

The LXX was translated about 200 B.C. Our Hebrew manuscripts were all from a much later time. It is entirely possible that the LXX preserved for us a translation of a Hebrew which has since been corrupted and most critical scholars about 30 years ago had a tendency to wherever the LXX and the Hebrew disagreed, say that the LXX is right and the Hebrew had been incorrectly transmitted. However, it is now quite the opposite in the case of most scholars because we discover as we find archeological evidences bearing on the scriptures that at point after point they exactly agree with the wording of the \_\_\_\_\_ text while at point after point they are strikingly at variance with the reading of the LXX. And there are many cases where the LXX is just on the face of it utterly wrong. And this we must say; the LXX was translated from a Hebrew at a much earlier time than the Hebrew which we have now, but the Hebrew Bible which we have has always been preserved with great care. Errors have crept in, no matter how careful you are they will creep in, but the creeping in of errors to our Hebrew Bible has been at a very very slow rate because such great care has been kept in preserving them. On the other hand the LXX was just a translation in a common language for ordinary use, nobody thought of it among the Jews as a sacred book and no great effort was made to keep it free from error in copying. That is perfectly obvious when you look at the proper names for you find that the proper names of the LXX are so twisted around that often you can hardly know what they are. which simply/just ordinary care in copying <sup>shows</sup> instead of the extreme care so I would say that in most cases the Hebrew is right and the LXX is wrong if there is a difference. But there is always the possibility that the LXX has preserved for us a correct reading. Question by student. No, I would say that if the N.T. builds an argument upon something which is in the LXX and not in our present Hebrew that is quite conclusive proof that the original Hebrew had this in it and not what our present Hebrew has, but if the N.T. simply quotes a passage and included in that passage are some matters which in the LXX are different from our present it may be that it is simply referring to that passage and not bothering to give you a new translation of these points in which the LXX is erroneous. The oldest thing we have, I believe, is either manuscript B or Aleph. About a century after that time there seems to have been an attempt to reach a uniform \_\_\_\_\_ which combined and ironed out many disagreements among manuscripts so the question of the LXX text is a very involved one. We are far surer of our N.T. text than