

will tell you that it is a young woman of marriageable age whether married or not. Actually you find the word never used of a little girl and always used of a young woman of marriageable and there is no evidence that it was ever used of a married woman. We have only nine cases. Here 200 years before Christ the LXX translators put down virgin, showing that they thought that this had the characteristics of virgin--a description of a pure, unmarried woman and therefore in the N.T. we read about the ten virgins, and the idea is not upon their being virgins but it is ten young women of which one of the characteristics is that of virginity. It would seem quite definitely provable from the Greek that that was what an alma was. One of the characteristics was that she was a virgin. It is very strong evidence that virgin is thought of here when we see how the LXX translated it. To say an alma will have a child would just as striking as to say that a virgin would bring forth a child. The statement as the professor made it was not so far from the facts but which as he gave it gave implications which are absolutely contrary to the implications of the case. Thus we see that the LXX can be of tremendous value to us in our understanding of the N.T. as showing what those men ~~thx~~ understood those phrases meant in the Hebrew before they had any reason to translate it in a certain way to prove Christianity to be true or false. It never even entered their heads to translate it thus. We have no idea who the translators were. Aquilla said that he was going to show exactly what the Hebrew said and did like the Concordant Version did out in Los Angeles. ^{He} ~~They~~ slavishly stayed by the Hebrew and consequently made a translation that didn't make sense and not the proper approach to language. For example he translates Gen. 1:1--In the beginning God created with the heaven and with the earth. It is very useful for textual purposes but absolutely useless for exegetical purposes, and if you don't know Heb. it makes no sense at all. Aquilla is very useful to find out what the text of the Heb. was but it is not much good for exegesis. On the other hand Theodician said that he would make a good flowing ~~translation~~ translation which would get the idea over and it is an entirely different type of translation. The three men had each a different approach to the problem and it is interesting to note in the Gospel of John, they, the quotations are more apt to be like Theodician than like the LXX which doesn't mean that John was written a second century after Theodician but shows that Theo. was basing his work on an earlier translation. These are three translations which are all different from each other. The bulk of them is lost though we have many references to them.