A CONSISTENCY AND AN INCONSISTENCY OF THE LEVITICUS TRANSLATOR

Philip Suciadi Chia

Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Email: pchia275@students.sbts.edu

Abstract. This paper has a few goals. First is to discover if the Greek translator of Leviticus uses literal (consistent) and / or free (inconsistent) translation technique. Then, this paper will list and group the evidences of the consistency of the Greek translator in this book. If there are any examples that show the inconsistency to the MT or looseness of the translator, then this paper will study every example carefully and it will categorize into a group. This group will be created based on the examples that share the same pattern or the similarities.

Keywords: Septuagint, Old Testament and Translation Technique.

INTRODUCTION

This paper has a few goals. First is to discover if the Greek translator of Leviticus uses literal (consistent) and / or free (inconsistent) translation technique. Then, this paper will list and group the evidences of the consistency of the Greek translator in this book. If there are any examples that show the inconsistency to the MT or looseness of the translator, then this paper will study every example carefully and it will categorize into a group. This group will be created based on the examples that share the same pattern or the similarities.

The comparison of MT and LXX will be used as the methodology of this paper. Every verse will be analyzed and presented in comparison format until chapter five to have a basic knowledge of the patterns and the characteristics of the Greek Translator. The patterns, however, will be scrutinized in the whole book of Leviticus.

In depth and a detailed analysis of this comparison will be put on the appendices. This methodology will be employed to accomplish the goals of this paper.

The Consistency of the Greek Translator

As the following examples will show, the translator is consistent in word order, preposition and the article, lexical meaning, cognate words, grammatical and on the syntax level.

The Word Order

1:5	וְשָׁתֵט אֶת־בֶּן	καὶ σφάξουσι τὸν μόσχον ἔναντι
	הַבָּקר לִפְגֵי	κυρίου καὶ
	יְהוָה	προσοίσουσιν οί
	וְהָקֶרִיבוּ בָּנֵי	υίοὶ Ααρων οί
		ίερεῖς τὸ αἶμα
	אַהַרָן הְלְּהַנִים	καὶ προσχεοῦσιν
	אָת־הַלַּם	τὸ αἷμα ἐπὶ τὸ

τοῦ μαρτυρίου

θυσιαστήριον κύκλφ τὸ ἐπὶ τῶν Τζτ θυρῶν τῆς σκηνῆς

In 1:5, the translator follows the word order of MT perfectly. The first sentence consists of conjunctive (and), the verb and the subject (implicit), the article and the object, the preposition and the Lord. The following sentence contains: conjunctive (and), the verb and the article + the explicit subject, the article and the object. The last sentence consists of conjunctive (and), the verb and the subject (implicit), the article and object, the preposition + noun, relative pronoun, and the preposition + noun.

This "consistency" pattern of word order also appears in 1:1; 1:2a; 1:3; 1:4; 1:5; 1:6; 1:7; 1:8; 1:9; 1:10a; 1:11; 1:12 "καὶ διελοῦσιν αὐτὸ κατὰ μέλη καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὸ στέαρ" and "ἐπὶ τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου"; 1:13, 14, 1:15; 1:16; 1:17; 2:1; 2:2; 2:3; 2:5; 2:7; 2:8; 2:9; 2:10; 2:11; 2:12, 2:14-16; 3:3; 3:4, 3:6; 3:7; 3:8, 3:9a, 3:10-15; 3:16; 3:17, 4:1-3; 4:6, 4:10, 4:11-15; 4:16-17; 4:19-35; 5:1; 5:3-9; 5:11-15, 5:18, 5:20-22.

The Preposition and the Article

3:5	טִירוּ אֹתוֹ בְנֵי־אַהָּרֹן הַמִּוְבֵּחָה עַל־ הָעֹלָה אֲשֶׁר עַל־הָעֵצִים אֲשֶׁר עַל־ הָאֵשׁ אִשֵּׁה רֵיחַ נִיחֹחַ לֵיהוָה	καὶ ἀνοίσουσιν αὐτὰ οἱ υἰοὶ Ααρων οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐπὶ τὰ ὁλοκαυτώματα ἐπὶ τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κάρπωμα ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας κυρίφ
-----	---	--

In 3:5, the translator does not only follow (copy) all the prepositions and the articles, but also translate them in the literal meaning such as preposition in Greek:עַל for έπὶ.

The Lexical Meaning

The Greek translator consistently translates "בהמה" or cattle as owned and used by man as "κτῆνος" (1:2; 7:25-25; 11:3, 26, 39, 46; 19:19, 20:16, 25; 24:18, 25:7; 26:22, 27:9-11, 26, 28). This translator also transliterates לבנה and it becomes λίβανον in Leviticus 2:1-2.

The Cognate Words

The following examples will show that the translator has a keen eye for the cognate words.

2:13	וֹכָל־קַרְ <u>בַּ</u> ן	καὶ πᾶν δῶρον
	מִנְחָתְּךְּ	θυσίας ύμῶν ἀλὶ
	בַּמַלַח	<mark>άλισθήσεται</mark> οὐ διαπαύσετε ἄλα
	*	διαθήκης κυρίου ἀπὸ
	תִּמְלָח וְלֹא	θυσιασμάτων ύμῶν
	תַּלְשְׁבִּית	έπὶ παντὸς δώρου
	מֶלַח בְּרִית	ύμῶν προσοίσετε
	אֱלֹהֶיךּ מֵעַל	κυρίφ τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν
	מִנְחָתֶּךְ עַל	ἄλας
	כָּל־קָּוְרָּ	
	תַּקְרִיב מֶלַח	
5:12	הַבִּיאַה אֵל־	καὶ οἴσει αὐτὸ πρὸς
	הֵי הַכֹּהֵן וְקַמֵּץ	τὸν ἱερέα καὶ
		δραξάμενος ὁ ἱερεὺς
	הַכֹּהֵן מִמֶּנָה	ἀπ' αὐτῆς πλήρη τὴν
	מְלוֹא קַמְצוֹ	δράκα τὸ
	אַת־	μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς
	•	έπιθήσει έπὶ τὸ
	אַזְכָּרָתָה	θυσιαστήριον τῶν
	וְהַקְּטִיר	ολοκαυτωμάτων ************************************
	הַמִּזְבֵּחָה עַל	κυρίφ ἁμαρτία ἐστίν

אָשֵׁי יְהוָה
חַטָּאת הָוא

In 2:13, the translator maintains the cognate words of salt (π/π): in Hebrew) for both noun and verb; and he uses wordplay in his translation ἀλὶ (in dative case as a substitute for a preposition 2 in Hebrew) and ἀλισθήσεται (ἀλίζω is the lexical form). In 5:12, the translator also keeps the cognate words of grasp with hand (π/μ): in Hebrew) for both noun and verb: δράκα and δραξάμενος.

Grammatical Level

	Grammat	icai Levei
2:4	תקרב וְכִי מְנְחָה קְרְבַּן מַנּוּר מַאֲפָה תַלּוֹת סֹלֶת בְּלוּלֹת מֵצֹת וְּרְקִיקִי מַצּוֹת מָצֵּוֹת בָּשָׁמֶן	ἐὰν δὲ προσφέρη δῶρον θυσίαν πεπεμμένην ἐν κλιβάνῳ δῶρον κυρίῳ ἐκ σεμιδάλεως ἄρτους ἀζύμους πεφυραμένους ἐν ἐλαίῳ καὶ λάγανα ἄζυμα διακεχρισμένα ἐν ἐλαίῳ
2:10	יהילת ק <mark>הנוֹתֶרְת</mark> לְאַהָרו וּלְבָנָיו לְדָשׁ קַדָשִׁים מֵאִשֵׁי יְהוָה מֵאִשֵׁי יְהוָה	τὸ δὲ καταλειφθὲν ἀπὸ τῆς θυσίας Ααρων καὶ τοῖς υἰοῖς αὐτοῦ ἄγια τῶν ἀγίων ἀπὸ τῶν καρπωμάτων κυρίου

In 2:4, two Hebrew verbs are בְּלוּלת and מְשַׁחִים in *qal* passive participle plural form.

They have been formed into two Greek participles perfect passive accusative plural:

πεφυραμένους and διακεχρισμένα. In 2:10, notice how precise the Greek translator is to translate every element in יְהֵנוֹתֶּהָח. It consists of particle conjunction; π article; verb is *niphal* participle feminine singular absolute. He translates τὸ δὲ καταλειφθὲν which contains the same elements in καταλειφθὲν which contains the same elements in καταλεισμέν τὸ is the particle conjunction; τὸ is the article; and a verb from participle aorist passive nominative neuter singular from καταλείπω. He translates with a slight different order than the MT; LXX: article, conjunction and verb, MT, on the other hand, has conjunction, article and verb.

Syntax Level

This pattern appears also in 1:3, 10, 14, 3:1 [4x], 6, 7, 12, 4:2, 3, 13, 22, 27, 32;5:23; 6:11, 20 [2x], 23; 7:12, 18 [2x]; 20; 11:32, 33 [2x, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39; 12:2, 5, 8; 13:2, 4, 7, 9, 12, 16, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 47, 51, 52, 53, 54, 56, 57; 14:21, 36, 43, 48; 15:2, 4 [2x], 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23 [2x], 24, 25, [2x], 26, 28, 31; 17:16; 19:5, 6, 7, 20, 33; 20:2, 4, 6, 11, 12, 14, 17; 21:9, 17; 22:6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 29; 24:15, [2x], 19, 25:2, 14 [2x], 20 [2x], 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 35, 39, 47, 49, 51, 52, 54; 26:3, 14, 18, 21, 23, 27; 27:5, 7 [3x]; 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 26 [2x], 27 [2x], 28, 29, 31, 32, 33. The examples below are a part of clause of one verse.

1:2	כִּי־יַקְרִיב מִכֶּם	ἐὰν προσαγάγῃ
	קַרְבָּן לַיהנָה	δῶρα τῷ κυρίῳ
2:4	תַקְרַב כִיוָ	έὰν δὲ προσφέρη
	מִנְחָה קָרְבַּן	δῶρον θυσίαν
4:2	בִּי־יַקְרִיב מִכֶּם	ἐὰν ἁμάρτη ἔναντι
	קָרְבָּן לַיהוָה קרָבָּן לַיהוָה	κυρίου ἀκουσίως
5:15	נֶפֶשׁ כִּי־תִּמְעֹל	ψυχὴ ἐὰν λάθη
	מַעַל וְחָטְאָה	αὐτὸν λήθη καὶ
	בִּשְׁגָגָה	ἀμάρτη ἀκουσίως
5:21	נֶפֶשׁ כִּי תָחֱטָא	ψυχὴ ἐὰν ἁμάρτη
	וּמָעֲלָה מַעַל	καὶ παριδὼν
	בַּיהנָה	παρίδη τὰς ἐντολὰς
		κυρίου

The MT uses three particles (אָם ; בְּיי) and qal imperfect to introduce the conditional clause. The Greek translator, on the other hand, uses ἐὰν plus subjunctive to match the syntax in the Hebrew text to create conditional clause; ἐὰν is not only a marker of condition as BDAG states, but also it is a marker of a new paragraph or idea in the book of Leviticus.

The Inconsistency of the Greek Translator

There are some reasons why the Greek translator does not follow MT: being faithful to the Greek, clarification, emphasis, Idiomatic / Stylistic Translation, homoioteleuton/ homeoarchy, smooth translation reason, avoiding repetition, and unpointed-text problem.

Faithful to the Greek.

This category has a definition that the Greek translator is consistent with the literary structure and Greek grammar while translating. The translator, therefore, has to unfollow (be unfaithful) to MT.

The Article in Greek.

This pattern appears in 1:4, 10, 3:2, 8, 13; 4:4, 15, 24, 29, 33; 8:9, 12, 14, 18, 22; 14:18, 29, 16:21; 21:10, 24:14.

16:21	על ראש	έπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν
-------	--------	-----------------

In the whole book of Leviticus, MT does not have article before the head (על) and after the preposition on (על). The translator, however, puts an article consistently throughout the entire book.

The 'Sentence' Pattern in Sacrificial Offering.

1.10	וְאָם־מָן־הַצֵּאֹן	έὰν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν
1:10	קַרְבָּנוֹ מָן־	προβάτων τὸ δῶρον
	הַכְּשָׂבִים אוֹ	αὐτοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπό
	מָן־הָעִזִּים	τε τῶν ἀρνῶν καὶ
	לְעֹלָה זָכָר	τῶν ἐρίφων εἰς
	הַּמִים יַקְרִיבֶנּוּ	όλοκαύτωμα ἄρσεν
		ἄμωμον προσάξει
		αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπιθήσει
		τὴν χεῖρα ἐπὶ τὴν
		κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ

Notice that MT does not have the red words in Greek. In other words, the translator adds this clause. This additional clause appears 5 times both in Hebrew and Greek in Leviticus (1:4; 4:4, 24, 29, 33). This clause is always preceded by a particular animal (1:4 is cattle; 4:4 is calf; 4:24 is a kid of goats, a male without blemish; 4:29 is a kid of goats, a female without blemish; and 4:32 is lamb, a female without blemish), and followed by a clause: they shall kill it (1:4; 4:4, 24, 29, 33). MT, however, does not maintain this pattern only in verse 1:10. The translator, on the other hand, keeps this pattern as we see in those verses. om this information, the Greek translator, therefore, is more consistent than MT in providing this pattern: a specific animal, laying his hand on the head and slaying the animal.

Clarification

The previous section illustrated a few places where the translator is different from the MT because of his faithfulness to the Greek grammar and sentence pattern. This section, moreover, will illustrate places where the translator has clarified MT.

The Lexical Meaning

1:5	זרק	προσχέω
-----	-----	---------

דרק , in *qal* form, has a few meaning such as toss, sprinkle and throw. The translator, nevertheless, limits the definitions of word זרק; by translating as προσχέω: to pour on/ to (see also 1:5, 11; 3:2, 8, 13; &:2, 14, 8:19, 24, 9:12, 18, 17:6). For sprinkle, Greek translator uses προσραίνω. In other word, the translator uses the word 'προσχέω' to clarify and specify זרק to his Greek readers.

Grammatical Level

1:2 דַּבֵּר	λάλησον
-------------	---------

The translator uses aorist imperative for *piel* imperative mood in Hebrew. It seems the translator employs aorist imperative to specify his discussion to burnt offering (compare Lev. 4:2). As Wallace states that the difference between aorist and present imperative is the aorist is most frequently used for a specific command rather than a general precept (usually the domain of the present).

The Ending Marker of Literary Structure

The translator adds the clause above which MT does not have. It seems that the translator adds this clause arbitrarily. The data, however, disapprove this view. This clause also appears in Leviticus 19:22 and

this clause serves as an ending marker of the discussion. In addition, a clause 'ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ' is always employed to close a discussion and before starting a new topic (4:26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18, 26; 19:22). In summary, the translator adds 'ῆς ἥμαρτεν καὶ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ ἡ ἀμαρτία' because he is consistent with his literary structure' marker which helps his readers to be aware of a closing section.

Singular translated with Plurals

2:6	is using אֹתָה	αὐτὰ (accusative
	suffix 3 fs.	neuter plural)

MT employs singular form; the translator, on the other hand, utilizes plural form. Based on the context, the translator is being consistent to the plurality of the subject in Greek: ἄζυμα (2:5).

Emphasis

This section will illustrate places where the translator has a stronger nuance than MT; either put emphasis on the subject or the action.

The Subject through Grammatical Selection

2:11	הַעְּשֶׂה is verb	ποιήσετε: verb
	niphal	indicative future
	imperfect 3rd	active 2nd person
	person	plural from
	feminine	ποιέω.
	singular from	
	עשה.	

There are many discrepancies from the table

5:6	ής ήμαρτεν καὶ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ ἡ
	άμαρτία

observation above, except the future aspect and the lexical meaning. The translator obviously puts emphasis on the subject (the ones who offer), instead of the offering like what MT communicates. In summary, the translator focusses on the responsibility of the offerer through grammatical selection.

The Action through Additional Verb

The translator adds δεῖ here to put emphasis on action about things that should have not been done as it is viewed as breaking the law of God. As BDAG states, "it is necessary of happening of the compulsion of law or custom".

Idiomatic / Stylistic Translation

The main characteristic of the Greek translator is using idiomatic and stylistic expression. This use is all over the book of Leviticus: on suffix, article, form, noun, verb, meaning (synonym) of the word, preposition / conjunction, relative particle, adverb, and independent pronoun. All information and examples will be presented in appendices. This section, however, will exhibit some of those categories and one or a few examples of each of them.

On Hebrew Suffix

The translator translates the suffix in Hebrew either with an article in Greek or personal pronouns interchangeably.

Article	Personal Pronoun
1:4 Greek replaces 3 ms suffix in Hebrew with the article τὴν before χεῖρα. 1: 12, 15, 16; 1:12 τὸ στέαρ; 1:9: τὰ δὲ ἐγκοίλια; τοὺς πόδας; 3:2 τοῦ δώρου (compare to σφάξει αὐτὸ on the same verse); 3:13 on τὸ αἶμα; 4:6 on τὸν δάκτυλον; 4:11, 4:17 τὸν δάκτυλον; 4:24, 33 on τὴν χεῖρα; 4:25, 30, 34 on τῷ δακτύλῳ; 5:1, 17 on τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, 5:24 on τῆ κεφαλῆ, τοῖς ἀκρωτηρίοις καὶ τῆ κοιλίᾳ καὶ τῆ κόπρῳ (compare to πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν σάρκα on the same verse).	4:15 (τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν), 26 (τὸ πᾶν στέαρ αὐτοῦ), 30 (αὐτῆς τῷ δακτύλῳ), 32 (τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ), 35 (πᾶν αὐτοῦ τὸ στέαρ); 5:3 (ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας αὐτοῦ), 8 (τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ), 18 (τῆς ἀγνοίας αὐτου).

On Verb

The translator tends to employ participle as a substitute of verbal form in Hebrew. Evans, in verbal syntax in the Greek Pentateuch, states that in all Pentateuchal books, there is a greater tendency for the present and perfect participles to be used in rendering Hebrew participles, other adjectives, and nouns (including Hebrew infinitives), but for the aorist participle to render Hebrew finite verbal forms. Second, Thackeray and Hanson mention, "where the participial construction is used in the Pentateuch, it is often rendered more idiomatic by varying the verb". Below are a few examples:

1.6		2 2 1
1:6	ָוְהָ פְ שִׁיט אֶת־	καὶ ἐκδείραντες τὸ
	הָעֹלָה וְנִתַּח אֹתָה	όλοκαύτωμα
	לְנְתָּחֶיהָ	μελιοῦσιν αὐτὸ
		κατὰ μέλη
2:8	וְהַבֵּאתָ אֶת־	καὶ προσοίσει τὴν
	הַמִּנְחָה אֲשֶׁר	θυσίαν ἣν ἂν ποιῆ
	יֵנְשֶׂה מֵאֵלֶה	έκ τούτων τῷ
	לֵיהנָה וְהִקְרִיבָה	κυρίφ καὶ
	אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן וְהָגִּישָׁהּ	προσοίσει πρός τὸν
	אֶל־הַמִּזְבַּח	ίερέα καὶ
		προσεγγίσας πρός
		τὸ θυσιαστήριον
4:5a	וְלָקַח הַכֹּהֵן	καὶ λαβὼν ὁ ἱερεὺς
	הַמָּשִׁיחַ מִדַּם הַפָּר	ό χριστός ἀπὸ τοῦ
		αἵματος τοῦ
		μόσχου
5:12	וְקָמֵץ הַכֹּהֵן מִמֶּנָּה	δραξάμενος ὁ
	מְלוֹא קַמְצוֹ	ίερεὺς ἀπ' αὐτῆς
		πλήρη τὴν δράκα

This observation denotes that the Greek participle has an idiomatic function to Hebrew finite verbal forms.

On Relative Particle (אֵשֶר)

The translator employs the article in Greek and relative pronoun interchangeably to translate this relative particle.

Article	Personal Pronoun
1:8, 12, 17; 3:5	2:8, 11 (τὴν θυσίαν ἢν
(τὰ ξύλα τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ	ἂν ποιῆ ἐκ τούτων), 4:3
πυρὸς), 9 (τὸ στέαρ	(περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας
τῆς κοιλίας); 4:8	αὐτοῦ <mark>ἦς</mark> ἥμαρτεν), 4:9
(πᾶν τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπὶ	(ὄ ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῶν
τῶν ἐνδοσθίων), 4:9	μηρίων), 13 (η οὐ
(τὸ στέαρ τὸ ἐπ'	ποιηθήσεται), 14, 18 (<mark>ὄ</mark>
αὐτῶν), 18 (πρὸς <mark>τῆ</mark>	έστιν ένώπιον κυρίου; ὄ
θύρα); 5:8 (τὸ περὶ	έστιν ἐν τῆ σκηνῆ τοῦ
τῆς ἁμαρτίας).	μαρτυρίου).

On Independent Pronoun

The last example of idiomatic or stylistic pattern is on independent pronoun. Table below is the places in which the translator leaves independent pronoun untranslated.

3:1	אָם־זָכָר מַקְרִיב הוּא	προσαγάγη ἐάν τε
	אָם־נְקַבָה	ἄρσεν ἐάν τε θῆλυ
5:3	הואוָ	δὲ γνῷ καὶ
	וְאָשֵׁם יָדַע	πλημμελήση

The next table is the places where he translates an independent pronoun as demonstrative pronoun or personal pronoun or ἐστιν.

5:1	עד הואן	καὶ <mark>οὖτος</mark> μάρτυς
		(demonstrative
		pronoun)
5:18	לא־ הוּא וְ	καὶ <mark>αὐτὸς</mark> οὐκ ἤδει
	יָדַע	(personal pronoun)
11:20	הוא שֶׁקֶץ	βδελύγματά ἐστιν ὑμῖν
	לָכֶם	(ἐστιν)

Based on this observation, the translator leaves this independent pronoun untranslated for a few times (3:1, 7, 5:2, 3). Sometimes, he translates it as demonstrative pronoun (5:1) and personal pronoun (5:18) and uses ¿στιν for the rest. It brings to the conclusion that he handles this independent pronoun in HT in various ways.

Homoioteleuton / Homeoarchy

Homoioteleuton means the "same ending". Homoioteleuton occurs when two words / phrases / lines end the same sequences of letters. The scribe, having finished copying the first, skips to the second, omitting al intervening words. Homeoarchy refers to eye-skip when the beginnings of two lines are similar.

2.0	הָקְרִיב מָזֶּבַח,	καὶ προσοίσει ἀπὸ
3:9	הַשְּׁלָמִים אִשֶּׁה	τῆς θυσίας τοῦ
	לֵיהנָה חֶלְבּוֹ	σωτηρίου κάρπωμα
	הָאַלְיָה תְמִימָה	τῷ θεῷ τὸ στέαρ
	לְעֻמַת הֶעָצֶה	καὶ τὴν ὀσφὺν
	יְסִירֶנָּה וְאֶת־	ἄμωμον σὺν ταῖς
	ַהַחֶלֶב הַ מְכַסֶּה	ψόαις περιελεῖ αὐτό
	אֶת־הֶקֶּרֶב וְאֵת	καὶ τὸ στέαρ τῆς
	כָּל־הַחֵלֶב אֲשֶׁר	κοιλίας
	עַל־הַקֶּרֶב	

In 3:9, the translator probably misses that line / phrase since there are two clause that contains the words of fat and entrails. There are two arguments to support this theory. First is the characteristic of Greek translator; he always translates the Hebrew words, either being consistent or his work is being idiomatic / stylistic translation, and adds more words to clarify MT. He never leaves a clause or even a phrase being untranslated. The last argument is the comparison of this verse with verse 3:3, 14 and 4:8; because the translator translates both clauses that contains the words of fat and entrails in those three verses. Leviticus 3:9 is the only occurrence that the translator only translates one clause and leaves the other clause.

Smooth Translation

The other characteristic of the Greek translator is a proneness to smoothen his translation through preposition and the usage of adverb.

Preposition

There are a few more examples in the appendices.

5:16	וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר	καὶ ὃ ἥμαρτεν ἀπὸ
	-חָטָא מָן	τῶν ἁγίων ἀποτείσαι
	הַלְּדָשׁ יְשַׁלֵּם	αὐτὸ καὶ τὸ

וְאֶת־חֲמִישָׁתוֹ	ἐπίπεμπτον
יוֹסֵף עָלָיו	προσθήσει ἐπ' αὐτὸ
וְנָתַן אֹתוֹ	καὶ δώσει αὐτὸ τῷ
לַכֹּהֵן וְהַכֹּהֵן	ίερεῖ καὶ ὁ ίερεὺς
יְכַפֵּר עָלָיו	έξιλάσεται <mark>περὶ</mark>
בְּאֵיל הָאָשָׁם	<mark>αὐτοῦ</mark> ἐν τῷ κριῷ τῆς
וְנָסְלַח לוֹ	πλημμελείας καὶ
	ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ
	αφεσησειαι αυτφ

In 5:16, there are two עָלָיוּ in MT. The translator, nevertheless, translates in two different forms: (1) ἐπ' αὐτὸ, and (2) περὶ αὐτοῦ. These two different translations of preposition על tells us that the translator does not employ a rigid translation, but he smoothens it according to the Greek grammar.

Adverb

5:22	ָגִשְׁבַּע עַל־שָׁקֶר	όμόση ἀδίκως
5:24	אַשֶׁר־יִשְׁבַע	οὖ ὤμοσεν περὶ
	עָלָיו לַשֶּׁקֶר	αὐτοῦ ἀδίκως

In 5:22, נְשְׁבֵע עֵל־שָׁקָר is translated as he swore on (the basis of) deception (literal translation). Instead of employing a preposition for preposition, the translator uses adverb to smoothen his translation: if he swore unjustly. This phenomenon also appears in 5:24 (קַשֶּׁקֶר : by deception; it consists of preposition; article; קֹי noun ms absolute). The translation of MT will be, "which he swore on (about) it with the deception". In order to produce a smooth translation, the translator ignores the preposition and the article in Hebrew and uses the adverb. The Greek translates, "which he swore concerning it unjustly".

Questionable Examples of Clarification

There are some of questionable examples of the Greek translator such as the words that has not been translated.

The Word

1:14	וְאָם מָן־הָעוֹף	ἐὰν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν
	עֹלָה קָרְבָּנוֹ	πετεινῶν κάρπωμα
	לֵיהנָה וְהִקְרִיב	προσφέρης δῶρον
	מָן־הַתֹּרִים אוֹ	τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ
	מָן־ <mark>בְּנֵי</mark> הַיּוֹנָה	προσοίσει ἀπὸ τῶν
	אֶת־קֶרְבָּנוֹ	τρυγόνων ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν
		περιστερῶν τὸ
		δῶρον αὐτοῦ

Based on the word study of בְּנֵי הַיּּוֹנָה, this is the *only* verse in which the translator does not add the word νεοσσός in Greek or young (compare to 5:7, 11; 12:6, 8; 14:22, 30; 15:14, 29). It could be just an idiomatic / stylistic expression. Nonetheless, the fact that this is the *only* verse with stylistic expression, it makes this view questionable.

3:11	וְהָקְטִירוֹ	ἀνοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς ἐπὶ τὸ
	הכֹהַן	θυσιαστήριον ὀσμὴ
	הַמִּזְבַּחָה לֶ <mark>חֶם</mark>	εὐωδίας κάρπωμα
	אָשֶׁה לַיהנָה	κυρίφ
3:16	וְהָקְטִירָם	καὶ ἀνοίσει ὁ ἱερεὺς
	הכֹהֵן	έπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον
	הַמִּזְבַּחָה לֶ <mark>חֶם</mark>	κάρπωμα ὀσμὴ
	אָשֶׁה לְרֵים	εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ πᾶν
	נִיחֹחַ כָּל־	τὸ στέαρ τῷ κυρίῳ
	חֵלֶב לַיהנָה	

In those two verses, the translator does not translate לְּחֶם. The word study of אָסֶׁם shows that the translator translates לְּחֶם as δῶρα or gifts in Leviticus 7:13; 21:6, 8, 17, 21, 22; 22:25; the rests are ἄρτος: bread / loaf. Further study is needed to examine the usage of בְּחֶם in the book of Leviticus and why the translator leaves לְחֶם untranslated in 3:11 and 3:16.

Conclusion

In light of the examples collected in this paper, one cannot immediately assume that the translator is always consistent or inconsistent to MT. This paper shows that the translator is both consistent and inconsistent with MT. Nonetheless, see someone cannot inconsistencies of translation as an arbitrary work. In addition, Dines states that these alterations are intended, apparently, to improve the Greek style. For other reasons for inconsistency, Wevers and Taylor state that the translator loves to translate a recurring Hebrew collocation in various ways, while remaining close to the original; he creates new idioms while necessary, especially when finding Greek equivalents for the technical cultic terms in which the book abounds.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] Dines, Jennifer M. *The Septuagint*. London: T. & T. Clark, 2004.
- [2] Evans, T. V. Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference 1st Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- [3] Köhler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament*. 3 vols. [1st English ed.]. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1994.
- [4] Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- .[5] Taylor, Bernard A. (ed.) (1997) *IX Congress Volume of the IOSCS, 1995.*Chico CA: Scholars Press.

KERUGMA, VOLUME 2 NUMBER 1 APRIL 2019

- [6] Thackeray, H. St. J. and K.C Hanson. A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint. USA: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2008.
- [7] Wallace, Daniel. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan. 1997.
- [8] Wevers, J. W. (1991) 'The Göttingen Pentateuch: Some Post-Partem [sic] Reflections', in *Cox* 1991.