

Comparing the LXX and the MT is one of the more fascinating scholarly projects in this course of study and we note the following:

First, the LXX is considerably longer than the MT. It contains many additional phrases, etc., which are interesting and helpful. Whether they are credible readings or not is part of the problem.

Second, while the LXX has considerable value, it is not thought in this quarter that it should be given preferential status over the MT. Some Christians have suggested that, since the New Testament writers quote from the LXX, the Greek text must have been the concept of inspiration and so should be regarded as the official text. To this we offer the following notes:

--The great lack of uniform transmission of the LXX raises considerable doubt about any of our copies being an accurate text with regard to the original LXX mss.

--There is no assurance that the LXX used a Hebrew text in any sense superior to our present Hebrew Text.

--There is some real doubt as to whether or not the NT writers did, indeed, use the LXX as we know it. This is a hot point among scholars. There seems to be no doubt that the NT writers quoted often from a Greek text but was it substantially the same as our LXX? Sperber: A HISTORICAL GRAMMAR OF BIBLICAL HEBREW, p. 327 ff, finds 300 Old Testament Greek citations in Vaticanus (NT) which he thinks do not accord with the LXX. Virtually all writers note some of these and raise the question as to whether the NT writers were quoting a Greek translation or making one! The unlikely nature of the latter seems apparent but it has led to the conjecture that the NT church had before it at least two Greek translations: one in the LXX tradition and one perhaps in the tradition of the non-LXX fragments of the Greek texts from Qumran.

All of these facts point out that while the LXX is an enormously valuable work, it neither discredits, replaces, or annuls the Hebrew text.

Third, there are some salient factors in the LXX work that must be considered: