CHAPTER THREE

CONCLUSIONS

1. MAIN CONCLUSIONS

This study has produced conclusions on a number of issues. It has firstly become clear that the translator of Proverbs (Chapters 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 25, 29, 30 and 31) must be awarded a unique position in the whole order of Greek translators. His unique approach is clearly observed in four areas, on a lexical, syntactic and stylistic/literary level as well as in regards to what I have called “theological/exegetical” perspectives. He has a clearly defined approach towards his parent text which, in terms of my analysis of his translation technique, has to be described as a free rendering of his parent text. This definition served as a foundation for the interpretations I offered in respect of a number of remarkable additions, omissions and adaptations. I nevertheless indicated that he displayed a striking combination of unity and diversity in this regard. On a lexical level in many instances he used an array of lexemes in order to describe a single Hebrew lexeme, but in other cases he applied a small number. Although I have not quantified this textual phenomenon, it has become clear that the translator’s flexible attitude to his subject matter is most conspicuous. The bottom line of his approach can be defined as the drive to make the intention of his parent text, as he understood it, evident to his readers.

In order to meet this fundamental intention he went to remarkable lengths in his rendering of the Semitic text before him. With an inquiring eye on this text, he applied all his knowledge to ensure that his readers would not form a false idea of what this text actually meant. A characteristic tendency was his intention to explicate his parent text. This can be observed clearly on a lexical level. The translator reveals a unique approach in that he made use of a remarkably large number of unique lexemes. The conclusion which Aejmelaeus¹ has drawn in

¹ Aejmelaeus, On the Trial of the Septuagint Translators, pp. 116-130.
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connection with the translator of Exodus, who also applied numerous new words, is applicable to the translator of Proverbs as well. He should be seen as an extremely competent translator, perhaps another one of the best. I presented abundant evidence that this translator was well versed in the Greek language. He evidently had an excellent education. This can be gleaned from his remarkable *stylistic* approach, which reaches a climax in Prov 8, the *locus classicus* of all creation passages. In this chapter the translator, apparently for stylistic reasons, added stichs in order to complete the structural beauty of the chapter, which is only partly harmonious in the Hebrew (MT). In some instances the translator also took account of stylistic considerations when using specific exegetical renderings. I quoted a number of additions that can only be understood in such a manner (for example Prov 8:13). But in many instances it was a nuanced combination of the stylistic and “religious” considerations that led to the application of exegetical renderings. The addition of the adjective καλὴ in the combination καλὴ βουλὴ for בּוּלָה in Prov 2:11 is a primary example. It is exactly these exegetical/theological perspectives that put us in the position to arrive at conclusions as to the religious disposition of this translator. And in this respect too he exhibits a unique approach.

Secondly, therefore, it is possible to conclude that this translator had a specific intention in his translation. From the conclusions I drew in respect of each chapter it has become clear that this translation should be seen as a religious document. The translator obviously had a “religious” intention in his rendering.

He also reveals a certain conspicuous systematisation in his approach towards his subject matter. This approach clearly was determined by the subject matter of a specific translation unit. For example, in Prov 1 and 2 contrasts and dualisms are the order of the day. I have indicated that this translator usually takes a cue from his underlying Hebrew text in stressing some “theological” issue. In other cases, however, he simply inserts interpretations without direct reference to this parent text. This is the case in the large number of dualisms I located in Chapters 1 and 2. However, this phenomenon was also encountered outside of these two chapters. I demonstrated that the translator even changed the order of a chapter in the LXX on account of such a contrast.

In other instances, such as in connection with Prov 9, this