from within and to knit the plot firmly together. Romance, on the other hand, tends to be more sensational, "that is," says Frye, "it moves from one discontinuous episode to another, describing things that happen to characters, for the most part, externally." He then goes on to speak of the "hence" narrative (the novel) and the "and then" narrative (romance)(Frye 1976:47). Or again, Frye writes,

. . . romance presents a vertical perspective which realism . . . would find it very difficult to achieve. The realist, with his sense of logical and horizontal continuity, leads us to the end of his story; the romancer, scrambling over a series of disconnected episodes, seems to be trying to get us to the top of it (Frye 1976:50).

It is this vertical dimension and the resultant episodic nature of the text that tends to come through so clearly in much of the Septuagint, and for which reason I refer to it as an interlinear text. In full recognition of this vertical dimension, in addition to the horizontal plane, the Prospectus for the newly launched IOSCS commentary series states,

When the text is a translation rather than an original composition, one should take an essentially two-pronged approach: First, because it is a translation, the contextual sense of Greek words or expressions may have suffered interference from the Greek's close relationship to the parent text. Consequently, one may be forced to treat the Greek text as being disjointed [cf. vertical dimension]. Second, because, in spite of its precise relationship to its parent text, the Greek text is nevertheless a new entity, one should treat it, as much as is warranted, as a unitary whole [cf. horizontal dimension] (Pietersma *et al.* 1998:47).

6.1.1. What "two-dimensional" does not imply

The final sentence of this citation brings me to my next point, namely: a second inference *not* to be drawn from the term "interlinear" is that as one mentally proceeds through the interlinear text, two lines at a time, one simply superimposes, morpheme for morpheme, the meaning of the Hebrew onto the Greek. That is to say, the fact that the translated text is recognized to have a vertical as well as a horizontal dimension does not mean that either grammatically or lexically Hebrew meanings eclipse Greek meanings. Nor does it mean that one is free to import Hebrew meanings whenever the going gets rough on the horizontal plane. That would patently abrogate Greek as a linguistic system, and in effect restrict the text to the vertical dimension alone. E.g. ἄνθρωπος, standing, as it were, below distributive ὡς ἕκαστος ("each") does not *ipso facto* become a Greek distributive. Yet, as is well known, that was precisely the kind of lexicography practiced by Liddell-Scott-Jones and to a lesser extent by Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich, still the most used lexica for biblical Greek. John Lee (1969:234-42) has demonstrated that that same ailment still afflicts the Supplement to LSJ (1968), and it continues, I might add, in the Revised Supplement (1996), even though the specific instances of error noted by Lee have been rectified.²⁸ As John Lee has written,

It is a basic principle of lexicography that in order to establish the existence of a new sense of a given word incontrovertible examples of that sense must be found. So long as the word can be understood in one of its established senses without undue strain, it ought to be classified under that sense. Only if the new sense is clearly demanded by the context can it be regarded as definitely established (Lee *op. cit.*:234).

²⁸ See e.g. ἀνάστημα which is said to mean "garrison" in 1Kgs (3Rgns) 10.5 (wisely ignored by Lust-Eynikel-Hauspie) and "hub (of a wheel)" in SymEzek 1.18, even though the latter lacks context.

6.1.2. Interlinearity and Septuagint lexicography

Interlinearity with its explicit and acknowledged vertical *as well as* horizontal dimension allows us, it seems to me, to go a step farther and say that what *appears* to be "demanded by the context" may in fact have to be disregarded, if the word in question can be shown to have been produced by linkage with its Hebrew counterpart rather than by (Greek) contextual considerations. In other words, the vertical dimension prevents the tyranny of context. Instances in which the vertical dimension exerts influence to the detriment of the horizontal are plentiful in the LXX corpus, even if not in all books. A useful illustration might be βραχίων ("arm") in Dan 11:22 (and elsewhere), in both LXX and Theodotion. 11:22 runs in part: "Armies shall be utterly swept away and broken before him" (NRSV). NRSV's "armies" translates Hebrew זרועות the (fem) plural of זרוע ("arm, forearm") but metaphorically used for military forces. Theodotion's translation might be glossed: "And the βραχίονες of him that overflows/overwhelms will be flooded away from before him, and they will be crushed."²⁹ The LXX runs slightly differently: "And he [a royal impostor] will crush the crushed βραχίονας from before him."³⁰ Since the context speaks clearly of military might and since the Hebrew counterpart of βραχίων can mean "military forces," it might be tempting to conclude that the Greek can mean that as well. In that case, lexicographically one would duly recognize "army" or "military force" as a bona fide semantic component of βραχίων.³¹ The problem is that apart from translation literature I can find no attestation for this meaning. As a result I can only conclude that in both LXX and Theodotion the vertical dimension of the text has interfered with the horizontal, and has put a severe strain on the context to yield any kind of coherent sense.³² One last point should be mentioned here, namely, that the interlinear paradigm proposed in no way precludes the existence of, simply put, Greek words with Hebrew meanings. NETS has called these *calques*, that is, words such as διαθήκη which no doubt long before the translation process began had taken on the meaning of Hebrew ברית. It should be emphasized, however, that it was usage among Greek speaking Jews that naturalized their foreign content, not their being used as translation equivalents in an interlinear setting. Where such naturalization has indeed taken place, one may typically expect to find attestation beyond the translated corpus.

²⁹ καὶ βραχίονες τοῦ κατακλύζοντος κατακλυσθήσονται ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ καὶ συντριβήσονται . . . (Theod).

³⁰ καὶ τοὺς βραχίονας τοὺς συντριβέντας συντρίψει ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ. (LXX)

³¹ Correctly not given in LSJ, BAG, and Lust-Eynikel-Hauspie.

³² It should be noted, however, that the principle involved does not depend on the correctness of this example. Furthermore, though it is true that βραχίων can be used as a symbol of strength that scarcely means it carries the concrete meaning of "army."

6.1.2.1. An instance of out-moded practice

In light of the important work being done on Septuagint lexicography by, among others, Lee, Muraoka, and Lust-Eynikel-Hauspie³³ there is no question that a new age has dawned in which the Greek of the Septuagint is taken with all the seriousness and linguistic integrity it merits. But from a recent *JBL* article by Al Wolters, it is clear just how deep seated the LSJ approach still is among biblical scholars. Wolters (1999) would have us believe that Greek βαρύνω in Zech 11.8 (βαρυνθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐπ' αὐτούς) means "to harden" since, it is suggested, (a) the Greek context demands this meaning and (b) it must therefore be labeled a case of semantic borrowing from the Hebrew, which has כבד. As external support Wolters appeals to the *TDNT* article on βάρος (Schrenk) which notes that βαρύνω is common in the LXX in contexts which have to do with "hardening of the heart" and where the Hebrew counterpart is כבד.³⁴ According to Wolters, βαρύνω was assigned a new meaning, when already in the Pentateuch it was used as a translation of כבד ("be heavy, be weighty"). Since, however, the Hebrew word, when it refers to the human heart, is commonly glossed, in deference to English idiom, by "to harden" and since Greek βαρύνω is used as a translation equivalent for כבד, ergo (so Wolters): βαρύνω also means "to harden," at least by the time Minor Prophets was translated. In point of fact, LXX lexicography has for very good reasons not posited semantic borrowing in this case, and it is particularly the interlinear paradigm that readily shows the mundane truth of what transpired. (a) Clearly Hebrew כבד with a basic sense of "heaviness," by metaphoric extension could refer to human organs (heart, ears, eyes), indicating their malfunctioning. Evidently this was standard Hebrew idiom, capable of being glossed differently in different receptor languages. (b) In the LXX it was commonly assigned βαρύνω (also having to do with "heaviness") as its translation equivalent, including in cases of metaphoric extension, even though such usage was evidently not Greek idiom. Though such translation equivalents were perfectly capable of becoming naturalized in Greek, we have no evidence that it occurred in the case of βαρύνω, since, as Wolters is forced to admit, βαρύνω meaning "harden" or "dull" is not attested outside of translation literature. (c) Thus all that happened is that βαρύνω in the LXX tends to stand in unidiomatic contexts,³⁵ since the vertical dimension rather than the horizontal dimension

³³ See especially T Muraoka (1993).

³⁴ Even though he cites it, Wolters seemingly ignores the fact that the *TDNT* article also notes βαρύνω (translating words other than כבד) in contexts of "dimming eyes" and "deafening ears." Thus by his own logic βαρύνω should as well mean "to dim" and "to deafen." He further bemoans the fact that the Schrenk article is ignored in LXX lexicography (Wolters *op. cit.*:686 note 12).

³⁵ That Wolters (*op. cit.*:686) finds no "consensus as to its [βαρύνω] idiomatic meaning when applied to the soul of the prophet-shepherd" is only to be expected: *it is not idiomatic Greek*. Only if one ignores this fact would one supply an idiomatic gloss.

determines its use. One of the erroneous assumptions seems to be that if a translation equivalency occurs often enough it automatically becomes part of the living language. It was precisely that assumption that produced the fiction of a Jewish Greek dialect of Koine Greek.

6.1.3. Praxis and theory in Septuagint studies

Even though, as I have noted above, the reigning paradigm in Septuagint Studies is that of the LXX as a free-standing, replacement translation, Septuagint scholars nevertheless time and again feel forced by the evidence to have recourse to the parent text for *essential* linguistic information, in order to account for the Greek.³⁶ Thus praxis and theory, or data and explanatory framework, would seem to be at loggerheads, since praxis and data demonstrate the Septuagint's dependence on and subservience to the parent text, whereas theory and (implicit) paradigm proclaim its independence and self-sufficiency. That being the case, one or the other might better be adjusted, and since internal criticism must surely take precedence over external criticism, it is clearly the paradigm that is in need of change. As I see it, it is only the interlinear paradigm with its articulated vertical dimension that can legitimize what Septuagint scholars in fact routinely do, namely, have recourse to the parent text in order to account for the translated text. In other words, only the interlinear paradigm can accommodate both the vertical and the horizontal dimension of the translated text.

6.1.4. Interlinearity and exegesis

In similar fashion to its direct relevance for Septuagint lexicography, the interlinear paradigm has important implications for Septuagintal exegesis, since again it creates certain expectations in the practitioner and thereby suggests parameters. Thus, on the one hand, the paradigm suggests fairly localized interpretive activity, while, on the other hand, this is precisely what one typically finds. That is to say, one expects the interlinear translator to render his source text a unit at a time. Needless to say, when the parent text presents no linguistic difficulty, its translated counterpart is adequate Greek if not literary Greek, but when the parent text is problematic or misunderstood, the minimum a translator can do is to produce a grammatical, if not semantically transparent text. Though there are plenty of instances where the translator does considerably better than that, there are also more than enough where such is not the case, and it is the latter category as well as the former that must be accommodated in the explanatory model one constructs. It is also typically at such points of difficulty that the translator lapses into contextual interpretation, albeit seldom sustained over more than one or two verses. In other words, a specific translation problem arises and is solved locally. Thus I find myself substantially agreeing with

³⁶ See e.g. Tov (1984:53-70) and *passim* in Tov (1997).

Soisalon-Soininen when he argues that unlike modern translators, the translators of the Septuagint often translated the Hebrew a fairly small unit at a time.³⁷ As a result of this procedure it becomes very difficult to speak of "the translator's view or conception of . ." since the translator cannot be said to be engaged in exegesis, in the standard use of that term. Any failure to recognize this limitation inherent in formal correspondence-type of translations—whether or not one subscribes to the strictures of the interlinear paradigm—can result in some far-fetched claims being made. I have touched on some of these issues in my review of Joachim Schaper's book on the Greek Psalter.³⁸ Not surprisingly, Schaper's conclusion on the Greek Psalter is that it does not present a unified view of life-after-death, and he then weakly suggests that the Psalter was therefore likely translated by committee, with members presumably holding differing views on the subject. Such disjointedness is exactly what one expects to find if the linguistic reality of the Septuagint is taken seriously. I happen to believe that the interlinear paradigm can explain this phenomenon better than any other model.

All of the above is not to say that exegesis does not and cannot occur in the Septuagintal corpus. There can be no doubt that it does occur! Yet the burden of proof is equally clear: exegesis in the Septuagint is a matter of *quod est demonstrandum*.

6.2. Paradigms and expectations

I have mentioned expectations created by one's model or paradigm. A rather important one of these has to do with the linguistic competence of any given translator. A problem tends to arise on the basis of the reigning paradigm of Septuagint origins. If the Septuagint was produced to stand in for the Hebrew and to take its place, how can we explain that its Greek is not infrequently of a "low" quality. Not only is it colloquial rather than literary, regularly literal and often hackneyed rather than dynamic and flowing, but there are a great many items that are unintelligible, including most of its transliterations. On the reasonable assumption that, especially if he is deemed to be translating a sacred text, the translator would surely have done his best, essentially two explanatory options are open: (a) the translator lacked basic linguistic competence, since he did not have native fluency or failed a basic course in Greek, or (b) the Greek he came up with is, on

³⁷ Soisalon-Soininen (1987:29). Soisalon-Soininen is fully cognizant of the fact (a) that different translators worked in different ways and (b) that a given translator did not always work in the same way. But again, a model must be able to accommodate such differences in *modi operandi*. Furthermore, that not all translated books of the LXX are "interlinear" will be suggested later in this paper.

³⁸ Joachim Schaper (1995). Cf. the review by Pietersma (1997:185-90). Van der Kooij's qualified approval of Schaper's approach is a direct result of his own "Schriftgelehrten-Modell" (1999:378), which sweeps under the carpet too much of the Septuagint text (see above note 23).

reflection, not as bad as it seems on first reading. I strongly suspect that the second option is the one most frequently exercised by biblical scholars generally: the Greek isn't all that bad! I would suggest that the interlinear paradigm, along with what I think to be the origin of the translation, presents us with a new perspective, one which can account for anything from literary beauty to errant nonsense. Though interlinearity does not demand unusual use of the receptor language, it does render it understandable.

6.3. *Interlinearity and the school*

I begin with the paradigm per se. Though as the introduction to NETS argues, the interlinear paradigm is an appropriate explanatory model for most of the books of the translated corpus, there are clearly exceptions; just how many is not germane to the present argument. There is no doubt that, for example, Job, as others have stated before, is a literary translation rather than a literal one. That is to say, in terms of the *verbum e verbo* and *sensus de sensu* distinction with which Brock works, Job stands decidedly on the *sensus de sensu* side, while the Pentateuch belongs on the *verbum e verbo* side (even though it is scarcely Aquilanic). If that is indeed the case, it is not only clear that translation options were available in the Hellenistic world, as Brock argues, but also that different choices were made by different translators of different biblical books. Therefore, the translators of the Pentateuch seemingly did make a deliberate choice, as Brock argues. But since their decision about translation mode was, as Brock admits, the direct result of their view that the Pentateuch was (essentially) a legal text, their choice was not primarily linguistic. Instead, it was a question of linguistic register, i.e. one translates the way one translates because that is what the situation or document requires. Nevertheless, the point can still be made that it hardly makes sense to blame the translators for incompetence in Greek,³⁹ when their mode was dictated by social convention. In fact, it would be patently unfair. What ignorance there was—and there certainly was ignorance—was not about the receptor language but about the source text! The conclusion that the translators' mode of translating resulted from a prior "choice" becomes ever more plausible on the assumption that the Septuagint text of most books is interlinear in character and that this text was produced as a schooltext and that schooltexts were translated into colloquial. In other

³⁹ This point is also made by Brock (1978:70), though from a somewhat different perspective. I therefore question van der Kooij's parenthetical remark when referring to Cicero's and Horace's distinction in modes of translation: ". . . während es Cicero und Horaz um eine Übersetzung in ihre Muttersprache ging, haben Juden in eine Sprache (das Griechische) übersetzt, die nicht ihre Muttersprache war" (Van der Kooij 1999:376). As Brock notes and as Lee (1983) has demonstrated there is no reason whatever to assume that the translators were deficient in their knowledge of Greek. Rather, they used Greek the way they did because of the model they followed.

words, the register is that of the school, not that of law. More particularly, the register is that of a study aid to a text in another language.⁴⁰

6.3.1. Education and liturgy

As we have already seen, a number of factors point unmistakably in the direction of the school. Brock seems reluctant to draw this conclusion, even though his arguments, based on the internal, linguistic evidence of the text itself, pointed him in the direction of the school rather than the liturgy. As he notes, in agreement with Bickerman, liturgical use does not tend to produce continuous translations of whole books, but instead tends to be selective.⁴¹ One might add that since liturgy has to do primarily with performance instead of comprehension, liturgy tends to be more tolerant of text in a foreign medium than is education. An apt parallel here is that, though for study purposes the Homeric text was translated into colloquial Greek, the text itself was used for recitation.⁴² As a result, it is *a priori* more likely that a translation arose in a school environment, before it was put to other uses, including liturgical use. Moreover, Brock surmises that a literalistic text (and thus clearly an interlinear text, though Brock does not use that term for the LXX), like Aquila, more than likely stems from a school environment. It should thus be noted that the word-for-word versus the sense-for-sense approach to translating cannot be made to run simply along "legal" versus "literary" lines, since Homer too was certainly a literary text, but clearly not a legal one. A better distinction might be between "instructional use" of a text as opposed to "recreational or edificational use."

6.3.1.1 Internal evidence of the Septuagint

Brock believes that the broadly based movement of correcting the Greek text to the Hebrew, already countered in the Letter of Aristeas, and brilliantly elucidated by Barthélemy in his *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* was the product of the school (Brock 1978:29). But if this *corrective* kind of study originated in the schoolroom, one might well ask, Why would one not posit the schoolroom for the *originating* kind of study? On internal grounds, there can be no question that most of the Septuagint reflects the school milieu as illustrated by the schooltexts we have. As several scholars have pointed out, the Latin>Greek schooltexts are direct descendants of the Homer schooltexts which doubtless show us how Homer was studied in the Hellenistic school. As Gaebel has commented with reference to both sets of texts,

⁴⁰ From that perspective, rather than wondering about the translators' fluency in Greek, one might better wonder whether such study was in part in aid of studying Hebrew.

⁴¹ It is from this perspective that Kahle's theory of Septuagint origins makes good sense, though confuted by translational uniformity in the extant text

⁴² Cf. Marrou (*op. cit.*:230). In similar manner, pieces of literature were being used as copying exercises before pupils could understand them (see Criboire 1996:145, 149)

In the word-lists exhibiting the complete text there is no indication that the contemporary Greek was intended as an independent literary version. On the contrary, the word-for-word translation is sometimes so rudimentary and insensitive that it raises the question whether literary considerations, especially for the Vergilian texts, were given any thought. Although it is certainly true that most of the Greek equivalents for Latin words are acceptable in a literal sense, many of them are erroneous translations when judged solely in the Vergilian context. . . . The word-order follows closely that of the literary text in question (Gaebel *op. cit.*:60).

I would submit that every point made by Gaebel applies to the Septuagint. Thus we see here demonstrated what Brock observes with regard to literal modes of translation, namely, that their purpose is to bring the reader to the text rather than the text to the reader. That implies *both* that the source text is the object of study *and* that the receptor language is a tool in that study. Consequently, it was the text of Vergil (and other Roman literati) that was being analyzed in a Greek-speaking schoolroom; similarly, it was the text of Homer that was studied in the Hellenistic school with the use of the colloquial language. It follows that it was also, then, the Hebrew text of the Bible that was the object of study in the Jewish school, with the Septuagint functioning as a crib. Not only is that relationship of subservience and dependence underscored by the interlinear paradigm, but that paradigm accounts fully for the Septuagint's aspect of unintelligibility *as well as for its intelligibility*. To be sure, when we compare Ecclesiastes with, for example, Numbers, it becomes immediately obvious that interlinearity can come in varying degrees of dependence on and interference from the parent text. Yet the precise manner in which the Greek language is used becomes readily transparent on the basis of interlinearity. There can be no doubt: not all translated books in the Septuagint collection will turn out to be interlinear texts. Yet since that paradigm fits the vast majority of books, one might go so far as to formulate a methodological dictum: the translated books of the LXX are interlinear, until proven otherwise. In my view, such a dictum would have a sobering and constructive effect on the discipline.

6.4. Some implications of an educational origin

If I have convincingly argued that the constitutive character of most of the Septuagint is that of an interlinear text, produced in the Jewish school a number of interesting conclusions follow. Let me once again begin with Sebastian Brock. According to Brock, that the Pentateuch was viewed as a primarily legal document put the Jews of the diaspora in a difficult position, for, writes Brock (1978:72),

either their Greek Bible required 'correcting' on the basis of the Hebrew original . . . or it had to be accorded the same position of prestige as the Hebrew original.

Egypt, says Brock, essentially adopted the latter position, namely, that the Greek was equal to the Hebrew, while Palestine adopted the former stance, namely, that of the superiority of the Hebrew, with the result that the Greek was in need of correction. Brock sees this split as having been occasioned by virtual unilingualism (i.e. Greek) among Egyptian Jews versus frequent bilingualism in Palestine. An increasingly literal rendering of the parent text, in Brock's view, presupposes a bilingual expositor who could render an otherwise unintelligible text intelligible. As a result the concept of *hebraica veritas* could flourish only in Palestine. Though Brock makes a good point, given his view that the Pentateuch was classified as a legal document by its translators and that it was accordingly translated in a *verbum e verbo* manner, a school origin for its text coupled with interlinearity as a linguistic paradigm has more explanatory power. As long as the Greek functioned as a crib for the study of the Hebrew, the question of relative authority could scarcely arise, since the Greek was only a tool. The problem of authority could only arise when the Greek text became an independent entity. That stage of development had already been reached by the time of Aristeas. Just how long the Greek continued as crib, we do not know, but it would seem certain that the relative authority of mother and daughter, so to speak, did not become an issue in the household of faith until the daughter asserted her independence. Furthermore, though Egyptian Jews may well have believed that the biblical text was essentially a legal document and may have regarded it as verbally inspired, neither can be inferred from the nature of the text as we have it or from its origin. What its school origin does allow us to infer is that what Homer was to the Greeks, the Hebrew Bible was to the Jews. Both were clearly regarded as texts to be studied in the schools, texts that were normative for the community. Typologically, I would see the development of the Septuagint in four stages: (a) the Hebrew text as sole authority, (b) the Greek as crib to study the Hebrew, (c) the Greek text as independently authoritative, (4) the debate over the relative authority of the Hebrew and the Greek.

7. CONCLUSION

In closing I would like to cast a quick glance beyond the Septuagint. Arie van der Kooij (1999:204-14) in a recent article has studied three passages in Jewish literature that touch on the issue of Bible translation. The first one, PT Meg. 7c, 8, deals with Aquila, the second one, BT Meg. 3a, with Targums Onkelos and Jonathan, and the third one, the Prologue to Ben Sira, speaks of the Septuagint. Van der Kooij argues that in all three the presupposed origin of the text in question is the school and its purpose as a tool for the study of the Hebrew. In his argumentation he draws on recent research on the targums and in particular on W.F. Smelik's work on Judges (Smelik 1995). Though it is the commonly held view that the targums originated in the liturgical setting of the synagogue, Smelik marshals a great

deal of external and internal evidence to show that in any case the written targums originated in the school and that their initial function was that of study-aids to the Hebrew. Liturgical use, in Smelik's view was secondary. Thus according to the view promoted by Smelik not only was the place of origin of the Targum and LXX identical but their origin and purpose was the same, namely, cribs for the study of the Hebrew, hence dependent on and subservient to the parent text.⁴³

If what I have argued is correct, we might then study the Septuagint in order to learn what was happening in the Jewish schools of the Greek speaking diaspora. A school setting might also have interesting implications for another implicit paradigm in Septuagint studies, namely that of the translator as solo-performer (Van der Kooij 2000:376). But I do not have in mind a return to Kahle.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aejmelaeus, A. 1996. *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*. Kampen: Pharos.
- Aejmelaeus, A. (ed) 2000. *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (MSU 24). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Barr, J. 1961 (SCM edition 1983). *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Barr, J. 1968. Common Sense and Biblical Language. *Biblica* 49 (1968) 377-87.
- Barr, J. 1990. "Guessing" in the Septuagint, in: Fraenkel *et al.*, 19-34.
- Blomquist, J. 1982. Translation Greek in the Trilingual Inscription of Xanthus. *OpAth* 14/2, 11-20.
- Boyd-Taylor, C. 1998. A Place in the Sun: The Interpretative Significance of LXX-Psalm 18:5c. *BIOSCS* 31, 71-105.
- Brock, S.P. 1969. The Phenomenon of Biblical Translation in Antiquity. *Alta* 2/8, 96-102.
- Brock, S.P. 1972. The Phenomenon of the Septuagint. *OTS* 17, 11-36.
- Brock, S.P. 1978. Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity. *GRBZ* (1978) 69-87.

⁴³ Too late to be included in the discussion of this paper, I became aware of Steven D. Fraade's essay (1992:253-86). Fraade there already proposes interlinearity as an appropriate descriptive for targumic activity.

- Brock, S.P. 1992. To Revise or Not to Revise: Attitudes to Jewish Biblical Translation, in: Brooke and Lindars (eds.), 301-38.
- Brooke, G.J. & Lindars, B. (eds) 1992. *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Studies* (SCS 33). Atlanta CA: Scholars Press.
- Cavenaile, R. 1958. *Corpus Papyrorum Latinarum*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Conybeare, F.C. & Stock St. G. 1995 (1905). *Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. Hendrickson, 1995 (expanded and reprinted from the edition originally published by Ginn and Company: Boston).
- Cribiore, R. 1996. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (American Studies in Papyrology 36). Atlanta CA: Scholars Press.
- Even-Zohar, I. 1986. The Quest for Laws and its Implications for the Future of the Science of Literature, in: Vajda and J Riesz (eds.), 75-79.
- Fraade, S.D. 1992. Rabbinic Views on the Practice of Targum, and Multilingualism in the Jewish Galilee of the Third-Sixth Centuries, in L.I. Levine (ed) *The Galilee in Late Antiquity* (New York and Jerusalem: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1992), 253-86.
- Fraenkel, D., Quast, U. & Wevers, J.W. (eds.) 1990. *Studien zur Septuaginta: Robert Hanhart zu Ehren* (MSU 20). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Frye, N. 1976. *The Secular Scripture. A Study of the Structure of Romance*. Cambridge MA/London: Harvard University Press.
- Gaebel, R.E. 1969/70. The Greek Word-Lists to Vergil and Cicero. *BJRL* 52, 284-325.
- Gehman, H.S. 1951. The Hebraic Character of LXX Greek. *VT* 1, 81-90.
- Goetz, G. 1888-. *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* vol. 3. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Harvey, F.D. 1978. Greeks and Romans Learn to Write, in: Havelock & Jackson (eds.), 63-78.
- Hatch, E. 1889. *Essays in Biblical Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Havelock, E.B. & Jackson, P.H. (eds.) 1978. *Communication Arts in the Ancient World*. New York: Hastings House, 63-78.
- Horrocks, G. 1997. *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*. New York/London: Longman.
- Horsley, G.H.R. 1989. The Fiction of 'Jewish Greek'. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* 5. Macquarie University, 3-40.

- Lee, J.A.L. 1969. A Note on Septuagint material in the Supplement to Liddell and Scott. *Glotta* 47, 234-42.
- Lee, J.A.L. 1983. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SCS 14). Chico CA: Scholars Press.
- Lust, J. (et al.) 1992/1996. *A Greek - English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Part I (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 1992); Part II (Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: Stuttgart, 1996).
- Marrou, H.I. 1964. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. New York: Mentor New York.
- Martinez, F.G. and Noort, E. (eds.) 1998. *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism*. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill.
- Muraoka, T. 1993. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)*. Louvain: Peeters.
- Ottley, R.R. 1920. *A Handbook to the Septuagint*. London: Methuen.
- Pietersma, A. & Cox, C. 1984. *De Septuaginta. Studies in honour of John William Wevers on his sixty-fifth birthday*. Mississauga: Benben Publications.
- Pietersma, A. review of Schaper, J. 1995. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. Tübingen: Mohr. *BibOr* 54, 185-90.
- Pietersma, A. et al. 1998. A Prospectus for a commentary on the Septuagint. *BIOSCS* 31, 43-48.
- Pietersma, A. 2000. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: The Psalms*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. and Garbini, G. (Foreword by G. Tucci; Introduction by U. Scerato) 1964. *A Bilingual Graeco-Aramaic Edict by Asoka. Text, translation and notes by* (Serie Orientale Roma 29.) Rome: Istituto italiano per il medio ed estremo Oriente.
- Rabin, C. 1968. The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint. *Textus* 6, 1-26.
- Riesz, V. and Riesz, J. (eds.) 1986. *The Future of Literary Scholarship*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Ros, J. 1940. *De studie van het Bijbelgrieks van Hugo Grotius tot Adolf Deissmann*. Nijmegen.
- Schaper, J. 1995. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Sherk, R.J. 1969. *Roman Documents from the Greek East*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

- Smelik, W.F. 1999. *The Targum of Judges*. Leiden: Brill.
- Smith, J.Z. 1990. *Drudgery Divine*. London: University of London.
- Soisalon-Soininen, I. 1987. *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax*. Helsinki.
- Swete, H.B. 1902. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Thackeray, H.St.J. 1909. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Toury, G. 1995. *Descriptive Translational Studies and Beyond* (Benjamins Translation Library 4). Amsterdam/Philadelphia.
- Tov, E. 1984. Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text? in: Pietersma & Cox (eds.), 53-70.
- Tov, E. 1997. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8). Jerusalem: Simor.
- Van der Kooij, A. 1998. Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint: Who are the Translators? in: Martinez & Noort (eds), 214-29.
- Van der Kooij, A. 1999. The Origen and Purpose of Bible Translations in Ancient Judaism: Some Comments. *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 1, 204-14.
- Van der Kooij, A. 2000. Zur Frage der Exegese im LXX-Psalter. Ein Beitrag zur Verhältnisbestimmung zwischen Original und Übersetzung, in: Aeijmeleaus (ed), 366-79.
- West, S. 1969. The Greek Version of the Legend of Tefnut. *JEA* 55, 161-83.
- Wolters, A. 1999. Semantic Borrowing and Inner-Greek Corruption in LXX Zechariah 11:8. *JBL* 118, 685-90.