

THE SAPIENTIAL SEPTUAGINT

EDWIN YAMAUCHI, A.B., A.M.

One of the most noteworthy developments in the field of Old Testament studies has been the acknowledgment of the importance of the Near Eastern setting of the Old Testament, as over against the old Wellhausen view of Israel as an isolated people.¹ Nowhere is this development more pertinent than in the study of the sapiential or wisdom books: Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes.²

The recognition of many Near Eastern parallels to Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes³ from very ancient sources calls for a reexamination of the later Greek parallels adduced for Proverbs, and more especially for Ecclesiastes. Although a final degree of unanimity may never prevail over critical opinions, nonetheless it may be safe to say that many of the motifs, even in Ecclesiastes, were anticipated in ancient Near Eastern texts and need not be ascribed to later Greek sources.⁴

One area, however, where Greek ideas and expressions have exercised a very patent and unmistakable influence on the sapiential books is that of the Greek translations of Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. A number of studies on these and other books have been undertaken which, presupposing that the translators had a Hebrew text basically similar to the Masoretic Text, have compared the differences between M and LXX and have then formed conclusions as to the attitudes of the translator which may have led to these differences.⁵

Septuagintal Studies.

The comparison of the Septuagint with the Massoretic Text, however, is fraught with difficulties. There is first of all the lack of a definitive critical edition.⁶ Max Margolis recognized this problem and sought to do something about it: he worked for twenty years to produce a critical edition of the Greek version of Joshua!⁷

Today, thanks to the recovery of early texts of the LXX in the papyri⁸ and the manuscripts from Qumran, we are in a better position to reconstruct the parent LXX text. Among those from Qumran are: leather fragments of Leviticus and of Numbers, papyrus fragments of Leviticus, and a manuscript of the Minor Prophets which represents a "lost" recension of the Septuagint—the old Greek version of the third-second centuries B.C.⁹ In addition to the Greek manuscripts we also have Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran such as portions from Exodus, Deuteronomy, and especially from Samuel which represent a text tradition closer to the LXX than to the MT, although not always consistently so.

The new texts of Samuel, especially 4 QSama which presents portions of the text of at least two-thirds of the chapters in I and II Samuel, show that Wellhausen and Driver were entirely wrong in considering the LXX translation as so free as often to be a paraphrase of its Hebrew prototype; actually its fidelity to the Hebrew prototype is much greater than has often been assumed. We now know that in the fragments so far described from the Pentateuch and the former Prophets (Joshua-Judges-Samuel-Kings) the Greek translators were almost slavish in their literalism (though they seldom pushed it to the point of absurdity, as later done by Aquila).¹⁰

Some scholars, notably Harry Orlinsky, have been less enthusiastic, to put it mildly, about a Septuagint-type *Vorlage* and have warned against over-enthusiasm in this regard when this results from an uncritical use of Kittel's apparatus. Orlinsky claims that the Hebrew text used by the Septuagint translators and the Massoretic Text are "two recensions of one original text tradition"¹¹ and explains

the differences between the two as amplifications of the Jewish transcribers of the text rather than as amplifications of the translators into Greek.

The questions that must be asked, then, when the Septuagint differs from the Massoretic Text are: 1) Are the differences due to a radically different *Vorlage* which has been literally translated? 2) Are they due to a cultural and theological bias of the translator? 3) Are they due simply to stylistic factors? Each text must be examined individually and even then a clear-cut decision may not be possible.

Furthermore, the presupposition of a difference between Hebraic and Greek thinking and expressions may lead to a biased selection of the evidence, as Orłinsky demonstrates in his reviews of some of the comparative studies of the Septuagint and the Massoretic Text.¹² (Cf. also James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, 1961, who criticizes Thorleif Boman's *Das hebraische Denken im Vergleich mit dem Griechischen*, 1954.)

Having issued these caveats we may nonetheless profit from an examination of some of the studies that have been attempted, at the same time conscious that many of the problems have not been made explicit by the authors.¹³

The Book of Job.

Orłinsky sets forth for us the problem of the Septuagint Job as follows:

The Septuagint text of Job frequently lacks single stichoi and verses of the Hebrew text, and even groups of as many as 6 and 7 consecutive passages. In total length the Greek version contains approximately but five-sixths of the masoretic text. . . . There are very many instances in which the Septuagint text does not appear to correspond to the masoretic Hebrew text. Scholars generally have tended either to ignore the Septuagint text at these points, or else to emend the Hebrew text in accordance with the Septuagint.¹⁴

To account for the diminution of the LXX, commentators have assumed that the translator shortened his version; Orłinsky, on the other hand, posits a shorter Hebrew *Vorlage*.

In the September, 1949, *Journal of Biblical Literature* Henry Gehman of Princeton published "The Theological Approach of the Greek Translator of Job 1-15." This article assumed that the differences of the LXX need not be due to a different *Vorlage* or to stylistic factors but may in some cases be attributed to the theological bias of the translator. Although, as Orłinsky pointed out,¹⁵ this approach was not new—it had been used by Bickell in 1862 and Dhorme in 1926—it nonetheless inspired a number of other articles, and studies.

Among these was a monograph by Donald Gard, also of Princeton, entitled *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job*, 1952. In this work, Gard collects differences and categorizes them as follows: I. THEOLOGICAL TONING DOWN: arrogance of man before God avoided; removal of the name of God when its retention would detract from the perfect character of God; uses of prepositions to tone down ideas offensive to the Greek translator. II. ANTI-ANTHROPOMORPHISMS: the removal of references to parts of the human body or their functions; references to God as conforming to human behaviour removed; the removal of references to "Sons of God" and to human emotions or mental processes as applied to God. III. DETRACTION FROM THE PERFECT CHARACTER OF GOD AVOIDED: descriptions of God which are avoided or changed (e.g. as those which would portray God as acting arbitrarily); portrayals of God as the agent of destruction or the persecutor of man avoided or changed by the translator.

For example, the MT at Job 12:16 reads: "With him is strength and sound counsel; He that erreth and he that leadeth into error are his." Gard concludes

that the translator objected to the implication that one who led into error was also God's, for the LXX has: "With him is might and strength; He hath understanding and knowledge," and does not have the "offensive" second line. The MT at 11:5 reads: "But oh that God would speak and open his lips with thee!" The LXX lacks the anthropomorphic phrase of the second stich, and reads simply: "But how would the Lord speak to thee?"

In the MT of Job 16:13-4, Job describes God's violent treatment of him:

His archers compass me round about;
He cleaveth through my reins and doth not spare;
He poureth out my gall upon the ground;
He breaketh me with breach upon breach;
He runneth upon me like a warrior.

The LXX removes God from the picture as the one who inflicts these evils upon Job, and makes the subject an indefinite plural:

They surround me with lances;
Having thrown into my kidneys (and) not sparing,
They poured out my gall upon the ground; etc.
Gard concludes:

The examination of the evidence shows that the the translator, a representative of the Hellenistic-Jewish circles, in working on the Hebrew text of Job used a *Vorlage* which was close to that of M. Thus it was seen that the logical reason for the changes which the translator made in rendering this *Vorlage* into Greek is that he followed a method of exegesis which is governed by a theological approach.¹⁶

Orłinsky, on the other hand, in his reviews (of Gard's work in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, (1954), pp. 251-3; and of Charles T. Fritsch's *The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch*, 1943, in the *Crozer Quarterly*, (1944), pp. 156-160) and in his series of "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 1957, 1958, and 1958, has been quite critical of these studies. Orłinsky points out that an anti-anthropomorphic revision cannot be assumed throughout; e.g. God's "face" is translated literally three times out of six in Job. Other differences he ascribes to stylistic factors and not to any theological bias. (See also two studies by Orłinsky's students in HUCA, 1957: "The Septuagint of Isaiah 36-39 in Relation to that of 1-35, 40-66" by Marshall Hurwitz, and "The Treatment of Anthropomorphisms and Anthropopathisms in the Septuagint of Psalms," by Arthur Soffer.)

The Book of Proverbs

Like the Book of Job, Proverbs is classified with those renditions which employ paraphrases and free renderings.

The Greek Book of Proverbs includes maxims and illustrations derived from extraneous sources, and metrical considerations sometimes outweigh in the translator's mind faithfulness to his original.¹⁷

Gilis Gerleman of Lund has provided us with a study of the Septuagint Proverbs in his article, "The Septuagint Proverbs as a Hellenistic Document," in *Oud-testamentische Studien*, VIII, 1950, pp. 15-25, and in his book, *Studies in the Septuagint. III. Proverbs*, 1956. He finds that the Greek translator has effected a transformation both in style and in content. In the first category are the changes from the synonymous parallelism of the Hebrew into an antithetical parallelism in the Greek to avoid the "monotony of thought" that the former represented to one steeped in Greek style. For example, the MT in Proverbs 17:21 reads: "He that begetteth a fool doeth it to his sorrow, and the father of a fool hath no joy." The

LXX has: "A father rejoices not over an uninstructed son, but a wise son gladdens his mother." Another stylistic variation is the replacement of a Hebrew metaphor. For example, the MT in 10:7 reads: "the memory of the wicked shall rot." The LXX reads: "the memory of the wicked is extinguished."

With respect to content, Gerleman notes a tendency to "elucidate and strengthen the religious and ethical bias" of the proverbs. For example the MT 19:22 simply has: "a poor man is better than a liar." The LXX amplifies this to: "A poor man who is righteous is better than a rich liar." Gerleman points out that the industriousness inculcated by the Hebrew maxims bear "an unmistakable resemblance to the attitude incessantly combated, and despised by the Stoic: that of the fool, with all his substantial cares and troubles, his esteem of wealth, of industriousness as a way to success, his interest in social intercourse, good manners, etc."¹⁸ With this in mind it is interesting to note the transformation of Proverbs 14:23 which reads in the MT: "In all labour there is profit, but the talk of the lips tendeth only to penury." In the LXX this becomes: "With every one who is worried there is abundance, but the contented and unsusceptible to distress shall be in want." There is evidently a chiasmus here which means that only the poor will be free from sorrows, where as those who have abundance will also have anxieties.

Gerleman also believes that the differences between the MT and the LXX do not arise from a difference *Vorlage*, but that they arise from stylistic and "theological" factors. (cf. I.L. Seeligmann's reconstruction of Proverbs 11:16, where the MT has two *stichoi* and the LXX four. Seeligmann considers that the latter arose as a midrashic expansion of the former by the translator. "Indications of Editorial Alteration and Adaptation in the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint," *Vetus Testamentum*, 11 (April, 1961), pp. 218-9)

The Book of Ecclesiastes.

The Greek translation of Qoheleth is so literal that it was suggested by Graetz in 1871 that this might be the work of Aquila, Aquila was a convert from Christianity to Judaism, who lived in the reign of Hadrian (117-138) and who produced a slavishly literal translation of the Old Testament into Greek that was intended to set aside the interpretation of the LXX, in so far as the latter appeared to support the claims of Christianity. However, our Greek Qoheleth does not coincide with the portions of Aquila's translation which were recovered from the Cairo Geniza in 1897.¹⁹ In any case, because of the literalness of the rendition, one would not expect rich comparisons on the one hand, yet one would expect that the comparisons that could be made would have firmer support, on the other hand.

Georg Bertram has provided us with such a study in his "Hebraischer und griechischer Qohelet, ein Beitrag zur Theologie der hellenistischen Bibel," in the *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 64 (1952), pp. 26-49. His comparisons and conclusions are as follows: The keyword in M which is "breath of wind" (*hebel*) becomes "vanity" (*mataiotés*) in the LXX; that is, a concrete term is replaced by a moral-religious concept. In M one is concerned with the burden or the need to lengthen his life, to create and to earn something. In the LXX the physical burden has been replaced by a psychological burden of sin and unrest of soul. The special burden which God has placed on man as man is in the MT the curse lying on man as formulated in Genesis 3:17; in the LXX this burden becomes the tormenting of oneself with the quest for the meaning of life. The complaint against the transitoriness and senselessness of human striving in the MT is replaced with the accusation against the vanity and wilfulness of the human spirit in the LXX.

The phrase *r'ut ruah*, "chasing after wind," occurs seven times (1:14; 2:11, 17, 26, 4:4, 6; 6:9) and is regularly rendered in the LXX *proairesis pneumatos*,

"waywardness (lit. deliberate choice) of spirit." In 3:10, the difficult Hebrew word *ha'inyan* "to afflict with," or "to occupy with sore labor," is rendered by the Greek *perispaó* which means "to draw in different ways," "to distract."

On the whole, however, the impression which one receives in actually comparing the two texts side by side is that these variations are few and far between and seem like scant material with which to erect such an elaborate hypothesis. Bertram himself admits: "*Der Übersetzer geht unbefangen an seine Arbeit heran und hat keine andere Absicht als die der philologischen Genauigkeit.*"¹⁹ "The translator goes about his business without bias and has no interest other than that of philological exactness."

Indeed the translator in places renders idioms quite literally so as to lose the meaning of the original. For example the phrases *la' sot tob* and *ra'ah tob* in 3:12, 13 which mean "to be happy" and "to enjoy happiness" are translated quite literally: "to do good" and "to see good," *poiein agathon* and *idé agathon*. In 5:12 the Hebrew phrase *ra'ah holah*, literally "sick evil," which means a "grievous evil," is rendered *arróstia*, an "infirmity."

Most of the variations then between the MT and the LXX of Qoheleth are very slight, and are not even due to any pronounced stylistic patterns, much less to any discernible theological bias. They are simply the inevitable discrepancies of a translation.²⁰

Conclusion.

There has been a wholesome reaction against the former widespread tendency to regard the Massoretic Text as hopelessly corrupt and to make restorations at will on the basis of the Septuagint.²¹ The Dead Sea Scrolls have shown that the Massoretic Tradition represents a very ancient and stable tradition. Albright remarked in 1955:

The greatest textual surprise of the Qumran finds has probably been the fact that most of the scrolls and fragments present a consonantal text which is virtually indistinguishable from the text of corresponding passages in our Massoretic Bible.²²

This conviction of the basic trustworthiness of the MT has resulted, on the one hand, in a phenomenon such as Gordis' commentary on Ecclesiastes in which all the emendations of the MT proposed occupy only a single page instead of scores of pages! On the other hand, it has formed the basis for the Septuagintal comparisons of Gard, Gehman, Gerleman, etc., who seek wherever possible to explain the differences not on the basis of a different *Vorlage* but on the hypothesis of stylistic, theological, and other controlling factors. Others who are not so ready to assume the virtual identity of the Septuagint *Vorlage* with the MT, nonetheless acknowledge its usefulness. Seeligmann says: ". . . already in the above examples of the Hellenization of transliterations we could not refrain from relying on the Massoretic text as a starting point, and it is clear that in investigating the revisions which occurred in the Septuagint, as well as in any attempt to restore the original reading of this translation, a comparison with the Massoretic text may often prove enlightening."²³

On the other hand as already noted above the Dead Sea Scrolls have also given us texts which may belong to a "recension" closer to the LXX than the MT and which indicate that the LXX of the book of Samuel and of others are literal translations of the Hebrew *Vorlagen* which we now possess. These claims have been strenuously criticized by Professor Orlinsky, however. Moreover further studies on the Hagiographa manuscripts from Qumran are necessary before any final conclusions regarding the Sapiential Septuagint can be made.

We note in closing that the Qoheleth fragment from Qumran described by Muilenburg in BASOR, October, 1954, pp. 20-28, gives the *coup de grace* to Ginsberg's Aramaic theory for the origin of Qoheleth and shows that Qoheleth may have reached canonical status by 150 B.C.²⁴

58 Lexington
West Newton, Mass.

FOOTNOTES

- J. Coppens, *The Old Testament and the Critics* (Paterson, N.J.: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1942), p. 55. cf. also, W.F. Albright, "The War in Europe and the Future of Biblical Studies" in *The Study of the Bible, Today and Tomorrow*, ed. by Harold R. Willoughby (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1947) pp. 171, 173: "But so rapid has been the progress of discovery and interpretation of the primary Near Eastern sources that the average biblical scholar is relatively ignorant of their bearing on his speciality. . . . In the full tide of discovery and of application one may easily overlook pertinent facts and forget that it was not always so. As is well known, Wellhausen drew his basic scheme of religious and institutional development from Wilhelm Vatke, whose major work, *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*, appeared in 1835, when he was a young Hegelian enthusiast of only twenty-nine. In those years not a single ancient Near Eastern script except Egyptian had been deciphered, and Champollion's solution of the hieroglyphic puzzle, still incomplete and widely rejected, had yielded virtually no new historical results. For all one's admiration of the young *Privat-Dozent's* acumen, his judgments on ancient civilization and his antiquarian footnotes strike a qualified modern reader as grotesque. . . . European scholars were the first to see the utter lack of accord between Wellhausenism and ancient Near Eastern fact"
- Roland E. Murphy, *Seven Books of Wisdom*, (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1960; Murphy, Professor of Old Testament at the Catholic University of America writes: "On the other hand, there is much in the Sapiential Books that neither demands nor betrays any supernatural revelation. Certainly there are many conclusions concerning human affairs which could have been and were in fact reached by an Egyptian or Canaanite as well as by a Hebrew. Much of Proverbs 10ff., and of the book of Sirach (e.g., the table etiquette of Sir 31:12ff.) belongs to the common heritage of the ancient East. These teachings represent the body of traditional advice handed down from generation to generation among the scribes; this was the scholastic material that educated young men would be expected to know. It was within the designs of God's Providence that this be preserved and put down in writing—to be included among the books which he inspired." p. 156. See also: *Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East*, ed. by Martin Noth and D. Winton Thomas, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955); W.O.E. Oesterley, *The Wisdom of Egypt and the Old Testament*, (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1927); John Paterson, *The Book That Is Alive*, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954); O. S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature*, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936); Harry Ranston, *The Old Testament Wisdom Books and Their Teaching*, (London: Epworth Press, 1930); W. Baumgartner, "The Wisdom Literature," *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley; J. Coert Rylaarsdam, *Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946). Rylaarsdam notes: "Perhaps the greatest argument against Gunkel's theory that the Hebrew wisdom movement became religious at a relatively late date is the objection that this would comport rather badly with the movement's setting amid the older wisdom movements of the Orient, its relation to them and dependence upon them. A religious note occurs frequently in the Egyptian wisdom literature." p. 70.
- For general reference consult *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*, ed. by James B. Pritchard (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955); Samuel Noah Kramer, *History Begins at Sumer*, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959); W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960); J. J. Van Dijk, *La Sagesse Sumero-Accadienne*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953). For the Amenemope parallel to Proverbs see ANET, Oesterley *op. cit.*, and R. O. Kevin, *The Wisdom of Amen-Em-Apt and its Possible Dependence upon the Hebrew Book of Proverbs*, (Philadelphia: 1931). For the Ahikar parallel to Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, see ANET, F. C. Conybeare, J. R. Harris, and A. Smith Lewis, *The Story of Ahikar*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1913), and R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, vol. II, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), pp. 715-784.
- Harry Ranston, *Ecclesiastes and the Early Greek Wisdom Literature*, (London: Epworth Press, 1925). Ranston points out the diversity of opinions as to the alleged Greek influence in Qoheleth: "Can we find in the book of Ecclesiastes any traces of Greek language or thought? Some experts reply in the affirmative. Pfeiderer believes that Qoheleth shows dependence upon Heraclitus; while Tyler, Plumtre, Siegfried, Haupt, and others find what seem to them unmistakable traces of Stoic and Epicurean philosophy. Others (Driver, Peake, Wellhausen, Kuonen, Grieve, etc.) think that, while he never adopted the tenets of any particular school, he was influenced by an atmosphere of Greek thought. Still others (Julicher, A. B. Davidson, Cheyne, Barton, McNettle, Lukyn Williams etc.) answer in the negative." p. 11. Ranston himself believes that Ecclesiastes was influenced by some of the pre-Aeschylean lyric poets such as Theognis and Hesiod. C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature*, (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1949). "I cannot help feeling that the northern character of Ecclesiastes should be stressed, rather than its reputed 'very late' and 'Greek' character. It is basically not a philosophic treatise of Greece; and whatever Greek elements there may be in it must have come through Phoenician channels." p. 133.
- In addition to the recent studies on the Wisdom Books that will be discussed in the article, we may cite: Charles T. Fritsch, *The Anti-Anthropomorphisms of the Greek Pentateuch*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943). This was reviewed by Harry Orlinsky, in the *Crozer Quarterly*, (1944), 156-60. D. W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1959). This deals with the Greek Exodus. Henry Snyder Gehman, "Exegetical Methods Employed by the Greek Translator of I Samuel," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LXX (1950), 292-296. Other works that may serve as an orientation to Septuagintal studies are: H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1900); Henry St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1909); Richard R. Ottley, *A Handbook to the Septuagint*, (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.), 1920; Bledyn J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions*, (Car-

diff: University of Wales Press, 1951); Henry St. John Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1921); Frederic G. Kenyon, *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*, (London, Oxford University Press, 1933); C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935);

- For surveys of the current state of Septuagintal studies, see: Harry M. Orlinsky, "Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research," *The Study of the Bible, Today and Tomorrow*, ed. by Harold Willoughby; (Chicago: 1947); D. Winton Thomas, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," *The Old Testament and Modern Study*; W. F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 140 (1955), 27-33; H. M. Orlinsky, "Notes on the Present State of the Textual Criticism of the Judean Biblical Cave Scrolls," *A Stubborn Faith*, ed. by E. C. Hobbs (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1956); H. M. Orlinsky, "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Septuagint Text," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 78 (1959), 26-33; Frank Moore Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1961), 164-194. H. M. Orlinsky, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament" *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. C. Ernest Wright, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1961), 113-132.
- Cross, *op. cit.*, 173 ff. cf. also, Orlinsky, "Current Progress . . ." *op. cit.*, 145 f.
 - The Book of Joshua in Greek*, (Paris, 1931). cf. also by Max Margolis: "LAMBANEIN including compounds and derivatives and its Hebrew-Aramaic Equivalents in Old Testament Greek," *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, 22 (1905), 110-114; and "The Scope and Methodology of Biblical Philology," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, I (1910-11), pp. 5-41.
 - Raymond Bowman, "Old Testament Research between the Great Wars," in Willoughby, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-7.
 - Cross, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
 - Albright, "New Light . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 29.
 - Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint, its Use in Textual Criticism," *Biblical Archaeologist*, ix (1946), p. 26. See also his "Notes on the Present State"
 - Harry Orlinsky, Review of Gillis Gerleman, *Studies in the Septuagint, I Book of Job, I Chronicles, 1946, Journal of Biblical Literature*, 67 (1948), 381-90. Review of Donald H. Gard, *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job*, 1952, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 73 (1954), 251-3.
 - Gard, for example, makes no mention of the possible bearing of the scrolls and fragments from Qumran upon his thesis.
 - Harry Orlinsky, "Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job," *Hebrew Union College Annual*, XXVIII (1957), 53-54.
 - Ibid.*
 - Gard, *op. cit.*, p. 93.
 - Thackeray, *Grammar op. cit.*, 15.
 - Gerleman, "The Septuagint Proverbs . . ." *op. cit.*, 23.
 - A. H. McNeile, "Appendix I, The Greek Version of Qoheleth," *An Introduction to Ecclesiastes*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1904), 115 ff.
 - See for example the tables of the different readings of the MT, the LXX, and the Peshitta in Robert Gordis, *Qoheleth—the Man and His World*, (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary, 1951), 130 f., and *passim*.
 - Roberts, *op. cit.*, "Firstly, it is quite misleading to regard the versions as simply a storehouse for possible emendations, which require but to be retranslated into Hebrew." p. 273.
 - Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
 - Seeligmann, *op. cit.*, p. 216.
 - James Muilenburg, "A Qoheleth Scroll from Qumran," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 135 (October, 1954), 27-28. For the theory of the Aramaic origin of Ecclesiastes, see: H. Louis Ginsberg, *Studies in Qoheleth*, (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950); "Supplementary Studies in Qoheleth," *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, XXI (1952). In one instance Muilenburg claims that this fragment confirms the thesis of M. J. Dahood's "Canaanite-Phoenician influence in Qoheleth," *Biblica*, XXXIII (1952) 30-52, 191-221. See also Dahood's Qoheleth and Recent Discoveries, *Biblica*, XXXIX (1958), 302-318.