

JU

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIBRARY

Statement
by author:

I hereby give permission to the Library to circulate my thesis

✓
(yes) (no)

The Library may sell positive microfilm copies of my thesis

✓
(yes) (no)

Date

Oct 10, 1960

Simon Cohen
(signature of author)

Library
record

The ~~below~~-named thesis was microfilmed on

Oct 11, 1960
(date)

For the Library

J. R. Lewis
(signature of staff member)

AUTHOR

Simon Cohen

TITLE

The Attitude of the Palestinian Teachers Toward the Greek Bible
Translations.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE PALESTINIAN TEACHERS TOWARDS

THE GREEK BIBLE TRANSLATIONS.

Simon Cohen.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE PALESTINIAN TEACHERS TOWARDS THE GREEK
BIBLE TRANSLATIONS.

A STUDY

- (1) Of the attitude of the Palestinian teachers towards the Greek language and the Greek translations in general,
- (2) Of the reports, preserved in their writings, of the various Greek translations, and
- (3) Of the attitude shown by these reports and the reasons for such an attitude on their part.

Offered as part requirement for the title of Rabbi,

Respectfully submitted,

Simon Cohen.

February 1, 1916.

TABLE

OF

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Chapter I. The Field of Investigation	1.
Chapter II. The Attitude toward the Greek Language and the Septuagint Prior to the Destruction of the Temple	9.
Chapter III. The attitude towards the Greek Bible Trans- lations in the Period after the Destruction of the Temple	21.
Chapter IV. The Babylonian accounts of the Greek Bible Translations	69.
Chapter V. On Symmachos and Theodotion	79.
Summary	82.
Appendix A. Did the Rabbis Conceive of the Changes they report as having been made in the Septuagint as having been made in the Hebrew Codex or by the Translators ?	83.
Appendix B. The Accounts of the Septuagint arranged in parallels	89.
Appendix C. Summary of the Citations from Aquila	91.
Bibliography.	

CHAPTERONE.THE FIELD OF INVESTIGATION.

The necessity for translations of the Bible arose logically and naturally from the gradual disuse into which the Hebrew language fell and its consequent replacement by other tongues. Even as far back as the return from the Babylonian exile there were influences at work that tended in this direction. The little band that returned from Babylon to rehabilitate the ruins of Judea found themselves a mere handful of people that spoke Hebrew surrounded by other larger groups that spoke another language, which they must have been urged to adopt by influences operating from the moment of their arrival. The necessity of maintaining their relations with the nations around them, and in particular the intermarriages that took place during the time of the earliest re-settlements in Judea, were facts that argued in favor of their learning the Aramaic tongue of their neighbors. That they did manage to maintain the Hebrew was no doubt only possible because of the energetic measures of Ezra and Nehemiah, who prohibited intermarriage and restricted their relations with the neighboring peoples. The disuse of the Hebrew grew slowly and surely. The writings that come from the Persian and the early part of the Greek period are still written in classical Hebrew, though they to a certain extent show the influence of the Aramaic. But the Hebrew of Ben Sira (written about the beginning of the second century B.C.E.) points to a consid-

erable disuse of Hebrew in his time. His writing is artificial and an obvious imitation of the style of the earlier Hebrew writers without a full appreciation of their language. Ecclesiastes, some time later, exhibits a type of Hebrew that is unlike the classical speech and resembles the Neo-Hebrew of the rabbinic writers. Among the people Hebrew must have ceased to have been spoken somewhere in the second century B.C.E., though it no doubt continued to be used in the Temple service, and to be spoken by the priests and the scribes, the spiritual leaders of the people. Finally it ceased altogether to be spoken in the classical form and was replaced by Greek and Aramaic. That Aramaic must have been the common language of the people in the second century is shown by the fact that the popular book of Daniel, written at that time, has large portions in the Aramaic tongue. Surely, if the redactors of the book had been able to find a complete Hebrew codex, they would have used the Hebrew instead of the Aramaic in the parts where the latter is found; but evidently no complete Hebrew manuscript was found, and this because Hebrew was not read or spoken by the people.

The Bible translations are the results of attempts on the parts of various individuals, or groups of individuals, to present the Scriptures in readable form, to people who no longer understood the language in which they were written. At first only undertaken by and for the Jews, they later were used more widely by the Christian Church to spread its own doctrines.

The subject of our study will be the attitude of the official synagogue towards these translations. Were they looked upon with enthusiasm, with extreme disapproval, or perhaps mere in-

difference? What translation or translations were preferred, and why were they preferred? Were there any criteria by which the value of a translation was to be gauged? Did they employ these translations as a help, and if so, in what field? Did the rabbis play any part in the origin of any translation, and if so, who of them were the originators? Were any restrictions made as to the language in which the translations could be made? Thus far is the scope of our study; but questions as to the relative merits of the translations as translations or their use in textual criticism, or similar topics are outside of the field of this investigation.

We shall further limit our study to the Greek translations alone. The discussion will center about the Septuagint and the translation of Aquila. Symmachos and Theodotion play so insignificant a part that I have thought it best to omit any consideration of them in the main discussion and shall treat them in a separate chapter.

We will, however, have to consider the attitude of the Rabbis to the Aramaic translations, as these to a certain extent throw light on the attitude toward the Greek translations. It must not be forgotten that the words תרגום --- "to translate", and תרגומן --- "translation", which in the Babylonian Gemara and subsequent writings refer only to the Aramaic translations, were in Biblical (*) and Mishnaic times equally used to designate all

(*)

The verb תרגום is only used once in the Bible, in Ezra IV, 7. $\text{וְכָתוּב בְּאֲרָמִית וּמִתְּרָגְמָהּ אֲרָמִית}$ --- "Written in Aramaic and translated into Aramaic". As it now reads, the passage is absurd, for there

translations of the Hebrew (*). It is thus always possible that the regulations given for the Targums may just as well have been intended to refer to the Greek translations also.

Before taking up the actual opinions of the rabbis on the Greek translations, we shall first review the conditions and the points of view that might have influenced them. We know that there was a difference of opinion among the rabbis as to the admission of proselytes, between Pharisees and Sadducees, between Hillelites and Shammaites, and even in later times. A Greek translation of the Bible, that set forth to the nations of the world the high ethical principles and the sublime God-conceptions of Judaism in a tongue that they could read, might

is no sense in translating a document in the same language in which it is written. We can get some light on this passage by referring to Daniel II, 4. There we find another absurd expression: וְיִדְבָּרוּ הַכַּשְׁדִּיִּם לְנָאֵךְ אֲרַמִּית "And the Chaldeans spoke to the king, in Aramaic". But a comparison of the two passages shows that, in both cases, the very next verse begins the Aramaic portion of the book. אֲרַמִּית is therefore not a part of the text, in Ezra IV, 7 as well as in the Daniel passage, but an indication to the reader that at this point in the book the Hebrew text ceases and the Aramaic begins---an indication that was necessary in unpointed texts, as the vocalization of the two languages is essentially different. Omitting the word אֲרַמִּית from the Ezra passage, it reads quite logically, "Written in Aramaic and translated", i.e. into Persian.

(*)Y. Kiddushin I, 1 59a line 10, Megillah 71c line 11. Megillah II, 1.

have been considered by some of the rabbis as a valuable aid in making converts to Judaism. The school of Alexandrian writers, who, in various pseudipigrapha, written in the Greek language, endeavored to advance the cause of Judaism, had shown how it might be possible to bring to the nations the knowledge of the Jewish Bible; such an idea ^dmight have been considered quite plausible by the Palestinian teachers. Again, among the Jews themselves there were very large numbers who knew only the Greek language. The question may have come up: "Were these to be barred from the knowledge of the Scriptures?" We can readily see how vital such a consideration might become after the Temple had fallen and the Jews were no longer held fast to their religion by the sight of the altar of burnt-offering and the priests ministering in the Temple ritual. At that time the study of the Scriptures was not merely a thing for the sages, a thing that need only be taken up by those who were willing to study the Hebrew language; it was deemed necessary to acquaint all of the people with the Jewish Scriptures. For such purposes the teachers might have been impelled to favor the Greek translations.

On the other hand, there were reasons that could be advanced against the use of the translations. Proselytizing was condemned as dangerous by some of the teachers. They contended that Judaism was universalistic, but not universal. There were those who held that there was no need to entrust the Bible to the masses, but that it should be kept in the hands of the learned only (*). The rabbis may also have been fearful of letting

(*)Such an attitude is still maintained by the Catholic Church.

the Scriptures go out into the world. There was danger of their being misunderstood and misinterpreted. If they were not presented in the original, the laws derived from the Bible on the basis of the rabbinic exegesis of the Hebrew, would lose their weight.

That such an attitude really prevailed to a certain extent among the rabbis is shown by their great reluctance in putting the traditional law into writing. They desired to preserve it for themselves, and for the Jews as well. Such an attitude is reflected in the following passage (Pesikta Rabbati, Chapter V, p. 14b ed. Friedmann):

אמר רבי יוחנן ברבי שלום ביקש משה שיהא המשנה בכתב
וצפה הקדוש ברוך הוא שהאומות עתידין לתרגם את התורה
ולקרות קוראים בה יוונית ואומלית אנו (א) הם ישראל אמר לו
הקדוש ברוך הוא לא משה עתידין האומות להיות אומלית אנו
הם ישראל אנו הם בבין של מקום ישראל אומלית אנו הם בבין
של מקום ועכשין המאמנים מצוין אמר הקדוש ברוך הוא לאומות
מה אהם אומלית שהם בני איני יודע אלא שמשילין
שלי בידן הוא בני אהלו לו ומה הם משילין שלך
אמר להם המשנה:

"Moses desired that the Mishnah should be handed down in writing. But God foresaw that the nations were going to translate the Torah into Greek and read it, and say, 'We are Israel'. The Holy One, blessed be He, said, 'Ah, Moses, the nations are going to say, 'We are Israel, we are the sons of God', and Israel will say 'We are the sons of God'. Thus far the scales will be balanced.

(*) Emending, in accordance with the sense and the same expression in the next line, from the present reading א'.

Then the Holy One, blessed be He, will say to the nations, 'Why do you say that you are my sons? I only recognize as my son he who has My mysteries in his possession'. They will say to Him, 'And what are thy mysteries?' He will say to them, 'The Mishnah'. " (*) .

This report reflects the conflicts of the Jews and the Christians. The latter, who were of the nations of the world, had the Torah in the Greek translation, and claimed therefore to be Israel and the sons of God. The rabbis could very well consider the translations of the Scriptures into Greek pernicious from this point of view.

Or again, there might have been reasons for opposing a certain existing translation. As we shall see, at a certain time they actually did oppose the Septuagint. This opposition may have had one or more motives. For instance, it may have been due to the general opposition of translations, or to the writing down of translations. Or they may have been reconciled to these things, but objected to it especially because of its paraphrasing translation. Indeed we have the statement, (Tosefta IV, 41) that indicates such a view:

האומר פסוק כצולתו הרי זה ברע והמוסיף הרי זה אומר

"If one translates a verse literally, he is a liar, and he who adds is a blasphemer." Although this dictum is intended for the Meturgemanim, it shows plainly the opposition to a translation that rendered anthropomorphic passages literally or that para-

(*) Parallels are found in Tanchoma Ki Sisso, to Exodus XXIV, 1, ed. Buber 58ab, Shemos Rabbah XLVII, 1.

phrased. Again they may have thought that the Septuagint mistranslated or deliberately changed certain parts. Or they may have been actual Halachic points depending on a particular interpretation of a certain form; the Septuagint may have failed to afford a basis for this and therefore have been condemned. A modern instance of such an attack on a translation is Phineas Horowitz' objection to Mendelssohn's translation of *וְאַתָּה יְהוָה* (Leviticus XIX, 17) by, "Du magst schelten", because the rabbis derive from these words a positive commandment, and the translation leaves it a matter of choice.

All these possibilities will have to be kept in mind in carrying on this investigation.

CHAPTERTWO.THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE GREEK LANGUAGE AND THE SEPTUAGINT
PRIOR TO THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE.

It is difficult to determine accurately just when the Greek influence in Palestine^{2/} began. It was in Egypt, of course, that *upon first* it was first felt. Even before the time of Alexander the Great there was a large Jewish community in Egypt, who, as is evidenced by the Elephantine papyri, had ceased to speak the Hebrew language at a very early time. It had grown to considerable numbers by the time of Alexander, and when he founded his new city Alexandria, the Jews settled there in large numbers. The Jews there observed the customs of the Jewish religion, but no longer spoke the Hebrew language. A small minority among the other peoples in the country, they had previous to this gradually forgotten their ancestral tongue and had used the Aramaic dialects. Now, that the Greek conquest of Egypt made Greek the prevailing language in the Nile Delta, the Jews were apparently not slow in adopting the new language of the country for their everyday speech. As observing Jews, they desired a knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures, and, as they no longer could understand the Hebrew, they made the Septuagint translation into the Greek language, the first rendition of the Bible into another tongue. First the Torah, about the middle of the third century B.C.E., and then the later Biblical books, as well as the Apocrypha, were translated for them into Greek.

The conditions in Palestine were totally different. The Greek language never became the universal language of the Jews. Alexander's transit through Palestine did not bring about the disuse of the Hebrew and its replacement by the language of the conquerors. The Greek influence could only have begun to be felt in the time of the Diadochoi, when both the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae were turning longing eyes towards the district of Coele-Syria, of which Palestine formed the largest part. The coast cities became populated with Greek colonists and adopted Greek names. Damascus and the Decapolis became thoroughly Hellenized. It could not have been very long before the Jews of Judea proper, through their relations with these cities, were subjected to a gradually denser Hellenic atmosphere. The result was that in the second century there were even conscious tendencies towards Hellenization.

In all likelihood these tendencies would have resulted in making Greek the language of the Jews of Palestine, as it was the language of the Jews of the Diaspora, had it not been for the acts of the madman Antiochus Epiphanes. His defilement of the Temple, and his attempt to wipe out the Jewish religion and to substitute in its stead the Greek worship, produced a violent counter-reaction. Those who wished to have Greek spoken could be charged with desiring to carry out the religious aims of the king, and thus from this time on we find the Hellenizing parties diminishing. Despite the failure of the movement to make Greek the universal language, it was not altogether dropped in Palestine. The fact that the Maccabean kings themselves assumed Greek surnames, and that the Second Book of the

Maccabees, and possibly the First, were written in Greek, shows that it was still known by a number of those of the upper classes.

Among the people there must have been a fair number of Greek words that were in familiar use. The book of Daniel, by its very nature a popular work, contains several Greek words. The Greek words found in the Mishnah were probably taken from the language of the people, and as there is no reason to believe that the Greek influence at the time that the Mishnah was being written down was any stronger than in the time before the destruction of the Temple, these words probably represent fairly the Greek words that were known to the people in the earlier time, and their numbers show that the Greek influence was by no means utterly uprooted. In the Mishnaic vocabulary, we find, for instance, in military matters, such words as ἡγεμών and ἡγεμονία, ἄρχή, πόλεμος, ὁψώνιον; in legal affairs, συνέδριον, ὑποθήκη, διαθήκη, ἐπίτροπος, προσβολή; among articles of wear, σάνδαλα, σουδάριον, στολή and others; in trade, σιτώνης, βαλανεύς, βυροεύς, μουσώλης, πλάττης, πίνος, and ἄλφα or Al, to indicate the best quality; among the domestic utensils are mentioned the καθέδρα, φιάλη, θήκη, πίθος, μαρούπιον. In common use we find the words ἰδιώτης, ληστής, ἀσθενής, διφθέρα, κύβειά. These are only a few of the Greek words found in the Mishnaic vocabulary.

Still, this does not prove that Greek was the language of the people of Palestine at any time. There is abundant evidence to show that Aramaic was the language universally spoken by the Jews there. When Titus wanted to address the besieged in Jeru-

salem, (Josephus, Bellum Judaicum, V. 9. 2, VI. 2. 1..), or Paul to speak to the Jews (Acts XXI, 40, XXII, 2), they had to use the Aramaic language. The employment of the Greek words in the Jewish language in Palestine was no doubt analogous to the use of such English words as "factory", "strike", "street-car" or "pants", that have now been taken into the Yiddish of the Jews of America. The fact that nearly all the Greek words given in the Mishnah are nouns shows that this must have been the case.

The Greek influence in Palestine was enhanced by the fact that many of the Jews of the Diaspora came to Palestine to make pilgrimages to the Temple. We know from Philo (De Monarchia, book II, section 5) that in almost every town there was a collection of the tribute for the Temple, which at stated intervals were entrusted to men of good standing, who conveyed it to Jerusalem. Josephus also quotes documents giving permission from the Roman emperors to convey such tribute to the Temple. Philo himself visited the Temple (De Providentia), probably around the year 30 C.E. There were synagogues of the Greek-speaking Jews in Jerusalem, as we know from Tosefta Megillah III, 6, where one is mentioned, and from Acts VI, 9, where it is stated that there were synagogues of the Alexandrinians, Cyrenians, Cilicians, Asiatics, and Libertinai (by whom are probably meant Jews that had been made slaves in the Diaspora and then obtained their freedom).

There was also a certain amount of communication between the Alexandrinians and the Palestinians as to religious questions. Hillel (Tosefta Kethuboth IV, 9) reports a case where

the elders in Palestine were called upon to decide the validity of a marriage that had been conducted according to certain Alexandrinian rights. In Negaim XIV,13 and Tosefta Negaim IX,9, we find the Alexandrinians asking questions about leprosy of a certain Rabbi Joshua, and in B. Niddah, beginning 69b, they are reported as asking twelve other questions of him. This Rabbi Joshua was probably Rabbi Joshua ben Perachiah, who is known to have fled at one time to Egypt, and they were evidently asked of him at the time that he was in that country. But it shows that the Alexandrinians were anxious to secure the opinions of a Palestinian rabbi on Biblical laws. In Challah IV, 10, we have a report that the men of Alexandria once brought their Challahs to the Temple in Jerusalem.

The fact that there was never any condemnation of the Temple at Leontopolis--an evident rival of that in Jerusalem--but only a denial of its full holiness, (Menachoth XIII, 10), shows what friendly relations existed between the two countries. The great synagogue in Alexandria was especially praised as a wonderful thing (Tosefta Sukkah IV, 6, Y. Sukkah V, 1 55a near the bottom, B. Sukkah 51b). There are even three cases mentioned where workmen were brought from Alexandria for the Temple service, once to make the shew-bread (Tosefta Yom ha-Kippurim II, 5), once to compound the incense (Tosefta Yom ha-Kippurim II, 6), and once to fix the copper cymbal in the Temple that had become injured (Tosefta Arachin II, 3). The Nicanor gates for the Temple were also made in Alexandria (Tosefta Yom ha-Kippurim II, 4).

In view of these relations with the Alexandrinians it was

impossible that the Palestinian teachers were aware of the fact that there was a translation of the Bible into Greek that was being used in Egypt. The fact that in Temple times we have no condemnation of the Septuagint (*) shows by an "argumentum ex silentio" that they may even have looked upon it with some sort of favor. That they do not mention it at all was undoubtedly due to the fact that it did not concern them directly. The Jews in Palestine were in no need of a translation of the Bible into Greek.

A further significant fact to be noted in all the accounts of the translations of the Septuagint is their unanimity in making the translators themselves come from Palestine. There must have been at least some truth in this feature of the story. They all originated from Egypt, and it is hardly likely that the Egyptian Jews, if they had made the translations themselves, would have denied themselves the credit for it to give it to the Palestinians. It is not within the scope of this investigation to discuss the validity of such stories; but this much is certain, that there must have been some Palestinian influence aiding in the Septuagint translation. The Egyptian Jews who first settled there and who were the first to cease speaking the Hebrew language, could not have been able to translate the Bible, unaided.

(*)

Graetz is the only one who holds the view that Soferim I, 7, which opposes the Septuagint, is old and historically correct (Geschichte III, note 2 pp. 579-580). I shall show later that this statement is much later than the time of the Septuagint translation, and actually dates from later than the destruction of the Temple.

o date

If there was not a deliberate calling in of Palestinians to perform the work of translation, it is most probable that it was made by those Jews who still spoke Hebrew and who were taken captive or who fled to Egypt in the time of the Diadochoi.

Furthermore, from certain positive statements in the Mishnah, we can see that there was no objection "per se" to the Greek translation. In Sotah VII, 1, it is expressly stated that the following things may be said in any language: the section that was read to the Sotah, the confession that was said over the tithes, the Shema, the prayer for the congregation, grace, the oath for testimony, and the oath for the deposit. It is noticeable that the first three of these passages are from the Bible and that the first two must have been used in Temple times. The confession for the tithes of course ceased when the Temple fell, and the ordeal for the Sotah was abolished by Rabbi Jochanan ben Zacchai. As we learn from Yadaim IV, 3, as well as from indications in Josephus and Philo, that tithes were collected from Egypt, it is certain that the people who brought the tribute from Egypt must have brought the tithes---or, rather, the money value of the tithes, -----to the Temple in Jerusalem and there made the confession required in the Torah. There is no restriction as to country in the case of the Sotah, and so it may have well happened in Temple times that one was brought from one of the Greek-speaking colonies, if not from the few Greek-speaking Jews of Palestine. In both of these cases the Biblical passage must have been said in Greek, and was therefore in all probability taken from the Septuagint, as it is very unlikely that the priests themselves were able to translate verb-

ally from the Hebrew. The use of the Septuagint in the Temple service could not have been looked upon with disfavor without some sort of a protest, so the absence of any such protest points rather to a decided tolerance.

A further point is the decided difference in legislation between that for the Greek and that for the Aramaic languages. The translations made in the latter were for a long time not permitted to be written down. Although all the discussions on this subject come from a later date than the destruction of the Temple, it is obvious that the prohibition must have been in force in Temple times as well. In fact we have a report of an action of Rabban Gamliel the Elder, who died eighteen years before the destruction of the Temple, which brings this out very clearly. It is reported (Tosefta Shabbos XIV, 2-3, Y. Shabbos XVI, 1, 15c line 5, B. Shabbos 115a), that while he was on the Temple mount he was brought a copy of an Aramaic translation of Job and that he directed the builders to bury it under the Temple wall. In later times Gamliel the Second did the same to another Targum of Job (see Tosefta and Babli passages) and we find Rabbi Samuel ben Isaac (Y. Megillah IV, 1. 74d line 14.) and Rabbi Jehudah bar Nachmani (B. Temurah 14b, Gittin 60b) declaring that the Bible was only to be translated into Aramaic verbally. This treatment of the Aramaic contrasts strikingly with the use of the Greek translation in the Temple, already noted in the last paragraph.

In Megillah II, 1 we find a law which has also some bearing on the Greek translations. While we have no means of ascertaining the time of the law, it probably was also in force in Temple

times. This is the statement:

קורא את המגילה למספר לא יצא. קראה על פה קראה בלב לבשין
לא יצא. אבל קורין אותה בלב לבשין בלעז והלכות שטמע אשיות יצא:

"If one reads the Megillah in the wrong order, he has not done his duty. If he reads it by heart, or if he reads it in a translation in any language, he has not done his duty. But they may read it to those who speak a foreign language in their foreign language, and the one who speaks a foreign language and hears it read in the Hebrew square character, discharges his duty."

The first part of this statement refers to those Jews who could read or understand the Hebrew, or could secure a Meturgeman, and who were not allowed to discharge their duty by reading the Megillah in a translation. But in the case of the שליש ---- by which is meant those Jews who spoke a foreign language and in particular those who spoke Greek (*) permission was given to read the Megillah in their own language. Since permission

(*) The word שליש is not connected with the other word of the same sound meaning "slander" or "bad report", but is in all probability a notarikon from השליש ידוע שליש ---- "the ^{why} language of the idol worship", in contrast to Hebrew, the holy language, שליש הקדוש. The heathens in Palestine were nearly all Greeks and so the word came to denote the Greek language in particular. A similar notarikon in ancient times was the Christian use of the word ἰχθύς, "fish" (Ἰησοῦς Χριστός Θεοῦ Υἱός Σωτήρ); in modern times the word "tip" (To Insure Promptness). In a similar way, I believe שליש (Sotah IX, 9) to be a notarikon for השליש ידוע שליש. 27.

was given to them because they did not understand Hebrew at all, it is obvious that the translation was not made verbally, but that they employed a written translation translation, which in this case also must have been the Septuagint. As we have seen before, there were synagogues for the Greek-speaking Jews in Jerusalem, and so in all probability, the Megillah was actually read by them in the Septuagint translation.

We can summarise the result of this survey of the Temple times in the statement that the Palestinian teachers, even if they did not openly praise the Septuagint, permitted its use freely, in the case of those Jews of the Diaspora who spoke Greek. It is not hard to find a reason for this. In Palestine there may have been some feeling against their own use of written Biblical translations, since there was always a large number of teachers who were able to understand and expound the Hebrew. The Jews of the Diaspora, however, who did not know the Hebrew, could only get a knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures, and in fact of the whole Jewish law, through the Greek Bible translation. The Septuagint was thus the great force that made the Jews of the Diaspora obedient to the laws of Judaism, and subservient to the administration of the Temple in Jerusalem. If the Jews who spoke Greek had been prohibited from reading the Bible in their own language, they would not have sent the half-shekels, the tithes, the first-fruits, and their other offerings that were the greater part of the support for the Temple service. At that time there were not the dangers from the Septuagint translation that arose later. Therefore, we need not be surprised to find the Palestinian teachers, in Temple times, per-

mitting the use of the Septuagint.

Before concluding this chapter, however, we must note a fact that is important in recording the history of the Greek translations. This is nothing less than the prohibition of Greek in the time just preceding the fall of the Temple. We have the report, (most accurately in Yerushalmi Shabbos I,4 3c lower half of the column, less accurately in Babli Shabbos 13b-17a and Tosefta Shabbos I, 16-17) that on a certain day the disciples of the various schools met in the upper chamber of Hananiah ben Hiskiah ben Gorion, and that there the Shammaites succeeded by violent means in getting a majority and passing eighteen measures directed against the Roman government and the heathen. The time of this occurrence is to be fixed, following Graetz (Geschichte III, 805-813) and Zeitlin (Les Dix-huit Mesures, Revue des Etudes Juives, 1914, 36) in the year 66 and not as Weiss (Dor I, 187) has it, in the year 44. Among the prohibitions is mentioned that of the language of the heathen (Yerushalmi, line 54). By this Greek as well as Latin was interdicted. The decree was evidently aimed at the Jews of the peace party, who were suspected—and not without reason—of having relations with the Roman government.

It is hard to state exactly the precise extent of this prohibition. In all probability it only applied to the Jews in Palestine. Whether it would have been extended to the Jews in the other countries if the revolt and subsequent war with Rome had been successful, is an open question. The Shammaites who passed the Eighteen Measures perished in the ruins of Jerusalem, and the surviving Hillelites repudiated the eighteen measures

that had been obtained through violence and declared that the day on which they were made was as grievous as that on which the golden calf was made. (See Yerushalmi and Tosefta passages.) Still, it is possible that the first seed of dislike for the Greek translation was then sown.

CHAPTERTHREE.THE ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE GREEK BIBLE TRANSLATIONS IN THE PERIOD
AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF THE TEMPLE.

We have absolutely no information as to attitude of the rabbis toward the Greek translations between the year 70 and the war of Quietus, in the years 115-117. We can only suppose, that since those who survived the war and remained in Palestine were of the peace party, and therefore not averse to relations with the heathen, they did not retain the prohibition of the Greek language that had been made in the year 66. No doubt the toleration of the Septuagint, which had existed in the time of the Temple remained in force. If there had been any prohibition, we would in all likelihood have some report or indication of it. It is hardly likely that the rabbis of that time were concerned at all with the Greek translations. It was their task to rehabilitate, first of all, the ruins of Judea, and to meet the changed condition of affairs after the destruction of the Temple and the downfall of the national existence.

This is further borne out by the fact that, in the war of Quietus, we meet with another prohibition of the Greek language that was decreed by the teachers-----a decree that would have been unnecessary if Greek was no longer spoken or read by the Jews there. In Sotah IX, 14, we find the passage:

בשנת ה'תק"ל (1737) ה'תק"ל ה'תק"ל ה'תק"ל ה'תק"ל

ה'תק"ל ה'תק"ל ה'תק"ל ה'תק"ל ה'תק"ל

"In the war of Quietus they decreed against the bridal crowns and that a man should not teach his son Greek." This prohibition was made probably shortly after the year 115, when, according to Dio Cassius (History LXVIII, 32), Lusius Quietus was appointed consular legate over Palestine. The reason given for this prohibition in Yerushalmi (Sotah IX, 16 24c line 12, Peah I, 1 15c line 11) is שומונה '1972 ---- "on account of the informers". This is quite plausible, as there was probably at this time also a peace party, as in the time of the earlier war with Rome, who might communicate with the Romans and inform them of the designs of the rebels, and so the peace party tried to prohibit such intercourse with their enemies, by the same sort of decree that they had made in the year 66. There is however this difference between the two prohibitions ---- it is to the next generation and not to the present one that the second prohibition applied. We may suppose from this that those in the majority were laying plans for the future. The attempt to enlist the Palestinian Jews in aid of the revolt which had begun in Egypt and Mesopotamia had not succeeded. From outside sources we know that Palestine took no part in the rebellion. This was probably due to the fact that the appointment of Quietus to the governorship of Palestine quelled any possible disturbance. The war party felt, that if at present there was

(*) This reading is found in the best sources, (1) the manuscript in the Royal Library of Berlin, MSS. Or. Fol. 567 and (2) the Cambridge manuscript, edited by Lowe, 1883. It is therefore to be read instead of the reading of our present manuscripts, שומונה '1972 שומונה '1972 ---- "the war of Titus".

no hope of a successful revolt, there might be in the next generation, and so they desired to sever any future relations between their sons and the Roman government. Accordingly, after they had decreed that the brides should no longer be adorned with crowns, as a sign of mourning, they decided to prohibit a man's teaching Greek to his son, as a war measure. That they were not wrong in expecting another revolt is shown by the fact that less than twenty years later the Bar-Kochba rebellion broke out.

We have also in Yerushalmi (Sotah IX,16 24c line 8, Peah I,1 15c line 7, Shabbos VI,1 7d) a report of Rabbi Joshua, that evidently comes from that time, as follows:

שאלו ר' יחושע מקו שלמד אדם את בנו יומית אצל להן ילמדו
בשעה שאינה לא יום ולא לילה דכתיב והקית ב יומם ולילה:

"They asked Rabbi Joshua:" When should a man teach his son Greek? " He said:" Let him teach him at a time when it is neither day or night, as it is written:(Joshua I,8. This book of the law shall not depart from thy mouth) and thou shalt meditate therein day and night." This story is also found, with slight variants, in Tosefta Abodah Zarah I,20, and in Midrash Tehillim to Psalm I,2, which in this version is the verse quoted by Joshua.

This evidently comes from about the time of the prohibition. Rabbi Joshua ben Chananiah, the disciple of Rabbi Jochanan, flourished about that time, and the question is the same as that with which the prohibition deals. But it is to be noted that the reason given by Rabbi Joshua-----that the study of Greek will interfere with the study of the Law-----is different from that advanced for the decree, "on account of the informers".

This prohibition of the Greek seems to have remained the law, though it may not have been actively enforced. The fact that it is expressly stated that the patriarchal family was permitted to teach its members Greek, and that Rabbi Abbahu later tried to secure the permission to teach girls Greek on the ground that it was an ornament to them (*), shows that it still must have been the law in later times. It probably was only intended for the Jews of Palestine, since it would have been impossible to make the Jews of the Diaspora stop speaking Greek. The prohibition therefore, has no bearing on the question of the Greek translations, except that it reminds us that all the later discussion of the translations must have been done with the Jews of the Diaspora in mind. In Palestine Rabbi Joshua opposed the learning of Greek, because it interfered with the study of the Torah; but he also aided later in bringing a Greek translation of the Torah to the Jews of the Diaspora.

In all this discussion we have been following the reports given in Yerushalmi. The reports of Babli on this whole subject are in the highest degree confusing. It takes the prohibition of Greek to be merely a prohibition of Greek wisdom, an interpretation that is proved impossible by Rabbi Abbahu's statement, that Greek is allowed to girls as an ornament to them. By this

(*) See the context of the Yerushalmi passages quoted in the last page. In this connection we are further told that Rabbi Shimeon bar Abba said that Abbahu only pretended that this permission was based on the authority of Jochanan ben Zacchai because he had let his own daughter learn Greek, which insinuation Abbahu indignantly denies.

he could only have meant the Greek language and not Greek wisdom. The story given by Babli (Sotah 49b, also found Menachoth 64 b , Baba Kamma 82b) as a reason for the prohibition mentioned in Sotah IX, 14, shows how little Babli understood the subject. It relates that in the time of the civil war between Hyrcanus and Aristobolus, the sons of Alexander Jannaeus, when the former was besieging the latter in Jerusalem, that the besiegers would send up the daily offering in a basket which the besieged lowered. An old man who knew "Greek wisdom" told the besiegers that they could not hope to capture the city as long as the daily sacrifice was being offered and so one day, by his advice, they sent up a pig in the basket. Whereupon the sages exclaimed, "Cursed be the man who raises pigs, and cursed be the man who teaches his son Greek wisdom!" Just exactly what this story of Hasmonean times has to do with a prohibition nearly two hundred years later, is not at all clear. It shows that Babli evidently knew nothing at all of the real reason, if they could only find this story on the subject (*).

We come now to the reports in the Talmudic literature that deal with the Septuagint. There are in all six important reports. Four of these contain a list of the changes that the Septuagint was reported to have made in certain verses. These are Mechilta to Exodus XII, 40, Y. Megillah I, 11 7ld line 46, B. Megillah 9ab, and Soferim I, 9. The other passages do not contain such lists, but merely a brief statement about the translation that is evidently hostile to it. These are Soferim

(*) We shall explain the Babli account in the next chapter.

I, 8 and the passage for the eighth of Tebet in the final chapter added to Megillas Ta'anis.

The Mechilta account runs as follows:

ואושב בני ישראל אשר ישבו במצרים ובארץ כנען ובארץ כנען
שליש שנה וארבע מאות שנה וזה אחד מן הדברים שנתנו לתלמי
המלך. כיוצא בו כתבו לו. אלהים ברא בראשית אדם בצלם
ובדמותו. צלם ונקבו בראש. וכל ביום קששו וישובות ביום השביעי.
הבה אירדה ואבלה שם שפתם. ותצחק שלה בקיוביה לאמר. כי באפם
הרגו שור וברצונם עקרו אבוס. ויקח משה את אשתו ואת בניו
וילכבם על נושא אדם. לא חמד אחד מהם נשאתי. אשלי חלק ה' אליהם
להאיר לכל העמים. אשר לא צויתי לעבדם. וכתבו לו את צעירות
רגלים:

Both Yerushalmi and Babli accounts are found in their commentaries to Megillah I, 8:

אין בין ספרים לפסלים ומזוזות אלא שהפסלים נכתבין בכל לשון
ותפילין ומזוזות אינן נכתבין אלא אשורית. רבי שמעון בן גמליאל
אמר אף בספרים לא התירו שיכתבו אלא יוונית:

"There is no difference between the books of the Bible and the Tefillin and Mezuzoth, except that the books can be translated into any language, and Tefillin and Mezuzoth can only be written in the Hebrew square character. Rabbi Simeon ben Gamliel said: Even in the case of books they only permitted them to be translated into Greek " (*)

Yerushalmi introduces the report very abruptly after a dis-

(*) We shall explain later in this chapter to what occurrence this statement of Rabbi Simeon refers. The reason for choosing such a method of procedure is because we are going chronologically, and this report is later than those we are now discussing.

discussion of the correct writing of the Sefer Torah. It runs as follows:

ג' עשר דבריה שיתו חכמים בתלמי המלך כתבו לו אלהים ברא
בראשית. אעשה אדם בצלם וברמות. צכר ונקובין בראה. ויכל בששי
וישבות בשביעי. הבה ארדה. ותצחק שרה בקרוביה לאמר. כי באפס קלנו שור
לברכות עקרו אבוס. ויקח משה את אשתו ואת בתו וירכיבם על נוסאי
בני אדם. ומושב בני ישראל אשר ישבו במצרים וכל הארצות
שלשיות שנה וארבע מאות שנה ואת האלונות את צעירות הרבליה
אמו של תלמי ארצות היום שמה. לא חמד אחד מהם נשאת. אשר חלק ה'
אלהיק אותם להאיר לכל העמים תחת כל השמים. אשר לא צוית לעבדו:

Babli connects it more closely with the discussion. First there comes a comparison of this passage with that in Yadaim IV, 5, which considers as sufficiently holy to require washing of the hands only those books that were written in the Hebrew square character. Then follows a statement (*) of Rabbi Jehudah that when our rabbis (ר' יוחנן) gave their permission to translate the Bible into Greek, it was only for the five books of Moses, and because of תלמי -- "the occurrence of Ptolemy", and goes on to explain what is meant by these last two words by the following Baraita(**):

ד' תנא אעשה בתלמי המלך שנים שבעים ושנים צקו והשיבו
בשבעים ושנים בתים ולא גילה להם על מה הושיבו צקו אצל
אחד ואחד מהם אמר להם כתבו לי תורת משה רבכם צפן הקב"ה

(*) The Munich manuscript reads ג' א' instead of ד' תנא in our ordinary editions.

(**) The passage here given is taken from the Munich manuscript.

בלב כל אחד ואחד מהם והסכימו לדעת אחת וכתבו לו אלהים
 ברא בראשות. אעשה אדם בצלם וברמות. ויכל כיוון השמי וישובות
 השבעי. צלם ונקבה בראו. הבה אירדה ואבלה שם שפוט. ונחמק שיה בקריו ביה.
 כי באפס הרבו שור ובפצונם עקרו אבוה. ויקח משה את אשתו ואת בניו
 וילכבו על כושא אדם. ומושב בני ישראל אשר ישבו במצרים ובשאר
 הארצות שלשים שנה וארבע מאות שנה. וישלח את צאטוטי בני ישראל
 ולצאטוטי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו. לא חמר אחד מהם נשאתי. אשר חלק
 ה' אלהיך אותם להאיר לכל העמים. וילך ויעבור אלהים אשר לא צוית
 לעבדו. וכתבו לו את צעירות הרבליה למח אחריו אשרי של תלמי הרבנות
 שמה שלא יאמר שחקו בו היהודים והטילו שם אשרי
 בתורה:

The account in Soferim runs as follows:

אעשה בראשית המלך שכינס שבעים זקנים והושיבם בפיס ולא
 הוריע כהם על מה כנסם. ונכנס אצל כל אחד ואחד מהם אמר להם כתבו לי תורת
 משה רבכם. כען הקב"ה עשה בלב כל אחד אחד והסכימו לדעת אחת
 וכתבו לו את התורה בפע עצמה וי"ג דבר שינו בה. אלהים ברא
 בראשית. ויאמר אלהים אעשה אדם בצלם וברמות. ויכל בשמי וישובות
 בשבעי. צלם ונקבה בראו (בראו ל). הבה אירדה ואבלה שם שפוט. ונחמק
 שיה בקריו ביה לאמר. כי באפס הרבו שור ובפצונם עקרו אבוה. ויקח
 משה את אשתו ואת בניו וילכבו על כושא אדם. ומושב בני ישראל אשר
 ישבו בארץ מצרים ובארץ כנען ובשאר הארצות שלשים שנה וארבע
 מאות שנה. ואל צאטוטי בני ישראל לא שלח ידו. לא חמר אחד מהם נשאתי
 ואת צעירות הרבליה. אשר חלק ה' אלהיך אותם להאיר לכל העמים וכתב
 כל השמים. אשר לא צוית לעבדו:

I do not translate these passages for the present because it
 will be first necessary to discuss the meaning of the individu-
 al changes.

Soferim I, 8 reads:

אעשה בחמשה עשר שכתבו לתלמי המלך את התורה יונתן
והיה היום קשה לשראש כי הם שנעשה העגל שלא הינה העוה יכולה
להפרכה כל צוריה:

"It happened that five elders translated the Torah into Greek for Ptolemy the king and the day was as grievous for Israel as that on which the golden calf was made; for the Torah cannot be translated adequately into Greek. "

The last chapter of Megillas Ta'anis contains a list of the days on which a person must fast. Among these we find:

טבת. בשמינה בטבת נכתבה התורה בימי תלמי המלך בלשון יונית
ולחשך בא לעולם שלשה ימים:

" Tebet. On the eighth of Tebet the Torah was translated into Greek in the days of Ptolemy the king, and darkness came upon the world for three days."

The hostile tone of these two statements is unmistakeable. They are evidently trying to contradict the favorable statements that are elsewhere made in regard to the Septuagint. The number of five for the translators, given in the Soferim account, is in evident contradiction to the seventy or seventy-two translators mentioned in the other accounts, a number that would constitute a great Sanhedrin. The three days darkness mentioned in Megillas Ta'anis is a repetition of the ninth plague of Egypt because of the sins of the Egyptian Jews, and likewise hints at the feast that was celebrated on the eighth of Tebet by the Alexandrinians on the island of Pharos, the Greek word for "light". Even such an honor as a request for a translation by Ptolemy is removed in Megillas Ta'anis by the statement that the translation was made only "in the days of Ptolemy". Finally, the statement that

the day on which the translation was made was as grievous as that on which the golden calf was made is a harsh expression of disapproval, and is only found again in condemning the day of the Eighteen Measures, which we have discussed in the last chapter.

If we turn to the four accounts of the changes of the Septuagint, we can readily divide them into two distinct classes, one of which is formed by the Mechilta and the Yerushalmi accounts, the other by Babli and Soferim I,9. There is very little difference in the account of the changes themselves, but a marked distinction in the descriptions of the manner of the translation. The Mechilta merely gives the change for Exodus XII,40 and then adds, "This is one of the things that they translated (*) for Ptolemy the king. Similarly they translated for him, etc. Yerushalmi simply introduces the changes by the words, "The Chachamim changed thirteen things for Ptolemy the king, and they translated (*) for him as follows:". But when we come to Babli for its account, we find quite a legend in regard to the translation: "It happened that Ptolemy the king assembled (**) seventy-two elders and placed them in seventy-two cells and did not tell them for what purpose he had placed them there. He came to each one of them and said: Translate (*) for me the book of Moses

(*) I translate the verb ¹⁹⁰ in this manner because I hold that the rabbis always conceived of the changes in the Septuagint as having been made by the translators, and not in a Hebrew codex. I shall reserve the discussion of this point for Appendix A.

(**) Or, possibly, "brought into his country".

your teacher. God put intelligence in the heart of each one of them and they were all of one mind, and they translated for him as follows:". Soferim, a late work, and one that is composed of reports from previous works for the most part, has an almost identical account.

How is it that the Mechilta and the Yerushalmi, which are certainly the earlier accounts of the four preserved, since they were written in Palestine itself, do not have any story of the miraculous origin of the Septuagint, if it was known at the time of the later accounts?

We have several accounts of the story of the Septuagint that do not come from the official synagogue. These are the Letter of Aristeas, Aristobolus, Philo, de Vita Mosis II, 5-7, sections 25-44, and Josephus, Antiquities, book XII, chapter 2.

The Letter of Aristeas is not primarily an account of the origin of the Septuagint. Its purpose is to show in what admiration and esteem the Jewish wisdom and the Jewish law were held by even the heathen philosophers in the courts of the Ptolemies. The story of the Septuagint does not occupy a large part of the book, and was evidently used only as a convenient background for the presentation of the Jewish virtues. This writing no doubt gives us the story as it was current in Egypt at the time of the writer (*). It relates how the king, at the advice of his librarian, decided to have the Hebrew Scriptures translated into the Greek language. He therefore brought from Judea seventy-two inter-

(*) It is, of course, outside the field of this investigation to discuss the exact time when this work was composed.

preters, six from each tribe, and gave them a separate spot on the island of Pharos for the accomplishment of their translation. No mention at all is made of their being separate cells or that they miraculously agreed in their translation, but it is distinctly stated (*) that the translators compared their various results, and combined them so as to form one translation. The work of translation was completed in seventy days, and the king, on reading it, was very much delighted with the intelligence of the law-giver, and sent the translators back to their country with rich presents.

We cannot tell what story was given by Aristobolus, as we no longer possess his works. There is only a fragment in Eusebius (*Præparatio Evangelica* XII, 12, 2) to the effect that Plato must have gotten his thoughts from the Jews, since the Septuagint had been translated before his time in the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

Philo's account is briefer than the Letter of Aristeas, but agrees in most of the details. A significant fact is that he states that the translators all arrived at one translation by divine inspiration. "They, like men inspired, prophesied, not one saying one thing and another, another. But every one of them employed the self-same nouns and verbs, as if some unseen prompter had suggested their words to all of them (**)". He says no-

 (*) Section 302. οἱ δὲ ἐπέτεδον ἑκάστα σύμφωνα ποιῶντες
 πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ταῖς ἀντιβολαῖς

(**) Section 37. καθάπερ ἐν θουσιῶντες προεφητεύον οὐκ ἄλλα
 ἄλλοι, τὰ δ' αὐτὰ πάντες ονόματα καὶ ῥήματα, ὥσπερ ὑποβολέως

thing of there being seventy two separate cells, however. He mentions the fact that the people on the isle of Pharos still celebrated annually the day on which the translation was completed.

Josephus excerpts largely from the Letter of Aristeas. He does not mention that the translators made their accounts agree, as his source does. But he implies as much when he says that they labored with great zeal and great pains. He makes no mention of divine inspiration, separate cells, or festival celebrated on the occasion. It thus seems that he has no other source for his statements than the Letter of Aristeas. As for the seventy separate cells, we find mention of them in the time of the Church Fathers. Justin, in his *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, Chap XIII, says that the translators were all placed in separate cells and their translations came all out alike. Irenaeus, *Heresies*, Bk. III, Chap. XXI, where he defends the correctness of the Septuagint translation, of Isaiah VII, 14, likewise states that there were separate cells and the translation came out all alike, although he states that the translation was made at the request of Ptolemy Lagus.

The Alexandrian Jews and the early Church Fathers, were thus aware of this legend of the Septuagint. It is impossible that the Jews of Palestine had no knowledge of it. And even if we did not know of these outside sources, it could still be proven that the Palestinian Jews knew the legend, by asking the question, "From where did the Babylonians get the story?" from the Christ-

ians? There were none in Babylon. " From the Alexandrian Jews?

 ἑκατόν τε ἄνθρωποι ἐν ἑνὶ χρόνῳ.

They, too, never went to Babylon. There could have been no other means than the Palestinian Jews and consequently they must have been acquainted with the legend as we find it in Babli.

The fact that the Palestinian accounts make no mention of the miraculous origin of the Septuagint is not due to the fact that they were ignorant of the story, but because at the time of these reports they were too much opposed to the Septuagint to say anything favorable about it. Babli, written later, and away from the scene of action, could afford to incorporate what Yerushalmi could not.

These differences in the accounts, as well as the general inaccuracy of Babli on this whole subject, has shown, for instance, in the account of the prohibition of Greek in the war of Quietus, makes it an absolute necessity for anyone dealing with this subject to treat the Yerushalmi account alone without reference to the Babli. If this is not done, it is impossible to get a clear view of the whole Palestinian attitude. We shall, therefore, in this chapter, as far as possible, resort only to the Yerushalmi reports, and in the next, take up the Babli accounts and discuss their historical value.

Excluding Babli and Soferim I, 9 from our discussion, we have four accounts that are plainly hostile to the Septuagint. Two of them deliberately omit all favorable references, and the other two plainly show their resentment against the Septuagint by declaring the day of this translation an evil day for Israel. In the earlier surely, and apparently up to the time of the war of Quietus we have found the Palestinian teachers tolerant of the Septuagint. The two-fold question arises: what is the reason

for the violent opposition found in these reports, and at what time did this opposition arise?

The accounts give us no information as to the time when they were written. The Mechilta, though supposed to have been compiled by Rabbi Ishmael in the early part of the second century, contains the opinions of later Rabbis, and is generally agreed to be, in its present form, a product of the fourth or fifth century. There is no way of telling the time of the report in Yerushalmi. Megillas Ta'anis contains reports of festivals instituted in the time of Trajan and Hadrian, and may have been completed at that time, but the last chapter, which does not form a part of the original part of the book, is probably later. Soferim, though it contains many early elements is a compilation from the time of the Gaonim. Furthermore the accounts themselves are not given in the name of any authority by which we could fix their time.

We shall obtain a definite idea of the time of the opposition, as well as a clearer conception of the reasons for the change in the attitude of the Palestinian teachers, if we study their relations with the translation of Aquila, which they praise very highly, at the same time that they were opposing the Septuagint.

We have one report of the translation of Aquila in Yerushalmi Megillah I, 11 71c line 9. This is a commentary to the passage in Megillah I, 8 that we have mentioned before and particularly to the statement of Rabbi Simeon ben Gamliel, "Even in the case of Biblical books they only permitted them to be translated into Greek". This statement has evidently reference to a permission granted in rabbinical time, and therefore to the translation of

Aquila. This is further born out by the fact that in the statement quoted by Rabbi Jehudah in Babli, the term לְבוֹנִיּוֹת "our rabbis" is used. If the permission reported by Rabbi Simeon were that given for the Septuagint translation, we would certainly expect him to use the term תַּכְמִּיחַ or יִקְוֶין, which we actually find in the reports about the Septuagint (Soferim I, 8 and 9, B. Megillah 9a, Y. Megillah 71d). Yerushalmi understood the passage correctly, and so it comments as follows:

בדקו ואמצאו שאין הטורה יכולה להיפרשם כל צורכה אלא יוונית.
 בורגני אחר בידא להם ארמית מתוך יוונית. לבי ירמיה בשם רבי
 חייא בר בא. תירגם עקילם הגל הטורה לפני רבי אליעזר ולפני
 רבי יהושע וקילמו אותו ואקילו לו יריפת מרבני אדמ:

* They searched and found that the Torah could only be translated adequately into Greek. A certain lodge-keeper devised for them a translation out of the Greek into the Roman language (*). Rabbi Jeremiah said in the name of Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba: Aquila the proselyte translated the Torah before Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua, and they praised him, and said, "Thou art the fairest of the children of men, (Psalm XLV, 3, grace is poured out on thy

(*) This very interesting passage is the only reference that we find in the Talmudic literature to a ²Latin translation. I give the usually accepted translation. Krauss alone differs (Magazin fuer Wissenschaft des Judenthums XX, 107 f) and makes it an Aramaic translation of Aquila, but without any basis. Discussion of this question is of course out of place here. In Esther Rabbah IV, 12, (to Esther I, 22) there is a different version of this statement, that makes the Latin language come from the Greek.

lips) " ". The quotation cited has a double signification, in the first half of the verse being a pun on the word *שופ*, used often by the rabbis to designate the Greek, the second half of the verse referring to the elegance of Aquila's style.

There is also a brief report in Y. Kiddushin I, 1 59a line 10:
 ראקל רב יוסי בשם ר' יוחנן תילגס עקילס הגר לפני ר' עקיבה ויא
 שפה ויא
 "Rabbi Jose said in the name of Rabbi Jochanan: Aquila the proselyte translated before Rabbi Akiba, And she was a maid-servant, etc, (Leviticus XIX,20)."

This last passage evidently refers only to the translation of the single verse cited. The first passage refers to the entire translation. The word *משנה* used there refers not merely to the five books of Moses, but to the whole Bible. In this sense we find it in B. Sahhedrin 91b, where passages from Kings, Psalms, and Isaiah, in ib. 104b, where a passage from Lamentations, and in Bechoroth 50a, where a passage in Ezekiel, are all spoken of as *משנה*. We know besides this, from outside sources, that Aquila translated the entire Old Testament. And finally, we have more rabbinical quotations from his works in the other parts of the Bible than from the five books of Moses.

Besides this praise of the translation of Aquila, we have the testimony of the Church Fathers as to the favor in which Aquila was held by the Jews. We learn from Jerome and others that they rapidly rejected the Septuagint in favor of his translation and employed it to a large extent in their services and their controversies with the Christians. This shows us that the objection of the rabbis was not to the Greek translations in general, but to the Greek translation, the Septuagint. Furthermore, as it is evident that they must have preferred Aquila because

he did away with the objectionable features of the Septuagint, we shall be better able to determine what considerations influenced their attitude.

We are now ready to discuss possible reasons for the disapproval of the Septuagint. Frankel (*Vorstudien zur Septuaginta*, p. 61 note) says that the Jews of Palestine at first only heard of the Septuagint through hearsay. They became acquainted with it through the Asia Minor Jews, and became for the first time aware how corrupt and difficult the text was, and so they did not want to have it read in the synagogues, and finally wanted to ban it entirely. Graetz (*Geschichte*, IV, 103-104) says that the Christians seized on the Septuagint to deduce from it numerous references to Christ. They accordingly changed various sentences to suit their own ideas. The Jews made counter-changes and the Septuagint thus became the battle-ground of the contending falsifiers. The Septuagint was therefore finally rejected by the Jewish synagogue, and the translation of Aquila adopted. Schuerer (*History of the Jewish people in the time of Jesus Christ*, Second division, Book III, p. 163-164) says that the Christian Church took possession of the Septuagint and derived therefrom polemical weapons against the Jews, and this gradually co-operated into bringing the Septuagint into discredit with the latter. Gottheil (*Jewish Encyclopedia*, article Bible Translations, III, 186) says that the divergence of the Septuagint from the Hebrew text was too evident, and therefore could not serve as a basis for theological discussion or homiletical interpretation. This distrust was accentuated by the fact that it was adopted as the sacred scriptures by the new faith.

I have collated these opinions, not because I intend to entirely agree with or directly oppose any one of them, but merely to show the range of possibilities in looking for a reason for the change in the attitude of the Palestinian teachers.

If we turn to the sources, we shall find that Mechilta, Yerushalmi and Megillas Ta'anis give no reason for the opposition to the Septuagint, Soferim I, 8, however, gives a reason, "because the Torah cannot be adequately translated". That this reason can not be the true one is shown by the fact that the translation of Aquila was approved by the rabbis, and that the Yerushalmi, in speaking of this fact, says just the opposite, "They searched and found that the Torah can only be translated adequately into Greek". It is evident that the reason given in Soferim is not the real reason.

The next step to take will be to examine the changes reported to have been made by the Septuagint translators. These were made in the Greek translation and not in a Hebrew codex sent to Egypt, as Frankel and Friedmann contend. As the discussion of this subject is out of place here, I shall reserve it for appendix A.

All the four accounts of the changes made in the Septuagint vary only slightly as to the nature of the changes (*). We may therefore suppose that they all came from one original source. All agree that changes were made in the following verses: Genesis I, 1; I, 26; either I, 27 or V, 2; II, 2; XI, 7; XVIII, 12 and XLIX, 6; Exodus IV, 20 and XII, 40; Leviticus XI, 6 or Deut-

(*) An arrangement of these four accounts of the changes, showing the parallels, is given in Appendix B.

eronomy XIV, 7; Numbers XVI, 15; Deuteronomy IV, 19 and XVII, 3---thirteen in all. Soferim adds Exodus XXIV, 11 and Babli includes this as well as verse 5 of the same chapter.

In studying these changes, we shall not follow the order of their sequence in the Bible, but group together those passages where the same motive actuated the changes mentioned.

GENESIS I, 1--- בְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים — בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים בְּרֵאשִׁית.

The motive for this change is not at all clear. The fact that the word בְּרֵאשִׁית was interpreted to mean the Logos and that the verse in general was used by Christians to prove that there were two Gods, has no bearing on the subject, as the verse when altered furnishes just as much basis for the Christian argument as before. The suggestion that it was to translate the verse "In the beginning God created" and not "In the beginning of God's creation", (which Rashi and other commentators give as the literal translation of this verse), is possible, but not likely, as Aquila probably represents the opinion of the rabbis of his time when he translates this verse "ἐν κεφαλῇ ἐκτίσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὸν γῆν," which means "In the head of things God created the heavens, the earth, and all therein," and therefore we would rather conclude that they would consider this proposed difference of translation no difference at all. The most probable explanation is that they simply desired to begin the Torah with the name of God. This is borne out indirectly by a Midrash (Bereshis Rabbah I, 16)! Rabbi Judan said in the name of Akilās: God was an appropriate name for such a one as He. It is customary in the world for a human king to be praised before he has built any public or private baths. But the Only One

of the universe first performs and then is praised. Shimeon ben Azzai said: 'And Thy meekness increases me (Psalm XVIII, 36). A man first mentions his name and then his glory, N.N., the prefect, S.S., the procurator; but God is different. First He discharges the duties of this world and then He mentions His name. בראשית ברא and only after that בראשית .” If the Akilas mentioned here is the same as Aquila, which seems more than likely, the observation is in all likelihood a side knock at the fact that the Septuagint does not realize that the true glory of God consists in placing the mention of His works first, and therefore has reduced Him to the level of an ordinary king by putting His name first.

The Septuagint translation of this passage, as reported in Origen's Hexapla, is ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, which does not agree with this report. But this, as well as most of the other cases where the Septuagint does not agree in its present text with the report, is due to the fact that the Septuagint text that Origen had was already altered by passing through the hands of many revisers, and that since his time further changes have been made in it.

GENESIS I,26—אֵלֹהִים בְּרָאנוּ אֶת הָאָדָם בְּצִלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ

GENESIS XI,7—הָבָה אֵלֶיךָ אֲבֹלָה — הָבָה וְיִרְדָּה נִבְלָה

Both these verses were changed to avoid the pluralization of God. We know that they were used by the Christians to argue for the existence of two Gods. In Sanhedrin 38b (parallel in Y. Berachoth I,9 12d-13a) we find the statement:

כָּל מְקוֹמוֹת שֶׁפָּקְדוּ הַחֲזוֹן תִּשְׁיַבְתָּן בְּצִד :

"Every place where the Christians(*) get a chance to display

(*) Munich MS. Some censored editions have instead בְּצִדֵּי .

their Epikorsos (*), the answer is right at its side." This point is illustrated, among others, by these very two verses. It has been argued from this fact, as well as from the absence of these changes in the present text of the Septuagint, that they were not in the original translation, but were made later by Jews in their conflicts with Christianity. This is indeed possible, but it is equally possible that the changes were actually made in the original Septuagint texts and later removed by a reviser who knew the Hebrew original. The reason for the change does not fix its time as later. The Jews in the time of the Ptolemies likewise did not want to pluralize God.

The change recorded in the second half of I, 26 (אֱלֹהִים בְּצֶלְמֵנוּ for אֱלֹהִים בְּצֶלְמֵי) is to remove an anthropomorphism. If man is said to be created in the image of God, then God has the same form as man. The change is made to prevent this idea, and is to the effect that God created man in a special shape of his own. This change is still partly preserved in the present text of the Septuagint, for it translates אֱלֹהִים בְּצֶלְמֵנוּ by κατ' ὁμοίωσιν "according to a (certain) likeness" and not κατ' ὁμοίωσιν ὁμοῦν "according to Our likeness," as all the other translators rendered it.

GENESIS I, 27 or V, 2--- אֱלֹהִים בְּצֶלְמֵנוּ.

Mechilta and Yerushalmi (I, 27)--- אֱלֹהִים בְּצֶלְמֵנוּ.

Babli and Sopherim (V, 2)--- אֱלֹהִים בְּצֶלְמֵנוּ.

The accounts vary as to the exact nature of the change made

(*) The word אֱלֹהִים is to be regarded as a denominative from the word אֱלֹהִים.

in the translation. But the reason for the change is very evident. It is an attempt to get over the difficulty caused by the fact that in the first and fifth chapters of Genesis it is stated that man and women were made at the same time, while in the second chapter it is recorded that first man was created, and then, after a number of other things were made, woman was created. According to one report of the change, this discrepancy was avoided by reading for אִשָּׁה ---"female" the word אִשָּׁה ---"his orifices". According to the second report the change consisted in translating אֱלֹהִים ---"He created them" as if it were אֱלֹהִים ---"He created him."---on the whole the more probable change of the two. The present Septuagint text does not have any change from the literal translation, but there is some indication that it originally read as the second report records it. This is indicated by the translation of the word אֱלֹהִים in the second half of V,2. The Hexaplar translation of this word is τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, a translation of אֱלֹהִים ---"his name". This reading is now only preserved in the Codex Cottonaeus Genesios, the other manuscripts having the reading τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῶν. This Hexaplar reading indicates that there was probably a different original reading in the first part of the verse, and that it used to read ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, instead of the present word αὐτοῦ. This seems to be borne out by the fact that Philo (de opificio Mundi, paragraph XXIV, section 76) says that the first man was a hermaphrodite, and only later were the sexes differentiated (*). It is also to be noted that the rabbis

(*) πάνυ δὲ καλῶς τὸ γένος ἀνδρωποῦ εἶπαι διέκρινε τὰ εἶδη

get over the difficulty in these two divergent accounts by the same explanation that Adam was first created a hermaphrodite and later was divided into two persons (Erubin 18a, Bereshis Rabbah VIII, 1, etc.).

EXODUS XII,40---וְיָשְׁבוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יָשָׁבוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וְיָשְׁבוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וְיָשְׁבוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם וְיָשְׁבוּ בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם

This change was also made to remove an exegetical difficulty. The period of bondage in Egypt is here stated as four hundred and thirty years. The years of the ancestors of Moses, as given in Exodus VI,20f cannot by any means be made to cover this interval. The rabbis are only able to solve this difficulty by making the four hundred years begin with the birth of Isaac. For instance, in Bereshis Rabbah LXIII, 3, we read: "Abraham is called Israel. Rabbi Nathan said: There is a deep word (אֶבְרָהָם אִשְׂרָאֵל) And the sojourn of the children of Israel during which they dwelt in Egypt, both in the land of Canaan and the land of Goshen was four hundred and thirty years." The words here quoted as the אֶבְרָהָם are the same as those given in the Mechilta account, and he may either quote that. It is more probable that he has an old rabbinical explanation in mind. We find a similar explanation of this difficulty in Tanchoma to this verse, where it is stated that the four hundred years of bondage decreed by God began with the birth of Isaac, and in Shemos Rabbah XVII, 19, where

 φήσας ἄρρεν τε καὶ θῆλυ δεδημιουργῆσθαι, μῆτις τῶν ἐν
 μέρει μορφῶν λαβούτων. And very beautifully after He had
 called the whole race "man", did He distinguish between the sexes,
 saying, that male and female he was created, though as yet no single
 individual of the race had assumed their distinct form."

it is stated that the actual sojourn in Egypt was only two hundred and ten years. The translators evidently had the same idea in adding the phrase, "And in the land of Canaan". The Septuagint text still retains this translation, reading $\epsilon\upsilon \gamma\eta \text{ Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐν γῇ Χαναάν}.$

GENESIS II, 2--- $\text{וַיְכַל אֱלֹהִים בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי וַיָּשָׁב וַיָּנוּחַ בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי}$

The reason for this change is very obvious. The passage as it now stands in the Hebrew reads, "And God finished his work on the seventh day", which implies that some work was actually done on the seventh day itself, and thus compromises the sanctity of the Sabbath. The translators feared this possible misinterpretation of the passage, and so changed it to, "And God finishedon the sixth day...and rested on the seventh day", which corresponds more exactly to the spirit of the passage. The Septuagint still retains this change, reading $\epsilon\upsilon \tau\eta \text{ ἡμέρᾳ ἣν ἔσται}.$

GENESIS XVIII, 12--- $\text{וַתֵּצֵאן שָׂרָה בְּקִלְבִּיהָ -- וַתַּצְחֵק שָׂרָה בְּקִלְבִּיהָ}$

There are two senses in which we may take the word $\text{בְּקִלְבִּיהָ}.$ It may perhaps mean "among her friends"---a change which seems very unlikely, as no where else in this passage (the promise of the birth of Isaac) is there any mention of there being anyone else with Sarah, and in fact the idea is rather out of place in the account of a secret revelation. Or else we may take it in the sense of "her inward parts" and note the comment of Rashi to this verse: "She looked at her bowels and said: 'Can these inward parts bear a child? Can these dry breasts give milk?'" . This change, however, is no change at all, as בְּקִלְבִּיהָ has practically the same meaning. The real change in this verse, as Geiger has pointed out, is in the last half of it, and in the words:

אחרי בלי ש יגיד --- "after I am worn out, shall I again have sexual pleasure?" This evidently was displeasing to the translators and so they vocalized the verse אַחֲרֵי בְלִי שִׁי יִגִּיד

אחרי בלי ש --- "after I have not born a child, shall I now have one?" This is the actual change found in the Septuagint text, the reading being οὐτω γένου μοι τέκνον ἕως τοῦ νῦν. The reason why the rabbis made a mistake was because the change was made in the vocalization of the words and could not therefore be represented in Hebrew. The only way to record it was by the verse, which was done by the usual method of citing the first few words. Later, when they no longer remembered the original change, they supposed it to be in the words cited, and they took the word אַחֲרֵי as the only word of the three cited that furnished any basis for a change, and made in that the change which they thought was the most likely one.

GENESIS XLIX, 6 --- כִּי בְאַפְסֵה הָלַךְ אִישׁ וּבְלִיָּוֹת עָקְרוּ שׂוֹר
כִּי בְאַפְסֵה הָלַךְ שׂוֹר וּבְלִיָּוֹת עָקְרוּ אֲבוֹהַּ

This change acquits Simeon and Levi of the charge of being murderers. The translators evidently thought that it was unseemly that the ancestors of two of the tribes, and one of them the priestly tribe, should be depicted in so unfavorable a light. They could not remove the verse, so they contented themselves with modifying its worst charge. Instead of translating, "In their anger they killed man, and in their self-will they hocked the ox" they put down "In their anger they killed the ox and in their self-will they hocked the stalled one".

Friedmann's suggestion (Commentary to Mechilta to Exodus XII, 40), that אֲבוֹהַּ means the Egyptian god Apis, is ingenious, but

far-fetched. The explanation of this change by Winter and Wuensche (note on p. 48, translation of the Mechilta) as being due to the fact that it was charged by the Anti-Semites that the Jews sacrificed a foreigner in the Temple, is possible, but not probable. If the Jews had wished to disprove the charge, they could have done so better by retaining the original reading and pointing out how severely this act of murder was condemned, in the words, "Cursed is their anger, for it is fierce, and their wrath, for it is stubborn; I shall divide them among Jacob, I shall scatter them among Israel."

EXODUS IV, 20--- ויקח משה את אשתו ואת בנו וילכיבם על דהמור
ויקח משה את אשתו ואת בנו וילכיבם על דהמור

NUMBERS XVI, 15--- לא חמד מקדש ושאתי לא חמד מקדש ושאתי

The same motive produced both of these changes, namely, the objection to the mentioning of the ass. Both of these alterations are genuine and are found in our present texts of the Septuagint, which renders the expression in Exodus IV, 20 by the words ἐπὶ τῷ ὑποζυγίῳ, and in Numbers XVI, 15 by ἐπιθύμενα. There are also other passages where the mentioning of the ass is avoided in the Septuagint, e.g. Genesis XLIX, 14 where the expression חמור

חמור is translated τὸ καλὸν ἐπιθυμητόν --- "the beautiful desire."

Just why the two passages here should be precisely those that were recorded by the rabbis is not clear. Probably they just happened to be familiar with them by their contact with the Greek-speaking Jews, and possibly may have heard some of the latter quote these very verses. It is unnecessary to suppose that these changes are late and due to the charge of Apion and others that the Jews worshipped the image of an ass. The ass was an object of abhorrence to the Egyptians before the time of the Ptolemies,

and, due to the fact that the sign for the god Set, the genius of evil, was interpreted as an ass, the ass was regarded as the animal of Set himself. The change seems therefore to have been actuated by the fact that the Egyptian Jews were sufficiently affected by their environment to share their neighbors' repugnance for the ass. They therefore took the liberty of changing the translation. They may have either considered the altered translation as a euphemistic circumlocution, or else, in passages where they translates it by *עֲשֵׂה לְךָ חֵן* --- "delight", they corrected the word *חֵן*, probably written defective *חֵן*, to *חֵן*. Parallels to this are found in the Kore and Kesiv, e.g. Isaiah XV, 2, or the reverse change in Jeremiah II, 20.

DEUTERONOMY IV, 19--- *אֲשֶׁר מִלֶּךְ ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵתָּה לְכָל הָעַמִּים וְתָמָּה לְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם*
אֲשֶׁר מִלֶּךְ ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵתָּה לְכָל הָעַמִּים וְתָמָּה לְכָל הַשָּׁמַיִם.

DEUTERONOMY XVIII, 3--- *אֲשֶׁר לֹא צִוִּיתִי לָעֲבֹדָה - אֲשֶׁר לֹא צִוִּיתִי.*

These two changes are places where the Septuagint supplies an ellipse in the Hebrew text. Several cases of this are cited by Frankel (*Vorstudien zur Septuaginta*, pp. 166-167). In these two cited passages there was an especial purpose in seeing that the meaning of the verse was absolutely clear. They are both passages that touch on the worship of the heavenly bodies. The first of them reads, "Lest you lift up your eyes and see the sun and the moon and the stars, all the host of heaven, and you go astray and bow down to them and serve them, which the Lord thy God has apportioned to all the nations under the sun." This passage as it reads may be interpreted to mean that God created the heavenly bodies with the design of having them serve as objects of worship for the nations! The change was made to show

that these bodies were only created to give light to all men and not to be worshipped by them. The second passage reads ,speaking of an apostate," And he go and serve other gods, the sun or the moon or the hosts of heaven, which I have not commanded." This verse is open to the interpretation that God never commanded the heavenly bodies to exist, and that consequently they are self-created or eternal and independent of God. If they are independent of God, they may be worshipped as deities. The supplying of the ellipse prevents this dangerous interpretation and makes it clear that God commanded man not to worship them. The interesting Sifre comment to XVII,3, which quotes the first passage and points out the possible dangerous interpretation we have mentioned, contains other things that belong more to the discussion in Appendix A and will be fully treated there. That the interpretations we have mentioned as dangerously possible were actually made, is shown by the fact that in Justin's dialogue with Trypho (Chapters LV and CXXI) both parties interpret IV, 19 as if it meant that God actually did apportion the heavenly bodies for the worship of the nations.

LEVITICUS XI, 6--אֵת צִיִּילֵי הַלֵּלִיף אֶת הָא לִנְבֵּט

The change is found in both places in the Septuagint, which has the reading δαρύπους ---"hairy-foot", a name for the hare. We ought therefore to correct the צִיִּילֵי of the rabbinic reports to אֵת צִיִּילֵי ---"hairy". In Mechilta no reason is given for the change. In Yerushalmi it is stated that the name of the mother of Ptolemy was Arnata, and it was feared that the Jews might be punished by the king if they put her name among the list of the unclean animals. Babli gives the same reason

for the change, but states that it was the wife of Ptolemy and that Arneves was her name. That these guesses are wrong is plain from the fact that the name in both cases resembles the Hebrew original. Ptolemy evidently could not read Hebrew, or he would not have wanted a Greek translation. Therefore there could have been no fear of the word אֲרִיֶּס in the Hebrew original, but there must have been some translation of the word that might have been likely to cause offense on the part of Ptolemy. As a matter of fact, the rabbis were partly right. The word feared in the translation was $\lambda\alpha\gamma\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, by which אֲרִיֶּס is actually translated by Aquila. Lagos was the name of the father of the first Ptolemy and we can well imagine how the Jews feared to place his name in the list of the unclean animals. The mistake of the rabbis was due to the fact that the word אֲרִיֶּס has a feminine termination, and so they took it to be the name of a woman.

It may also be remarked here that the word $\delta\alpha\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is not peculiar to the Septuagint, but is found elsewhere in Greek literature, for instance, in Aristotles works on animals.

The changes in Exodus XXIV, forming as they do a part of the later reports, will be treated in the next chapter.

We have therefore reports of thirteen changes made by the translators of the Septuagint, and for the following reasons: one to begin the Torah with the name of God, two to prevent the pluralizing of God, two to remove exegetical difficulties, one to preserve the sanctity of the Sabbath, two to modify unseemly expressions that are found in the original, two to avoid the mention of the ass, two to prevent an interpretation favoring the worship of the heavenly bodies, and one the choice of a somewhat

unusual name of an animal because the usual name was such as might give offense to Ptolemy. Not one of these reasons for change is open to condemnation and some of them are even praiseworthy. It is evident, therefore, that this direction of investigation will not yield us the reasons for the disapproval of the Septuagint.

We turn therefore to the translation of Aquila. That was as warmly approved of at the time of its origin as the Septuagint was disapproved of. In fact, it appears on internal evidence to have been written in direct opposition to the Septuagint, as it is more divergent from it than any other translation. The three points in which the translation differs clearly from the Septuagint are as follows; (1) Aquila translates the text as the rabbis had it, while the Septuagint translation has many deviations from it; (2) he translates according to the rabbinic exegesis of his time, while the Septuagint has the exegesis of the time of the Soferim; (3) he removes all Christological references that are found in the Septuagint translation, and thereby incurred the disapproval of the Church Fathers. The first point needs no illustration; for the second, we may mention the use of the Greek preposition *σύν*—"with" to translate the particle *סָם*, the sign of the accusative, following the rabbinic principle of exegesis, *סָם וְכִי* ; for the third, the translation, in Psalm II, 2, of *ה' יְהוָה* by *ἡ λαμπρότης* instead of *Χριστός*, in Isaiah VII, 14, of *נָחַשׁ* by *νεῆκος* instead of *παρθένος*, in Isaiah IX, 6, of *יְהוָה* by *ἰσχυρός* *δυνατός*, which Theodoret calls viciousness (*κακουργία*).

All of these three points of deviation are indicative of the reasons for the disapproval of the Septuagint and the prefer-

ence shown for the translation of Aquila. In order to determine the sequence and relative importance of these reasons, we must study the history of the relations between Judaism and Christianity.

Christianity arose in the middle of the first century as a sect among the Jews of Palestine. It slowly grew, and by the end of the first century it had already acquired some influence and power. Instead of only being composed of the poor and ignorant, it attracted the rich and the learned; it spread out from Palestine in all directions. In the second century it was making extensive propaganda. At this time there must have been the beginning of the debates between Jews and Christians, the earliest recorded, though of course not the earliest that occurred, being that of Justin Martyr with Trypho, shortly after the Bar-Kochba revolt.

A striking feature of all the early Christian writings are the frequent quotations from the Old Testament. Not only is this the case with the New Testament books, but even more so than therein the writings of the Church Fathers. These quotations are used in every possible way that could be devised to aid the Christian propaganda. It is evident that these quotations were intended more for the Jews---whom they desired most of all to convert to Christianity---than for the heathen world. It was not so necessary to impress upon the heathen, in order to convert him, the fact that Jesus had been foretold in the old Jewish writings. He was rather to be won over by the salvation that was held out to him if he became a Christian. It was the Jew who was to be won over by proofs from his own Scriptures, and it was

mainly at him that these quotations were directed.

The Jew who lived outside of Palestine, the Jew who spoke Greek, was the one who was the most likely to be affected by these propaganda. The Jews who lived in Palestine were able to answer the Christians by pointing back to the original Hebrew and giving the rabbinic explanations of the text. But the Greek-speaking Jew could not do this, as he had to depend on the Septuagint translation for his knowledge of the Bible. The text of this was uncertain, as it had been gone over at different times by different hands, and could therefore be interpolated or changed by the various contenders. Such in fact was actually done, as we can see from the discussion in the Dialogue with Trypho, chapters LXXI to LXXIII. The Messianic translations of the Septuagint were also an argument for Christianity and a danger for Judaism.

The rabbis in Palestine could not have been slow in seeing the dangers into which the Septuagint was bringing the Jews of the Diaspora. They were also aware of the use of the Septuagint by the Christian propagandists. They probably now found out for the first time how widely the Septuagint texts differed from the original Hebrew, especially in the prophetic books, the ones most used by the Christians. The Messianic passages in the Septuagint, as they could well see, were also snares for the feet of the Greek-speaking Jews. As long as the Messiah had not yet come, it was considered safe to retain all possible passages in a Messianic interpretation; and the Christian interpretation of these passages is only the old Jewish one. But when there arose a new religion that claimed that these prophecies were fulfilled and that the Messiah had come, there was a reaction among the Jews

in the other direction tending to minimize the Messianic predictions and to regard Messianic interpretations of passages in the Scriptures as pernicious.

It did not trouble the rabbis that Christianity was making converts among the heathen. It was rather to be desired, as bringing them half-way to Judaism. But that they were making converts among Jews was another matter. The feeling that the Septuagint was likely to add this produced the impression that this Greek Bible translation was after all harmful to Judaism. It is impossible to state when this feeling began. Such ideas spread only gradually, as a rule. It perhaps originated at the time of the first prohibition against the Greek language in the year 66, and was merely part of the opposition to the language of the heathen. It more likely became evident at the end of the first century, when Christianity was becoming active in the Greek-speaking world. It evidently must have been the feeling of the majority of the rabbis in the time just preceding the translation of Aquila, as is shown by the warm reception that was accorded his translation.

The translation made by Aquila was not ordered by the rabbis. The fact that in Megillah I, 8, where reference is made to the permission given to translate the Biblical books into Greek, and which, as I have shown before, refers to the translation of Aquila, use is made of the word לְפָנֵינוּ --- "permitted" shows that there was no definite decree to the effect. If so a stronger expression would have been used. It is also said (Y. Megillah 71d) that Aquila worked under the direction of Rabbis Eliezer and Joshua, and that they gave him their commendation. The fact that A-

quila is also represented as translating a certain verse in Leviticus under the direction of Rabbi Akiba (Y. Kiddushin 59a) does not prove that the latter was also a director of the translation, but simply that Aquila consulted him, as the greatest Halachist of the time, on this one verse (*). If there had been a regularly decreed translation it would have more likely been done under the direction of the patriarch Gamliel II, as was the case with Shimeon ha-Pikuli's arrangement of the Shemoneh Esreh (B. Berachoth 28b, Megillah 17b). It may, however have been suggested to Aquila by one of the rabbis, possibly Rabbi Joshua, who is known to have had disputations with the Christians. But it is also quite possible that Aquila himself conceived of the idea of making a new Greek Bible translation. He himself knew Greek and probably felt that he was the one best fitted to make such a translation. As a proselyte, he would naturally desire to do something to show his allegiance to his newly adopted religion. So it is more likely, on the whole, that it was he who suggested the idea to the rabbis. Whoever originated the plan, it certainly was received warmly, for the rabbis felt that a way had been found to counteract the evil wrought by the deviations from the original and the Messianic interpretations of the Septuagint.

In addition to these two reasons for favoring the translation of Aquila, there was a third reason--it restored the bond between the Jews of the Diaspora and the Jews of Palestine. As long

(*) Jerome's testimony to the effect that Aquila in his translation followed the directions of Akiba, does not call for serious consideration. He probably never heard of Eliezer or Joshua.

as the Temple had stood, the Jews all over the world had looked to Jerusalem as the center of the Jewish religion. The destruction of the Temple had destroyed this connection. The translation of Aquila once more brought to the Greek-speaking Jews the authority of the Palestinian teachers, for it presented to them the laws which the rabbis had derived from the Bible, as well as their Haggadic interpretations, in the form of a translation that they could read. It was probably for such a reason that so rigorous a Halachist as Rabbi Eliezer sponsored the translation.

The date of Aquila's translation can be fixed nearly accurately around the year 130. Epiphanius (*De Ponderibus et Mensuris*), in the account of Aquila, chapters XII-XVI) gives the date as the twelfth year in the reign of Hadrian, 129. This was during the same period that Joshua and Eliezer flourished. It also gives time for the use of the Septuagint to have spread among the Jews, as it is reported by Irenaeus (*Adversus Haereses*, book III, chapter XXI, 1), who wrote in the year 177. The period between 118 and 135, one of peaceful times, is also the most probable period for such a work.

The Church Fathers tell us that Aquila's translation spread rapidly among the Jews and enjoyed great favor from them in preference to the Septuagint, which from then on became exclusively the Christian version. This is borne out by the fact that the translations of Aquila are cited as authoritative by the rabbis. Many of them have no rabbinic parallel and appear to have been Aquila's own interpretation. There are about a dozen of these citations in all. The fact that we have no more is easily accounted for by the fact that Aquila was in use almost exclusively as

mong the Greek-speaking Jews. If we had any of their discourses in writing, as we have from Philo, we would no doubt have found many more such citations. The translations of Aquila cited by the rabbis are as follows: (*)

GENESIS XVII, 1--- וְיָשָׁר אֱלֹהֵינוּ וְאֵין עֲדָה

This citation is found in Bereshis Rabbah XLVI, 2, to this verse. The Hebrew transliteration of the Greek words has suffered corruption. וְאֵין עֲדָה might be taken for the Greek ἄξιός -- "worthy"; and וְיָשָׁר is plainly a corruption of the Greek word ἰκανός "sufficient". In this case we have two renderings of the word

וְיָשָׁר. We know from Jerome that Aquila made a second edition of his book in which he revised his translation, and it is possible that we have here a citation of both editions. But it is more probable that וְאֵין עֲדָה is a corruption of the transliteration of the Greek word ἰσχυρός -- "powerful", as a translation of the word אֱלֹהֵינוּ, and that Aquila translated here, as elsewhere, ἰσχυρός καὶ ἰκανός. If this is so, then it is worthy of notice that the Greek καὶ is rendered by the Hebrew וְ.

The translation thus agrees with the rabbinic conception of אֱלֹהֵינוּ or אֱלֹהֵינוּ as representing the severe side of God's nature, and the explanation of וְיָשָׁר by וְיָשָׁר, "He Who is sufficient for the world."

The translation of Aquila to this passage is lost.

LEVITICUS XIX, 20--- וְאֵין עֲדָה וְאֵין עֲדָה

This translation is found in Y. Kiddushin I, 1 59a line 10, where it is said to have been made by the authority of Rabbi Akiba. It

(*) A summary of these citations is given in Appendix C.

is to be noted that the translation is not given in the Greek, but in a Hebrew word that is the equivalent of the translation, made possible by the fact that the word translated is not a usual one. Aquila translates אָקוּיִל , which really means "acquired", by a Greek word equivalent to the Hebrew אָקוּיִל , "crushed, deflowered". We do not have the translation of Aquila for this verse, but according to this report, it would probably be the words κακομύετον ἄνθος .

The comment on this verse connects it with the words in II Samuel XVII, 19 $\text{וַיִּשְׂרֹף הָאִשָּׁה עָלָיו וַיִּשְׂרֹף הָאִשָּׁה עָלָיו}$ --- "and she spread upon it dried grain" and Proverbs XXVII, 22 $\text{אִם תִּכְרֹם אִשָּׁה בְּמֹרֶת בָּרֶמֶשׁ בְּעֵלֶיךָ}$ --- "If thou bray a fool with a pestle with dried grain in a mortar". This connection of the word

אָקוּיִל with הָאִשָּׁה shows that Aquila took the א of the word אָקוּיִל as if it were a ה . This is in accordance with the statement: $\text{לֹא מִתְּמַנְנִין לְרַבּוֹתָא דְּבִין חִי"ה לְה"א}$ --- "The rabbis never refrained from interpreting 'He' and 'Ches' interchangeably", found in Yerushalmi Peah VII, 6 20b line 57, where הָאִשָּׁה (Leviticus XIX, 24) is explained as if it were הָאִשָּׁה , in Ma'aser Sheni V, 3 56a line 42, and Shabbos VII, 2 9b line 75, where the word אֶלֶף (Exodus XXXV, 1) is made out to be a Gematria of 39, by reading it אֶלֶף .

LEVITICUS XXIII, 40 --- וְהָיוּ - הָדָר

This translation is recorded in Yerushalmi Sukkah III, 5 53d line 26 and Vayikra Rabbah XXX, 8. It consists in translating the word הָדָר --- "myrtle", by the similar-sounding Greek word ὕδωρ --- "water", in the sense of "the tree that grows by the water". Though on the whole rather free, it is quite like Aquila.

la's style in other places of rendering words by Greek words of a similar sound. Examples of this sort are the rendition of יָבֵן (Deuteronomy XI, 30) by ἄνθρον, of חֵלֶב by μῶμος, of חִפְּזָה (I Samuel XV, 23) by θεραπεΐα, of כִּיכָר (II Samuel VI, 16) by καρφαριμένον, of שֹׁרֶר (Ezekiel IX, 12) by ἄστυ, of שִׁלָּה (Ezekiel XXVII, 24) by εὐμαγώσους, and of יָסַד (Amos VII, 1) by μάλα, confusing the word with שִׁלָּה. We have therefore no reason to doubt that this translation is genuine. We have no record of Aquila's translation of the verse.

ISAIAH III, 20—שֹׁרֶרֶת יָבֵן—הַכִּיכָרִים וְהַחֵלֶב

This passage is cited in Y. Shabbos VI, 1 8b line 60. It is an attempt to translate one of the lists of women's ornaments given in the third chapter of Isaiah. The real translation is "Scent-boxes". The Septuagint gives the reading ἐμπόκιον. Aquila translates it by the word εὐστομαλῆα, meaning "ornaments of the bosom".

EZEKIEL XVI, 10—הַחֵלֶב—הַכִּיכָרִים וְהַחֵלֶב

This translation is recorded, with some slight variation in the translation of the Greek, in Echah Rabbati I, 1, Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah IV, 23 and 25. Here we apparently have two translations of the same word. חֵלֶב is the Greek word ποικιλία, "variegated." חֵלֶב is similarly translated by ποικιλίαν in Ezekiel XXVI, 24 and ποικιλία in Psalm XLV, 15, as recorded in the Aquila fragments that we possess. ποικιλίου is the actual Aquila reading to the passage and so we must regard the Hebrew report as slightly corrupt or else an inexactness in quotation. חֵלֶב may be either ἐμπόκιον, "embroidered", or else φυλακτήριον, "phylacteries", "amulets", an explanation of this verse found in Pesikta Rabbati (XXX, p. 154a

ed. Friedmann) and parallel passages.

EZEKIEL XXIII, 43— וְהָיָה כִּי יִשְׁכַּח אֶת-יְהוָה וְיִשְׁכַּח אֶת-יְהוָה

Given in Vayikra Rabbah XXXIII, 6. The Greek words are παλαιὰ πόρνη, "old harlot". This is again an attempt to render the Hebrew by a similar-sounding Greek word. The report does not agree with the report of Aquila's translation in the Hexapla, which has: κατατρίψαι μοιχεύς. It is closer to Symmachos' παλαιούται μοιχεύς, but the resemblance is not close enough for us to suppose that the rabbis quoted Symmachos under the impression that his translation was that of Aquila. (*) Most likely we have again to do with a different edition from that which Origen used.

PSALM XLVIII, 15— וְיִקְרֶינָנוּ — אֲθָנָא-אֵל

This translation must certainly have been very famous. It is cited in no less than six times in the various rabbinic sources: Y. Moed Koton III, 7 83b line 65, Megillah II, 4 73b line 40, Vayikra Rabbah XI, 9 (to Leviticus XI, 1), Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah I, 23 (to Song of Songs I, 3), Koheleth Rabbati I, 30 (to Ecclesiastes I, 11) and Midrash Tanhuma, Seder Shemini to Leviticus XI, 1. The Greek word αθανασία, "the place where there is no death", is transcribed in several different ways in the Hebrew. The verse reads וְיִקְרֶינָנוּ מִן-הַמָּוֶת. The first two words clearly mean "He leads us". וְיִקְרֶינָנוּ, however, really belongs to the begin-

(*) Knauss, Akilas der Proselyt p. 154, on the authority of Fuerst, Glossarium Graeco-Hebraicum p. 166, says that this translation comes from Symmachos. I do not find sufficient grounds, in the reports given in the Midrash and the translations recorded in the Hexapla, to warrant such an assertion.

ning of the next Psalm and should be vocalized וְיִזְכֹּר, as we find it in Psalm XLVI, 1, with the meaning "for soprano voices". The verse was naturally difficult to explain for the ancient writers. Aquila took the word to be the same as וְיִזְכֹּר - זָכַר, found in Proverbs XII, 28. Similarly he takes וְיִזְכֹּר in Psalm XC, 10 to be the same as וְיִזְכֹּר, and translates it ἀναγῶν. We also know from various Talmudic reports (Y. Berachoth II, 4d line 48, B. Megillah 24b Berachoth 32b) that certain of the people of Palestine did not differentiate in their pronunciation between ז and נ. The translation ἀθανασία must have become very popular, because it was a support to the belief in life after death. The Codex Vaticanus of the Septuagint does not translate the last words of this verse at all, but the Hexaplar reading, which has been preserved also in the Codices Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus, Psalterium Graeco-Latinum Veronense and Psalterium Turicense has ἀναγῶν ποιῶναι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, which indicates a vocalization וְיִזְכֹּר.

PROVERBS XVIII, 21--דְּבַר הַלֵּשׁוֹן בִּיד וְחַיִּיתוֹ בְּגֹחַל אֲזִיכִיּוֹן.

Cited Vayikra Rabbah XXXIII, 1 (to Leviticus XXV, 14). The meaning of the Hebrew is, "Death and life are in the power of the tongue." Aquila is supposed to translate this verse by the Greek word μυστρίον μάλαριον, an implement that consisted of a spoon on one end and a knife on the other. The use of such a word is too free for any translator. It is moreover a typical Midrash illustration by means of an article seen in everyday life. The Greek word was no doubt the name of an instrument known to the people, since no explanation is given in the passage for its meaning, and could therefore be used by a speaker in addressing an audience of people who did not know Greek. This expression

may have been an explanation made by Aquila and not a translation, (*) or else it was made by some other rabbi, and later recorders, not knowing by whom it was said, assigned it to Aquila because it was a Greek word.

PROVERBS XXV, 11--- חֲכָמִים כְּחֵלֶב זָהָב בְּכִיּוֹת כֶּסֶף
 חֲכָמִים כְּחֵלֶב זָהָב בְּכִיּוֹת כֶּסֶף

Cited in Bereshis Rabbah XCIII, 3 (to Genesis XLIV, 18). A peculiar feature of this citation is the fact that all the words except the essential one are given in Aramaic. This is the word חֲכָמִים, the Greek word διοκάρσιον, meaning "flat plate", given as the translation of חֲכָמִים --- "show-piece carvings". The versions vary as to the translation of this word, the Septuagint having the reading ὀφείων, Symmachos and Theodotion περιβλήτους. That of Aquila is not recorded in the Hexapla.

ESTHER I, 6--- אֵילָנִים קִיפְּנִיּוֹן - חֹר כְּלָל

The translation is recorded in Esther Rabbati II, 7 to this verse. The Greek words, as we know from the actual Aquila reading, are ἄριον καρπείων. The first of these words is again a rendering of the Hebrew by a similar-sounding Greek word. The second word can hardly be classed as such, because both the Hebrew and Greek words are loan-words from the Sanskrit karṇṣa, "Cotton" or "fine linen". The Septuagint reads βυσσίνος καὶ καρπείων and possibly the citation refers only to the first word.

DANIEL V, 5--- חֲכָמִים בְּכִיּוֹת כֶּסֶף - חֲכָמִים בְּכִיּוֹת כֶּסֶף

This translation is recorded in Y. Yoma III, 8 41 a line 24.

(*) חֲכָמִים then would mean not "translated", but "explained", as it is used elsewhere.

I give the text as it is given by Azariah dei Rossi, which is a better reading than the לַמִּנְיָה of our present texts. The Greek word is $\lambda\alpha\mu\pi\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ --- "lamp". We do not have the reading of Aquila for this passage, but Theodotion uses the same word in his translation. The Septuagint translates by the word $\phi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma$.

DANIEL VIII, 13--- $\text{לְיָמֵי שָׁנָה אֶחָדָה}$

Cited in Bereshis Rabbah XXI, 1 (to Genesis III, 22). Here again the translation is given in an equivalent Hebrew word. Evidently Aquila translated $\text{לְיָמֵי שָׁנָה אֶחָדָה}$ --- "a certain one" by a word that was equivalent to $\text{לְיָמֵי שָׁנָה אֶחָדָה}$ --- "the inner one", in which sense he evidently understood the Aramaic word. The probable Greek word used was $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$.

In addition to these twelve certain citations, there are a few other passages where translations are recorded that might be from Aquila. I need not take up Isaiah V, 6, where the translation reported in the name of Aquila has long ago been shown by Azariah dei Rossi to come from the Targum Jonathan.

LEVITICUS III, 45--- $\text{וְהָיָה כְּחֹדֶם הָאֵשׁ וְכִי יִשְׂרָף הָאֵשׁ וְהָיָה כְּחֹדֶם הָאֵשׁ$

Cited in Echa Rabbati III, 35, to this verse. The name of Aquila is not mentioned here and there is some doubt as to whether the words given are actually Greek or Aramaic. Jastrow takes them to be Aramaic, from $\text{וְהָיָה כְּחֹדֶם הָאֵשׁ}$ --- "to be repulsive" and $\text{וְהָיָה כְּחֹדֶם הָאֵשׁ}$ --- "blemish". Levy, and Winer and Wunsche, in their translation, take them to be the Greek words $\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha$, "hated" and $\varphi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\tau\alpha\varsigma$, "bare". The authorship of Aquila is possible.

Krauss (Akylas der Proselyt, Festschrift zum achtzigsten Geburtstag Moritz Steinshneider's, p. 156-163) tries to show that all the translations, given in Yerushalmi Shabbos 8a, of the

articles in the list of women's ornaments (Isaiah III) come from Aquila. He therefore takes up one by one the explanations given there and endeavors to show either that they are the same as the known translations of Aquila, or else may have come from him. It is indeed possible that they may have been taken from Aquila, but, apart from the fact that Krauss, to gain his point, has often to assume considerable corruption in the text, there are two serious objections to his view, namely: (1) the translation of $\Psi 9 \gamma \eta \omega \tau$ in Isaiah III, 20, which we have discussed above, is expressly mentioned as that of Aquila, and none of the others are so designated, (2) if, as Krauss supposes, the rabbis were familiar with Aquila's rendition of the words, how does it happen that only twelve out of the twenty-one articles, and this only by dint of changes of the readings, can be made out to be Greek words? The discussion of the possibilities of these passages throws no light on the attitude of the rabbis toward the Greek translations, and so we shall not enter into it.

Several other Greek expressions cited by Krauss (pp. 155-158) as possibly coming from Aquila, may very well be so. These are $\alpha \phi \acute{\epsilon} \varsigma$ for $\alpha \gamma \alpha$, $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta \iota \nu \acute{o} \nu$ for $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta \iota \nu \acute{o} \nu$ (Exodus XXV, 5) $\mu \alpha \lambda \alpha \lambda \acute{\iota} \alpha$ for $\eta \gamma \gamma \omega$ (Genesis XLIX, 5) and $\mu \omega \rho \acute{o} \varsigma$ for $\mu \omega \rho \acute{o} \varsigma$. The verses Exodus XXIV, 5 and 11 will be taken up in the next chapter. It is possible that the renditions cited by Krauss may really come from Aquila; but it also must not be forgotten that some of the rabbis knew Greek and explained difficult passages in the Bible by Greek words, for instance, Rabbi Isaac (Bereshis Rabbah XLVIII, 6) who explains רָאָה (Psalm LXXXII, 1) by the Greek word $\epsilon \tau \alpha \rho \epsilon \mu \acute{o} \varsigma$, "ready".

Another possible translation of Aquila's, cited in Babli Baba Bathra 99a, will be discussed in the next chapter.

The translation of Aquila removed any possible objection of the rabbis to the Greek language or the Greek translations "perse". We find in fact several favorable expressions in regard to the Greek language. Such for instance is the statement in Yerushalmi Megillah I, 11 71b line 63 and Sotah VII, 2 21a line 12 (*):

אמר ר' יונתן דבית גוברין ארבע לשונות באין להשתמש בהן העולם
ואילו לא היו באין לארבע לשונות לא יכלו ללמוד;

"Rabbi Jonathan of Beth-Govrin said: There are four languages that it is good for the world to use, and they are: Greek for poetry, Latin for warfare, Aramaic for lamentations, and Hebrew for speech."

Rabbi Jehudah ha-Nasi, also, favors the Greek the Greek language over the Aramaic (B. Sotah 49b, Baba Kamma 82b):

האמר רבי בארץ ישראל לשון מדינה למה לי או לשון הקדש
או לשון יוונית.

"And behold Rabbi (Jehudah ha-Nasi) said: Why should there be the Aramaic language in the land of Israel? Let there be either Hebrew or Greek!"

In Yerushalmi Megillah I, 11 71b line 54, we have the following passage:

רבי בר קפרא יפת אלהים לזנות וישכון באהליו שם יתרו מדינת
בשטן שם יפת באהליו של שם;

(*) The parallel passage in Esther Rabbati IV, 12 (to I, 22) has לשון for לשון , and פירי instead of פירי .

"Bar Kappara taught: "May God give increase to Japhet and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem (Genesis IX, 27)" means that they will speak the language of Japhet (Greek) in the tents of Shem (Israel)".

After this passage there come seven lines identifying the peoples given in the genealogical table in Genesis X, 2. Then (line 62) comes the statement:

רבי יודן בר שלום אקרי קיין לתרגום

"Rabbi Judan bar Shalom said: From this passage we deduce the Bible translation". It is evident that this last statement can only refer to Genesis IX, 27, and so the intervening passage must be regarded as an interpolation.

Bar Kappara here is noting the fact that many of the Jews at his time spoke the Greek language. I find absolutely no ground for the statement of Ginzberg (Jewish Encyclopedia II, 504) that he was "probably the sole Palestinian who judged the literary activity of the Palestinian Jews favorably". It is also to be remembered that Rabbi Judan bar Shalom is the author of the statement in *Besikta Rabbati*, quoted by us in the first chapter, which points out the danger of the nations' translating the Bible into Greek and then asserting that they are Israel. We can see by this that he regards the Septuagint as the translation made by the nations, i.e. by the Christians, and accordingly his statement favoring the Greek translation of the Bible applies only to the translation of Aquila.

In *Bereshis Rabbah* XXXVI, 12, this Midrash is given in a slightly different form, as follows: "May God give increase to Japhet (and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem). Bar Kappara

said: This means that the words of the Bible (*) shall be spoken in the language of Japhet (Greek) in the tents of Shem (Israel). Rabbi Judan said: From this passage we deduce the Bible translation." The continuation, which goes on to explain Nehemiah VIII, 8 and interprets the word וְהִלְשֵׁנוּ there to mean וְהִלְשֵׁנוּ , refers to the Aramaic translation and not to the Greek and therefore is not to be taken together with our Midrash. The connection was due to a misunderstanding of the word וְהִלְשֵׁנוּ used by Rabbi Judan.

We may also mention in this connection a report (Y. Sotah VII, 1 21b line 57) of a synagogue in Caesarea where they read the Shema and the prayers in Greek. We are told Rabbi Levi bar Chaysah found this out and tried to stop it. Rabbi Jose heard of Rabbi Levi's efforts and became angry. "Just because they cannot read the prayers in Hebrew, shall we say that they shall not read them at all? ", he said, "Let them read in any language that they can!"

We have another outside report, in the law-code of Justinian, that in the year 553 the Jews in a synagogue in Byzantium had a dispute as to whether the section from the Torah should be read in Hebrew or Greek. This may have been a dispute as to whether a Greek translation was to be read after the Hebrew portion, or not. Justinian, in his 146th Novella, directs them to read a Greek section. As a Christian emperor, he naturally favors the use of the Septuagint, but he permits them to use the translation of Aquila.

With the downfall of those countries in which Greek was spoken, the Jews migrated to other lands and lost their knowledge of the

(*) See the discussion on the meaning of וְהִלְשֵׁנוּ , p. 37.

Greek language. It thus has been brought about that while the Septuagint, fostered by the Church, still remains, the translation of Aquila, adopted by the Jews, only comes down to us in fragments.

CHAPTERFOUR.THE BABYLONIAN ACCOUNTS OF THE GREEK BIBLE TRANSLATIONS.

We have so far been able to obtain a clear conception of the relations between the rabbis and the Septuagint and Aquila translations, by relying almost completely on the Palestinian sources. We shall now turn to the Babylonian accounts and find out just how much they knew of the actual facts.

Conditions in ~~Palestine~~ were quite different from those in Palestine. The Babylonians never heard the Greek language spoken. They and the peoples around them used Aramaic. They were far away from any Christians and so did not feel the necessity of polemizing against the Christian actions.

We have already seen how little Babli knew of the reason for the prohibition of Greek in the war of Quietus, and how they conceived of the prohibition as only being directed against Greek wisdom. As we can see from the discussion in Sotah 49b and Baba Kamma 82b, their confusion on this subject was due to the fact that they were also aware of the statement of Rabbi Jehudah ha-Nasi, quoted in the last chapter, which urges that either Hebrew or Greek be used in Palestine, to the exclusion of Aramaic. They did not know that Jehudah ha-Nasi was probably only giving his own individual view, which was probably not that of the majority, and most likely an overwhelming majority, of the rabbis of his time. They did not know that the family of Rabbi Jehudah ha-Nasi had long before been permitted to speak Greek for the reason

that they enjoyed special relations with the Roman government. They took this statement to be authoritative, and, with their usual tendencies toward smoothing away the difficulties, they tried to reconcile it with the prohibition in Sotah ix, 14. The only way that they could do this was to assume that the prohibition did not refer to the Greek language, but to the "Greek wisdom".

The report of the question asked of Rabbi Joshua as to learning Greek and the answer that he gave are preserved in a Babli report, but in a vastly altered form. In Menachoth 99a we read: "Ben Dama, the son of the sister of Rabbi Ishmael, asked Rabbi Ishmael, 'When shall a man like myself, who have already learned the entire Torah, learn Greek wisdom?' He quoted for him the verse (Joshua I, 8): And this book of the Law shall not depart from thy mouth and thou shalt meditate therein day and night. 'Go and find an hour that is not of the day nor of the night, and learn Greek wisdom then! ' ".

We can thus see how it was possible for the Babylonian Talmud and Soferim I, 9, which is taken from the Babylonian Talmud, to preserve their favorable account of the Septuagint. They did not know anything about the conflict between Judaism and Christianity over the Bible translations. As we shall see later in this chapter, they scarcely even knew of Aquila as a Greek translator. They could very well afford to give a favorable report of the Septuagint, and they did so, as they regarded the miracle wrought as creditable to Judaism. It thus happened that while the Palestinian sources have either deliberate silence regarding this story, or else speak bitterly of the day of the Septuagint

translation, Babli and Soferim report a story that is embellished with as many miracles as are reported by the Church Fathers themselves.

The Babylonian reports also make a mistake in reporting as changes made in the Septuagint translation two places which the earlier accounts do not have. These are Exodus XXIV, 5 and 11. Soferim only records the second of these verses as having been changed. The alteration reported is the substitution of 'ס' for 'ל' in verse 5 and 'ל' in verse 11. This report in Babli arises from a confusion with the report in Sifre (to Deuteronomy XXXIII, 27, ed. Friedmann 148b), Yerushalmi (Ta'amis IV, 2 68a line 46) and Soferim VI, 4, as follows:

שְׁלֹשָׁה סְפָרִים בְּקִצָּתוֹ אֶחָד שֶׁל מַעֲוָה וְאֶחָד שֶׁל הִיא
וְאֶחָד שֶׁנֶּקְרָא סֵפֶר לְסוֹטָר

The interpretation given by the rabbis in Sifre and Soferim, that this report speaks of the scrolls of the Law in which certain different readings were found, has been usually adopted by scholars, and many unsuccessful attempts have been made to explain the presence of the word 'ס' . Lauterbach, however, has very recently (*) shown that this interpretation of the statement is wrong and that these books are really books of genealogies,

הַסֵּפֶר הַזֶּה הוּא סֵפֶר לְסוֹטָר being the book of the genealogy of the nobles. Babli may either have had only a faint idea of the report, or else may have heard it with the explanation that this was a

(*) The proof for this is given in a paper to be read before the Jewish Theological Society of Cincinnati, February 14, 1916, the contents of which were previously communicated to me by the author.

change made in the text of the Torah, and it mistakenly grouped it with the only other list of the changes in the Torah that it knew, that of the changes made in the Septuagint translation.

Babli is also barely aware of the translation of Aquila--- or rather, of another translation in Greek besides the Septuagint. Megillah 9a, which comments on Megillah I, 8, which, as we have already seen in the last chapter, refers to the permission granted to Aquila, only gives the statement of Rabbi Jehudah, " Even when our rabbis permitted the Greek translation, they only permitted it for the five books of Moses, and because of the occurrence of Ptolemy". The first part of this report is incorrect, as we have seen in the past chapter that Aquila was undoubtedly permitted to translate the entire Bible. The reason why it was given was because the changes reported just below this passage, as having been made in the Septuagint translation, were all taken from the five books of Moses. The second part of the report is correct to the extent that Aquila's translation was permitted because the Septuagint was opposed, but there is only the barest hint of an opposition to the Septuagint, and no mention at all of the name of Aquila.

In Megillah 9b, we have given as a reason for the statement of Rabbi Shimeon ben Gamliel, the report: "Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba said: His reason was, because it is written, (Genesis IX, 27) May God give increase to Japhet (יִפְתָּח יִבְרַךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ), which means that the beauties of Japhet (יִפְתָּח יִבְרַךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ) shall be in the tents of Shem". Here we have the Midrash quoted before in the name of Bar Kappara, varied by another pun on יִפְתָּח. The whole context of Babli in this discussion is such, that this Midrash

might even be regarded as favoring the Septuagint!

The Babylonian Amoraim have only a confused recollection of Aquila and that in the form of Onkeles, the supposed translator of the five books of Moses into Aramaic. We have the report in Megillah 3a:

אמר רבי ירמיה ואיתאמא לבי חייא בר אבא פלגא טל פולק
אתקלס הגר אמרו גרי לי יאמליעזר ולבי יהושע:

"Rabbi Jeremiah---and some say Rabbi Hiyya bar Abba---said: Onkelos the proselyte made the Targum to the five books of Moses before Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Joshua".

The similarity between this report and that found in Yerushalmi Megillah 71 d is obvious and it is plain that Onkelos the proselyte, that we find in the Babli accounts, is the same as Aquila in the Yerushalmi reports. The difference consisted in making him translate the Bible, not in Greek, but in Aramaic, as in the eyes of the Babylonian rabbis Aramaic was the most important language for Bible translation. This change from Aquila to Onkelos is also found in the Tosefta, which relates some genuine reports of Aquila, and was probably made in our present editions under Babylonian influence. The Babylonian Talmud also records stories of Aquila, under the name of Onkelos, but with a certain amount of myth and confusion. For instance, it makes him a nephew of Hadrian or of Titus, confusing him with that other illustrious proselyte, Flavius Clemens. (*)

(*) For a complete list of the passages where Aquila (Onkelos) is mentioned, see Friedmann's Onkelos und Akylas and Anger's De Onkele Chaldaice. I have thought it best not to discuss the stor-

of Aquila as a translator into the Greek language, and noting that this passage was not taken from the Aramaic Targum, which they ascribed to Onkelos, took it to be the statement of some obscure Tanna by the name of Onkelos, and so recorded it in this form (*).

Of the translations recorded elsewhere in the name of Aquila, we have two reminiscences in Babli. His translation of Leviticus XIX, 20, is paralleled in Kerithoth 11a, and that of Leviticus XXIII, 40 is given as א'קל'ס ב'ן by Ben Azzai, in Succah 35a.

We are now in a position to conclude the discussion of the passage in Soferim I, 8. As we have said before, Graetz is the only one who holds that this report is older than the report of the changes made by the Septuagint translators. He believes it to be an expression of the early dislike of the Septuagint from the time of the Soferim, and that this opinion was only altered after the favorable report of the Septuagint was brought from Egypt. As a matter of fact the reverse is the case. We have already seen that there was no objection to the Septuagint before the war with Rome, and that the feeling was at its height in the second century, and on account of the Christians. This report therefore, which is violently opposed to the Septuagint, emanates from the second century.

This is further shown by the statement that the day of the

(*) It is possible that this explanation of the word א'קל'ס as א'קל'ס is the basis of the rabbinic explanation of the word א'קל'ס by an Aramaic word א'קל'ס -- "a child" and taking the word to be א'קל'ס -- "like a child". (Sukkah 5b, Hagigah 13b).

translation was as grievous to Israel as the day on which the golden calf was made. This statement may have a two-fold connotation. It may either refer to the first golden calf in the days of Moses, which led the people away from God, or to the golden calf that Jeroboam made, that divided the people into two parts, Israel and Judah. The use of this expression in referring to the day of the Eighteen Measures has the second connotation in mind, because it was the day of the division of the rabbis into two warring factions. The connotation in the report of the Septuagint may either be that it tended to divide the Jews into those who did and those who did not believe in Christ, or else, with more probability, that it tended to lead the Jews away from Judaism. Neither of these implications would have been applicable in the earlier times, as the Septuagint really aided in bringing the Jews of Alexandria in close connection with the Jews of Palestine.

We have already seen that the reason given here for the opposition to the Septuagint could not have been the real one. We have, on the whole, good reason to regard it as a later insertion. If it were genuine, it would have had to be written before the permission granted to Aquila to translate the Bible into Greek. But it is hardly likely that the reason for this condemnation would have been written down so soon as this date presupposes (*).

(*) The rabbis hesitated to give the reason for a recent decree, lest it should be attacked by their opponents. For instance, we find Rabbi Joshua (Abodah Zarah II, 5) asked by Ishmael, why the cheese of the heathen was prohibited (one of the Eighteen Measures).

We can also note that the reason for calling the day of the Eighteen Measures a day of evil is not given in the original report. It is more probable that the reason in Soferim I,8 was added by a later commentator who was altogether ignorant of the fact that there was any other translation of the Bible into Greek than the Septuagint. Accordingly he could only understand opposition to the Septuagint as opposition to the Greek translations in general, and so he added the explanation, "because the Torah cannot be translated adequately into Greek."

This report was probably not taken in Yerushalmi because they later ignored the Septuagint completely; and not in the Babli, either because they were not aware of it, which is most probable, or else because they could not reconcile it with their favorable view of the Septuagint. It was incorporated in Soferim, because it happened to deal with the Torah.

Combinations of the story in Soferim I,8 with the account in I, 9, of the changes made, are found in Maseches Sefer Torah I, 8-9 and Aboth d'Rabbi Nathan, Rescension II, chapter 37. In this last passage mention is made of ten (*) translators and ten

He gives one or two ambiguous answers, and when pressed, changes the subject. Both Talmuds (Yerushalmi II, 8 41 c line 67, Babli 35a) give as a reason for Rabbi Joshua's behavior, the statement that it was a new decree.

(*) Ed. Schechter, p. 94. We read in a note of Schechter that he found two versions, one recording ten translators and ten changes, the other five translators and the following five changes: Genesis XLIX, 6, Numbers XVI, 15, Exodus IV, 20 and XXI, 40, and

changes. However, eleven of the changes are recorded, Genesis II, 2 and Deuteronomy XVII, 3 being omitted.

A report in Midrash Tanchuma to Exodus IV, 19 (ed. Buber 7 ab) gives eleven of the changes, omitting Genesis XVIII, 12 and Numbers XVI, 15.

Leviticus XI, 6. In his edition he puts down a composite report of five translators and ten changes. The report of the ten translators and the ten changes is shown by the context to have been the correct one here. The chapter is a commentary on Aboth V, which records lists of happenings grouped around the number ten, and Aboth d'Rabbi Nathan in this chapter also records a number of these, such as the ten things that were created between the sixth and the seventh day, the ten names for prophet, the ten names for prophecy, the ten places where it is mentioned that God descended from heaven, etc. In such a context only a report of ten translators fits. The other version found, as well as the selection made by Shechter in his final edition, are due to the fact that elsewhere only five translators are recorded.

CHAPTERFIVE.OF SYMMACHOS AND THEODOTION.

There is almost no rabbinic knowledge of these two translators and no passages at all that directly report a translation by them.

Symmachos is not referred to at all in the rabbinic writings. Geiger's attempt to identify him with the Tanna of the same name is only a guess, and entirely unfounded. It is even uncertain whether he was a Jew or an Ebionite.

Theodotion has been suggested by Geiger (Urschrift, 164) as the one whose translation of the Bible is the real source of the story of the translation of Jonathan ben Uzziel, reported in Megillah 3a, following the statement that Onkelos was the author of the Targum to the five books of Moses:

תרבות של נביאים יונתן בן עוזיאל אמרו קפי חזי צריה וקלאכי
 ובדעצעה ארץ ישראל אלבע מאות פנים על אלבע מאות פנים יצפה
 בת קול ואמרה מי הוא זה שגילה ספרי לבבי אדם. עמר יונתן בן עוזיאל
 על יבנין ואמר אמי הוא שגליט ספרי לבבי אדם. גלוי וידוע לפניך
 שלא לכבודי עשית ולא לכבוד בית אבא אלא לכבודך עשית שלא
 ילבו מחלקות בישראל ועוד ביקש לעלות תרגום של נביאים יצפה
 בת קול ואמרו לו דייך:

" The Targum of the prophets was made by Jonathan ben Uzziel under the direction of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi (*), and the

(*) The statement that Jonathan learned the Targum from these

of Israel shook four hundred parasangs in every direction. A Bath Kol came forth and said: "Who is the one that is revealing My secrets to mankind?" Jonathan ben Uzziel stood forth and said, "I am the one who is revealing Thy secrets to the children of men. It is revealed and known unto Thee, that it is not for mine own glory that I am doing this, nor for the glory of my family, but I have done it for Thy glory, in order that dissensions may not increase among Israel." He further sought to publish a Targum of the Haggiographa, and a Bath Kol came forth and said, "Enough!" "We are not concerned with the story here, which is in place in a study of the Aramaic, and not the Greek, translations (*). The important thing is that a Jonathan is thought of a translator. It is true, as Geiger says, that Jonathan is the Hebrew equivalent of Theodotion. And it is possible that no mention is made of him in Yerushalmi because they favored the translation of Aquila to highly to consider any other, and that he was reported in Babli under the guise of an Aramaic translator, as was the case with Aquila. And it is also possible that they connected the Jonathan of that report with Jonathan ben Uzziel, the disciple of Hillel, of whom ~~many~~ stories are told, (e.g. in

 three prophets is suspicious, since he was regarded the disciple of Hillel. Perhaps these words are a later insertion.

(*) We can see from this passage that it was written at a time when the Aramaic translation of the Torah was an accepted fact, that of the prophets a debated question, and that of the Haggiographa was generally opposed. I hope to be able, at some other time, to take up the attitude of the rabbis toward the Aramaic Bible translations.

B. Baba Bathra 134a, where it is said that he was the greatest of the disciples of Hillel, and that when he would sit and teach any bird that flew over his head would be burnt.). But the whole idea must remain only a possibility. We know so little of Theodotion that we are not in a position to decide anything definitely on this ingenious suggestion.

SUMMARY.

We can summarize the results of this study in four general statements:

(1) Up to the time of the destruction of the Temple, the Palestinian teachers rather favored than opposed the Septuagint.

(2) In the period after that, especially from the beginning of the second century on, they opposed it because they saw the dangers that would come through it to the Greek-speaking Jews, on account of its use by and service for the newly risen religion of Christianity, and its numerous deviations from the Hebrew text.

(3) They welcomed the translation of Aquila as doing away with these objectionable points in the Septuagint readings, and also because it aided in establishing their authority over the Jews of the Diaspora.

(4) Of the other translations they knew little or nothing.

APPENDIX A.

DID THE RABBIS CONCEIVE OF THE CHANGES THEY REPORT AS BEING MADE
IN THE SEPTUAGINT AS HAVING BEEN MADE IN THE HEBREW CODEX OR
BY THE TRANSLATORS?

Frankel and Friedmann both argue that the changes recorded in the rabbinical sources as having been made in the Septuagint were actually made in a Hebrew codex that was sent to Egypt, and not by the translators. A discussion of this matter in the third chapter was out of place. I shall take it up here and show that the rabbis always conceived of the changes as having been made by the translators.

Frankel (*Verstudien zur Septuaginta*, pp. 31-32) is careful to differentiate between the Palestinian and Babylonian sources, the latter being considered by him unreliable. He says that only a Hebrew text was given to Pharaoh and that the changes were made for fear that this text might later be translated and misunderstood. He brings forward the following arguments: (1) that there is no mention in the Palestinian accounts of a request for a translation on the part of Ptolemy, or of any inspired translation, (2) that only four of the changes mentioned are found in the present text of the Septuagint, and (3) that these changes are recorded in Hebrew.

Friedmann (*Onkelos und Akylas*, pp. 15-25) asserts the reliability of Babli, and separates the account of the origin of the translation from the report of the changes. He brings forward

the following arguments: (1) Soferim I,9 is a distinct report from I,8, and does not speak of a translation, (2) We have the report of the three books that were found in the Temple court, in one of which לְעִבְרָה was in the text, which is the same as the change recorded in Babli, (3) that we have the following report in Sifre (to Deuteronomy XVII, 3, ed. Friedmann 84a):

עובר קצין עליו לומר ויזך יעבור אלפה אחריה ומצן אך להשיגהו במצור
 לומר וישמח להם ~~הם~~ לשמש או ליה או לכל צבא שאם אשיל לא צוית-כשהוא
 אומר לעוברת ~~לעברת~~ את השטף

and that this shows that there was an actual reading in some texts of the Torah, that had the word לְעִבְרָה , and (4) that in Bereshis Rabbah mention is always made of these changes, as if to prevent a mistake through the Alexandrinian Torah-scrolls.

To these might have been added the following reasons in support of this view: (1) that the report of the changes in Yerushalmi follows after a discussion of the correctness of the Hebrew text, (2) that the expressions used in Yerushalmi and Mechilta are לְעִבְרָה "the sages changed" and לְעִבְרָה , which usually means "write" and (3) The fact that Rabbi Nathan in Bereshis Rabbah LXIII, 3, quoted a saying (לְעִבְרָה) which has the same words as those used by the Mechilta to Exodus XII, in reporting the change to that verse.

None of these arguments have sufficient force to prove that the changes made were in a Hebrew codex. The discussion of this question will naturally center around the Palestinian reports. We have already had sufficient examples of the unreliability on this question to justify us in not stopping to refute Fried-

mann's defence of it here.

We have already seen that the reason why the Palestinian accounts do not mention a request for a translation by Ptolemy or a divine inspiration was not because they did not know of such a story, but because they deliberately omitted it. Its absence, therefore, cannot be brought forward as an argument.

Frankel's statement that there are only four of the changes in the present text of the Septuagint is incorrect. He records as such only Genesis II, 2, Exodus IV, 20 and XII, 40, and Numbers XVI, 15. As a matter of fact the change reported in Leviticus XI, 6 (after the change of one letter in the text is made) is actually found, there is a change in Genesis XVIII, 12, though the rabbis made a mistake as to the words that were changed, we have an indication in the Hexaplar reading to Genesis V, 2, that the change reported was actually originally there and in I, 27, and we have a part of the change in Genesis I, 26 still preserved. We thus have eight, or more than half of the changes reported, actually found in the Septuagint. In view of the many revisions and corrections that the text has undergone, it is not surprising that the other five are not found.

The changes were recorded in Hebrew because there was no other way to indicate them. The Jews of Palestine did not understand Greek, and so a list of Greek words would have been meaningless.

It is true that Soferim I, 9 does not speak directly of a translation into Greek, but the whole context of the story of the seventy separate cells and the miraculous agreement points to a translation. If it were merely a writing out of the Torah from memory, what did Ptolemy want with seventy-two Torah's and how

did he manage to find out that they all came out alike? To sever the story from the report of the changes is a very violent proceeding.

We have already seen that the three books in the Temple court were really genealogy-books. But even if we did not know this, the omission of the report of the changes in Exodus XXIV from the Yerushalmi account should have been enough to show that the report in Babli could not have been genuine.

As for the Sifre passage, it is to be noted that while in the first two points the question is put, "Whence do we get so and so?", which is answered by citing the text, in the third point the Biblical reading is first cited and then the inference drawn. It would thus seem that the word הָיָה is not from XVII, 3 but from XXVIII, 24, which is cited as a support to this verse, just as immediately below XVII, 3 itself is cited as a support for IV, 19. Another explanation of this passage is that the rabbis quoted the verse from memory, and confused it with other passages, such as Deuteronomy XXVIII, 24, Judges II, 19 or several places in Jeremiah where הָיָה is used in a similar connection. But even if we grant that the word occurred in a Torah reading, what does this prove? That the rabbis used an Alexandrian Torah? Hardly. It could only show that there were certain Torahs, existing before the time of the Septuagint, in which this extra word was found, and that the Septuagint translators used one of these. Then the rabbis were wrong in supposing this to be a change made at the time of the translation, and no proof at all is afforded for Friedmann's contention.

The mention of the changes in Bereshis Rabbah is only derived

from the earlier reports of the changes. Rashi also records some of these changes in his commentary. Are we to suppose that he did so because he was afraid that there were any Torah-scrolls at his time in which such changes were found?

Nothing can be argued from the place of the reports in Yerushalmi, as that Talmud has such abrupt introductions of diverse topics again and again.

As to the expression "the sages changed", it can as well mean a change in the translation as in the text. The sages referred to may as well have been Alexandrian as Palestinian. Since the stories given in the Babylonian accounts, which the Palestinians knew, make the changes in the translation, there is no reason why the Palestinians should have thought differently.

The verb *אָד* is frequently found in the meaning "to translate". No better proof for this could be found than the fact that in Megillah I, 8, in the two accounts in Soferim, and in Babli, where undoubtedly a translation is meant, this very word *אָד* is used.

Finally, the *אָד* mentioned by Rabbi Nathan is not a reading in a Torah-scroll. If it had been, he would have undoubtedly said so more definitely. It was evidently only an explanation.

Several of the changes themselves show that they must have been made in the Greek. One of these is the change in Genesis XVIII, 12, where the change is made in the vocalization of the words and could not have been made in the unpointed Hebrew text. Three others were evidently made from the point of view of the Egyptian Jews. Their very nature shows that they could not have been made by Hebrew-speaking Jews and in Palestine. Let us take a modern illustration. In Deuteronomy XXV, 11, we have the expression *בְּשֵׁם שְׁכָמוֹ*. Luther translates literally, "bei seiner Scham". The French Catho-

the Bible renders it, "par un endroit que la pudeur defende a nommer". Are we to suppose that the French and German translators had different texts? Certainly not. The French made the change in the translation because the literal translation would offend the sensibilities of the French readers. Similarly the avoidance of the mentioning of the ass in Exodus IV, 20 and Numbers XVI, 15 could only have been made by the people in Egypt, i.e. the translators. The ass was abhorred in Egypt, but not in Palestine.

The change in Leviticus XI, 6, is still more striking. It is again a change that could only have been made by the Greek translators, for the change consists only in using another and a somewhat less usual word for "hare". The expression "hairy-footed", used to mean "hare", is only found in the Greek language. It is impossible, therefore, that this change could have been made by the Hebrew-speaking Jews in Palestine.

It is further to be noted that all the changes I have cited here are attested as genuine by the fact that they still survive in the Septuagint.

The reason why such a hypothesis as that of Frankel and Friedmann is advanced at all is because it is our present view that the variations in the Septuagint from the Hebrew text are due to the fact that its translators had a different manuscript. But are we sure that this view accounts for all or two changes? We have just cited four genuine variations that must have been made by the translators. Is it not possible that the rabbis are partly right, and that in many places the variations are caused by a change in the translation itself?

APPENDIX

B.

[illegible]

Piece	Masoretic Text	Mechilta	Yerushalmi	Babli	Soferim	Septuagint Reading	Notes.
Exodus <u>10</u> , 20	וַיִּקַּח מֶטֶל אֶתְמֹנֶה וְאֶם בְּנֵי וַיִּלְכְּבֵם עַל הַחֲמֹז	וַיִּקַּח מֶטֶל אֶתְמֹנֶה וְאֶם בְּנֵי וַיִּלְכְּבֵם עַל כְּנוֹשָׁא אֶדְהָם	וַיִּקַּח מֶטֶל אֶתְמֹנֶה וְאֶם בְּנֵי וַיִּלְכְּבֵם עַל כְּנוֹשָׁא בְּנֵי אֶדְהָם	Same as Mechilta	Same as Mechilta	ἐπὶ τὰ ὑποπόδια	Reported, but change not given, in Shemos Rebbah II, 5.
Exodus <u>XII</u> , 40	וּמוֹסֵב בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יֵשְׁבוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם שְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה וְאַלְבֶּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה .	—	וּמוֹסֵב בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יֵשְׁבוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם וּבְכָל הָאֲרָצוֹת שֶׁשָּׁם שָׁנָה וְאַלְבֶּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה .	Same as Yerushalmi	וּמוֹסֵב בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר יֵשְׁבוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם וּבְכָל הָאֲרָצוֹת שֶׁשָּׁם שָׁנָה וְאַלְבֶּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה .	ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Χαλδαίᾳ .	Mechilta report of change is in introduction.
Exodus <u>XXIV</u> , 5	וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת צִיְרֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	—	—	וַיִּשְׁלַח אֶת צִיְרֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל	—	—	wrongly inserted
Exodus <u>XXIV</u> , 11	וְאֵל אֲצִילֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לִשְׁלַח יָדָם	—	—	וְאֵל אֲצִילֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לִשְׁלַח יָדָם	וְאֵל אֲצִילֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לִשְׁלַח יָדָם	—	in list.
Leviticus <u>XI</u> , 6	וְאֵת הַדְּבָרִים	—	וְאֵת הַדְּבָרִים צִיְרֵי הַדְּבָרִים אֲחֵן שֶׁלֹּא מֵאֵת אֲלֵבֶתָא הַדְּבָרִים	—	—	καὶ τοῦ δαύποδα	Should read שִׁיטֵי הַדְּבָרִים
Numbers <u>XVI</u> , 15	לֹא חֲמֹד אֶחָד בָּשָׂא	לֹא חֲמֹד אֶחָד מִדָּם בָּשָׂא	Same	Same	Same	οὐκ ἐπιθύμουν οὐδὲν	Omitted in Tanachom
Leviticus <u>XI</u> , 6	See above	—	—	—	וְאֵת צִיְרֵי הַדְּבָרִים	See above	Very likely mis- placed by copyist
Deuteronomy <u>XX</u> , 19	אֲשֶׁר חָלַק יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶתְּכֶם לְכָל הָעָמִים תַּחַת כָּל הַשָּׁמַיִם	אֲשֶׁר חָלַק ה' אֶתְּכֶם לְכָל הָעָמִים	אֲשֶׁר חָלַק ה' אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֶתְּכֶם לְכָל הָעָמִים תַּחַת כָּל הַשָּׁמַיִם .	אֲשֶׁר חָלַק ה' אֶתְּכֶם לְכָל הָעָמִים	Same as Yerushalmi	καὶ ἀπέειπεν Κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου αὐτῶν	
Deuteronomy <u>XXI</u> , 3	וַיִּלְכְּבֵם וַיַּעֲבֹד אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וַיִּשְׁכַּח לָהֶם לִשְׁמֹעַ אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיהֶם לֵכֶן לָבַע הַשָּׁמַיִם אֲשֶׁר לֹא צִוִּיתָם :	אֲשֶׁר לֹא צִוִּיתָם לַעֲבֹדָה	Same as Mechilta	וַיִּלְכְּבֵם וַיַּעֲבֹד אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים לֵכֶן לָבַע לַעֲבֹדָה	Same as Mechilta	οἱ οὐ προετίθεν	
Leviticus <u>XI</u> , 6	See above	וַיִּלְכְּבֵם לֹא אֶת צִיְרֵי הַדְּבָרִים :	—	וַיִּלְכְּבֵם לֹא אֶת צִיְרֵי הַדְּבָרִים לָכֵן אֶתְּכֶם אֶתְּכֶם שֶׁלֹּא תִלְכְּבוּ אֶתְּכֶם שֶׁמֶת שֶׁלֹּא יִתְּכֶם שֶׁחֵן בִּי יִתְּכֶם וְהָשִׁיב שֶׁמֶת אֶתְּכֶם בְּתוֹרָה :	—	See above	

Summary of the Citations from Aquila.

Place in Text	Hebrew Words	Place Cited	Citation	Probable Greek word	Aquila Translation	Septuagint	Notes
I. In Greek.							
Genesis <u>XVII</u> , 1	יְהוָה בָּרָא	Bereshith Rabbah <u>XVII</u> , 2	הָרַבּוֹת הָיוּ	ἰσχυρὸς ἰκανός.	Lost.	ὁ θεὸς σου	See p. 57.
Leviticus <u>XVIII</u> , 40	וְיָדָה	Y. Sukkah 53d. Vayikra Rabbah <u>XXX</u> , 8	וְיָדָה	ὕδωρ	Lost.	ὕδατος	Parallel in name of Ben Azzai B. Sukkah 35a.
Isaiah <u>III</u> , 20	וְיָדָה	Y. Shabbos 8d.	הָרַבּוֹת הָיוּ	ἐυστομαχία	Lost.	ἐμπόλιον	
Ezekiel <u>XVI</u> , 10	וְיָדָה	Eke Rabbati I, 1 Shema Shema Rabbah <u>III</u> , 13 and 25	וְיָדָה וְיָדָה וְיָדָה	ἐμποικιλία οὐ φυλακτήριον ποικιλία	ποικιλίου.	ποικιλία	See p. 59.
Ezekiel <u>XXI</u> , 43	וְיָדָה	Vayikra Rabbah <u>XXXIII</u> , 6	וְיָדָה	παλαιά παύση	κατατρίψαι μοχλίας	οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ μοχλίσαι	Cf. LXX translation to Daniel <u>XVIII</u> , 12. See p. 60.
Psalm <u>XLVIII</u> , 15	וְיָדָה	Y. Moed Koton 8b Y. Megillah 73b Vayikra Rabbah <u>VI</u> , 4 Shema Shema Rabbah I, 20 Koheleth Rabbati I, 10 Tanchum 2	וְיָדָה וְיָדָה וְיָדָה וְיָדָה	ἀθανασία	Lost	εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα	Synonymaphla indicates Aquila reading equivalent to "super morte", but very obscure.
Proverbs <u>XVIII</u> , 21	וְיָדָה	Vayikra Rabbah <u>XXXIII</u> , 1	וְיָדָה	μυστρογάλαρα	Lost	θάνατος καὶ ζῆλος ἐν χειρὶ γλώσσης	Not a translation.
Esther I, 6	וְיָדָה	Esther Rabbati <u>II</u> , 7	וְיָדָה	ἀέριον καρπίασιον	ἀέριον καρπίασιον	βυσσίου καὶ καρπίασιον	
II In Greek and Aramaic							
Proverbs <u>XXV</u> , 11	וְיָדָה	Bereshith Rabbah <u>XXIII</u> , 3	וְיָדָה	δισκάριον	Lost	ἐν ὁμίῳ	

Place in Bible	Hebrew words	Place Cited	Citation	Probable Error	Agreement Translation	Septuagint	Notes
Daniel <u>IX</u> , 5	אֲנִי וְכָל בְּרִיּוֹתַי	Yema 41a	אֲנִי וְכָל בְּרִיּוֹתַי	אֲנִי וְכָל בְּרִיּוֹתַי	lost	φύτος	Theodotion has same as citation
<u>III</u> Cited in Hebrew							
Leviticus <u>XIX</u> , 20	וְכָל בְּרִיּוֹתַי	Yiddishke 81a	אֲנִי וְכָל בְּרִיּוֹתַי	אֲנִי וְכָל בְּרִיּוֹתַי	lost	διαπεφύκιστος	Parallel in B. M. tract 11a
Daniel <u>III</u> , 13	אֲנִי וְכָל בְּרִיּוֹתַי	Arabic's Rabbin	אֲנִי וְכָל בְּרִיּוֹתַי	Εὐδοτέρος	lost	φύτος	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SOURCE MATERIAL.

(a) Works in Hebrew.

Talmud Yerushalmi, Kretschschin edition. Citations are made by chapter, halachah, page, column, and line.

Talmud Babli. Readings corrected by Rabbino-wiez, R. Dikduke Seferim, Munich 1867.

Tosefta, ed. M.S. Zuckermann, Trier 1882.

Mechilta, ed. I. H. Weiss, with commentary "Middoth Seferim." ed. M. Friedmann, with commentary "Me'ir Ayin".

Sifre, ed. M. Friedmann.

Masseches Seferim, ed. Joel Muller, Leipzig 1878.

Megillas Ta'anith.

Midrash Rabboth.

Midrash Bereshis Rabbah, ed. J. Theodor, Berlin 1903.

Midrash Tanchuma.

Midrash Tanchuma, ed. S. Buber, Wilna 1885.

Pesikta Rabbati, ed. M. Friedmann, Vienna 1880.

(b) Works by Greek authors.

The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, ed. H. B. Swete, Cambridge 1895.

Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, ed. F. Field, Oxford 1875.

Aristeas ad Philocratem epistulam, ed. P. Wendland, Leipzig, 1900.

The Letter of Aristeas, tr. and ed. Andrews, in Charles, E. H.,

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, II,
83-122.

Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt, ed. L. Cohen and P.
Wendland, Berlin, 1896.

The Works of Philo Judaeus, tr. C.D. Yonge, London 1854.

The Works of Flavius Josephus, tr. W. Whiston, New York, 1906.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers, tr. and ed. A. Roberts and J. Donaldson
New York 1903.

II. WORKS DEALING WITH THE SUBJECT.

Jewish Encyclopedia, following articles:

Aquila, II, 34.

Bible translations, III, 185.

Dialects, IV, 556.

Diaspora, IV, 559.

Greek language and the Jews, VI, 55.

Jonathan ben Uzziel, VII, 238.

Megillah, VIII, 426.

Megillas Ta'anith, VIII, 427.

Symmaches, XI, 619.

Targum, XII, 57.

Theodotion, XII, 127.

Abrahams, I: Chapters on Jewish Literature, Philadelphia 1899, 26-27.

Anger, R.: De Onkelos Chaldaico, quem ferent, Pentateuch paraphraste
et quid ei rationis intercedat cum Akila Graeco veteris
Testamenti interprete, Leipzig 1845.

Aptewitzer, V.: Die rabbinischen Berichten ueber die Entstehung der Septuaginta, in HaKedem, II (1908) 11-27.

: Das Schriftwort in der rabbinischer Literatur, Vienna, 1906. Vol. I. Prolegomena.

Bacher, W.: Agada der Tannaiten, Strassburg 1890.

: Agada der Palaestinischen Amoraer, Strassburg 1892.

Bentwich, N.: Philo-Judaeus of Alexandria, Philadelphia 1910.

Burkitt, C.J.: Aquila, in Jewish Quarterly Review, X, 207-216.

Eichhorn, J.G.: Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Leipzig, vols. I and II.

Elbogen, I.: Die Ju-dische Gottedienst in seiner geschichtlicher Entwicklung, Leipzig 1913, especially, 186-194.

Frankel, Z.: Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta, Leipzig 1841.

Friedmann, M.: Onkeles und Akylas, in Jahresbericht der Israelitisch Lehranstalt in Wien, 1896.

Fyne, S.: The title "Septuagint" and what it may possibly mean, in Jewish Exponent, January 12, 1912.

Geiger, A.: Urschrift und Uebersetzung der Bibel in ihrer Abhaengigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judenthums, Breslau, 1857.

: Symmachos der Uebersetzer der Bibel, in Juedische Zeitschrift fuer Wissenschaft und Leben, I (1862), 39-64.

Graetz, H.: Geschichte der Juden, vol II part 2 to IV. Citations are given from the fifth German edition.

: Die Septuaginta im Talmud, in Zeitschrift fuer die religioesen Interessen des Judenthums, II (1845) 429-437, with a comment of Frankel, 438-441.

Joel, M.: Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte zu Anfang der zweiten

christlichen Jahrhunderts, vol I: Der Talmud und die Griechische Sprache.

Juster, J.: Les Juives dans l'Empire Romaine, 1914.

Koenig, E.: Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Bonn 1893.

Krauss, S.: Akylas der Preselyt, in Festschrift zum achtzigsten Geburtstage Moritz Steinschneider's, Leipzig 1896, 148-163.

Noeldeke, T.: Histoire Literaire de l'Ancienne Testament, chapter IX, Les Anciennes Traductions, p. 355-389. Used in the French translation.

Reider, J.: Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila, Jewish Quarterly Review, New Series, IV (1913-1914) 321-356, 577-620.

DeiRossi, Azariah: Meor Enaim, ed. Cassel, Wilna 1866. Chapter 45, 383-393.

Schuerer, E.: A History of the Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ. Citations are given from the English translation.

Weiss, I.H.: Der Der Vedorshev, Vilna 1904, vols I and II.

Zeitlin, S.: Les dix-huit Mesures, in Revue des Etudes Juives, LXVIII (1914), 22-36.

Zunz, L.: Die gottesdienstliche Vortraege der Juden, Frankfurt 1892, chapter V, 65-86.

This list does not include a number of works that were cited only occasionally. Some of these are cited in their particular place.