



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# The Jewish Quarterly Review.

---

APRIL, 1890.

---

## ARE THERE TRACES OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY IN THE SEPTUAGINT ?

THE inquiry into the philosophical views of the Greek translators of the Bible has as yet been carried to no definite issue. The researches of German scholars between the years 1830-50, uncertain in method as well as wanting in knowledge, have been rectified, but scarcely carried further or definitely completed by more competent investigators. Much difference of opinion accordingly prevails on the subject even at the present time, and one must endeavour to attain to positive results by means different from those hitherto made use of.

First, let me call to mind the general course that previous inquiries have taken. Humphrey Hody, with whom the scientific investigation of the Septuagint really begins, was also the first to hold the opinion that the influence of a foreign philosophy is discernible in the Greek translation of certain scriptural passages. He finds traces of the wisdom of the Egyptian priests in the title of the first book of Moses (Genesis) and in the translation of Deut. xxxii. 8.<sup>1</sup> About fifty years later, David Michaelis endeavoured to prove<sup>2</sup> that in six passages of the Septuagint traces of Gnostic and Manichæan teaching are evident. But so faint are these traces

---

<sup>1</sup> *De bibl. text. origin.*, p. 115.

<sup>2</sup> *Dissertatio de indicibus gnosticæ philosophiæ tempore LXX. interpretum et Philonis Judæi*, printed in *Syntagma Commentationum*, Götting., 1767. II., p. 251f.

that it was not difficult for Ernesti<sup>1</sup> and Horn<sup>2</sup> to deny their existence, and to show that the interpretations of Michaelis rested upon mere mis-understandings.

Research in this field was now suspended for a long time, and was only renewed in 1831 by A. F. Gfrörer, in his "*Geschichte des Urchristenthums*."<sup>3</sup> This brilliant and learned, but shallow and untrustworthy scholar sees in the LXX. "the source of the beginnings of the Alexandrian theosophy."<sup>4</sup> The Alexandrian translators sought to avoid, as Gfrörer says, all expressions that refer to a visible God, and this deviation from the customary conception of God's existence had the most important consequences on Jewish theology. It necessarily led up to the doctrine of divine powers, of the existence of creatures between God and men, and to that of a transcendental God, wholly alienated from the finite world, or what perhaps is more correct, this latter doctrine must be presupposed and God's invisibility derived from it.<sup>5</sup> All these opinions Gfrörer finds clearly expressed in different passages of the LXX. He supposes that the Greek translators separate God from the visible world; that they are persuaded of the existence of divine beings subordinate to God, and that they invest the Messiah himself "with an eternal and heavenly character."<sup>6</sup>

A. F. Dähne goes still further in his *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie*.<sup>7</sup> He thinks he can show that not only the most important doctrines of Philo, but also those of the Christian Alexandrians, Clement and Origen, were known to the translators, and are traceable in their work. Like Gfrörer he maintains that they sought in the first place to remove, or to moderate<sup>8</sup> many of the human qualities and passions attributed to God in the Bible. Dähne finds a clear expression in the LXX. of the doctrine of creation which Philo teaches in his philosophical writings, viz.: the creation of the world of ideas before that of sensuous things, the denial of creation out of nothing (*Creatio ex nihilo*), the doctrine of the androgynous Adam, and of the divine creative and preservative powers. Even the ecstasy of the Epopets, the assumption of a two-fold divine revelation, the allegorical exegesis of the Alexandrians,—these and many other strange things Dähne finds in the translation, both of the Pentateuch and of the other portions of Scripture.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Exegetische Bibliothek*, Vol. VIII., p. 716f.

<sup>2</sup> *Biblische Gnosis*, p. 67f.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. II., p. 8ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>5</sup> Gfrörer, *ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Gfrörer, *ibid.*, p. 17.

<sup>7</sup> Vol. II., p. 2f. (Halle, 1834).

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37f.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, II., p. 11f.

Dähne bestowed so much learning and acuteness upon the demonstration of his hypothesis, that for a time he made even excellent scholars believe, that the influence of the Alexandrian theosophy on the LXX. was actually proved.<sup>1</sup> But in truth his proofs were so arbitrary and insufficient, based on so little knowledge of the language and the method of translation followed by the LXX., that he soon met with violent opposition. H. G. Thiersch criticised the various errors of Dähne in a now almost forgotten, but excellent work.<sup>2</sup> But Thiersch threw the force of his criticism on details and left uncontested the fundamental views of Dähne. He no less than the latter believed that the Greek translators anticipated the peculiar doctrines of the Alexandrian philosophers.<sup>3</sup>

But other scholars, among whom Zacharias Frankel deserves foremost mention, arrived at very different conclusions. In his epoch-making *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, which appeared in 1841, in his *Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, a work published ten years later, and in smaller essays, Frankel clearly showed that Gfrörer and Dähne not only had committed errors, but that their hypothesis is built up on wholly insecure foundations; that they do not prove the influence of Greek philosophy on the Septuagint; that this influence is certainly less than they supposed, and that it is only the avoidance of anthropomorphism and anthropopathism which is discernible most decidedly in the translation of the Pentateuch, less distinctly in other books of the Bible, which were translated at a later period; and that not Greek philosophy, but Palestinian influence produced this effect.<sup>4</sup>

E. Zeller agrees with Frankel in all essential points about the pretended philosophy of the LXX. The renowned author of the *Philosophie der Griechen* says<sup>5</sup>: Some of the translators were offended at the physical manifestations of Jehovah, but from that circumstance, as well as from the translations of other passages, we dare not conclude that the LXX. were familiar with Platonic or Stoical philosophy, or that the doctrines of the school of Philo were shared by them. There is no reason to suppose "more than a small and superficial contact with Greek ideas."

---

<sup>1</sup> See the remarkable essay of Georgi in Ilgen's *Zeitschrift*, 1839, Vol. IV., p. 50.

<sup>2</sup> *De Pentateuchi Vers. Alexandrina* (Erl., 1841), p. 43ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 41, p. 43.

<sup>4</sup> See especially *Vorstudien*, p. 175 s.; c. *Einfluss*, p. 30f, 82f, 130f; *Palästin. und alexandrin. Schriftforschung*, p. 24.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. III., Part II<sup>3</sup>, 253ff.

With this negative result the first researches into the philosophical views of the LXX. close, but we cannot be satisfied with it. For even if all the arguments of Gfrörer and Dähne do not stand the test, does it necessarily follow that their hypothesis itself is false? Cannot new and more careful researches prove the same assertions with other arguments? As long as criticism did not go beyond the refutation of Gfrörer and Dähne, there was no certainty on the subject of the philosophical or non-philosophical spirit of the Greek translation. It hence resulted that the judgments of the most learned inquirers differed widely from one another. Frankel, who by a more accurate explanation of hitherto misunderstood passages had eliminated so many philosophical theories supposed to have been insinuated into the translation, repeatedly speaks of the philosophical exegesis of the LXX.,<sup>1</sup> and regards some words as bearing a philosophical importance, which Zeller thinks quite insignificant.<sup>2</sup>

Though Zeller contradicts the extreme views of Dähne, he nevertheless believes that in some passages traces may be found of the anthropological terminology of Plato and the Stoics.<sup>3</sup> Siegfried, one of the greatest living authorities on Jewish Hellenism, thinks it doubtful whether there are any traces of Greek philosophy in the LXX. Yet he supposes that the doctrine of the intellectual world, the *κόσμος νοητός*, is expressed in the translation of Gen. i. 2.<sup>4</sup> But if we indeed find that this Platonic, or rather Philonic, doctrine is embodied in the LXX., we should naturally expect to find many other philosophical doctrines more in accord with the ideas that were current in the Alexandrian school.

G. W. Bickell, in fact, discovers such other doctrines. He declares<sup>5</sup> that the avoidance of anthropomorphism and anthropopathism (which, as he thinks, is in no book more rigidly observed than in the translation of the book of Job,) was connected most intimately with Alexandrian theology and the allegorical exegesis, and that both point to a long acquaintance with Greek, especially Platonic, philosophy. He thinks that the doctrine of God's absolute unchangeability, of his complete unity, and of matter as the source of Evil, must have been the cause of certain interpretations of Scriptural passages found in the LXX.

The foregoing facts are enough to show the uncertainty

<sup>1</sup> *Einfluss*, pp. 21, 30, 82, 130.

<sup>2</sup> *Paläst. und alex. Schriftf.*, p. 24.

<sup>3</sup> *Philos. der Griechen*, III., 2<sup>3</sup>, p. 255.

<sup>4</sup> *Philo von Alexandria*, p. 8.

<sup>5</sup> *De indole ac ratione versionis Alexandrinæ in interpretando libri Jobi*, p. 5f.

still prevalent as to the philosophical level of the LXX., even after the investigations of Frankel and Zeller. The question arises whether there are no means of removing the doubts which have hitherto existed. It is evident that the most cautious and acute exegesis of single passages of the LXX. cannot provide them. For very often the Hebrew original that lay before the translators is no longer discoverable, or the reading and the meaning of the Greek text are alike doubtful. Copyists, commentators and editors, each in their various ways, have contributed to bring the original text of the LXX. to its present state of confusion. Under such circumstances it is impossible from individual passages to recognise the spirit which inspired the translators in their work.<sup>1</sup> But it is probable that the examination of the large linguistic material of the LXX. will lead us to safe results. Researches like those which Frankel, Thiersch and others made in respect to the grammar of the Septuagint, can and must be extended to philosophical questions. Here the sources of errors are fewer, the chance of mistake is reduced by the large number of passages to be examined, and we may therefore hope that cautious researches in this field will lead to the desired end.<sup>2</sup>

In spite of the great difference of opinion as to the sense of single words and expressions in the LXX., we may certainly believe, that if Greek philosophy influenced the translation of the Septuagint, this influence must not only be discernible here and there, but must find its expression in the choice of certain fixed technical terms. As there is no philosophy in a technical sense to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures, if the translators of the Septuagint actually were in contact with philosophical ideas, the choice of certain expressions for psychological, ethical and metaphysical notions, must clearly show difference between the original and the translation. To what result do we come, if we look at the LXX. from this point of view?

---

<sup>1</sup> One instance in place of many may demonstrate this fact. The words of the second verse of Genesis וְהָאָרֶץ הִיְתְּמָה תְהוֹ וּבְהוֹ are translated *καὶ ἡ γῆ ἦν ἄορατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύατος*. Dähne (l.c., p. 11), and Thiersch (l.c., p. 44), see in these words a clear allusion to the doctrine of the creation of a spiritual before the sensual world. Zeller (l.c., p. 255) declares they were chosen without any *arrière pensée*, and Bickell agrees with him (l.c., p. 6). Frankel, however, attacks their genuineness (*Paläst. und Alex. Schriftf.*, p. 24). Siegfried (*Philo*, p. 8), returns to Dähne's opinion.

<sup>2</sup> Not long ago the late Dr. Edwin Hatch, in his learned essays on Biblical Greek (Oxford, 1889, p. 94f), examined the sense of some psychological notions in the LXX. He, however, mainly contents himself with the mere reckoning up of the manifold translations of Hebrew words, without entering into the particulars of the meaning and the origin of the ideas expressed.

The investigation of words like *ψυχή*, *αἴσθησις*, *νοῦς*, *φρόνησις*, *ἀνδρεία*, *ἀρετή*, *πρόνοια*, *κόσμος* and other philosophical terms gives us an unequivocal answer to this question.

### 1.—*Ψυχή*.

The meanings of the Greek word *ψυχή* are equivalent to those of the Hebrew נפש. Therefore the one is the common translation of the other, as we see in a great many passages. But in some respects *ψυχή* deviates from נפש. The Hebrew word, which originally means "breath," "breeze," "blast," denotes ordinarily the principle of life, sensuous as well as spiritual, but occasionally it is used as synonymous with "man," "person"; sometimes it even signifies "dead body," "corpse." To the Greek word *ψυχή* these significations are wanting.<sup>1</sup> When once philosophical reflection had grasped the difference between soul and body, *ψυχή* tended to become more and more abstract, and in educated speech it loses the sensual connotation which it formerly possessed. Where נפש is used in this sensual meaning, the Greek translator, if he had not felt it his duty to translate literally, would have had to deviate from the original. So even the Aramaic translators often render נפש by נשם or נש בר נש.<sup>2</sup> In the LXX. we very seldom find such deviations, in the Pentateuch only twice (Gen. xiv. 21, and xxxvi. 6), in the rest of the Bible only four times, and that in a single chapter (Joshua x. 28, 30, 35, 39). In the great number of passages, where נפש means "living being," "man," "person," "slave," or "dead body," "corpse," the LXX., heedless of the true sense of the Greek word, uses *ψυχή*. For instance Gen. i. 24, *ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ ψυχὴν ζῶσαν*; xii. 5, *καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἣν ἐκτίσατο*<sup>3</sup>; xli. 15, *πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαί, υἱοὶ καὶ θυγατέρες*, and the same v. 18, 22, 25, 26, 27, and in many other passages. So we read (Lev. vii. 8-10), *ψυχή, ἥτις ἐὰν φάγη ἀπὸ κρεῶν* and (Lev. vii. 11; xxii. 6), *ἡ ἂν ἀψήγεται παντὸς πράγματος* or *ἐὰν δὲ ψυχή προσφέρῃ δῶρον* (Lev. ii. 1), and similar expressions (Lev. iv. 2, 27; v. 1, etc.); Deuter. xxiv. 7 (9), we find *κλέπτων ψυχῆν*.—More decidedly the LXX. deviate from the Greek use

<sup>1</sup> In some dictionaries *ψυχή* is translated by "person" on the ground of passages like Soph. *Œd. Col.* 1207; *El.* 775, 786, 1127; Aristoph. *Nub.*, 711; *Polyb.* viii. 5, 3. But this translation is not the right one. In all these and similar passages the true sense of *ψυχή* is "life," "soul," or "spirit."

<sup>2</sup> See Frankel, *Einfluss*, p. 126. Isaiah xxix. 8; xliii. 4; Jer. li. 14; Prov. xiii. 4; xvi. 26; xxiv. 12; Psalm xl. 3, and in some other passages the translation of נפש is not literal, but it has its usual sense. Hatch did not take notice of many of these passages.

<sup>3</sup> Frankel sees the influence of the Agadah in this translation (*Einfluss*, p. 48). The analogous translations prove that this opinion is groundless.

of language where they put *ψυχή* instead of *νεκρός*, as Lev. xix. 28, *ἐντομίδας οὐ ποιήσετε ἐπὶ ψυχῇ*, xxi. 11, *ἐπὶ πάσῃ ψυχῇ τετελευκυία*; Num. v. 2 and ix. 6, *ἀκάθαρτον ἐπὶ ψυχῇ*.

This use of the word explains why *ψυχή* is declared to be identical with blood, even in a passage where the masoretic text does not precisely make this identification. So Levit. xvii. 11, *ἡ γὰρ ψυχή πάσης σαρκὸς αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐστίν*, where the Hebrew text reads *כי נפש הבשר בדם היא* the soul of every living thing is in the blood. (See also Lev. xvii. 14; Deut. xii. 23.) This meaning of *נפש* and therefore of *ψυχή* occurs in the other books of the Scripture less frequently than in the Pentateuch. But we can quote Jer. xliii. 6 (l. 6); Ezech. xlv. 25; Hag. ii. 13; Psalm civ. (cv.) 18; cxxiii. (cxxiv.) 4; Prov. xiii. 25; 1 Chr. v. 21. These and similar passages show how extensive this use of the word is.<sup>1</sup>

No servile dependency on the Hebrew original can have induced this translation. For in that of the Pentateuch, as well as in that of most books of the Bible, we find very numerous deviations from the original, as Frankel<sup>2</sup> and Thiersch<sup>3</sup> have conclusively proved. We even find the un-Greek use of *ψυχή* where the Hebrew text does not use *נפש*, but employs quite another word. Thus *ψυχή* is the translation of *מת*, Ezech. xlv. 25; of *בטן*, Prov. xiii. 25,<sup>4</sup> of *יש*, Lev. xvii. 9 (in a great number of manuscripts collated by Holmes). We may therefore conclude, that if the Greek translators give to *ψυχή* the meaning of "person," "slave," "dead body," "corpse," they could not be familiar with the abstract meaning which the word obtained in later Greek, and they could not be conscious of the opposition between body and soul, which is sharply accentuated in Greek philosophy.

## 2.—*Πνοή*.

The consideration of this word shows how little the Greek translators understood the method of expressing the difference between the sensuous and the spiritual, and how unphilosophically they reasoned. *Πνοή*, etymologically synonymous with *πνεῦμα*, is not often used in good Greek. It

<sup>1</sup> The use of this word in apocryphal books and in the New Testament is the same as in the LXX. See Sap. xii. 6, *γονεῖς ψυχῶν ἀδοθητῶν*; 1 Macc. x. 33, *πᾶσαν ψυχὴν Ἰουδαίων*; ii. 38, *ἕως χιλίων ψυχῶν ἀνθρώπων*; Acts ii. 41; iii. 23; Apocal. xvi. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Einfluss*, pp. 6, 73, 122, 177, 202.

<sup>3</sup> L.c., p. 59.

<sup>4</sup> Lagarde, *Anmerk. zur griech. Uebers. der Prov.*, p. 46, would not have altered the text of the LXX., if he had noticed these analogies.

means the blowing of the wind, the fire, the breath, the wind itself, and metaphorically the spiritual breath, the storm of feelings and passions. But the word is never used for the principle of spiritual life, it is never synonymous with *ψυχή* or *νοῦς*. And just in the last-named sense *πνοή* is used in the LXX. We read Prov. xxiv. 12, *ὁ πλάσας πνοὴν πᾶσιν* for נוצר נפש; xx. 27, *φῶς κυρίου πνοὴ ἀνθρώπων* for נר ה' נשמת אדם; Ps. cl. 6, *πᾶσα πνοὴ αἰνεσάτω τὸν κύριον* for כל הנשמה. Not less remarkable is Prov. i. 23, *προήσομαι ὑμῖν ἐμῆς πνοῆς ῥήσιν*; Is. lvii. 16, *πνοὴν πᾶσαν ἐγὼ ἐποίησα*; Job xxxii. 9, and xxx. 4, *πνοὴ δὲ παντοκράτορος ἢ διδάσκουσα*. The men who translated the Scripture in this manner could not have been acquainted with the terminology of Greek psychology.

### 3.—*Νοῦς*.

Remarking how often the LXX. substitutes *νοῦς* for such expressions as: "heart," "ear," "breath," one might be tempted to consider this as due to the influence of Greek philosophy. But a more exact examination shows us, that *νοῦς* in the LXX. has the same meaning as in common speech, and not as in philosophy. It does not denote the spiritual principle of life, or intellectual activity, but "opinion," "attention," "resolution," and similar notions. So Exod. vii. 23, and Isaiah xli. 22, *ἐπέστησε τὸν νοῦν*; Job vii. 17, *προσέχειν τὸν νοῦν* for שוב, שורת לב, and the same sense is expressed also by *καρδίαν τιθέναι* (Prov. xxii. 17; xxvii. 23). In a similar sense the word is used Jos. xiv. 7, *κατὰ τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ* (or *αὐτῶν* in many manuscripts) for כאשר עם לבבו "according to his wish"; Job vii. 20, *ὁ ἐπιστάμενος τὸν νοῦν τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, "he who knows the intentions," and Isaiah x. 12, *ἐπισκέψομαι ἐπὶ τὸν νοῦν τὸν μέγαν* "I shall watch over the proud mind." In the sense of resolution we find it in Isaiah xl. 13, *τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου*. That this is the true sense of the word is proved by the parallel idea that follows *τίς αὐτοῦ σύμβουλος ἐγένετο*, and by another passage (Is. x. 7), *ἀπαλλάξει ὁ νοῦς αὐτοῦ* for בשמך בלבבו.

There is much difficulty in deciding on the meaning of a certainly corrupt passage, Prov. xxxi. 3 (xxiv. 71,) where we find a double translation of *דרך νοῦς καὶ βίος* and Job xxxiii. 16, where *אזן* "ear" is translated *νοῦς*. Here probably *οὖς* was the original translation. That *νοῦς* *δεήσεως* (Job xxxvi.

<sup>1</sup> It is necessary to read *ἀπαλλάξει*, as we conclude from the synonym *ἐξολοθρεῖσαι* and from *ἀφανίσει* the variant of numerous manuscripts.

19) is not identical with the *νοῦς* of Greek philosophy, needs no proof.<sup>1</sup>

The fact that where the source of spiritual activity, the principle of thinking and reasoning, is understood, the Greek translators never put *νοῦς* must be specially marked. We find *ψυχῆ* where *νοῦς* would have been the right expression, Jos. xxiii. 14, *γνώσεσθε τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ*; Is. x. 7, *τῇ ψυχῇ . . . λελόγισται*; xlv. 19, *οὐκ ἐλογίσατο τῇ ψυχῇ*; Prov. xxiv. 14, *αἰσθήσῃ σοφίαν τῇ σῇ ψυχῇ*; Ps. cxxxviii. (cxxxix.) 14, *ἡ ψυχῆ μου γινώσκει*, and so on. *Καρδιά* is substituted for *νοῦς*, Exod. xxxvi. 2, *θεὸς ἔδωκεν ἐπιστήμην ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*; Deut. xxix. 4, *εἰδέναι*; 1 Sam. iv. 20, *ἐνόησεν ἡ καρδιά*, Neh. v. 7, *ἐβουλεύσατο καρδιά μου*, and frequently. We find *πνοή* in the same sense, Prov. i. 23, *πρόησομαι ὑμῖν ἐμῆς πνοῆς ῥῆσιν*; Job xxxii. 9, *πνοῆ παντοκράτορος ἡ διδάσκουσα*, and in other passages (see above p. 212). This fact, too, proves that the sense given by Greek philosophers to the word *νοῦς* was not known to the LXX.

4.—*Φρόνησις, φρόνιμος, ἄφρων.*

*Φρόνησις* denotes, in philosophical language, "practical wisdom." Aristotle gives the definition *ἔξιν ἀληθῆ μετὰ λόγου πρακτικὴν περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπων ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακὰ* (E. N. vi., 5, 1140 b 5); the Stoics *ἐπιστήμην κακῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ οὐδετέρων* (D. L., vii. 92; S. E. Pyrrh. iii. § 271), or *ἐπιστήμην ὧν ποιητέον καὶ οὐ ποιητέον καὶ οὐδετέρων* (Stob., ecl. ii., p. 102, Heer.) But the LXX. attribute *φρόνησις* also to God. So 1 Kings iii. 28, *φρόνησις θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ*; Is. xl. 28, *οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἐξεύρεσις τῆς φρονήσεως αὐτοῦ*; Jer. x. 12, *τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ ἐξέτεινε τὸν οὐρανόν*; Prov. iii. 19, *ὁ θεὸς ἠτοίμασεν οὐρανοὺς φρονήσει*. It is used simply for "wisdom," 1 Kings iv. 25, 26 (29, 30); Prov. iii. 13; xix. 8, and so on. In the same meaning *φρόνιμος* appears, 1 Kings iii. 12; iv. 26 (30); v. 7; Is. xlv. 25, and so on.

Still more unlike the usual Greek is the meaning which the LXX. give to *ἄφρων*. It is used not only to denote the foolish, thoughtless, unreasonable, but also the morally reprobate man. It is the translation of *נבול*, 2 Sam. xiii. 13; Jer. xvii. 11; Psalm xiii. (xiv.) 1; xxxviii. (xxxix.) 9; lii. (liii.) 2; lxxiii. (lxxiv.) 18, 22; Prov. xvii. 7; xxx. 22 (xxiv. 57); Job ii. 10; xxx. 8. We find it for *מביש*, Prov. xvii. 2; for

<sup>1</sup> Eccl. iii. 21, *רוח בני אדם* is translated *πνεῦμα υἱῶν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* instead of *νοῦς ἀνθρώπων*. This fact would be very important if we knew the original version of Ecclesiastes. But the Greek translation of this book is written by Aquila, or interpolated according to his version. See Graetz *Kohélet*, p. 173, and Freudenthal, *Hellen. Studien*, p. 65. Certainly we must write here, with 12 codd. of Holmes, *οἶδε* instead of *εἶδε*.

אין אש, Job xxxiv. 36 ; for בלי יעל, Prov. vi. 12 ; xvi. 27 ; xix. 28. In the same sense ἀφροσύνη is put for נבלה, Deut. xxii. 21 ; Jud. xix. 23, 24 ; xx. 6<sup>1</sup> ; 1 Sam. xxv. 25 ; 2 Sam. xiii. 12 ; for תפלה, Job i. 22.

### 5, 6.—Δόξα and λόγος.

Both words, so frequent in the philosophical writings of the Greeks, hardly ever appear in the LXX. in their philosophical meaning ; δόξα is used for "glory," "honour," "magnificence," כבוד, תפארת, הדר. In the sense of *opinion* we find it only once, Isaiah xi. 3, οὐ κατὰ τὴν δόξαν κρινεῖ. Even δοξάζειν does not denote in the LXX. "to mean," "to suggest," but "to praise," "to glorify," and is therefore frequently used for רומם, כבוד, פאר, and so forth.

λόγος has in the LXX. only the concrete meaning of "word," "speech," and is never used for "reason," "cause," "reflection." In Prov. v. 1 we read indeed ἐμοῖς δὲ λόγοις for ולרבונותי. But the plural proves that the word bears here merely the sense "words." It is probably interpolated from iv. 20, τοῖς δ' ἐμοῖς λόγοις, and has replaced the original σύνεσις or φρόνησις.<sup>2</sup>

### 7.—Αἰσθάνομαι, αἴσθησις.

These terms are employed, both in the common speech and loosely by writers acquainted with philosophy, not only for sense-perception but also for "mental conception," "observation," and so forth. Thus Euripides (*Electra* 288) speaks of an αἴσθησις τῶν κακῶν ; Plutarch (*Anton.* 24), of βραδεία αἴσθησις (ἀμαρτημάτων). Even Aristotle, though only in his physical and political writings, makes mention of αἴσθησις ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ (*Politics* 1, 2. 1253 a 17), and αἴσθησις ἐπιμελητικὴ τῶν τέκνων (*Anim. Gen.* III. 753 a 8). In more exact philosophical usage, however, αἴσθησις in the connotation of sense-perception is most strictly opposed to intellectual conception, thinking, or knowing—a statement for which I need offer no proof. The LXX. employ the term solely in its inexact signification, and in this respect go far beyond the usage of Greek writers. They translate Exod. xx. 18, וכל העם רואים את הקולות, πᾶς δὲ ὁ λαὸς ἑώρα τὴν φωνήν, and similarly with verse 22 ; for הבין and ידע on the other hand αἰσθάνεσθαι is

<sup>1</sup> Many good codd. have here ἀφροσύνην.

<sup>2</sup> Like δόξα and λόγος, some other words, as εἶδος, ἰδέα, ὕλη, which are very frequent in the writings of Greek philosophers, never have in the LXX. the sense given to them in philosophical terminology.

used, *αἴσθησις* being treated as a synonym of *φρόνησις*, *ἐπιστήμη*, *σοφία*. Thus for Exodus xxviii. 3, *וְרָאָה בְּלִבָּהּ וְרָאָה בְּכַחַךְ*, we read οὐς ἐνέπλησα πνεύματος αἰσθήσεως<sup>1</sup>; in Prov. i. 7, *דַּעַת ה' רָאָה וְרָאָה ה' רָאָה* is rendered εὐσέβεια εἰς θεὸν ἀρχὴ αἰσθήσεως; *ibid.* i. 22. *וְכַחַכְיָם יִשְׁנֹאוּ דַעַת*, ἀσεβεῖς γερόμενοι ἐμίσησαν αἴσθησιν; iii. 20, *ἐν αἰσθήσει (בדעת) ἄβυσσοι ἐρράγησαν*; xxiii. 12, *τὰ δὲ ᾠτά σου ἐτοίμασον τοῖς λόγοις αἰσθήσεως*. In this unusual meaning we find the word most frequently in Proverbs (ii. 10; v. 2; x. 14; xi. 9; xii. 1, 23; xiv. 6, 7, 18; xv. 7, 14, etc.), but besides these instances and the passages from Exodus already quoted, the same use of the term may be noted in Isaiah xlix. 26, *μεθυσθήσονται καὶ αἰσθήσεται<sup>2</sup> πᾶσα σάρξ*, and Job xxiii. 5, *αἰσθοίμην δὲ τίνα μοι ἀπαγγελεῖ*.

One may fairly maintain that no one acquainted with the philosophical and more particularly with the psychological terminology of the Greeks, would have used *αἴσθησις* as a synonym with *ἐπιστήμη* or *σοφία*. But as this is done by the translator of Proverbs, who surpasses the majority of the translators of the Bible in knowledge of Greek, he must as decidedly as the others be pronounced ignorant of the fundamental notions of Greek philosophy.

#### 8.—*Ἄρετή*.

*Ἄρετή*, as is well known, originally signifies man's power and capacity; hence the term serves to denote all bodily and mental excellences, and, though more rarely, their effects or "great achievements," or the "glory," or "fame" acquired in consequence. Thus Sophocles says (*Phil.* 1420) *ἀθάνατον ἀρετὴν ἔσχον*, and Pindar (*Isthm.* v. 49) *ὑψηλαῖς ἀρεταῖς ἀναβαίνειν*. In philosophical language these usages fall into the background, and the abstract sense of "virtue" preponderates. But it is precisely this ethical meaning, which afterwards became universal, that is never found in the Septuagint. *Ἄρετή* is there used only as a translation of *הללה* *וְרָאָה*, and synonymous terms, in the sense of "praise," "glory," "honour," "excellence," "quality worthy of honour." Thus Isaiah xlii. 8, *οὐ δώσω τὰς ἀρετὰς μου τοῖς γλυπτοῖς*; xlii. 12, *τὰς ἀρετὰς αὐτοῦ. . . ἀναγγελοῦσιν*; Hab. iii. 3, *ἐκάλυψεν οὐρανοὺς ἡ ἀρετὴ αὐτοῦ*. The same may be seen in Zech. vi. 13; Isaiah lxiii. 7; lxiii. 7.

<sup>1</sup> Later on, *αἰσθήσεως* was altered into *σοφίας*; hence *both* words appear in some codices. One would be inclined to read *νοήσεως* for *αἰσθήσεως*, but that the latter is so often used in this sense.

<sup>2</sup> There is no reason to believe that the Greek translators wrote *αἰσθανθήσεται*, which we read now in the manuscripts and editions of the LXX.

The purely ethical signification of the word is found for the first time in those books of the Apocrypha that were originally written in Greek. Thus 2 Macc. vi. 31, *μημόσυνον ἀρετῆς καταλιπών*; Wisdom iv. 1, *κρείσσον ἀτεκνία μετ' ἀρετῆς*. So with Wisdom v. 13; viii. 7, and frequently in the fourth book of the Maccabees. In the New Testament the word is almost always employed in the same fashion as in the LXX. (comp. 1 Pet. ii. 9; 2 Pet. i. 3; Phil. iv. 8). Only in one passage does the word seem used in the philosophical sense, viz.: in 2 Pet. i. 5, where we read: *ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετὴν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν*, "In your faith supply virtue, and in your virtue knowledge."<sup>1</sup>

### 9.—*Ἀνδρεία, ἀνδρείος.*

No word is less exposed, either by etymology or usage, to mis-interpretation than *ἀνδρεία*. Already popularly used, to express "manliness" and "courage," ethical inquiry restricted the term still more closely within these prescribed limits.<sup>2</sup> The LXX. neglect this usage most markedly. In Prov. xii. 4; xxxi. 10, *אִשַׁת הַיָּלִד* is translated by *γυνὴ ἀνδρεία* (and consequently, the same is the case with Sir. xxvi. 2; xxviii. 15); in Eccles. ii. 21; iv. 4; v. 10, *כַּשְׂרוֹן*, and in Ps. lxvii. (lxviii.) 7, *כּוֹשְׂרוֹת* is rendered *ἀνδρεία*; in Prov. xv. 19, *יִשְׂרִים* become *ἀνδρείου*, and so do the *חַרְוֹצִים* of Prov. x. 4; xiii. 4. The word thus denotes here not the "brave" but the "excellent," being used as a synonym with *ἀγαθός, χρηστός*. Hence, it is never employed in the LXX. for *גְּבוּר*. In the Apocrypha, the ethical idea again comes clearly to the front (Wisdom viii. 7; 4 Macc. 271, 28. 284, 6 Bekk.); in the New Testament the word is altogether wanting.

### 10.—*Μεγαλοπρεπής, μεγαλοπρέπεια.*

The latter term has a sharply circumscribed ethical signification, of which Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* iv. 4, 1122 a, 18f.) gives evidence. It denotes the generosity of the noble man, who is equally removed from petty avarice on the one side and lavish extravagance on the other. The use of the word by the LXX. shows no trace of this ethical meaning. Here it signifies merely external splendour, serving as a translation for *הוֹד*

<sup>1</sup> Compare Hatch (*loc. cit.*, page 40), who regards this passage as very difficult, and leaves it unexplained.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Plato, *Laches*; Aristotle, *E.N.* III., ch. 9; *Rhet.* I., ch. 9, II., ch. 14.

גאורה, תפארת, הדר, Compare Ps. viii. 2; xx. (xxi.) 5; xxviii. (xxix.) 4; cx. (cx.) 3, etc.

### 11.—Πρόνοια.

The idea of divine Providence could not have been unknown to the Greek translators of the Bible, for it is presented in every page of Scripture. The LXX. however does not use *πρόνοια*, the term technically expressive of the idea of Providence from the fifth century onwards, but *ἐπισκοπή* or other words. *Πρόνοια* occurs only once, and then signifies merely "knowing" or "deliberating," like the corresponding verb *προνοεῖσθαι*. Compare Job xxiv. 15, οὐ προνοήσει με ὀφθαλμός; Prov. iii. 4, καὶ προνοοῦ καλά (וְיִשְׁפֹּר לְיָדְךָ); Jos. xx. 3, πατάξαντι ψυχὴν ἀκουσίως ἀνευ προνοίας.<sup>1</sup> In the Apocrypha we for the first time encounter the word in the connotation given to it by philosophy. The author of the Wisdom, who was very familiar with Platonic and Stoic ideas, says, xiv. 3, ἡ δὲ σὴ, πάτερ, διακυβερνή πρόνοια and vi. 8, ὁμοίως προνοεῖ (ὁ θεὸς) περὶ πάντων. So also 2 Macc. xiv. 9, τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν προνοήθητι, and in many places in the fourth book of the Maccabees. It is noteworthy that *πρόνοια* in the sense of "divine Providence" is also absent from the New Testament.

### 12.—Κόσμος.

*Κόσμος*, from the time of Empedocles (v. 299 Sturz) frequently used by philosophers in the sense of "world," or "universe," in almost the same sense as τὸ πᾶν, is employed by the LXX. only in the original meaning of "ornament," "arrangement," "drawing up of an army," and even for "army" itself. Thus it is the translation of עדי, תפארת, צבא,<sup>2</sup> while it is never found in the LXX. with the meaning "world." It is otherwise with the Apocrypha and the New Testament. Wisdom contains passages like these: vi. 26, πληθὸς δὲ σοφῶν σωτηρία κόσμου; vii. 17, εἰδέναι σύστασιν κόσμου; xi. 18, κτίσασα τὸν κόσμον ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης, etc. The second and fourth books of the Maccabees also are acquainted with this meaning, which is the usual sense in which the word is used in the New Testament.

<sup>1</sup> These last two words are wanting in the great majority of MSS.

<sup>2</sup> Zezschwitz in his stimulative but superficial *Profangrécitat und biblischer Sprachgeist*, p. 22, believes that the LXX., in translating צבא by κόσμος, either confused צבא with צבי, or meant to represent the stars as the ornament of heaven. But the true signification is apparent from Nahum ii. 9, where תכונה is rendered κόσμος, and from Ezekiel xxiii. 41, and Eccl. vii. 13 (14), where ערך and תקן are translated κοσμεῖν. This author's remarks on the use of the word in the New Testament are ingenious but unfounded.

The consideration of the foregoing terms shows that the LXX. were unacquainted with the usages of language which the Greek philosophers had brought into circulation; the philosophical meanings of terms like *αἰσθησις*, *φρόνησις*, *νοῦς*, *ἀνδρεία*, *ἄφρων* remained unknown to them; words in common use like *ἀρετή*, *δοξάζειν*, *κόσμος*, *μεγαλοπρέπεια*, *λόγος*, *εἶδος*, *ἰδεά*, *ἕλη*, *πρόνοια*, they never employ in the sense which philosophy has assigned to them. It is inconceivable that the philosophy of the Greeks can have exercised any considerable influence over men who betray so complete an ignorance of the most common psychological and ethical terms, or that the LXX. were influenced by the Platonic, Aristotelian or Stoic systems. And these conclusions are true not merely for certain portions of the LXX., but for the whole of it. For in regard to the use of these philosophical terms no difference can be detected between the oldest and what are probably the latest translations, between the version of the Pentateuch and that of Job and Nehemiah, between the historical and the poetical books, between the translation of the Prophets and that of the Hagiographa.

The arguments that could be adduced against these conclusions, arguments that have indeed been brought forward to show the influence of philosophy on the LXX., are of no real weight. Objectors point to a few instances of translations which are thought to bear a philosophical stamp. But he who has learnt to recognise the unphilosophical character of the LXX. from the mass of evidence here collected will not be misled by single words and stray expressions. In the unlimited state of corruption in which the text of the LXX. has come down to us, a suspicion of spuriousness must fall upon every word that contradicts a well-established fact. Even an appeal to the oldest LXX. text could not entirely weaken this suspicion, since, as Philo's quotations prove, the text of the LXX. was already at the earliest period disfigured with corruptions of manifold character.

We do not however need this method of escape, a method always dubious in the eyes of timid critics. He who does not venture to follow Gfrörer and Dähne, in introducing into the Greek translation of the Bible, Platonic, Stoic, Philonic and Gnostic dogmas, on the strength of arbitrary and forced interpretations that violate the rules of the language; who, with Thiersch, Frankel and Zeller, stigmatises the procedure of these writers as unscientific, will expect to find the trace of foreign systems of philosophy at the most in but few pas-

sages, and even this diminutive trace to vanish on closer examination.

The LXX. translation of Job vii. 15, and of Psalm l. (li.) 14 reminds Zeller<sup>1</sup> of the anthropological terminology of Plato and the Stoics. In the first passage, where the original runs וּרְבַחַר מִחֵנֶךָ נַפְשִׁי, we find ἀπάλλαξαις ἀπὸ πνεύματος μου τὴν ψυχὴν μου. It is, however, not clear what these words would signify in Platonic or Stoical terminology. With Plato πνεῦμα plays so subordinate a part that I cannot understand why the translators should have here introduced this idea. In the doctrine of the Stoics, moreover, the soul itself is a πνεῦμα, and therefore there can be no reference to this doctrine in the passage before us, where a separation of the πνεῦμα from the ψυχή is spoken of. As a matter of fact, there is probably some corruption in the text under consideration. It is not the habit of the translator of Job without pressing reasons to depart from the original to the extent that he must have done in this instance, if the text were genuine. We must therefore, in accordance with the *Cod. Alex.* and 157 (Parsons), eliminate μου, and with a very slight emendation read πνίγματος for πνεύματος, just as in Nahum ii. 13 (12), מְחַזֵּק is translated ἐπέπνιξε. In this way only do the Greek words receive a good meaning, and correspond with the thought expressed in the second part of the verse. The words of Ps. l. (li.) 4, וְרוּחַ נְדִיבָה תִּסְמְכֵנִי are represented in the LXX. by καὶ πνεύματι ἡγεμονικῶ στήριξόν με. The words refer to God, not at all to the spirit of man. Interpreted in a Stoic sense they would therefore introduce into the Bible the grossest materialism, comparing God to a breath. As we cannot attribute this to the LXX., we must perceive in the rendering before us but an echo of Stoic phraseology, and no sign of the influence of Stoic teaching. In fact, Zeller,<sup>2</sup> with his delicate tact, speaks only of the "terminology" and not of the "philosophy" of the Stoics. It may, however, be that ἡγεμονικὸν was selected as an equivalent for נְדִיבָה without the faintest influence of Stoicism. For the ordinary translation of נְדִיב is ἄρχων or δυνάστης. (Compare Is. xxxii. 5; Ps. lxxxii. 12; cvi. 40; Job xii. 21; xxi. 28; Jud. v. 9<sup>3</sup>; Prov. xvii. 27; xxv. 7, and frequently).

The word ἀόρατον for רֵוָה in the second verse of Genesis was according to Zeller<sup>4</sup> chosen without any *arrière pensée*.

<sup>1</sup> *Philos. d. Griechen*, III., 1<sup>3</sup>, p. 195f.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 255.

<sup>3</sup> For δυνάσται many MSS. have ἐκουσιαζόμενοι, which, however, is easily seen to be a later emendation of the original translation.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 255.

Frankel and Siegfried<sup>1</sup> differ from this view and both see in the phrase an echo of the *κόσμος νοητός* of Philo. This is untenable. For *ἀορασία* is the standing expression in the LXX. for “darkness” and “confusion,” and is regularly employed for ערוּן, סנוּרִים, מסתּר, מפלה (compare Gen. xix. 11; Deut. xxviii. 28; Isaiah xlv. 3; lix. 9). That a distinction between the invisible world of ideas and the world of sensible things could not have been intended in this place is shown by the co-ordinate expression *ἀκατασκευάστος* which has no meaning if applied to the *κόσμος νοητός*.

Significant is the translation of Exodus iii. 14, אהיה אשר אהיה, by ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν, and of אהיה שלחני by ὁ ὢν ἀπέσταλκέ με. It cannot well be denied that God is here described as the eternally existent, and it is difficult to suppose that any change has occurred in the text. Still there is here nothing that compels us to assume the influence of Stoic or Neo-Pythagorean philosophy. For Palestinian exegesis explains these important words in the same manner,<sup>2</sup> and the terminology of the philosophers would have required τὸ ὄν in place of ὁ ὢν.<sup>3</sup>

Technical expressions borrowed from the psychological writings of the Greeks seem to meet us, in the occasionally used *αἰσθητικός* and *αἰσθητήριον*; Prov. xiv. 10, *καρδία ἀνδρὸς αἰσθητικὴ λυπηρὰ ψυχῆ αὐτοῦ* (following Lagarde); *Ibid.* v. 30, *σῆς δὲ ὀστέων καρδία αἰσθητικὴ* and Jeremiah iv. 19, *αἰσθητήρια καρδίας κ.τ.λ.* Precisely in these passages, however, it is conclusively seen how unphilosophically the LXX. went to work. *Αἰσθητικός* is in neither passage what Greek philosophy would have conveyed by the term—it is used not for “what is capable of perception by the senses,” but for *ἐμπαθής*, “perceptible,” “sensible”; in the latter passage indeed it is used to translate *קנאה*—“jealous.” Thus there is no ground for assuming here the actual influence of Greek psychology. The LXX. merely used a word made current by Greek psy-

<sup>1</sup> Frankel, *Paläst. und alex. Schriftf.*, p. 24; Siegfried, *Philo*, p. 8.—Frankel thinks, however, that *ἀόρατος* must be regarded as spurious, since Philo does not cite it. But compare Philo *De opif.*, § 7, p. 8, 17 (ed. Cohn), where the passage occurs *ἐποίει οὐρανὸν ἀσώματον καὶ γῆν ἀόρατον*.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Frankel *Vorstud.* p. 179. Frankel there proves that in Jer. xiv. 13; xxxii. (xxxix.) 17, ὁ ὢν has been corrupted from ὦ.

<sup>3</sup> Greek philosophy expresses the indeterminateness and generality of the divine nature by the neuter. Parmenides speaks of *εἶν*, Plato of *τὸ ἀγαθόν*. The Stoics also, when they do not purposely employ popular language, call the deity *τὸ ὄν* (Stob., ecl. 1, 374, *Diels. doxogr.* p. 463, 14f.) The deity to the Neo-Platonists is *τὸ ἔν* (Plotinus, *Enn.* vi. 9, 3, etc.) It is only Philo who calls God now *τὸ ὄν* and now ὁ ὢν. This is because he taught the personal God of the Bible, and was influenced by the passages in the LXX. quoted above.

chology, but they misinterpreted it and gave it a thoroughly unphilosophical meaning. The same inference, though to a lesser extent, may be drawn from Jeremiah iv. 19, where *αἰσθητήρια τῆς καρδίας* is spoken of. For the plural here employed does not accord with philosophical usage, in which the heart—or according to others the brain—is the single common organ of sense, *αἰσθητήριον*, while it would be impossible to speak of the “sense-organs of the heart.”<sup>1</sup>

Bickell finds an indication of the influence of Greek philosophy on the LXX. in the efforts of the translators to avoid ascribing human form and feelings to God. His remarks run thus: (l. c., p. 5), “Hæc autem detestatio anthropomorphismorum et anthropopathismorum arctissime cohæret et cum theologia alexandrina et cum interpretatione allegorica; utraque autem nonnisi post longiorem philosophiæ græcæ, imprimis platoniciæ cognitionem oriri potuit. Apud Philonem perspicere possumus omnes causas illius detestationis e philosophia græca desumptas esse, nempe immutabilitatem Dei absolutam (*ἀτρεπτον τὸ θεῖον*), ejusdem simplicitatem perfectam, e quacum omnibus qualitatibus, nedum membris et affectibus carere concludit, opinionem denique quæ materiæ et corpori causam mali et peccati tribuit. Hæc ergo dogmata philosophica antecedeabant, rejectio anthropomorphismorum ea consecuta est.”

We must pronounce this argument absolutely groundless. It is improper calmly to assign to the translators of the LXX. the same reasons that Philo gives for his assumption of a Deity without attributes—grounds which certainly coincide most closely with the views of the Greek philosophers. Such a method of historical inquiry is hardly better than the procedure of Dähne, which no one has more sternly censured than Bickell himself.<sup>2</sup> The LXX. did not need the stimulus of Greek philosophers to induce them to assign an interpretation different from the literal one to numerous passages in the Bible, in which bodily parts and properties are ascribed to God,—to soften or to paraphrase a pictorial or poetical mode of expression. The Bible itself was bound to lead to a spiritual interpretation of such passages by remarks such as we find in Numbers xxiii. 19; Deut. iv. 15; 1 Sam. xv. 29; Is. xl. 18; Mal. iii. 6. And that, as a matter of fact, the endeavour to weaken and paraphrase anthropomorphisms and anthropo-

---

<sup>1</sup> Compare Aristotle, *De somno*, 2, 455, a 21; *De juvent.*, 1, 467, b 28; *De rita*, 3. 469, a 12, and the Stoics, Plut., *De plac.*, iv. 8; *Diels doxogr.*, 394, 5 s.; Galen, *Hipp. et Plat.*, p. 28 f.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, page 6, note 8.

pathisms grew up on national ground<sup>1</sup> is proved by the circumstance that the tendency manifested itself in Palestine at a period when there can be no question of the presence of Greek influence, and that it found expression in the *מקוני סופרים* as well as in the Samaritan and Aramaic translations of the Pentateuch. For who would venture to ascribe to the Soferim, Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan a knowledge of systems of philosophy which could only be acquired after a long devotion to their study?

Whoever cannot bring himself to dispute these arguments can find no ground on which to dispute the conclusions arrived at from the foregoing examination. He will, therefore, recognise that the translation of the so-called Septuagint bears no traces of the inroad of Greek philosophy into Jewish Hellenism.

J. FREUDENTHAL.

<sup>1</sup> Frankel also accepts this view, but the grounds upon which he supports it are untenable. His words are (*Vorstudien*, p. 175): "From the fact that the anthropomorphisms recur more frequently in the most recent portions of the LXX., which were composed at a time when Platonism and Greek philosophy in general were more prevalent and widely known, it may be deduced that Greek philosophic theories exercised but little influence upon the translators. The very desire, indeed, to avoid anthropomorphisms by euphemistic turns of speech seems to have been borrowed from Palestine." The fact on which Frankel here relies is incapable of proof. It is not true that in the later translated books the anthropomorphisms become more and more numerous. In no part of the translation are they avoided more markedly (as Bickell has shown) than in Job, which was certainly only composed at a late date. But Bickell is himself entirely in error, when he says (l.c.) that apart from Job the conscious avoidance of anthropomorphisms is only visible in seven other passages of the LXX. One needs to give but a very moderate attention to the Greek translation of the Bible, and a mere glance into the ample material collected by Frankel to rebut this strange assertion, which is apparently based upon the few instances used by Gfrörer.